

Cash Transfer Programmes on Refugees welfare in Uganda. A case Study of Adjumani and Yumbe Districts

Article by Benson B. Okech¹

¹PhD, Financial Management Specialist and Director BE-OK Associate

E-mail: okechb@gamil.com

Abstract

This paper provides an empirical review of the role Cash Transfer Programmes play on refugees' welfare in Uganda. Cash Transfer was measured using non-conditional cash and Cash for works whereas refugees' welfare was measured using food security, education and medical. The study anchored on contingency theory. The target population was 425,732 refugees in the two districts and a sample of 400 were drawn. The study used primary data collected from refugees and corroborated with key informants' interviews from Districts officials. The scope of the study was 2015-2018. A cross sectional descriptive design was used while data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation and regression analyses. It was found that cash transfers play significant role on refugees' welfare in Uganda. The study recommends as follows; encourage the use of direct cash transfer, discourage the use of vouchers, enforce cash for works scheme only up to the extent possible, increase and regularly review the transfer value and the Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Health and World Health Organisation to be actively involved with implementing organisations and review the approaches and modality of cash transfer before implementation. Further, government particularly Office of the Prime Minister and UNHCR including key actors within the humanitarian space to formulate policies which deter misappropriation of resources meant for refugees, acquisition of advanced technology which can track financial resources from source to the point of distribution and most importantly, conduct value for money audits within 3 months of implementation and thereafter on quarterly basis.

Keywords: Cash Transfer, Non-Conditional Cash, Cash for works, Vouchers, Uganda.

Introduction

Uganda has provided asylum to forcefully displaced persons from its neighboring countries for decades and has on average recorded at least 512,925 refugees in 2015 (CSBAG, 2018). However, when renewed conflict broke out in South Sudan in July 2016, an unprecedented number of refugees came to Uganda, with the number reaching 692,013 in 2016 and doubling to 1,395,146 in 2017 while by the end of 2018 the number was 1,190,992 (UNHCR, OPM, 2019). As a result, the refugee population in Uganda has increased significantly since 2015 with more than 66.3% (789,099) of the refugees coming from South Sudan, 26.3% (312,699) from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the rest from Burundi, Somalia, Rwanda, Eritrea, Sudan, Ethiopia and others (UNHCR, OPM, 2019). The refugee population of about 1.1 million people (UNHCR, OPM, 2019) constitutes about 2.6% of Uganda's total population of about 45,142,930 million people (World Population Review, 2019), making Uganda the leading refugee-hosting country in Africa and the third largest in the world (Finn Church Aid, 2019). In terms of gender and age composition, women and children constitute about 80 per cent of all refugees in Uganda (OPM statistics, 2017).

Refugees are primarily hosted in rural settlements in 12 districts of Northern, South West and Mid-West Uganda. For West Nile sub region which this study focused on, refugees are mainly hosted in the districts of Yumbe (222,960), Adjumani (202,382) and Arua (153,545) with the three districts hosting the highest number of refugees (578,887), accounting for 48.6% of the total refugee population in Uganda (UNHCR, OPM, 2019). Most refugees in Adjumani, Yumbe and Arua are from South Sudan.

The national mandate for responding to refugee and other disasters primarily rests with the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). OPM, therefore, budgets and implements programmes in refugee

settlements on behalf of Government of Uganda (GoU) as well as facilitating coordination between the various actors. At the national level, the budget approved, released and expended for refugees hovered between UGX 1 and 1.5 billion between FY 2014/15 and 2017/18 (Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, 2016, 2017, 2018). During the same period, nearly all funds budgeted for were released and expended in the same financial year. Allocations were targeted towards refugee management and support for refugee resettlement.

Apart from the budget allocation, Uganda also incurs indirect costs for the management of refugees. In the Financial Year 2016/2017 alone, UNDP, UN development organisation estimated that Uganda's expenditure on refugee management amounted to US\$ 323 million which is equivalent to UGX 1,130 billion (UNDP, 2017). This was further reinforced by the UN Oversight body, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (2018) which conducts investigations for the UN. Disaggregation of these expenditure estimates shows that Uganda's resources for refugee response efforts was primarily indirect and highly concentrated in natural resources like energy, water, ecosystem loss and land (UNDP, 2017). Indirect costs collectively accounted for 97.2 per cent of the UGX 1,130 billion estimated by UNDP. Of this, a significant portion (14%) comprised tax exemptions to UN agencies. Direct costs in service delivery were only to education (0.25%), health (1.61%) and security (0.94%) which translates to approximately UGX 32 billion. When this service delivery expenditure is combined with the allocation through OPM, Uganda's direct expenditure on refugees in 2017 was about UGX 33.5 billion.

In 2017 Uganda adopted a Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) to allow Local Government (LGs) to cope with the stress imposed by the presence of refugees. The framework is anchored on three pillars: Humanitarian Refugee Response, the Refugee and Host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) Framework, and the Settlement Transformative Agenda (STA). While development partners contribute significantly to support the humanitarian response and ReHoPE frameworks, implementation of the STA is still predominantly undertaken by Government. Consequently, in partnership with UNDP and the World Bank, the National Planning Authority has been tasked to build capacity of Chief Administrative Officers and district planners to recognize both humanitarian and development aspects of refugee management in district planning. Therefore, from FY 2017/18 onwards, districts will be expected to revisit their budgets and incorporate refugee management within their priorities.

Adequate funding is essential to enable the provision of critical life-saving services at the point of arrival and the continued building of resilience and livelihoods of refugees. However, the fast-growing refugee population has continued to strain Uganda's modest resources. As such, Uganda relies heavily on external support to fund operations in refugee spaces. Several funding modalities have been used to finance refugee response in Uganda. The main ones are direct donations from governments of developed countries, pooled funds, UN agencies, nongovernmental organizations, societies and, most recently, private individuals and foundations. UNHCR being the agency with the primary mandate of humanitarian response leads Uganda's refugee response mobilization through strategic fundraising directed towards potential donors all over the world. The tools that are employed to fundraise in Uganda are the South Sudan Response Plan and the Burundi Response Plan. In addition, UNHCR has recently prepared a comprehensive refugee response plan for Uganda so as to circumvent the disconnectedness between different fundraising tools. Overall, donor funding for refugees has been rising over the last five years. In absolute terms, donor financing for refugees grew from US\$ 134.2 million in 2015, to a peak of US\$ 310.4 million in 2018 (Financial Tracking Services, 2019). The increased financing can be attributed to the unprecedented refugee influx, as well as Uganda's deliberate drive to raise funds through the Solidarity Summit which took place in May 2017. Although the marked growth in financing is noted, the current levels of funding are unable to provide refugees with adequate food rations, health and educational services as well as sufficient clean water. In some cases, the chronic and severe underfunding has compromised the lives and livelihoods of refugees.

The evolving financing landscape has seen governments of many developed countries taking centre stage in supporting the refugee-hosting efforts of Uganda. Key among these are the United States, United Kingdom, Sweden, Canada and Germany. These governments contribute to refugee response

bilaterally, herein referred to as donor governments - or through multilateral platforms. In cases where governments of developed countries pool resources prior to contributing towards humanitarian interventions, they are categorized as pooled funds. The governments of the United Kingdom, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, Norway, Belgium, Ireland, Denmark, United States of America and Australia constitute the largest sources of pooled funding.

There is also a noted emergence of a new donor group, i.e. private individual organizations, foundations and, in some cases, individuals using their own funds to finance refugee response. In 2017, the private group accounted for almost 24 per cent of funding for refugees. Other donor groups include societies like the Red Cross and other non-governmental organizations.

Data from the Financial Tracking System (FTS) shows that most (68%) of the current resource inflows for humanitarian support is collectively classified as multi-sector (FTS, 2019). This is partly attributed to the wide range of interventions undertaken by implementing partners in order to provide a comprehensive resettlement package for refugees. These services range from activities at reception points which include screening, healthcare, provision of basic care materials like blankets, cookware and warm meals as well as provision of transportation to allocated settlements.

The refugees upon arrival in Uganda, the OPM and UNHCR lead in receiving and providing the first point of assistance. In 2017, provision of food took up 21% of total donor funding, while funds directly traceable to the social sectors (Education, Health and Nutrition and WASH) collectively accounted for under 8.8% of total donor funding.

Large-scale refugee populations have implications on social service delivery in host communities. From the moment of arrival, refugees compete with the local citizens for scarce resources such as schools, medical services, land, water, to mention but a few. Thus, increased refugee presence exerts extra pressure on the already strained resources and infrastructure, thereby aggravating the hardships affecting the host communities. In many refugee situations, problems are aggravated when refugees are a substantial proportion of the local population as is the case with the study districts of Adjumani and Yumbe. Consequently, huge inflows of refugees into such communities that are already poor and vulnerable are likely to worsen access to social services.

Statement of the problem

Whereas Uganda has been applauded and widely recognized by the international community for its open door policies in favour of refugees (OPM, 2018), and whereas Uganda has received significant assistance financially in her efforts to ensure the welfare of the refugees in form of livelihood, education and health including protection are well catered for using either direct cash transfer and/or cash for work to the refugees, on the other hand, however, there has been public outcry on mismanagement of resources meant for refugees including inflation of the number of refugees and financial misappropriation. This mismanagement and inflation of numbers has therefore, attracted the donor community and civil society organisations not only in Uganda but world over. This mismanagement of resources meant for the refugees has further been confirmed in an audit report issued by the UN Office of Internal Oversight services (OIOS, 2018).

Purpose of the study

The overall purpose of the study was to evaluate the role of cash transfer programme on refugee welfare in Uganda.

Objectives of the study

The key specific objectives of this study included the following:

1. To examine how non-conditional cash transfer has improved refugees' welfare
2. To find out how cash for work has improved refugees' welfare
3. To establish the transfer value per household

Research question

This study was therefore, guided by the following questions:

1. How has non-conditional cash transfer improved refugees' welfare?

2. How has cash for work improved refugees' welfare?
3. What is the transfer value per household?

Research hypothesis

The study had the following research hypothesis which were tested.

1. Non-conditional cash transfer has significantly improved refugees' welfare
2. Cash for work has significantly improved refugees' welfare
3. The transfer value per household is not known

Scope of the study

The study focused majorly on Cash Transfers specifically the non-conditional direct cash transfer as well as cash for works to the refugees. The study, however, incorporated other modalities like vouchers as part of the direct cash transfer and conditional cash transfer as part of cash for work. In terms of the period, the study took into consideration 2015 through to 2019. 2015 is chosen because that witnessed a period of increased refugee influx into Uganda. Meanwhile, for geographical scope, the study focused on West Nile sub region which takes up 48.6% of the total refugees' population in Uganda and specifically, the study took two districts of Adjumani and Yumbe because they host more than 35.7% or (425,342) (UNHCR, OPM, 2018) of the refugee population in Uganda.

Significance of the study

The study is useful to Policy makers, government, UN organisations and development partners including donors who fund support to the refugees whose lives and living conditions are most vulnerable during humanitarian and/or crisis periods. As such, this document can be used as a tool for decision making, literature and policy.

Conceptual framework

This study was guided by the following conceptual framework, taking cash transfer as the independent variable while refugees' welfare as the dependent variable.



Source: Researcher and adopted from (CaLP, 2018).

The remaining parts of this study are arranged as follows. Section two of the study presents literature review, section three presents the methodology whereas section four presents data and results as well as a discussion of the results. Section five presents conclusion and possible policy recommendations.

Literature review

Cash transfer programmes

Cash Transfer Programmes (CTP) refers to all programs where cash (or vouchers for goods or services) are directly provided to beneficiaries. In the strict sense and context of the humanitarian assistance, cash transfer programming refers to provision of cash and/or vouchers given to individuals, household or community recipients; not to governments or other state actors. CTP as

such, therefore, covers all modalities of cash assistance, which includes vouchers. On the other hand, however, it excludes any remittances and/or microfinance assistance in humanitarian interventions. The term can be used interchangeably with Cash Based Interventions, Cash Based Assistance, and Cash and Voucher Programming (CaLP, 2019). Many actors notably governments, international aid agencies (UN, Red Cross and NGOs), and national civil society organizations fund or directly implement such programmes. The cash can be spent how, where and when the recipient wants. In the appropriate circumstances, cash transfers can be an effective short and long-term response option that helps aid recipients meet their essential food and non-food needs while supporting local producers. This approach of Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) is therefore, increasingly being used as a new and adaptive approach in the humanitarian response because of the recognition that it can complement the provision of any in kind assistance during emergencies. Provision of cash therefore, empowers the affected population to decide on their own how to meet their own needs using available local resources.

Cash Transfers can be categorized as: Unconditional cash transfers- Using this, refugees are given money as a direct grant with no conditions or work requirements. There will be no requirement to repay the money back and refugees are entitled to use the money in any way they wish. Meanwhile with conditional cash transfers, the agency puts conditions on how the cash is spent, for instance stipulating that it must be used to pay for the reconstruction of the family home. The other alternative approach to this is that cash might as well be given when the recipients have met a given condition, like enrolling children in school or having them vaccinated. This type of conditionality, however, is rare in humanitarian settings; Vouchers- A voucher is a paper, token or electronic card that can be exchanged for a set quantity (e.g. \$15) or as predetermined commodities or services (e.g. 5kg of maize; milling of 5kg of maize). Vouchers, on the other hand, are redeemable at pre-selected vendors set up by the implementing agency. Cash for work- CFW is cash payments provided on the condition of undertaking designated work. Cash for works scheme is usually as a principle is paid according to the time worked by someone (for instance, number of days worked), but the cash for works may as well be quantified in terms of outputs (for instance the number of items produced in terms of cubic metres dug). Cash for Works schemes are usually applicable in community work programmes but could as well be home based. For this research study, only unconditional and Cash for work will be taken as all the other types relate directly with unconditional cash transfers (CaLP, 2019).

The use of cash transfer programming (CTP) in humanitarian support including all forms of assistance has grown significantly. In 2016, the estimated amount of transfer was US\$ 2.8 billion disbursed through cash and vouchers, up to about 40% from that of 2015 and approximately 100% from that of 2014(CaLP, 2018). The move to CTP has strong roots and is set to continue. Cash Transfers is now undoubtedly widely appreciated and recognized as one of the most significant areas of innovation in humanitarian settings, with huge potential to meet more needs, more efficiently and more effectively. The gap between humanitarian needs and available funding has increased to over 40% (Development Initiatives, 2017). In recognition of CTP's potential, many humanitarian actors, through the Grand Bargain and independently, have made public commitments to increase its use.

The benefits derived from the adaption of cash transfer assistance are shown to cut across many sectors. And many opportunities have been identified to align CTP with major reforms at every level, from achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, to strengthening social protection systems and realizing the UN's New Way of Working. Cash Transfer Programming is actively linked to several other forms of assistance among them are: financial inclusion, the digital revolution, evolving coordination mechanisms, strengthening local leadership, enhancing dignity and accountability to the most affected people and improving monitoring including reporting of results.

The concept of aid in the form of cash or vouchers is not new, and there are powerful examples of agencies providing effective humanitarian assistance this way over many years. However, Cash Transfer Programme as an approach has only become a mainstream priority recently. Major commitments to increase the use of CTP were made in 2015 and 2016, particularly through the Grand Bargain, adopted at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in May 2016. As of today, 53 of the most significant donors and implementing agencies have made formal commitments to the Grand

Bargain. Many organizations have also made their own public commitments to increase the use of CTP.

The commitments which have been built are based on analysis which were developed in 2015 and 2016. In 2015, the Council of the European Union adopted “10 Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash-Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs” (European Union, 2015) and the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Cash Transfers published their report “Doing cash differently: How cash transfers can transform humanitarian aid” (Overseas Development Institute, 2015)). In 2016, the Principals of the United Nation’s Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) commissioned the World Bank to write a “Strategic note on Cash Transfers in Humanitarian Contexts” (The World Bank Group, 2016). Since then, a great deal of further analysis and case studies have been published, much of which is summarized in this report.

The use of cash transfers has shown to significantly reduce some financial barriers to goods and/or services to mention; medicines, school fees and travel costs (Bastagli et al., 2016), as well as fostering employment by enabling the recipients to invest in productive assets and/or training (Jacobsen and Fratzke, 2016). Further, the use of cash transfers has had some important effects on not only gender equality, psychosocial well-being but as well on empowerment (Bastagli et al., 2016). The form of financial barriers to the health and education services do vary across many countries and this to some degree depend on public policies which support the provision of affordable services for vulnerable groups. Therefore, to reduce possible access barriers for refugees in displacement, assistance needs to move from short-term humanitarian assistance to more reliable types of support.

Refugees welfare

Uganda’s regulatory framework and settlement approach (2006 Refugee Act) and (2010 Refugee regulations) which emphasize the integration of refugees within the host communities, with access to the same services as nationals, is widely regarded as an exemplary model. The framework ensures refugees have access to the main social services in the settlements, i.e. health, education, water, sanitation, community services and land for settlement.

Before the introduction of the 1999 Self-Reliance Strategy (SRS), social services were provided to refugees and host populations in two parallel systems with refugees and hosts accessing services from separate service points. With this parallel arrangement, services for refugees were perceived to be better than those of their hosts and created tension among hosts and refugees (GoU and UNHCR, 2004). In response to this, the SRS sought, among other things, to harmonize and integrate the use of social services by locals and refugees by levelling off disparities in access; supporting local governments to plan, coordinate, supervise and deliver such services; and promoting peaceful co-existence (World Bank, 2016). As a result, basic services such as health, education, and water were integrated and the parallel service system for refugees and the host population was eliminated initially in Arua, Moyo, and Adjumani districts and, subsequently, in all refugee-hosting districts in Uganda.

On the health services, refugees carefully weigh the opportunity cost of attending different types of services. It ought to be clear that whereas consultations and services at government owned facilities are cheaper, they are, however, very time consuming than in the privately-owned facilities. Depending on the seriousness of the ailment, households might decide to self-medicate and go straight to a pharmacy. Additionally, public services lack sufficient free medication, which means that patients must purchase it from pharmacies at their own cost which together with transport costs to more sparsely located public facilities can off-set the benefit of subsidized treatment. The UNHCR cash transfer therefore, alleviates some of the financial costs of accessing healthcare whether private or public but on the whole is not decisive to accessing health treatment. The transfer enables some beneficiaries to partially cover the costs or to secure a loan.

In Uganda, financial barriers to education service is low because the sector is subsidized by the government. The Government of Uganda extends the right to free education from citizens to refugees with financial support from the international community. Costs linked to transport, school uniforms and pocket money are estimated to be between UGX 80,000 per term per child (UNICEF, 2016). While these costs strain the household budget, it’s not considered to be major barriers that prevented parents from enrolling their children in schools.

Theoretical review

The study is guided by the contingency theory as noted below.

Contingency theory

Contingency theory contends that there is no one best way of organizing and as such, an organizational style that is more effective in some situations may not be successful in others (Fiedler, 1964). Based on this assertion therefore, the optimal organization style is contingent upon various internal and external constraints. The contingency theory originated from the work of (Woodward, 1958), and it has sought to formulate broad generalizations about the formal structures that are typically associated with or best fit the use of different strategies. The central belief of the contingency theory is that organizations are open systems that need careful management to satisfy and balance internal needs and to adapt to environmental circumstances. The appropriate form to use depends on the kind of task or environment one is dealing with. Therefore, different types of organizations are needed in different types of environments.

Because of the chaotic nature and manner of the disaster, crisis management as such is extremely therefore, complex and with a lot of uncertainty. In crisis management, consequences that come with it vary a lot as one situation may be overlooked. In such cases, in order to perform well in any crisis management, the government which has the sole authority of protecting the lives of citizens needs to consider both the environmental situations as well as internal conditions. The theoretical lens of contingent theory fits well with crisis management specifically when it comes to managing refugees' crisis in Uganda. When the government is faced with this kind of crisis, the contingency theory can provide a clear guidance in managing the refugees crisis management and settlement. The government may be able to perform effectively and efficiently in crisis management if it's able to consider the contingent factors. However, according to (Pearson and Clair 1998), little attention has been paid to the contingent factors in the crisis management.

Empirical review

Non-conditional cash transfer and refugees' welfare.

Non or unconditional cash transfer refers to the provision of cash or vouchers given to individuals, household or community recipients; not to governments or other state actors to improve their welfare. These welfares may include; livelihood, education, health among others.

In a study conducted by (Luisa Natali; et al. ,2018) on unconditional cash transfer in Zambia using randomized controlled trial on women as recipient of direct cash from the government cash transfer project in the rural area across 90 communities, it was found that provision of direct unconditional cash transfers to the poor households had an impact on self-reported happiness. The findings further revealed that the programme led to a 7.5 to 10 percentage point impact on women's happiness after 36- and 48-months, respectively. The study further found that women in comparison to men have higher overall satisfaction with young children's well-being, including indicators of satisfaction with their children's health and positive outlook on their children's future.

Furthermore, in a related study done in Kenya by (Johannes Haushofer and Jeremy Shapiro, 2016) also using randomized controlled trial to study the response of poor households in rural Kenya to unconditional cash transfers. This cash transfers do differ from other programs. The differences are that they are explicitly unconditional, large, and concentrated in time. The study found out a strong consumption response to transfers, with an increase in household monthly consumption. As a result, transfer recipients experience large increases in psychological well-being. Monthly transfers are more likely than lump-sum transfers to improve food security, whereas lump-sum transfers are more likely to be spent on durables, suggesting that households face savings and credit constraints. The results, therefore, suggest that unconditional cash transfers do have significant impacts on economic outcomes and psychological well-being.

Relatedly, in a study conducted in low to middle income countries on vulnerable children and adults using both parallel group and cluster-randomized controlled trials (RCTs), quasi-RCTs, cohort and controlled before-and-after (CBAs) studies, and interrupted time series studies which included 21 studies (16 cluster-RCTs, 4 CBAs and 1 cohort study) involving 1,092,877 participants (36,068

children and 1,056,809 adults) and 31,865 households in Africa, the Americas and South-East Asia using meta-analyses and narrative synthesis. It was found that unconditional cash transfer may not impact health services use among children and adults in LMICs. Unconditional cash transfer may improve some health outcomes (i.e. the likelihood of having had any illness, the likelihood of having secure access to food, and diversity in one's diet), one social determinant of health (i.e. the likelihood of attending school), and healthcare expenditure. The evidence on the health effects of UCTs compared with those of CCTs is uncertain.

In a report done by (Sarah Baird et al., 2018) in low to middle income countries, on a wide range of cash transfer programmes notably; government transfers, charitable giving, cash remittances, search, cash transfers for business start-up, cash assistance for job possible and bundled interventions. Therefore, overall, use of cash transfers which are made without explicit employment in focus (Like conditional and unconditional cash transfers and remittances) tend to result in little to no change in adult labor. The main exceptions to these are the transfers to elderly and refugees. In contrast, however, any cash transfers made for any job search assistance and/or business startups do tend to increase adult labor supply and earnings, with the likely main channels being the alleviation of liquidity and risk constraints.

(Pega F, et al., 2015) using randomised and quasi-randomised controlled trials, as well as cohort, interrupted time series, and controlled before-and-after studies on unconditional cash transfer in low to middle income countries conducted three studies in Nicaragua and Niger which comprised of Three studies (one cluster-RCT and two CBAs) of 13,885 participants (9640 children and 4245 adults) as well as 1200 households. The Five programmes by government, non-government organisation and one with the research organisations that gave recipients cash handouts worth US\$ 145 to US\$ 250 as part of a disaster response. The studies, however, had some serious methodological limitations. UCTs appeared to contribute to a very small increase in the proportion of children who received vitamin or iron supplements and a beneficial effect on children's home environment. This may have presented results which showed a very large reduction in the chance of dying, a moderate reduction in the number of days spent sick in bed, and a large reduction in children's risk of acute malnutrition. Compared with grants of food, there was no evidence that a UCT influenced the chance of child death or severe acute malnutrition. Compared with the same UCT paid via mobile phone, a UCT paid in-hand led to a moderate increase in household dietary diversity, but there was no evidence of any effects on the social determinants of health, expenditure on health services, or even on local markets and infrastructure.

In another fascinating study done by (Hanna Tappis; Shannon Doocy, 2018) on effectiveness and value for money of cash-based humanitarian assistance taking reference of 4094 identified studies, only five met effectiveness review inclusion criteria. The five and the five others met cost review inclusion criteria. Although there has been some sort of limited conclusions on the comparative effectiveness, value for money can therefore, be drawn from this review, findings which provide important insights for possible considerations in the design as well as evaluation of programmes in any crisis-affected settings.

An interesting report by (Solon Ardittis, 2017) on experiences of cash-based assistance in Uganda, the Netherlands, Finland, Kenya, Ontario and Scotland, there is a revelation that such schemes have transformed considerably ways in which the recipients do behave economically. This makes the recipients feel less disenfranchised and gradually gain a more dignified status in society.

Invariably, (Solon Ardittis, 2017) using Turkey as an experience from the EU perspective, where refugees in Turkey were supported with direct cash assistance but through the use or delivery of a delivery of a debit card. The card gives the recipients access to a fixed amount of €30 per household member, with an additional quarterly top-up depending on the size of the family every month. The findings of this assistance found out that using a debit card proved to be a more dignified means of delivering assistance, since beneficiaries can now decide on what they need and when they need it, the card further provides predictability, since refugees can anticipate on what to expect every month and for how long.

In a wide scope of study conducted by (Basic Income Earth Network, 2019) and (Kela and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health of Finland (2019) in Finland, Kenya, Netherlands, Ontario,

Scotland, Uganda and United States, preliminary results published in February 2019 indicate that the recipients of a basic income perceived their wellbeing as being better than did the control group. It was further reported that about 55% of sampled recipients of a basic income and a further 46% of the control group did perceive their state of health as good or very good. Another 17% of them (recipients) of basic income and more 25% of the control group experienced quite a high degree or a very high degree of stress.

Cash for work and refugees' welfare.

There are studies which have reported that cash for work rather than direct cash assistance improves refugees' welfare. The argument is seen in the following context.

In a report published by (James Odong, 2018) authored on behalf of Save the Children, it has been confirmed indeed that cash for work improves the welfare of refugees. In this specific case, Cash for Work beneficiaries worked for 30 days each, earning US\$120 (UGX 432,000) per person.

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the near East commonly abbreviated as, UNRWA. A report published by (UNRWA, 2017) on how cash for work (CfW) programme has helped Mohammed improve his family grocery. In this case, Mohammed was offered four three-month contracts in a span of four years working as a janitor in one of the UNRWA schools in the camp. Mohammed used the cash he received through Cash for Works to carry out a rehabilitation of his dwelling house and establish his small shop. In 2016 alone, UNRWA provided Cash-for-Work opportunities to 8,526 individuals. Such opportunities are seen to benefit not just individuals but the entire household, resulting in 45,688 persons indirectly benefiting from the Cash-for-Work programme. Beneficiaries are given three to four months contract offering cash subsidies of about US\$ 380 per month. Therefore, Cash for Works chances are created in coordination with and based on the needs of local partners, including camp services committees and community-based organizations.

In a related report, Action Against Hunger (ACF) has been providing response to Syrian refugees in Southern Lebanon. In this approach, the objective was to reduce the negative coping mechanisms of the target population (Syrian refugees and vulnerable Lebanese households) and reinforce the local capacity to deliver community services through municipalities involved in the project, ultimately diminishing the pressure on local infrastructures. However, the arrival of the Syrian refugee population has burdened the already overwhelmed community services of the host municipalities from Southern Lebanon, including public health, education, social structures and access to basic goods. A view expressed by one municipality that seemed to summarise the view felt by all was: *"If before the Syria crisis, we did not have enough field personnel to attend the needs of our Lebanese households, imagine what our situation is now, upon the arrival of the refugees"*. In the end, an impact evaluation found that funds distributed as part of the CfW covered 50% of the monthly expenses of the targeted households, thus contributing to reduce the different negative coping strategies adopted by the refugee population to deal with their challenging condition (CaLP, 2018).

Further, more studies have provided more insights on how cash for works has improved the welfare of refugees. For instance, cash for works implemented by ACTED has been applauded for improving Womens' income in Azraq and Za'atari camps in Jordan. In this case, ACTED empowers vulnerable Syrian women through CfW) cleaning activities in the camps, enabling them to have their own income and restore their dignity. CfW) inside the camp is one of the few permitted ways refugees can generate any income, and is often a lifeline for many vulnerable families, especially women headed households. In Za'atari camp, there are currently 361 cash for works people in total per week. Out of these 361, there are 47 women. Initially, the programme only had 8 women. In over 3 months, this number has increased to a significant 47, with the aim of reaching a 50-50 ratio for the solid waste management programme. Meanwhile in Azraq camp, there is a total of 54 people enrolled on the cash for works programme, of whom there are 15 women taking role as cleaners, which represents 30% (ACTED, 2016).

Relatedly, a similar and fascinating study was done by UNDP in Aivu sub county in Yumbe District where it is implementing cash for work project for the vulnerable people. In this project, those participating in the project would after thirty days' work, receive US\$ 120 as payment. Furthermore, participants in the project are encouraged to save at least one third of their earnings from Cash for

Work during the time they participate in the activities. With these savings, they can choose to remain with the project and receive support to start a small business or they can leave the project and use them as they please (UNDP, 2018). If participants decided to choose and carry on with the project, the savings for each is tripled to make an initial start-up grant for a micro business of their choice. During this phase, the participants receive intensive support to develop business plans, including business skills and financial literacy training.

(UNDP, 2018) further published on how cash for works has given hope to refugees' women and their hosts in Uganda. In this project, the Cash for Work Programme activities include road maintenance, tree planting, rubbish pit digging, garbage collection and cleaning. These activities were selected through consultations with representatives of both refugee and host communities, local authorities, and other stakeholders in consideration of the needs on the ground. After thirty (30) days' work, participants receive UGX 434,691, an equivalent of US\$ 120. In the project, five hundred (500) people, among them 60% are women, were selected to take part in the programme. A few of the women are widows or survivors of Sexual Gender Based Violence (SGBV). Like in the other project, Participants were required to save one- third of their daily wage and at the completion of their work, they had the choice to take their saving and leave the project or continue with a business skills training for small enterprises development where their savings would be tripled by the programme.

Transfer value per household

The value of the cash transfer to the most vulnerable and disadvantaged people including refugees have different values. Below is a review of the different values from selected studies.

In Uganda, there are several actors providing direct cash transfers to the disadvantaged people including refugees. Notable among them are; UNHCR, Give Directly, Andrews International, ACTED, World Vision, Eight and Mercy Corps. Each agency provides different value to each participant monthly. For instance, Eight, a charitable organization based in Belgium, began disbursing unconditional cash payments in the Ugandan village of Busibi where each adult receives US\$ 18.25 per month while a child receives US\$ 9.13 per month (Kate McFarland (2017). Give Directly in its project of unconditional Cash transfer in Kyaka II, is providing US\$ 670 per household per year and disbursed in 3 installments (Uganda Technical Working Group on Cash-Based Activities, 2018). World Food Programme, on the other hand provides direct cash as follows; UGX 31,000 per household member per month for those who are not very vulnerable. However, for those who are very vulnerable, they receive UGX 45,000 per person per month (World Food Programme, 2016).

In Turkey, the story looks different from Uganda in that it is a flagship programme that is attracting increased attention and that is starting to produce valuable lessons in terms of the benefits and challenges of delivering humanitarian assistance in innovative ways using a debit card. This project is implemented in partnership with UN World Food Programme (WFP), the Turkish Red Crescent (TRC) and the Turkish Ministry of Family and Social Policies. In this cash transfer project, the recipients are entitled to €30 per household member, with an additional quarterly top-up depending on the size of the family every month to an estimated 1.3 million people in Turkey.

In Finland, according to a study and report produced by (Kela and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health of Finland (2019). The value of cash transfer to about 2,000 people randomly selected from the age of 25 to 58 was US\$ 590 per person per month. Whereas this value is significantly higher per person per month, the economic status of Finland, a developed country in Europe might not be the same with other countries within Europe and elsewhere. This was indeed an experiment which the national government was undertaking to investigate the effects of basic income on labour participation.

In Kenya, Give Directly, a US based Charity organisation is as well providing unconditional cash to about 200 villages constituting 26,000 rural people of Kenya. According to the report from the study, an individual is given unconditional cash of US\$ 23 per month for 12 years (Johannes Haushofer, and Jeremy Shapiro (2016) reinforced by another publication (Haushofer, Johannes, and Jeremy Shapiro (2018).

In Netherlands, however, much as there was a rejection at the initial stages because of the need for compliance with the participation Act, the project of provision of direct cash to randomly selected

beneficiaries from a pool of current social assistance beneficiaries indicated that each beneficiary receives euros 199 per month for two years (Kate McFarland (2017)).

Methodology

Design

The study adopted a descriptive design. This design was appropriate because it describes a situation the way it was (Mugenda, 2003). Descriptive design has further been applauded in the sense that it allows for collection of data from the population by use of the questionnaire (Micheni, 2011).

Study Population and Sample size

The population of the study included 425,732 refugees in the two districts of Adjumani and Yumbe in the west Nile sub region of Uganda (OPM, 2019). The choice of West Nile sub region was motivated by the fact that the area has hosted almost all the South Sudanese refugees that were forcibly displaced from their homes during the last three to four years. The sub region (West Nile) is currently providing asylum to about 48.6% of the total refugee population in Uganda. For example, while Bidibidi settlement in Yumbe is one of Uganda's newest refugee settlements, established in August 2016, it is not only the largest refugee settlement in Uganda but also in the world (CSBAG, 2018). Adjumani, on the other hand, is an old refugee-hosting district characterized by protracted refugee situations. Unlike other districts that have one or two refugee settlements, refugees in Adjumani are scattered all over the district in up to 18 settlements. The oldest settlement in Adjumani was established in the 1990s and the newest in August 2016. Intriguingly, the refugee population in Adjumani is higher than that of the native nationals and stood at 59% by the end of December 2017 (OPM, 2017). Jointly, refugees in Adjumani and Yumbe account for about 60% of all refugees in the West Nile sub-region (UNHCR, Government of Uganda, Office of the Prime Minister, 2018). The sample of the study was 400 arrived at using the formulae advanced by (Yamane, 1973). Simple random sampling method was used in selection of the samples. From the sample, the response rate was 97% which is representative of the population.

Data collection instruments

The instruments used for data collection were structured questionnaire and key informants' interviews. Because during the pre-test, it was found that most respondents had committed fatal errors in filling the questionnaire, interviews was used and face to face interviewing of the respondents to facilitate answering the questionnaire. The questionnaire was used because it allows the detailed collection of information required while key informants' interviews was used to corroborate, and triangulate information obtained through questionnaire.

Validity and reliability

To ensure validity of the research instruments, experts were used to review the questionnaire and the Content Validity Index (CVI) was calculated and overall, the results showed that the contents were 0.86 and as such were valid as per (Sakaran, 2000). For reliability, (Cronbach, 1951) alpha was used. As the rule of thumb, any coefficient of more than 0.5 is acceptable (Nannally, 1978). As such, the reliability overall was 0.87.

Data analysis and presentation

Data was analysed using descriptive statistics where frequencies, percentages and means were computed. Further, data was analysed using correlations and multivariate logistics regression analysis. Descriptive statistics was used because it allows presentation of data in a logical and easy to understand manner, whereas correlation and regression were used to establish if cash transfer explain variations in welfare of refugees and the magnitude to which it explains. A combination of several techniques of analysis is used as a way of ensuring robustness of results to arrive at a logical and objective conclusion.

Results and discussions

Sex: District, Age and Nationalities of the respondents: The study had 399 respondents out of which 284 were males (71.2%) while 115 (28.8%) were females. Of the 228 (57.1%) from Adjumani, 169 were males (74.1%) and 59 (25.9%) were females. Meanwhile out of 171 (42.9%) from Yumbe, 115 were males (67.3%) and 56 (32.7%) were females. Of the 284 males, 182 (64.1%) were below 20 years, 52 (18.3%) were between 21 and 30 years while 50 (17.6%) were between 31 and 40 years. Similarly, Of the 115 females, 84 (73.0%) were below 20 years, 5 (4.3%) were between 21 and 30 years while 26 (22.7%) were between 31 and 40 years. All the 284 males and 115 females are from South Sudan and none were from DRC or others.

Education: Marital status, Age and Nationalities of the respondents: Out of the 399 respondents, 19 (4.8%) had a Diploma while 19 (4.8%) had Advanced level, 304 (76.2%) had ordinary level and 57 (14.3%) had qualifications below ordinary level. Out of the 19 who had a Diploma, 0 (0.0%) are from Yumbe, and all 19 (100%) are from Adjumani. Similarly, out of the 19 who had Advanced level, 0 (0.0%) are from Yumbe, and all 19 (100%) are from Adjumani. Meanwhile out of the 304 who had Ordinary level, 133 (43.8%) are from Adjumani and 171 (56.2%) are from Yumbe. Out of the 19 with Diploma, 19 (100%) were married, all the 19 (100%) with Advanced level were married, meanwhile out of the 304 with Ordinary level, 285 (93.8%) were single and 19 (6.2%) were married. Out of the 57 others, 38 (66.6%) were married and 19 (33.3%) were separated.

Out of the 19 with a Diploma, 18 (94.7%) were males and 1 (5.3%) were females. Of the 19 with Advanced level, 17 (89.5%) were males and 2 (10.5%) were females. Of the 304 with Ordinary level, 217 (71.4%) were males and 87 (28.6%) were females. Of the 57 others, 32 (56.1%) were males and 25 (43.9%) were females. All the 57 (100%) others are from Adjumani. All the 399 are nationals of South Sudan.

Non-conditional cash transfer and refugees' welfare

The study sought to in objective 1, examine how non-conditional cash transfer has improved refugees' welfare. In this objective, the alternative hypothesis (H1) stated that non-conditional cash transfer has significantly improved the welfare of refugees. To test this statement of hypothesis, several questions with sub variables of direct cash and vouchers were administered to the respondents regarding the hypothesis. The table below is a correlation matrix of non-conditional cash transfer and the different variables of refugees' welfare.

Table 1. Relationship between non-conditional cash transfers and refugee's welfare

		Non-Conditional cash	Livelihood welfare	Education welfare	Health welfare
Non-Conditional cash	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	399			
Livelihood welfare	Pearson Correlation	.349**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	N	399	399		
Education welfare	Pearson Correlation	.514**	.565**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		
	N	399	399	399	

Health welfare	Pearson Correlation	.213**	.355**	.534**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	399	399	399	399
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data.

From the results in the table above, it is seen that none conditional cash transfer has had a weak improvement on the livelihood of the refugees (Correlation, $r = 0.349$) and its level of significance $p = 0.000$. This correlation is positive and the magnitude to which it has improved the livelihood is weak. Therefore, it can be authoritatively induced that there is weak improvement in the livelihood welfare of refugees caused because of the non-conditional cash transfer. Therefore, since the p value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.000 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) rejected. This is because there is conclusive evidence about the significance of the relationship between livelihood welfare and refugee's welfare.

Similarly, non-conditional cash transfer has had some impactful improvement in education welfare of refugees with correlation as ($r = 0.514$). The level of significance $p = 0.000$. This correlation is positive, and the magnitude to which it has improved refugees' welfare is moderate. Therefore, it can be authoritatively induced that there is moderate improvement in the education welfare of refugees caused because of the non-conditional cash transfer. Therefore, since the p value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.000 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) rejected. This is because there is conclusive significant evidence that non-conditional cash transfer improves education welfare of refugees.

In terms of the improvement of the health welfare of the refugees by non-conditional cash transfer, results from the above table show that the correlation is ($r = 0.213$). The level of significance $p = 0.000$. This correlation is positive, and the magnitude to which it has improved refugees' welfare is weak. Therefore, it can be authoritatively induced that there is weak improvement in the health welfare of refugees caused because of the non-conditional cash transfer. Therefore, since the p value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.000 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) rejected. This is because there is conclusive evidence that non-conditional cash transfer improves health welfare of refugees.

A further analysis between direct cash and voucher was done to determine if all or one or none of them has a significant improvement on refugee welfare. Results show that direct cash has a correlation of $r = 0.614$ with the level of significance at 0.000. meaning that direct cash has a high positive improvement on the welfare of refugees. Meanwhile, use of vouchers has a correlation of $r = 0.042$ with the level of significance at 0.405. This means use of vouchers did not have any improvement in the welfare of refugees.

A regression analysis was further run to establish the degree and nature of the relationship between the independent variable (Non-conditional cash) and dependent variables (Livelihood, education and health) welfares. The results are represented in the tables below.

Table 2.0. Regression of Non-conditional cash and Refugees welfare

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.452 ^a	.204	.202	5.62393
a. Predictors: (Constant), Non-Conditional cash				

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data

Table 3.0. ANOVA

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3218.857	1	3218.857	101.770	.000 ^a
	Residual	12556.571	397	31.629		
	Total	15775.429	398			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Non-Conditional cash						
b. Dependent Variable: Refugee welfare						

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data

Table 4.0. Coefficients of Variables

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	29.627	.850		34.871	.000
	Non-Conditional cash	.320	.032	.452	10.088	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Refugee welfare						

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data

From table 2.0 above, the proportion of variance (R^2) is 0.204, which is an estimate of how well non-conditional cash predict refugee's welfare. Therefore, from the results, non-conditional cash predict refugee's welfare by 20.4% only since R^2 is (20.4%). Other factors predict 79.6%.

To determine the direction and strength of the relationship between non-conditional cash and refugee's welfare, the standardize beta coefficient is important. From table 4.0 above, the Beta Coefficient is positive at ($\beta = 0.452$) indicating that an increase in non-conditional cash does influence refugee's welfare. Therefore, from the above analysis, the results of the regression showed that non-conditional cash does predict refugee's welfare; $P < 0.204 (R^2 = 0.204)$; $F(101.770) = 1.224$ and $\beta = 0.452$.

Cash for work and refugees' welfare

The study sought to in objective 2, find out how cash for works has improved refugees' welfare. In this objective, the alternative hypothesis (H1) stated that Cash for works has significantly improved the welfare of refugees. To test this statement of hypothesis, several questions were administered to the respondents regarding the hypothesis. The table below is a correlation matrix of cash for works and the different variables of refugees' welfare.

Table 5. Relationship between Cash for Works and refugee's welfare.

		Cash for works	Livelihood welfare	Education welfare	Health welfare
Cash for works	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	399			
Livelihood welfare	Pearson Correlation	.215**	1		

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	N	399	399		
Education welfare	Pearson Correlation	-.007	.565**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.887	.000		
	N	399	399	399	
Health welfare	Pearson Correlation	.474**	.355**	.534**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	399	399	399	399
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data.

From the results in the table above, it is seen that cash for works has had a weak improvement on the livelihood of the refugees (Correlation, $r = 0.215$) and its level of significance $p = 0.000$. This correlation is positive and the magnitude to which it has improved the livelihood is weak. Therefore, it can be authoritatively induced that there is weak improvement in the livelihood welfare of refugees caused by of cash for works. Therefore, since the p value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.000 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) rejected. This is because there is conclusive evidence about the significance of the relationship between cash for works and livelihood welfare of refugees.

Similarly, cash for works has had some negative improvement in education welfare of refugees with correlation as ($r = -0.007$). The level of significance $p = 0.887$. This correlation is negative, and the magnitude to which it has improved refugees' welfare is almost not there. Therefore, with this overwhelming evidence, it can be authoritatively induced that there is a negative improvement in the education welfare of refugees caused by cash for works. Therefore, since the p value ($p = 0.887$) is more than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.887 > 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) is rejected and the null hypothesis (H0) accepted. This is because there is inconclusive significant evidence that cash for works improves education welfare of refugees.

In terms of the improvement of the health welfare of the refugees by cash for works, results from the above table show that the correlation is ($r = 0.474$). The level of significance $p = 0.000$. This correlation is positive, and the magnitude to which it has improved refugees' welfare is moderate. Therefore, it can be authoritatively induced from this results that there is moderate improvement in the health welfare of refugees caused by cash for works. Therefore, since the p value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.000 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) rejected. This is because there is conclusive evidence that cash for works improves health welfare of refugees.

A further analysis between the various variables constituting cash for works (works in public roads, schools, health centres and markets) and refugee welfare was done to determine if all or one or none of them has a significant improvement on refugee welfare. Results show that works in public roads has a correlation of $r = 0.396$ with the level of significance at 0.000, works in public schools has a correlation of $r = 0.161$ with the level of significance at 0.001, works in public health centres has a correlation of $r = 0.201$ with the level of significance at 0.000 and works in public markets has a correlation of $r = 0.192$ with the level of significance at 0.000. These results show that there is a weak improvement in the welfare of refugees with the exception of works in public roads with a moderate improvement in the welfare of refugees.

A regression analysis was further run to establish the degree and nature of the relationship between the independent variable (Cash for works) and dependent variables (Livelihood, education and health) welfares. The results are represented in the tables below.

Table 6.0. Regression of cash for works and Refugees welfare

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.263 ^a	.069	.067	6.08094
a. Predictors: (Constant), Cash for works				

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data.

Table 7.0. ANOVA

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1095.248	1	1095.248	29.619	.000 ^a
	Residual	14680.181	397	36.978		
	Total	15775.429	398			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Cash for works						
b. Dependent Variable: Refugee welfare						

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data.

Table 8.0. Coefficients

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	30.966	1.277		24.253	.000
	Cash for works	.124	.023	.263	5.442	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Refugee welfare						

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data.

From table above, the proportion of variance (R^2) is 0.069, which is an estimate of how well cash for works predict refugee's welfare. Therefore, from the results, cash for works predict refugee's welfare by 0.69% only since R^2 is (0.69%).

To determine the direction and strength of the relationship between cash for works and refugee's welfare, the standardize beta coefficient is important. From table above, the Beta Coefficient is positive at ($\beta = 0.263$) indicating that an increase in cash for works does influence refugee's welfare. Therefore, from the above analysis, the results of the regression showed that cash for works does predict refugee's welfare; $P < 0.069$ ($R^2 = 0.069$); $F(29.619) = 1.224$ and $\beta = 0.263$.

Transfer value per household.

The study sought to in objective 3, find out the transfer value per household to refugees. In this objective, the null hypothesis (H_0) stated that the transfer value per household is not known. To test this statement of hypothesis, several questions were administered to the respondents regarding the hypothesis. The table below shows the transfer value per household per month and per quarter.

Table 9. Monthly cash transfer value per household per member.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	UGX 31,000	399	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data.

Table 10. Quarterly Cash Transfer value per Household per Member.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	UGX 400,000	399	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Authors calculation based on Primary data.

From table 10 above, the average monthly non-conditional cash transfer per household per month is UGX 31,000 within the areas sampled. Whereas, the average quarterly non-conditional cash transfer per household is UGX 400,000.

Conclusions and policy recommendations

From results of objective 1, it is concluded that non-conditional cash has improved the welfare of refugee moderately since the (Correlation, $r = 0.452$) is positive with the level of significance $p = 0.000$. More importantly, direct non-conditional cash has contributed significantly ($r = 0.614$ with $P = 0.000$) than the voucher which had ($r = 0.042$ with its $p = 0.405$). Overall, therefore, overall, since the p value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.000 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) which stated that non-conditional cash transfer has significantly improved the welfare of refugees is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) rejected.

From results of objective 2, it is concluded that cash for works has improved the welfare of refugee weakly since the (Correlation, $r = 0.263$) is positive with the level of significance $p = 0.000$. Among the four variables which constituted cash for works, its only works in public roads with correlation ($r = 0.396$ and its $p = 0.000$) which has a moderate improvement in the welfare of refugees. The rest have weak improvement in the welfare of refugees as follows: Works in public schools ($r = 0.161$ with $p = 0.001$), works in health centres ($r = 0.201$ with its $p = 0.000$) and works in public markets ($r = 0.192$ with its $p = 0.000$). Overall, therefore, since the p value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the alpha value $\alpha = 0.05$, ($0.000 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H1) which stated that cash for works has significantly improved the welfare of refugees is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) rejected.

From results of objective 3, it is concluded that the transfer value per household per month and per quarter respectively are; UGX 31,000 and UGX 400,000. Since the transfer value per month and per quarter to the refugees are known, the null hypothesis (H0) which stated that transfer value per household per month is not known is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H1) accepted.

From the conclusions, the following policy recommendations have been put forward.

- Encourage the use of direct cash transfer because it has had strong positive improvement in the welfare of refugees. Office of the Prime Minister of Uganda together with development partners supporting cash transfer programme should adopt this modality because of its associated benefits including addressing needs that go beyond saving lives such as providing cash grants to rebuild sustainable livelihoods and Supporting local trade and the provision of basic services and with the recognition that it positively impacts on local economies and boost growth and development in rural areas.
- Discourage the use of vouchers. Vouchers have had no improvement in the welfare of refugees. The underlying reasons were that; there are no vendors in the areas of Adjumani and Yumbe who makes and accepts vouchers as alternative to cash. This is further attributed to the nature and context of the sub region and Uganda in general where such services are foreign and people including vendors prefer immediate cash as opposed to vouchers.

Vouchers were further noted to have been misplaced, stolen or destroyed at some point during the storage.

- Enforce cash for works scheme only up to the extent possible. As noted from the results and conclusions, cash for works has generally had weak improvement in the welfare of refugees save works on public roads. Works in public community roads has had a moderate improvement because almost all abled bodied adults were involved in opening up community roads leading to the market, trading centre or distribution point for food items. The direct cash given to the households are used in the trading centres and markets for commercial purposes to boost their income level and topped up with the income derived from the cash for works scheme. However, works in health centres, schools and markets have not been Favorable for most refugees and as such, not preferred alternative to income sources to promote their welfare. The reasons were that even the host community needs services from health centres, schools and others and the refugees see that as not viable.
- Increase and regularly review the transfer value. From the results, the transfer value per household per month and per quarter respectively are; UGX 31,000 and UGX 400,000. It is a serious concern among refugees that different development partners and implementing organisations use different transfer value even when they are in the same area with same economic conditions. The Office of the Prime Minister together with implementing partners should map out each sub region and review the economic conditions and have a uniform transfer value other than each organisation applying its own independent value.
- The Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Health and World Health Organisation needs to be actively involved with each implementing organisation and review their approach and modality before implementation of cash transfer programme. This is to ensure that the minimum calories, institutional requirements are adhered to otherwise there will be no impact of the implementation on the welfare of refugees.

References

- [1]. ACTED (2016). Jordan: How cash for work activities make life move forward in refugee camps. Accessed on February 17, 2019 and available at; <https://reliefweb.int/report/jordan/jordan-how-cash-work-activities-make-life-move-forward-refugee-camps>
- [2]. Bastagli, F.; Hagen-Zanker, J.; Harman, L.; Barca, V.; Sturge, G. and Schmidt, T. (2016) Cash transfers: what does the evidence say? A rigorous review of programme impact and the role of design and implementation features. London: ODI.
- [3]. Cash Learning Partnership (2019) accessed on February 17, 2019 and available at; <http://www.cashlearning.org/news-and-events/news-and-events/post/175-cash-for-work-in-southern-lebanon-a-acf-lebanonas-response-to-the-syrian-refugee-crisis>
- [4]. Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group (2018). Public Financing for Refugees Crisis in Uganda Study Report. Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group. May 2018.
- [5]. Development Initiatives (2017). Global Humanitarian Assistance Report.
- [6]. European Union (2015). 10 common principles for multi-purpose cash-based assistance to respond to humanitarian needs.
- [7]. Fiedler, F.E. (1964). A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. *Advances in experimental social psychology* (1), pp. 149-190.
- [8]. Financial Tracking Services (2019). Tracking Humanitarian aid flows. Access on February 7, 2019 at <https://fts.unocha.org/>
- [9]. Finn Church Aid (2019). Verification exercise confirms Uganda hosts Africa's largest refugee population, but funding fails to match. 19 NGOs call on international donors to share responsibility and increase funding. Accessed on February 7, 2019 at <https://www.kirkonulkomaanapu.fi/en/latest-news/news/verification-exercise-confirms-uganda-refugee-population/>
- [10]. Government of Uganda and UNHCR. (2004). Self-Reliance Strategy (1999-2003) for Refugee Hosting Areas in Moyo, Arua and Adjumani districts, Uganda. (Report of the mid-term review April 2004).

- [11]. Hanna Tappis; Shanon Doocy (2018). The effectiveness and value for money of cash-based humanitarian assistance: a systematic review. *Journal of development effectiveness*. Volume 10, Issue 1. 121-144; available at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19439342.2017.1363804?src=recsys&journalCode=rjde20>
- [12]. Haushofer, Johannes, and Jeremy Shapiro (2016). The Short-Term Impact of Unconditional Cash Transfers to the Poor: Experimental Evidence from Kenya. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, accepted manuscript, July 19, 2016.
- [13]. Jacobsen, K. and Fratzke, S. (2016) Building livelihoods opportunities for refugees' populations. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- [14]. James Odong (2018). Cash for work improves south Sudanese refugees' livelihoods. Save the children. Accessed on February 10, 2019 and available at: <https://uganda.savethechildren.net/news/cash-work-improves-south-sudanese-refugees-livelihoods> .
- [15]. Johannes Haushofer and Jeremy Shapiro (2016). The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1973–2042. doi:10.1093/qje/qjw025. Available at https://www.princeton.edu/haushofer/publications/Haushofer_Shapiro_UCT_QJE_2016.pdf
- [16]. Johannes Haushofer, and Jeremy Shapiro (2018). The Long-Term Impact of Unconditional Cash Transfers: Experimental Evidence from Kenya. Working Paper, January 2018.
- [17]. Johannes Haushofer; Jeremy Shapiro (2013). The Impact of Unconditional Cash Transfers in Kenya.
- [18]. Kate McFarland (2017). Current Basic Income Experiments (and those so called): An Overview. Accessed on February 10, 2019 and available at <https://basicincome.org/news/2017/05/basic-income-experiments-and-those-so-called-early-2017-updates/>
- [19]. *Kela and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health of Finland (2019)*. Preliminary results of the basic income experiment: self-perceived wellbeing improved, during the first year no effects on employment. Accessed on February 10, 2019 and Available at <https://www.kela.fi/web/en/-/preliminary-results-of-the-basic-income-experiment-self-perceived-wellbeing-improved-during-the-first-year-no-effects-on-employment>
- [20]. List of signatories and text of Grand Bargain available at www.agendaforhumanity.org/initiatives/3861
- [21]. Luisa Natali; Sudhanshu Handa; Amber Peterman; David Seidenfeld; Gelson Tembo. (2018). Does money buy happiness? Evidence from an unconditional cash transfer in Zambia. *SSM Population Health*. Volume 4; PMID: PMC5976828. 225–235. Available at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5976828/>
- [22]. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2016). Annual Budget Performance Report FY 2015/2016. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, October 2016.
- [23]. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2017). Annual Budget Performance Report FY 2016/2017. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, October 2017.
- [24]. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2018). Annual Budget Performance Report FY 2017/2018. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, October 2018.
- [25]. Office of Internal Oversight Services (2018). Audit of the Operations in Uganda for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Report 2018/097. Office of Internal Oversight Services, October 2018.
- [26]. Overseas Development Institute (2015). Doing cash differently. How cash transfers can transform humanitarian aid Report of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Cash Transfers.
- [27]. Pearson, C., and Clair, J. (1998). Reframing Crisis Management. *The Academy of Management Review* (65:1), pp. 59-77.
- [28]. Pega F, Liu SY, Walter S, Lhachimi SK (2015). Unconditional cash transfers for assistance in humanitarian disasters: effect on use of health services and health outcomes in low- and middle-income countries. *The Cochrane Collaboration*. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Available at <https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/pega-et-al-2015-the-cochrane-library-sup-2.pdf>
- [29]. Pega F, Liu SY, Walter S, Pabayo R, Saith R, Lhachimi SK (2017). Unconditional cash transfers for reducing poverty and vulnerabilities: effect on use of health services and health outcomes in low- and middle-income countries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017, Issue 11. Art. No.: CD011135. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD011135.pub2. available at file:///C:/Users/benson.okech/Downloads/Pega_et_al-2017-Cochrane_Database_of_Systematic_Reviews.pdf

- [30]. Sarah Baird; David McKenzie; Berk Özler (2018). The Effects of Cash Transfers on Adult Labor Market Outcomes. Policy Research Working Paper 8404. The World Bank Group. WPS8404. Available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/334251523556191237/pdf/WPS8404.pdf>
- [31]. Solon Arditis (2017). Direct cash grants to refugees: The EU experience in Turkey one year on. Humanitarian Action/Migration. Available at <https://blogs.icrc.org/law-and-policy/2017/11/07/direct-cash-grants-refugees-eu-experience-turkey-one-year/>
- [32]. The Cash Learning Partnership (2018). Cash Transfer Programming.
- [33]. The Cash Learning Partnership (2018). The state of the World's Cash Report. Cash Transfer Programming in Humanitarian Aid. May 2018.
- [34]. The World Bank Group (2016). Cash Transfers in Humanitarian Contexts. Final draft prepared for the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee.
- [35]. Uganda Technical Working Group on Cash-Based Activities (2018). Meeting #16- Notes for the Record 21st Mar 2018 11:00 am – 1:00 pm. Technical Working Group on Cash-Based Transfers for the Refugee Response.
- [36]. UNDP (2018). Bringing refugee communities together through 'Cash for Work' activities. UNDP. Accessed on February 17, 2019 and available at; <https://medium.com/@UNDPUGanda/bringing-refugee-communities-together-through-cash-for-work-activities-7374f0aef9da>
- [37]. UNDP (2018). Cash for Work' programme gives hope to refugee women and their hosts in Uganda. Accessed on February 17, 2019 and available at; <https://medium.com/@UNDPUGanda/cash-for-work-programme-gives-hope-to-refugee-women-and-their-hosts-in-uganda-9f551a4ca7ba>.
- [38]. UNHCR, Government of Uganda, Office of the Prime Minister (2019). Uganda Comprehensive Refugees Response Portal accessed on February 7, 2019 at <https://ugandarefugees.org/en/country/uga>
- [39]. United Nations Development Programme (2017). Summary of study: Uganda's contributions to Refugees Protection and Management.
- [40]. United Nations Relief and Works Agency, UNRWA (2017). The cash-for-work programme that helped Mohammed establish a grocery for a secure income. Accessed on February 17,2019 and available at: <https://www.unrwa.org/newsroom/features/cash-work-programme-helped-mohammed-establish-grocery-secure-income>
- [41]. Woodward, J. (1958). Management and Technology. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- [42]. World Bank. (2016). An Assessment of Uganda's Progressive Approach to Refugee Management.
- [43]. World Food Programme (2016). Cash|Food. A Comparative analysis of the effectiveness of food assistance modalities in refugee settlements. VOLUME 3 SEP. 2016.
- [44]. World Population Review Report (2019). Uganda Population 2019. Accessed on February 7, 2019 at <http://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/uganda-population/>