

Child Migration from Karamoja



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The opinions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration; and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Publisher: Plot 6A, Bukoto Crescent, Naguru
P.O Box 11431,
Kampala - Uganda

© 2014 International Organization for Migration (IOM)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Child Migration from Karamoja

February 2014



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

With the support of



ROYAL NORWEGIAN EMBASSY

Acknowledgements

This report and the associated research were funded by the Royal Norwegian Embassy under the Coordinated Response to Human Trafficking in Uganda (CRTU) project. The research design was developed by Karol Czuba with the assistance of the lead researcher, Dr Christopher Lee. The interviews and focus group discussions were conducted and translated by Lokiru Denis Pius. Nangiro Paska helped to revise the research instruments and advised on **Dkaramojong** terminology. Initial drafts were written by Karol Czuba and reviewed by IOM Uganda staff Alexander Billings and Mariela Guajardo. A comprehensive review of the paper was undertaken by Roselinde den Boer. The logistics field team was composed of Kutesa Seth, Golooba William, Isingoma Robert, Komakech David and Ntensibe Juma.

Glossary

Elejilej

Traditionally, *elejilej* are income-generating activities undertaken by young Karimojong to supplement the income of their families. Although traditionally associated with activities like cattle grazing, the term has recently been associated with children begging in the streets. *Elejilej* have become particularly common among minors in Kampala and other urban centres in Uganda, but small income-generating activities like begging and grazing are also undertaken by children in rural destinations.

Kraal

Kraals are temporary camps where Karimojong, predominantly male, and their livestock move during the dry season. *Kraals* are located in areas receiving relatively more rainfall and are therefore suitable for cattle herding. Some women and children join their husbands and fathers to perform household activities and tend the animals. Boys that are old enough can join the men without the supervision of their mothers.

Manyatta

Manyattas are enclosed residential areas, surrounded by sharp thorns and with only one small entry point. One *manyatta* can house multiple families and many heads of cattle. The Karimojong reside in the largely permanent *manyattas* during the wet season when conditions are suitable for agriculture and livestock herding. When men move to *kraals* during the dry season, some women and children remain in the *manyattas* to prepare for agricultural production.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Acknowledgements | 5 |
| Glossary | 7 |
| 1. Introduction | 11 |
| 1.1 Objectives and scope | 11 |
| 1.2 Research questions and key findings | 12 |
| 2. Background | 15 |
| 2.1 Dual settlement system..... | 15 |
| 2.2 Political and natural shocks..... | 16 |
| 2.3 Migration | 16 |
| 2.4 Push and pull factors..... | 17 |
| 3. Research Methods | 19 |
| 3.1 Sampling method..... | 19 |
| 3.2 Data collection techniques..... | 19 |
| 3.3 Informed consent..... | 20 |
| 3.4 Analysis | 20 |
| 4. The Evolution of Karimojong Migration Patterns | 21 |
| 4.1 Traditional migration..... | 21 |
| 4.2 Shifting livelihood strategies | 22 |
| 4.3 Initial flows of child migration..... | 23 |
| 5. Structural Causes..... | 25 |
| 5.1 Violence and food insecurity..... | 25 |
| 5.2 Family expectations and obligations | 26 |
| 6. Motivations | 27 |
| 6.1 Individual motivations..... | 27 |
| 6.2 Peer pressure | 28 |
| 7. Mechanisms of Karimojong Child Migration | 29 |
| 7.1 The decision-making process | 29 |
| 7.2 Preparing for migration..... | 30 |
| 7.3 Family ties | 30 |
| 7.4 Urban survival | 31 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 8. Return and Reintegration | 33 |
| 8.1 Family tracing | 33 |
| 8.2 Family and community reception | 34 |
| 8.3 Reintegration package..... | 35 |
| 8.4 Role of the community in reintegration..... | 36 |
| 8.5 Role of the family in reintegration | 38 |
| 8.6 Re-migration and other challenges | 39 |
| Conclusion | 41 |
| References..... | 43 |
| Appendix I: List of Research Sites | 47 |
| Appendix II: Research Instrument – Causes and Mechanisms | 49 |
| Appendix III: Research Instrument – Return and Reintegration | 59 |
| Appendix IV: Informed Consent Script for Adult Research Participants | 65 |
| Appendix V: Assent Script for Child Research Participants..... | 67 |

Introduction

1.1 Objectives and scope

Since the start of the new century, Karimojong migrant children have become an increasingly common sight in the streets of Kampala and other urban centres in Uganda. Due to the nature of their activities on the street, particularly, begging around traffic lights at busy intersections, these children are highly visible. Clearly living in extreme poverty and highly vulnerable, these children are widely understood to come from a highly specific ethnic and geographic background – that is, the Karamoja region – and public perception of these children is informed by an understanding of the drivers of poverty in Karamoja, as well as consideration of these children’s humanitarian plight. As a consequence, attitudes towards these children range from great sympathy to outright hostility. The solutions to their problems may variously be seen as “political” or economic, or as a matter of policing.

Due in large part to their high visibility, child migration from Karamoja to Uganda’s urban centres has attracted considerable attention from governmental, city council and non-governmental bodies, giving rise to various programmes which either directly or indirectly address their issues. A common refrain among such projects is to “tackle the root cause,” and to prevent “recycling” or to take “holistic” approaches, although these projects may, in fact, be based on quite widely differing, often not fully articulated, understandings of what the “root cause” of the problem is.

Perhaps the most comprehensive effort to address the issue of the Karamoja Street Children is the IOM project entitled “Coordinated Response to Human Trafficking in Uganda” (CRTU) and which is supported by the Norwegian Government. The project focuses on providing assistance to unaccompanied minors from Karamoja who are exploited for labour and live on the streets of Kampala. CRTU beneficiaries are screened to identify psychosocial needs and provided with necessary medical assistance; in addition family tracing is conducted, and the children are returned home and attend school. The families and communities of the returned children are provided with support in order to prevent them from returning to the streets.

To improve assistance delivery to these children and inform future programming, IOM has built in an extensive research component to the CRTU project in an endeavour to gain a better understanding of the causes and mechanisms of child migration from rural Karamoja to urban centres in Uganda. To this end,

this report attempts to address the reasons children migrate; why some migrate without their parents; why most move to urban centres; why many travel further than before; and why the phenomenon mainly involves children from the Bokora community.

The scope of this study is limited to the Karimojong community from the Karamoja subregion in north-eastern Uganda. Other communities from the Karamoja subregion, such as the Jie and the Dodoth, do not participate in child migration to Kampala and other urban centres in Uganda to the same extent as Karimojong from the Bokora and Matheniko communities. The second chapter of this report provides background information on the Karimojong based on existing research and literature. It is followed by a chapter explaining the methods and data collection techniques used in this study, and why such methods were selected.

The findings are presented in five chapters. The first of these chapters discusses how traditional Karimojong migration has evolved into contemporary migration practices; the next examines the structural causes of child migration; the third explores individual motivations for migration; the mechanisms enabling child migration are then analysed, followed by a chapter critiquing past efforts to return migrant children and analysing currently available reintegration assistance.

1.2 Research questions and key findings

The study seeks to shed light on the following issues:

- (a) How does child migration from Karamoja relate to historical and contemporary migration patterns of the Karimojong?
 - **Key finding:** Migration and mobility have always been an integral element of the Karimojong livelihood system. Over the last 15 years, however, communities located in Napak and Moroto Districts have experienced increased rates of child migration to urban centres, representing a shift from historical migration patterns, particularly among the Bokora.
- (b) Why do more children from the Bokora community migrate compared to other Karimojong communities?
 - **Key finding:** Children from the Bokora community are more likely to migrate for a variety of reasons: (i) successful disarmament from 2001 to 2008 led to increased vulnerability to cattle raids from neighbouring communities; (ii) early exposure to education from missionaries created links and opportunities to urban centres; and, (iii) compared to the Matheniko and Pian communities, the Bokora are likely to have established most of their economic partnerships outside Karamoja.

- (c) What are the causes of child migration among the Bokora and the Matheniko?
- **Key finding:** Due to the overall decrease in the number of cattle in Karamoja and the general lack of livelihood opportunities, many children can no longer contribute income to their households and, therefore, migrate to urban centres to seek alternative ways of generating income, such as begging and cleaning. Due to positive perceptions (or misperceptions) of urban destinations, child migration has become an increasingly viable livelihood and survival strategy for children and households in Napak and Moroto Districts.
- (d) What mechanisms affect the experiences of migrant children?
- **Key finding:** In some instances, the decision to migrate is made solely by the child, without prior consultation with a parent. However, parents are often involved in the decision-making process and would consent to the migration following a household meeting. Karimojong migrants, especially children, rely heavily on established networks of Karimojong in urban areas and nearby districts such as Teso. In urban centres, children undertake income-generating activities like begging, scrounging or theft. Despite the distance, many children maintain family ties through regular telephone contact with family members or relatives.

2. Background

As a primarily agro-pastoral population, migration is an integral and critical element of the Karimojong¹ livelihood system. Over time, however, migration patterns and practices evolved from traditional ones in response to an overall decrease in access and control of resources in Karamoja during the course of the twentieth century. Historically, migration patterns were closely associated with the dry and wet seasons and confined within Karamoja and adjacent areas like the Acholi, Lango and Teso regions. More recently, migration patterns from Karamoja have involved minors who migrate, sometimes unaccompanied, to Uganda's urban centres to earn money. Similar to traditional migration, current migratory behaviour is circular in nature. In other words, children often return home with their earnings after a period of time, and eventually re-migrate to earn more.

The communities based in the north-eastern part of Uganda, which borders Kenya and South Sudan, are commonly referred to as the Karamojong, and compose the Eastern Nilotic Ateker cluster. The Karamojong include the Dodoth, Jie and Karimojong communities. The Karimojong, on which this report focuses, can be subdivided into the Bokora, the Matheniko and the Pian. The Karimojong inhabit the southern part of the Karamoja region, that is, the Moroto, Nakapiripirit and Napak Districts.

2.1 Dual settlement system

The Karimojong are agropastoralists employing a diverse mixture of agriculture and livestock livelihood techniques (Knaute, 2009; Knighton, 2010). Similar to other agro-pastoralist societies in Kenya, Ethiopia, the Sahel and elsewhere, economic production is structured by gender and age (Hodgson, 2000). Girls and women are responsible for most elements of agricultural production, while men attend to livestock, occasionally helping women with the harvest (Stefansky-Huisman, 2011; Stites et al., 2007).

To practice both agriculture and pastoralist livelihood strategies, the Karimojong have adopted a dual settlement system. During the wet season, they live in largely permanent *manyattas* situated in locations suitable for agriculture and cattle herding. During the dry season, the cattle are taken to *kraals* in areas

1 The communities in the north-east of Uganda, Karamoja, are commonly referred to as the "Karimojong." The Karimojong can be subdivided into the Dodoth, Jie and Karimojong. The Karimojong can be further subdivided into the Pian, the Matheniko and the Bokora, among whom independent child migration is most commonly practiced.

receiving more rainfall (Gray et al., 2003; Stites et al., 2007; Stites and Akabway, 2010; Stites et al., 2010). This dual settlement and livelihood system enables households to absorb frequent shocks like droughts, diseases and cattle raids.

2.2 Political and natural shocks

Over the course of the twentieth century, the Karimojong livelihood system experienced multiple political and natural shocks. After the collapse of Idi Amin's government in 1979, arms depots in Karamoja were looted by the various Karimojong communities. This event contributed to three decades of violent cattle-raiding and conflict among feuding communities of Karamoja (Gray, 2003; Knighton, 1990 and 2006; Mirzeler and Young, 2000; Olowo-Onyango, 2010; Stites et al., 2007). Political shocks have been accompanied by natural shocks including droughts, diseases and successive famines. Political and natural shocks have compounded Karamoja's insecurity, leading to the disintegration of traditional Karimojong livelihood systems.

2.3 Migration

Many Karimojong migrate away from Karamoja in search of alternative livelihood strategies. Women and children are found to comprise the majority of the migrant population in Uganda's urban centres. More research is required to determine why women and children migrate more than men; however, what little existing literature there is suggests women and children move due to challenges that arise following the death of or abandonment by husbands, fathers and other male guardians (Stites et al., 2007b; Sundal, 2010).

It appears that the Bokora community comprise the vast majority of migrants currently moving to urban areas outside Karamoja. Previous research indicates that Bokora dominance in current migratory practices is a result of the Ugandan disarmament policy of 2001 to 2008 (Knighton 2010; Stites et al., 2007). The basis of this argument is that because the disarmament policy was successful within the Bokora community, the Bokora became more vulnerable to attacks and raids by neighbouring armed communities. As a consequence, the traditional Bokora livelihood system disintegrated disproportionately compared to other Karimojong communities. As such, many Bokora looked for alternative livelihood opportunities outside Karamoja.

2.4 Push and pull factors

The decision to migrate may also be analysed in terms of a combination of push and pull factors (Castles and Miller, 2009). Push factors may include demographic growth, low living standards and the lack of economic opportunities. Pull factors may include demand for labour and good economic opportunities. These theories on the causes of migratory behaviour emphasize the individual decision to migrate based on a rational comparison of the relative costs and benefits of remaining in the area of origin or moving someplace else. While it is true that these push and pull factors characterize the situation of the Karimojong, they do not fully explain why some Karimojong communities have a higher prevalence of migration than others. It is likely that the disintegration of the traditional Karimojong livelihood system has contributed to the shift in patterns of Karimojong child migration, but this does not offer sufficient evidence to explain the unique character of the phenomenon.

3. Research Methods

The data for this report was collected over a period of 10 weeks, between 30 April and 6 July 2012. The data was collected by a team with a fair command of English and fluency in NKarimojong, the native language of the Karimojong.

3.1 Sampling method

The research sample was limited to the Karimojong community, an informed judgement based on the observation from IOM's activities in this field that the Jie and Dodoth communities of Karamoja do not participate in unaccompanied child migration. Twenty communities with different prevalence rates of child migration were selected. The research sites were identified by social workers of IOM's implementing partners, Dwelling Places in Kampala and the International Institute for Cooperation and Development in Moroto. Fieldwork was conducted in seven communities with high prevalence rates of child migration; seven communities with average numbers of migrants; and six communities where the practice is rare. The sub-counties of Lokopo and Lopeei in Napak District were identified as sites with high child migration prevalence; Matany, Ngoleriet and Iriiri sub-counties in Napak District were identified as sites with average child migration prevalence; and Moroto and Nakapiripirit Districts were identified as sites with rare child migration prevalence (see Appendix I).

Purposive sampling techniques were used to identify households participating in child migration. In every site, an individual interview with the local leader was conducted. Each local leader was asked to identify two households in the community that have migrant children. They were also asked to assist in the organization of a focus group discussion (FGD) with adult community members of different ages, genders and social statuses, some of whom were involved in child migration and some who were not. Thus, 20 FGDs were held, and 20 local leaders and 40 households, with a total of 51 parents, were interviewed. Aside from these, 19 former migrants were interviewed as well.

3.2 Data collection techniques

This report is based on qualitative data that was complemented with quantitative data where available. The main tools used were semi-structured interviews and FGDs. While interviews and FGDs generally proceeded according to the topic guide developed for this purpose (see Appendix II), some questions were altered as necessary during the course of the interview or FGD. Iterative questioning was

employed to ensure the soundness of the participants' responses. Informant feedback was collected at the end of each interview and FGD to check the accuracy of the responses, and frequent debriefing sessions were held at the IOM Office in Moroto. During each interview and FGD, a Njkarimjong-speaking member of the research team took detailed notes in English. All interviews and FGDs were recorded, transcribed and translated when important information had not been included in the research notes.

3.3 Informed consent

Consent was obtained before each interview and FGD, after participants were fully informed about the nature of the research and implications of participation (see Appendices III to V). Since children cannot legally consent to participate in research, consent was obtained from their legal guardians (i.e. parents in most cases). To allow the children some involvement in the consent process, they were given a separate script and form (see Appendices IV to V). Respondents were guaranteed anonymity to ensure their ability to speak freely about their experiences. IOM standards of data protection were strictly observed, and data were stored in a locked compartment or on a password-protected computer. All hard copies of interviews and FDG notes were destroyed following transcription.

3.4 Analysis

Analysis of data incorporated both observer impression and coding techniques. NVivo, a computer-assisted qualitative analysis software package, was used to code sources, distinguish important themes, trends and patterns, and aid the interpretation the data. Data triangulation was used to achieve credibility of the findings and compensate for the shortcomings of the individual data collection techniques.

4. The Evolution of Karimojong Migration Patterns

4.1 Traditional migration

Migration has traditionally been part of the Karimojong livelihood system, which is characterized by dual settlement. Regular movement has reduced the risk from recurrent shocks on food supplies by permitting a dual livelihood system consisting of agriculture and pastoral production. During the wet season, Karimojong live in *manyattas*, which only need to be relocated in situations of insecurity, outbreaks of diseases or intra-communal conflict. The location of *kraals* during the dry season is less permanent due to the exhaustion of pasturage and livestock.

Patterns of Karimojong seasonal migration have traditionally been gender- and age- related. Elders usually stay at the *manyattas* during the dry season, while the men move to the *kraals* with their livestock. Migration patterns of women and children are more complex, as they travel to the *kraals* in waves to join their husbands and fathers, respectively. Some women remain at the *manyattas* to prepare for agricultural production once the rains return. Other women return a few weeks before the men in order to prepare for crop planting. Young children move or stay with their mothers, while the older children travel to the *kraals* if there is little food left for them at the *manyattas* following a poor harvest. Thus, from a young age, Karimojong children are exposed to periodic migration and the occasional absence of their parents. These patterns may be seen as being echoed in the current migration flow of some Karimojong children.

Traditionally, the Karimojong migrate to pastures in south and western Karamoja during the dry season. In the past, they also established *kraals* in neighbouring subregions like Iteso and Langi. A group of young men was sent ahead to obtain permission from local leaders to stay in those areas. Permission was usually granted, since it provided the hosts with the opportunity to trade with the Karimojong. This, at times, resulted in long-term relationships that lasted several generations. However, most Karimojong entered into more temporary relationships with their hosts. In these cases, the host would provide the Karimojong with food and assign them a plot of land for agriculture. In return, the Karimojong would lease their oxen to help their hosts cultivate their lands. When the Karimojong returned to harvest, they would end the lease of the oxen. This type of partnership was renewable if it proved beneficial to both parties.

Although the degree of influence is unclear, early contact with Christian missionaries provided Bokora with a unique skill set to adapt to situations outside Karamoja. Anglican missionaries first arrived in Lotome, Napak District in 1929 and were soon followed by Catholic missionaries. The missionaries set up schools in the region to educate the Bokora. For several generations, Bokora have been able to travel beyond Karamoja to find more skilled employment, a practice that continues now. Through the Catholic Church, some Bokora children received scholarships which allowed them to go to boarding schools in other parts of the country. Although the number of educated Bokora was small, they successfully conveyed their positive experiences to other Bokora, translating to high rates of school attendance in Napak District. As more Bokora were educated, agricultural and pastoral production were no longer perceived as the only viable livelihood strategies. Life in an urban setting and participation in the formal economy increasingly became perceived as a viable alternative to the hardships of Karamoja.

4.2 Shifting livelihood strategies

The Karimojong experienced multiple political and natural shocks in the course of the twentieth century that significantly eroded the Karimojong traditional livelihood system. Due to this erosion, minors and youth started to look for additional ways to contribute to their household's income. Some began to undertake *elejilej* in the neighbouring subregion of Iteso during the dry season. Boys would herd their employers' livestock, while girls would perform household tasks.

In the early 2000s, the Bokora became increasingly dependent on its youth conducting *elejilej* in neighbouring rural areas. It has been argued that this was in large part due to the fact that they lost more livestock than other Karimojong communities. The Bokora attribute the loss of livestock to the successful disarmament initiative of the Ugandan Government from 2001 to 2008 among Bokora communities, leaving them more vulnerable to outside attacks than other Karimojong communities. They became the target of frequent raids by the Jie, Matheniko and Pian communities. Initially, the Bokora community relied almost exclusively on agricultural production. However, since the disarmament, the region has experienced a number of droughts, which made reliance on cultivation extremely difficult. Thus, migration to neighbouring districts to conduct *elejilej* became essential to the survival of many Bokora households. The Matheniko also participated in *elejilej*, but in their case, the practice may be more closely tied to changes in the distribution of food assistance. Other Karimojong communities do not appear to participate in *elejilej* on the same scale as the Bokora.

Although it is primarily Bokora youth who migrate to urban destinations outside their traditional migration zone to engage in *elejilej*, entire families would sometimes relocate. The first urban centres with large numbers of Bokora migrants are Busia, Mbale and Iganga. These initial flows of migration originated from Matany sub-county in Napak District, where the largest Bokora trading centre is located. Migration outside the traditional Karimojong migration zone entailed a significant evolution from the traditional livelihood system, as the Karimojong now have to support themselves through trade or wage labour.

4.3 Initial flows of child migration

In the early 2000s, the security situation in the Karamoja Region deteriorated significantly. Lokopo and Lopeei sub-counties in Napak District were particularly affected by violent cattle-raiding. The Catholic church in Lokopo Trading Centre offered a safe haven for children whose family members were killed in the violence. Increasing flows and positive perceptions of child migration can be traced to this church, as illustrated by the following comments:

“There was only one church, in Lokopo, where children would meet together. There they planned when to move to the town ... The church accommodated them for some time ... Later, some children went to their homes and others went to Kampala because the church did not have funds to support them.” - Catechist, Catholic church in Lokopo Trading Centre, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

“Children who had been to Kampala before came to the church nicely dressed. They started talking about where they had come from and others followed them later to the city.” - LC1 Chairperson, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

Although it is unknown what kind of livelihood strategies these first migrant children employed at their destinations, it appears that they regarded their experiences as positive. In the following years, large numbers of children followed them to the urban centres in Uganda, usually Kampala, while existing patterns of adult and family migration continued.

Migration systems theory suggests that migratory movements generally arise from the existence of prior links between sending and receiving countries, or, in this case, sending and receiving regions. It is argued that once a movement is established, the migrants mainly follow “beaten paths” and are helped by relatives and friends already at the destination. These “social networks make the migratory process safer and more manageable for the migrants and their families. Migratory movements, once started, become self-sustaining social processes” (Castles and Miller, 2009).

Adults from the Bokora community favour migration to rural Teso, while children and young adults usually move to urban centres. The Pian communities from Nakapiripirit District migrate mainly to Busia Town in Busia District and Namatala Town in Mbale District. Only a small number of the Pian children move to Kampala and other major cities (see Figure 2). The Matheniko communities in Moroto District only began to participate in child migration by the end of the first decade of this century. The few Matheniko that migrate are predominantly boys and men who move to rural areas, where they largely engage in pastoral wage labour. These boys and men are among the few who still migrate for pastoral production.

5. Structural Causes

5.1 Violence and food insecurity

As noted earlier in this report, Karamoja has experienced a number of political and natural shocks during the course of the twentieth century. When asked about the causes of child migration, there was broad agreement among the respondents that the phenomenon is directly caused by violence and food insecurity, as illustrated by the following comments:

“Many people were killed by enemies during the raids. This is why children have gone to peaceful places such as towns.” - FGD participant, Iriiri sub-county, Napak District

“When a child sees that people are dying, she runs away to town.” - LC1 chairman, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

“There were many raids. Everything we owned was taken away.” - Parent of child migrant, Matany sub-county, Napak District

“There was hunger. Staying at home was very hard because food was not there.” - Child migrant, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

Relative security was restored in Karamoja after the 2001–2008 disarmament initiative of the Ugandan Government, but some areas, like Napak District, proved more vulnerable to continued raiding compared to others. Disarmament was supplemented by an army-led policy to protect Karimojong livestock. Under this policy, livestock was gathered in *kraals* under the protection of the Uganda People’s Defence Forces (UPDF). This UPDF initiative and overall presence in Karamoja has successfully reduced the number of raids and increased general security, but has simultaneously contributed to a number of other livelihood problems, such as an increase in the spread of livestock disease, massive redistribution of livestock ownership and increased dependency on agriculture in drought-prone areas of Karamoja. Furthermore, some studies in Karamoja suggest that dependency on crops is associated with an increase in vulnerability and food insecurity (Levine, 2010; Mubiru, 2010), highlighting the extraordinary complexities of the rapid adaptation of livelihood strategies which have evolved to function in specific cultural and geographic environments over many hundreds of years.

5.2 Family expectations and obligations

As soon as they are able, Karimojong children are expected to contribute to the family's livelihood by performing age- and gender-appropriate labour. Traditionally, boys would assume responsibility for herding calves, goats and sheep from the age of five or six years. Older boys oversee the younger boys' activities. At five or six years, children were considered too young to leave their mothers, and would only follow their livestock to the *kraals* if both parents migrate during the dry season. From the age of 10 years old, boys would be allowed to graze cattle and remain at the *kraals* with their fathers and other men. Girls were expected to start assuming work responsibilities at the same age as boys. Similar to boys, girls would initially stay with their mothers. At the *manyattas*, they would assist their grandparents and other elderlies, while at the *kraals* mothers would assign their daughters to help give water to the animals and perform household tasks. From the age of 10, girls would look after the younger children, help boys graze animals, and travel between the *manyatta* and the *kraal* without the supervision of their mothers.

Due largely to the overall erosion of the traditional Karimojong livelihood system, specifically the tending and herding of livestock, children have sought alternative methods to contribute meaningfully to their households. Child migration has emerged from the perceived or real obligation of Karimojong children to fulfill family expectations in times when traditional labour contributions to livestock can no longer be made.

"When our neighbours started eating their food, my brothers and sisters always cried. This is why I decided to go to town to look for food." - Child migrant, Nadunget sub-county, Moroto District

"When my mother wanted to go herself, I said that I would go and that she should stay with the smaller children." - Child migrant, Matany sub-county, Napak District

"The love which children have for their parents makes them go and work in cities and come back later to support them." - LC1 Chairperson, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

Parents and children seek ways to maintain traditional household dynamics. The circular nature of Karimojong child migration is important in this respect. After children earn money and collect food at their destinations, they return to their families to share their earnings. A few months or even weeks later, the cycle is often repeated. Like traditional migration patterns, re-migration is most likely to take place during the dry season, when children's assistance with agricultural activity is not necessary. Equally beneficial is the fact that parents do not need to provide scarce food for their children.

6. Motivations

6.1 Individual motivations

The major reason given by children for migrating is their responsibility to contribute to their households (also see section 5.2). Thus, it is not the disintegration of the traditional Karimojong livelihood system itself that causes unaccompanied child migration. The reason most children migrate is not only because they lack cattle to herd in Karamoja, but also because Karimojong children feel perceived or real obligations of children towards their parents.

While some parents accompany their children, most adults find it difficult to adjust to life at urban centres. The following example illustrates this point:

"My husband and I went to Jinja and to Kampala, but it was hard, so we came back. We decided that the girl would stay there because she was mature." - Parent of child migrant, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

Some adult respondents expressed their worries about child migration, as expressed in the following comment:

"If they all go to towns, who will remain with me? And what about when I grow old? Who will take care of us?" - Parent of child migrant, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

As explained in the previous section, the desire for education is widespread among the Bokora. Among the Bokora children who were interviewed, the inability to raise the funds necessary to attend school is a reason often stated as a key influence on the decision to leave home.

"I tried selling firewood but could not raise money for books, pens and fees." - Child migrant, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

Other children were attracted by the energy and opportunities represented by urban destination centres.

"My mother wanted me to go, but it was also my dream to be in the city." - Child migrant, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

6.2 Peer pressure

The first groups of unaccompanied migrant children moved away from Karamoja in the early 2000s. They were encouraged to do so by their peers who had previously migrated to Kampala with their families (see section 4.3: *Initial flows of child migration*). Upon return, these children would meet at the Catholic church in Lokopo Trading Centre with the children that had stayed behind in Karamoja.

“Some 10 years ago, some children from Lokopo went to Kampala, and when they came back, they told other children here how good cities are. Afterwards all children wanted to follow them.” - LC1 Chairperson, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

These migrants, as well as hundreds of other migrants since, have continued to encourage their peers to follow them to urban destinations. The existence of large numbers of Bokora in many Ugandan cities provides migrant children with a social network that will help them to survive in the new, frequently hostile, environment. These networks gradually expanded as a result of the positive feedback about the potential benefits of migration.

“It started when a boy brought food. He was really smart. The rest of the children found out from him that there were good opportunities in town. Now, households which take part in the migration of children employ many people in their fields because they have a lot of money. This persuaded many parents to send their children to towns and do the same.” - LC1 Chairperson, Matany sub-county, Napak District

Over time, unaccompanied child migration has become a socially accepted practice among the community that remained in Karamoja. Children who return to their communities bring food, money and utensils, constituting an important Karimojong survival strategy that has been employed by many households in recent years. Although some children return with little to nothing, others reported that they could earn as much as UGX 300,000 in a few months and bring food that can last their families for several months. These families frequently support other members of their community, raising their own social status in the process.

7. Mechanisms of Karimojong Child Migration

7.1 The decision-making process

Many Bokora and Matheniko parents are aware of their children's motivations and consent to their decision to migrate to urban centres. In such cases, a family meeting may be held to determine the child's destination and make transportation arrangements. According to migration system theory, the role of the family and community in the decision-making process is crucial. In situations of rapid change, a family may decide to send one or more members to work in another region in order to maximize income and survival chances (Castles and Miller, 2009).

The decision to migrate is more often made by the children without prior consultation with their parents. Findings from a separate quantitative study² measuring the prevalence of child migration from Napak and Moroto Districts found that 59.94 per cent of child migration is initiated by the child and 34.16 per cent is reported to be initiated by the head of household. Even if the parents do not give permission to leave the household, their objection will not necessarily persuade a child to stay at home, as illustrated by the following comments:

"Children escape poverty. When they see that there is no food at home, they do not waste time asking parents for permission to leave." - LC1 Chairperson, Nadunget sub-county, Moroto District

"Children started going one by one and now there are so many going ... when you come back from the garden you realize your child is no longer at home." - Parent of a child migrant, Ngoleriet sub-county, Napak District

Some parents only approve of the migration of children they consider mature enough:

"We made a decision for the eldest son to go to Apeitolim (a fertile rural area on the western border of Napak) because all people in the community were going there, but we did not let the girls go, even though they wanted to. We only realized that one of the girls had left when she called from Jinja. The other girl told us that she was going to the church, but she had disappeared and only called after two days. When I asked her the day she called why she had left, she told me: 'There is no food at home. How can you feed me?'" - Parent of a child migrant, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

² See IOM's 2013 report, *Child Migration from Karamoja's Napak and Moroto Districts*.

The decision-making process of children is often influenced by their friends with whom they have agreed to leave the community. They are likely to run away from home if they are confronted with actual or anticipated parental objection. Groups of friends are encouraged to move by recent returnees who recount positive experiences and assure the availability of accommodation and employment (see also section 6.2).

7.2 Preparing for migration

Most children are able to raise the funds necessary to make the journey themselves by taking advantage of the (limited) income-generating opportunities available in their communities. Girls find employment digging in the fields of fellow community members or in neighbouring villages and trading centres, gather firewood, brew local alcoholic beverages or help adults make charcoal. Boys may also assist in charcoal production or catch rats. Some children may be unable to raise enough money to pay for transportation to their chosen destination at once. For this reason they may travel in stages, stopping at urban centres en route to earn money to fund the rest of the journey. The inability to raise sufficient funds for transportation is, thus, unlikely to determine the choice of destination, which is based more on the children's perception of the quality of life and work availability in a certain locale, as communicated by the migrants' predecessors.

Nearby districts like Teso are perceived to be more welcoming to migrants since they speak a similar language and can understand Karimojong culture. Urban centres, on the other hand, offer more income-generating opportunities. As a result, urban centres, including Busia, Iganga, Jinja, Kampala and Mbale have large and well-established Karimojong communities. The established networks of Karimojong in urban centres also facilitate child migration. These networks are complex, hidden and connect Karamoja to most of Uganda's urban centres. For instance, children who are unable to raise enough money to fund the transportation to their destination may borrow funds in Karamoja and reimburse the costs to a member of the same network once the child begins earning money at the destination. As a result, many migrant children are victims of debt bondage and are forced to pay off their debt under exploitative circumstances.

7.3 Family ties

Although the separation of child and parents potentially disrupts existing family and community dynamics, spatial dislocation does not necessarily have to be experienced by the child and his or her parents as a rupture of family and community ties. Most Karimojong migrant children are able to maintain regular contact with their parents while they are away. Contact is usually made through

mobile phones borrowed from local council chairmen or community members and fellow migrants. Some migrants have their own phones. Due to frequent communication and circular migration, family ties are, to some extent, maintained while the child is away.

Many parents are unaware of the dire conditions in which their children live and work at their destination. When children return home – either on their own or assisted by a government or agency programme – they may decide to finally disclose their more negative migration experiences to their parents. Even as many of these returnees report being afraid to leave their communities again, they would still re-migrate in order to continue providing for their families. After spending a few months at their destination, migrant children typically return home and stay there until the money, food and other goods they have brought back with them have been spent or consumed. Depending on the child's success working abroad and his or her family's generosity in dispensing the earnings to neighbours, he or she can stay at home from a period of a few weeks to many months. Re-migration is most likely to take place during the dry season, when children's assistance with agricultural activity is not necessary. Equally beneficial is the fact that with these children away, there are less members of the family that parents need to provide scarce food for. The economic advantages of child migration can influence the decisions of children and parents to migrate, despite the danger and risk of exploitation.

7.4 Urban survival

Since most Karimojong are trained for agro-pastoral production, their skills are often not immediately transferable to a world in which expertise and specialized education is required. Migrant children usually engage in low paid manual labour, or find alternative, sometimes illegal, forms of income generation. In rural areas, apart from agricultural and pastoral activities girls may also brew local alcoholic beverages or undertake domestic work for the local population. Urban centres can be more attractive for migrant children, because they offer a greater variety of jobs. A number of the migrant children – most of them girls – find employment in markets where they help carry, sort and measure produce, or sell charcoal. The availability of opportunities in urban centres convinces new migrant children to follow their peers to town. However, children usually perform poorly paid manual labour, such as collecting unconsumed food in market places or spilt from trailers. Many children engage in begging in the streets of Kampala and other Ugandan towns.

"Begging is good because there is no energy wasted." FGD participant, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

This income is apparently large enough to justify the practice of “leasing” children to others, as a mother who migrated to Kampala with her daughter recalls:

“Sometimes I would go with the child to beg, and sometimes my Karimojong friends would rent her out. They cheated me and brought me little money, so I took the child back.” Parent of a child migrant, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

However, begging may expose them to violence from city dwellers and authorities. Although profitable, street begging attracts the attention of authorities and townspeople who do not welcome these children in their city (cf. Young, 2003). Begging children are frequently assaulted on the streets. Employers, particularly of girls working in domestic labour, often expect them to work excessively long hours, seven days a week, and some girls were beaten. The girls’ inability to pay expensive rent fees also frequently results in assaults. Although rape was not reported in any of the interviews, some girls reported that they were informally “married” and had given birth while they were away from home.

Many of the interviewed children had been “rounded up,” or physically withdrawn from the streets of Kampala and detained at Kamparingisa National Rehabilitation Centre (KNRC)³. A March 2013 joint assessment of KNRC by the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development, the Kampala City Council Authority (KCCA) and IOM found that the shelter required significant improvements in order to be able to house victims of trafficking for more than one week and lacked staff with sufficient Nkarimojong language skills to provide adequate psychosocial counselling. The succeeding chapter explores past initiatives by the Government to return migrant children from Karamoja exploited on the streets of Kampala and other urban centres.

3 KNRC is Uganda’s only rehabilitation facility specifically for youth in conflict with the law.

8. Return and Reintegration

In 2008 the Kampala City Council Authority (KCCA) began a programme to detain children begging on the streets of Kampala.⁴ For reasons discussed in previous sections, many of the children detained were from Karamoja, specifically from Napak District. Until IOM's CRTU project began facilitating the direct assistance, return and reintegration process for Karamojong children, various elements within the Government facilitated the return process. The first two sections of this chapter explore previous return initiatives from the perspective of the people directly affected – the Karimojong. To learn from past return initiatives, we asked migrant children to discuss their experiences returning to their families and communities; we asked community members to discuss the reintegration process as well.

8.1 Family tracing

An important component of the return process of migrant children is family tracing, in which the parents of the child are identified and informed about the return of their child. However, family tracing is not always completed before the child's actual return, leaving the child stranded and distressed until the parents are correctly identified.

"They forced us to get on the bus. I was scared, and when we arrived in Lokopo, I could not remember where our home was. Fortunately, some woman from my village saw me and took me home." – Returnee, Ngoleriet sub-county

Due to the lack of adequate family tracing, many parents do not know that their children have already been returned to Karamoja. Returnees are usually provided with transportation to their homes, although in some cases parents have to travel many kilometres away from their homes to the settlements. The lack of communication often leads to wasted time and unnecessary anxiety on the part of the parents:

"I first went to Lokopo, because they told me that children had been taken there. When I arrived there, I was told that the returned children had all gone back to Kampala. I was very worried, but, fortunately, I found my son in a house in Lokopo." – Parent, Ngoleriet sub-county, Napak District

⁴ This practice, dubbed as "round-ups," is currently still being carried out by the KCCA.

8.2 Family and community reception

Many returnees worry about how they will be received, especially when they were unable to acquire food and money for their families:

“I was worried about coming home. I was thinking: What will I take to my parents? How will people at home look at me when I bring nothing?” – Returnee, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

Children worry because they feel obligated to contribute to their families, as this was the primary reason for migration in the first place in most cases.⁵ These concerns are largely unjustified, since the majority of all parents expressed satisfaction about the return of their children. Only on a few occasions were family members disappointed with the returnee not bringing anything home, as the following examples illustrates:

“Only my grandmother was angry because I did not bring any food.” – Returnee, Lokopo sub-county

Yet parents’ delight in seeing their children again may be increased by the expectation of material benefits, as expressed by these returnees:

“My parents know that I always bring money for them when I come back from Kampala.” – Returnee, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

“My parents were happy. They slaughtered a chicken for me and I bought ekwete [local alcoholic beverage – KC] for them. The trouble with parents is that when they see that you are back from Kampala, they know that you have money.” – Returnee, Lopeei sub-county

The strong family ties and community ethos that characterize Karimojong society ensure that returnees are looked after, even when they don’t have parents to return to. However, generosity may sometimes come reluctantly due to extreme poverty, as illustrated by the comment below:

“I was thinking: why have they brought the children to Karamoja again? Where will I get money and food for helping her? She is an orphan, not my child.” – Guardian, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

As a result, the child may feel unwanted. Other community members may also hold negative attitudes towards returnees, as the following examples illustrate:

“They are spoilt children who have shamed Karamoja.” – FGD participant, Lopeei sub-county

5 For more details on the causes and mechanisms of unaccompanied child migration, see the IOM report “The Causes and Mechanisms of Unaccompanied Karimojong Child Migration to Ugandan Urban Centres Outside Karamoja” (2013).

“The returnees are children who do not respect their parents, because they went away without asking for permission. They have brought shame to our community because the whole world knows that Karimojong children are beggars.” – FGD participant, Lopeei sub-county

At any rate, community members are usually able to understand that the returnees have experienced many hardships during their migration. In fact, the suffering of unaccompanied migrant children in Kampala and other urban centres may even be exaggerated by rumours in the community, as the following comment illustrates:

“We did not know that children would be returned home, but we were very happy when they came back, because we were tired of hearing that Karimojong children were tortured in Kampala.” – FGD participant, Matany sub-county

Such rumours may also lead to unsubstantiated fears of the potential consequences of receiving returnees. Many community members expressed the worry that the children may have contracted diseases at their destinations, while others worry about the future conduct of these children. Indeed, many left their homes without parental consent and were exposed to behavioural norms unfamiliar to Karimojong society. These anxieties could be reduced by increased dialogue and understanding within the affected communities. Return initiatives should play an important role in communicating the experiences, fears and concerns of the receiving community.

8.3 Reintegration package

Most returnees and their families are provided with a reintegration package upon return. Ideally, the contents of this package are based on the needs of the recipient. However, for the last several years, the contents of the reintegration package have remained the same: basic household items such as saucepans, plates, cups, spoons, knives, machetes, hoes, basins, jerry cans, clothes, shoes, blankets, tarpaulin, mosquito nets and soap. Some returnees are also provided with a limited amount of food items such as beans, maize and rice, which do not last longer than a few weeks.

Recipients are usually not consulted on what package contents they prefer and, consequently, frequently complain that they did not receive the items that they needed the most. Instead, they claim to have received items that are of limited utility, as one respondent noted:

“What is the use of saucepans when there is no food?” – Parent from Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

As a consequence, many returnees sell the contents of their reintegration package and choose to re-migrate. In addition, the provision of integration packages tends to be unsystematic and poorly organized. Furthermore, the contents of the assistance package may differ substantially among returnees. These inconsistencies create a sense of discrimination and may give rise to tension within the community.

The limitations of the reintegration package aside, most recipients express satisfaction with the assistance provided to them. Arguably, however, reintegration support provided has tended to focus on short term needs as opposed to promoting long-term solutions for the Karimojong. For example, some reintegration packages contain mosquito nets to reduce the occurrence of malaria, but recipients reported not being trained on how to use them correctly. While the knives, machetes and hoes from the package could aid agricultural production, many of the recipients lack basic agricultural skills and training. Many attempts to reinvigorate traditional livestock production have been limited in scale and lack government support. Similarly, assistance to encourage children to go to school has been offered only to a small number of returnees. The widespread desire for education among returnees indicates their ability to seek durable solutions, as expressed by one respondent:

“I was not happy with the assistance: why did they give me blankets and not books or pens which would allow me to go to school?” – Returnee, Matany sub-county, Napak District

The limited success of reintegration programmes to address the needs of returnees is arguably due to the absence of systematic efforts to identify, articulate and address the underlying causes of child migration. Despite receiving assistance, returnees and their community members by and large continue to be exposed to the hardships they experienced prior to migration. Thus, reintegration initiatives lack the ability to contribute to the development of new and durable Karimojong livelihood strategies that could ease the hardships they face.

8.4 Role of the community in reintegration

Karimojong returnees are usually confronted by traumatic incidents at all stages of the migration cycle. Although returnees usually find forms of psychosocial support within their communities, this does not undermine the value of professional assistance that can help children to successfully deal with their negative experiences.

Unfortunately, many reintegration initiatives in Karamoja do not involve consultations with community and local leaders. Such consultations may help

community members gain a better understanding of returnees' experiences and explain to them the importance of positive attitudes towards returnees in helping them overcome their traumas. As pointed out in the previous chapter, community members are not always informed about the arrival of the child, and the concerns of the community are usually unaddressed. The exclusion of the community in the reintegration process reinforces commonly held perceptions of marginalization, neglect and a lack of interest in the Karimojong. Another adverse side effect of the reintegration package is that it may create perverse incentives for other children to migrate, as illustrated by the example below:

“When they brought posho and beans, it helped community members because they could borrow from families whose children had migrated. Many families started sending children to town because they also wanted to benefit from food assistance.” – FGD participant, Matany sub-county, Napak District

Although poor households are more likely to participate in child migration, almost all Karimojong live in dire conditions. Assistance should thus involve all community members. Since the economic status of returnees and their families is unlikely to be much different from other Karimojong households, exclusive assistance to returnees is likely to undermine community cohesiveness as it could promote conflict within the community:

“Some people are very annoyed because we got free things. Others say that if they had sent their children away, they would have also got[ten] free things. Some people are jealous because they do not have such items in their families.” – Parent of a returnee, Lopeei sub-county

A minority of community members expressed their discontent about children participating in migration, as they consider it to be a practice shaming the rest of the community. However, after interacting with the returnees, their perceptions gradually changed:

“We thought they were bad children who did not respect their parents, but they now help their parents in cultivation.” – FGD participant, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

“Because they have not migrated again, our opinion of them has changed. We now love them and have trust in them.” – FGD participant, Ngoleriet sub-county

8.5 Role of the family in reintegration

Given the lack of effective return initiatives, the relationship of the returnees with their families becomes crucial to their well-being. Most respondents agree that the love and respect from their parents enhance the quality of their lives. Parents, in turn, are anxious that their children might re-migrate, and so they make sure that their children feel welcome at their homes:

“There is love in the family. I love her because I am afraid that she may leave again. I go to the bush every day and I collect vegetables and wild fruits, so that she does not sleep hungry and follow her sisters in Kampala.”
– Parent of a returnee, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

“My daughter has promised never to go back again. We work and look for elejilej together, so that we can get food. She is a good girl these days because she collects firewood and fetches water. She has learnt that staying in a town is very expensive.” – Parent of a returnee, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

Parents are likely to demand less labour from their returned children, who, consequently, have more time to play with their peers and attend school – if fees have been paid by their parents or a reintegration initiative. Sometimes the return of a child migrant can change family relations to such an extent that some of the push factors, such as mistreatment, are eliminated:

“My parents love me now because I am back home, but before I migrated they used to beat me whenever I made a mistake.” – Returnee, Matany sub-county, Napak District

“If I started beating the boy, he would run away. This is why I only advise him on proper behaviour. Our relationship is good because he does what I tell him to.” – Parent of a returnee, Lorengechora sub-county, Napak District

Good family relations are often reflected by broader social structures within the community, which further facilitate returnees’ reintegration:

“People in the community are very kind to me and advise me not to leave again. They say that they were worried about me when I was away.” – Returnee, Matany sub-county, Napak District

Returnees can also rely on the support of their peers, who serve as a trusted social circle in which they can share and discuss traumatic experiences. This may help them overcome the psychological impacts of migration.

8.6 Re-migration and other challenges

Strong family relations and community cohesiveness help returnees deal with their painful memories. However, despite the difficulties experienced by unaccompanied migrant children, root causes continue to drive children to migrate from Karamoja, as the following statements show:

“Many of the children who were returned have gone to Teso, while those who liked Kampala have gone back there.” – FGD participant, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

“They returned nearly all children from this community, but now none of them are here [anymore] because they went back when they saw that their parent[s] had no food in their homes.” – FGD participant, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

“Many children were returned, but some have already left again because they had no money for school.” – FGD participant, Matany sub-county, Napak District

Despite the close social relations of Karimojong children with their communities and families, reintegration is impeded by the same hardships as the ones that forced them to leave the region.

“Life is very difficult in Karamoja. I eat residue from ekwete as my only meal every day because my mother cannot afford to buy food for the family.” – Returnee, Ngoleriet sub-county, Napak District

“I am responsible for eight younger siblings. We sleep hungry at least three times a week because we cannot afford to buy food.” – Returnee, Ngoleriet sub-county, Napak District

“I want to go to school, but there is no one who can pay my fees.” – Returnee, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

The challenges that returnees and their parents face affect their emotional well-being and add to the psychological distress brought about by their migration experiences;

“I am afraid that there will be no food in the future.” – Returnee, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District

“Sometimes I cry when there is no food at home and my children are sleeping hungry.” – Parent of a returnee, Lokopo sub-county

“I am afraid that I will not finish school because my parents cannot afford to pay for it.” – Returnee, Matany sub-county, Napak District

Although returnees continue to face hunger, poverty and a lack of formal education, they express being more satisfied with their lives in Karamoja than in their migration destinations. The most common reason was the presence of their families in Karamoja:

“Life at home [is] better than in towns. It is not good to love a place which is not yours because in a town you do not have relatives who can help you.”
– Returnee, Lopee sub-county, Napak District

“Life is better at home because you are with your parents.” – Returnee, Lopee sub-county, Napak District

In addition to family relations, many returnees expressed their preference for traditional forms of production rooted in community cooperation and mutual assistance, as explained in the following comment:

“Home is good because there is no begging here, [un]like in Kampala.” – Returnee, Matany sub-county

“Home is better. You do not have to pay rent and buy food. In Mbale, you need money for everything. Here, I do not sleep hungry because I can go to the neighbours and eat.” – Returnee, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District

“Here, we grow our own food, while in Kampala you have to go to the street and beg for food.” – Returnee, Matany sub-county, Napak District

9. Conclusion

This report aims to provide a better understanding of the causes and mechanisms of Karimojong child migration to urban centres. Ultimately, child migration from Karamoja is caused by a combination of traditional, social, economic and political factors. In this report, the causes were connected to the Bokora's successful disarmament, which made communities in Napak more insecure and vulnerable to cattle-raiding from neighbouring communities who did not disarm. Another contributing factor highlighted in this report was the early missionary efforts in Napak District, providing members of the Bokora community with the education and skills desirable in urban areas. In addition, the Bokora have a long history of migration tied to their agro-pastoral livelihood strategy.

The early establishment of migration flows of migrant children from Napak to Uganda's urban centres has long been perceived as a coping strategy for Bokora households struggling to survive. The decision for a child to migrate is often made at the household level, but can also be made by the child independent of his or her parents or other household members. A child's decision to migrate is often due to a perceived responsibility to his or her family, or because of peer influence from children who return to Karamoja from urban centres with money or food. Whether the decision is made in consultation with the family or independently, once a child has migrated to an urban centre, he or she is vulnerable to countless forms of exploitation.

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, large groups of unaccompanied minors from Karamoja, Uganda have increasingly appeared on the streets of Kampala and other urban centres in the country. Since these children are vulnerable to marginalization and exploitation, the Ugandan Government has the responsibility to protect them. Therefore, the Ugandan Government launched return initiatives, first in 2007, which were then followed up in 2008 by NGO reintegration programmes. This report aimed to gain a better understanding of the return and reintegration process of unaccompanied migrant children from Karamoja. It tried to answer how unaccompanied internal migrant children from Karamoja experience the return and reintegration process, what assistance they receive in Kampala and upon return, and what roles the family and community have in the reintegration process.

This report found that many unaccompanied migrant children are forcibly removed from the streets of Kampala despite the common wish to return to

Karamoja. Children expressed their dissatisfaction with this method, but were relieved when they found out that they could go back to Karamoja. It was also discovered that there is inadequate information about assistance and transportation to Karamoja available to migrant children. In addition, it was determined that family tracing is not always completed before the arrival of the child returnee in Karamoja, leaving the child distressed. Post-arrival assistance is limited to an outdated reintegration package of household utensils that are not always useful to the returnee and his or her family. Furthermore, the delivery of the package is uncoordinated, and not all packages reach the intended recipients. What appears to help the returnees most to effectively reintegrate is the love and help they get from their families and communities. However, families and communities are usually unaware of the migration experiences and the consequent needs of returnees.

Children who migrate from Karamoja in search of income opportunities are vulnerable to labour exploitation, and many become victims of trafficking in persons. Understanding the “why” and the “how” of this phenomenon is critical because it will lead to better programmatic interventions by the Government, civil society organizations (CSOs) and international organizations like IOM. Child migration is a symptom of a deeper and larger sense of insecurity and instability among the Bokora. National and international stakeholders must join in a coordinated response to this phenomenon and address root causes of child migration by improving socioeconomic opportunities and providing durable livelihood support to source communities. Without a quick and coordinated response to the root causes of child migration and labour exploitation, the phenomenon is at risk of spreading beyond Napak and Moroto to other districts of Karamoja.

10. References

- Castles, S. and M.J. Miller
2009 *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., Houndmills, Basingstoke and Hampshire.
- Chiswick, B. R.
2000 Are immigrants favorably self-selected? An economic analysis. In: *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines* (C.B. Brettell and J.F. Hollifield, eds.). Routledge, New York.
- Gray, S.J.
2000 A memory of loss: Ecological politics, local history, and the evolution of Karimojong Violence. *Human Organization*, 59(4):401–418.
- Gray, S.J. et al.
2003 Cattle raiding , cultural survival, and adaptability of East African pastoralists. *Current Anthropology*, 44 (Supp.):3–30.
- Hashim, I.M.
2005 Exploring the Linkages Between Children’s Independent Migration and Education: Evidence from Ghana. University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Iversen, V.
2002 Autonomy in child labor migrants. *World Development*, 30(5):817–834.
- James, A., C. Jenks and A. Prout
1998 *Theorizing Childhood*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Knaute, D.
2009 A synthesis of major publications on the Karamoja region of Uganda, using the “Nine Spheres of the Syndrome” approach as a framework. In: *Sustainability in Karamoja? Rethinking the Terms of Global Sustainability in a Crisis Region of Africa* (D. Knaute and S. Kagan, eds.). Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, Köln, pp. 19–142.

- Knighton, B.
1990 Christian Enculturation in Karamoja, Uganda. University of Durham, Durham.
- 2006 Belief in guns and warlords: Freeing Karimojong identity from Africanist theory. *African Identities*, 4(2):269–286.
- 2010 ‘Disarmament’: The end or fulfillment of cattle raiding? *Nomadic Peoples*, 14 (2):123–146.
- McKendrick, J.
1999 Multi-method research: an introduction to its application in population geography. *Professional Geographer*, 51(1):40–50.
- McKinney, P.
2009 *Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis*. World Food Programme, Rome.
- Mirzeler, M. K. and M.C. Young
2003 Pastoral politics in the northeast periphery in Uganda: AK-47 as change agent. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 38(3):407–429.
- Olowo Onyango, E.
2010 *Pastoralists in Violent Defiance of the State. The Case of the Karimojong in Northeastern Uganda*. The University of Bergen, Bergen.
- Stahl, C.
1993 ‘Explaining International Migration’, in *Global Population Movements and their Implications for Australia*, edited by Stahl, C., Ball, R., Inglis, C., and Gutman, P. (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Stefansky Huisman, C.
2011 ‘Once Patriarchs and Warriors: Masculinity and Modernity in Karamoja, Uganda’, *Praxis: The Fletcher Journal of Human Security*, XXVI (2011), 60-80.
- Stites, E. et al.
2007 *Angering Akujũ: Survival and Suffering in Karamoja. A Report on Livelihoods and Human Security in the Karamoja Region of Uganda* (Medford, Massachusetts, United States: Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, 2007).

- Stites, E. and D. Akabwai
2010 "We are now reduced to women': Impacts of forced disarmament in Karamoja, Uganda. *Nomadic Peoples*, 14(2010):24–43.
- Sundal, M.B.
2010 Nowhere to go: Karimojong displacement and forced resettlement. *Nomadic Peoples*, 14(2010):72–86.
- Thorsen, D.
2007 "If Only I Get Enough Money for a Bicycle!": A Study of Childhoods, Migration and Adolescent Aspirations Against a Backdrop of Exploitation and Trafficking in Burkina Faso. Paper, University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Whitehead, A., I.M. Hashim and V. Iversen
2007 Child migration, child agency and intergenerational relations in Africa and South Asia. Paper, University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Young, L.
2004 Journeys to the street: The complex migration geographies of Ugandan street children. *Geoforum*, 35(4):471–488.

Appendix I: List of Research Sites

| Site | Inclusive dates |
|--|-------------------------|
| Lorunget, Nakwamoru Parish, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District | 9 and 14 May 2012 |
| Lorengelup, Nakwamoru Parish, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District | 10 and 14 May 2012 |
| Lopeei Trading Centre, Lopeei Parish, Lopeei sub-county, Napak District | 11 and 15 May 2012 |
| Kalukmeri, Akalale Parish, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District | 16 and 31 May 2012 |
| Lorikitae, Akalale Parish, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District | 17 and 17 May 2012 |
| Kokorio, Lokupoi Parish, Matany sub-county, Napak District | 21 and 23 May 2012 |
| Kachodo, Kayepas Parish, Matany sub-county, Napak District | 22 and 23 May 2012 |
| Nawoikorot, Konyanga Parish, Ngoleriet sub-county, Napak District | 24 and 29 May 2012 |
| Naitakwae, Kakutalem Parish, Ngoleriet sub-county, Napak District | 28 and 29 May 2012 |
| Locholi, Lokuwas Parish, Matany sub-county, Napak District | 30 and 31 May 2012 |
| Nabokath, Iriiri Parish, Iriiri sub-county, Napak District | 4 and 11 June 2012 |
| Lolet, Lorengechora Parish, Iriiri sub-county, Napak District | 6 and 11 June 2012 |
| Natumkasikou, Nakadeli Parish, Rupa sub-county, Moroto District, | 19 June and 6 July 2012 |
| Nakapelimen, Nadunget Parish, Nadunget sub-county, Moroto District | 20 and 22 June 2012 |
| Lokilala, Nadunget Parish, Nadunget sub-county, Moroto District | 21 and 22 June 2012 |
| Naturum, Napenayia Parish, Loregae sub-county, Nakapiripirit District | 26 and 29 June 2012 |
| Nabilitatuk Trading Centre, Nabilitatuk Parish, Nabilitatuk sub-county, Nakapiripirit District | 27 and 29 June 2012 |

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Nakayot, Kokuwam Parish, Namalu sub-county, Nakapiripirit District | 28 and 29 June 2012 |
| Napeilet, Kayepas Parish, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District | 3 and 5 July 2012 |
| Napusligoi, Kayepas Parish, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District | 4 and 5 July 2012 |
| Lokopo Trading Centre, Lokopo Parish, Lokopo sub-county, Napak District | 6 July 2012 |

Appendix II: Research Instrument – Causes and Mechanisms

I. Local leaders

1. Traditional migration/mobility patterns and practices
 - 1.1 What are the traditions of mobility and movement in this community?
 - 1.2 How often would people traditionally move to ḡawuyoi? Would some of these ḡawuyoi be in Teso or Lango? Would people go to Teso or Lango for any other reason than grazing cattle? Was it always seasonal migration?
 - 1.3 Did people have established relationships with people to whose lands they would travel? Are you familiar with stock associates? What do you know about them?
 - 1.4 What categories of community members would leave the community to go to any of these places (including ḡawuyoi)? Would it be adult or young men, women, boys or girls? How old would a child need to be to be taken to any of these places?
 - 1.5 Would children ever leave the community unaccompanied?
 - 1.6 Did people require elders' approval when they left the community?
2. Changes in migration/mobility patterns
 - 2.1 How have these practices changed in recent past? Why have they changed?
 - 2.2 Did people stop going to any of the places described above? If so, why?
 - 2.3 Did they start going to new places? If so, why?
 - 2.4 What places are these? Why do they go to these places, and not others?
 - 2.5 When did people start going to these places? Is it a recent development, or did people start going to rural Teso/Lango or urban centres such as Busia and Namatala some decades ago? Which places did they initially go to? Are the current destination areas different? If so, why is this the case?
 - 2.6 What categories of community members go to these new places?
 - 2.7 If they are different to the people who would traditionally leave the community, why is this the case?
 - 2.8 Do people require the permission of elders or the LC1 Chairperson to leave the community?

3. Child migration prevalence
 - 3.1 Is child migration widely practiced in this community?
 - 3.2 Why do children leave this community?
 - 3.3 Why do children leave this community in such numbers, while other similar Bokora/Karimojong communities have many more/fewer migrant children?
 - 3.4 We know that people leave Napak District more often than other parts of Karamoja. Why is this so?

4. Child migration origins
 - 4.1 When did children start leaving the community? How did this practice start?
 - 4.2 Did the first migrant children from this community copy what children from others did?
 - 4.3 How was information about child migration and its benefits distributed between different communities?

5. Migrant children's destination
 - 5.1 Where do the children go?
 - 5.2 Do more children go to rural areas or urban centres? Why is this the case?
 - 5.3 Which rural areas/urban centres do children go to?

6. Child migration vis-à-vis adult migration
 - 6.1 Do more adults or children leave the community? Why is this the case?
 - 6.2 Do adults go to different places than children? If so, why is this the case?

7. Do more boys or girls leave the community? Why is this the case?
 - 7.1 Do boys go to different places than girls? If so, why is this the case?
 - 7.2 Do boys and girls engage in different economic behaviours in places to which they migrate?

8. What households within the community tend to be involved in child outmigration? Are they richer or poorer, better or worse educated, male- or female-headed, or have a history of outmigration?

9. Unaccompanied child migration
 - 9.1 What forms of child outmigration are practiced in this community?
 - 9.2 Do people usually leave with their children? Do they send a child unaccompanied? Do many children run away or do they leave out of their own volition but ask permission from their parents? Why is this the case?

- 9.3 What proportion of migrants fall under each category?
 - 9.4 If parents send a child unaccompanied, why do they not go with their child?
 - 9.5 If children run away, why do they do it? Do they simply escape poverty, or do they also face abuse or exploitation in their homes?
 - 9.6 If parents give permission for a child to leave the community, why is such permission given? Are they allowed to go because of any benefits of child migration to families and their budgets? If this is the case, why will the parents not go with their children to work?
10. Arrangements for migrant children at the destination
 - 10.1 If children go unaccompanied, are there usually family members, friends or other known people awaiting the children at the destination?
 - 10.2 If not, how do children find accommodation and work there?
 - 10.3 Are there some people in or outside the community who facilitate child outmigration (arrange for transport, pay for transport, promise to arrange for jobs and accommodation at the destination)? If so, who are those people? Have you ever heard of such people operating in Karamoja? If so, what do you know about them?
11. Return of migrant children
 - 11.1 When children leave, do they usually stay in the places to which they go, or do they come back? If they come back, how often do they do so? Why do they come back? Do more children stay in destination areas permanently, or do more of them return to the community on a regular basis?
 - 11.2 When children come back, do they bring food and/or money with them? How much food or money do the children usually bring? Do these contributions from children form an important component of their families' budgets?
12. Respondent's view of child migration
 - 12.3 What do you think about child outmigration?
 - 12.4 Do you think it is a violation of children's rights, survival strategy for the child and his or her household, or a tradition grounded in cultural practices and traditional livelihood strategies (such as movement between *ɲireria* and *ɲawuyoi* or to grazing areas)?
13. Have you previously encouraged or discouraged child outmigration in the community? If so, why did you do it?

II. Migrant children who have returned to their communities

1. Have people in your family or household moved to cities or towns outside Karamoja before you did, or were you the first to leave Karamoja?
2. Have other children in your family or household also moved outside Karamoja?
3. Did you leave Karamoja because you were told to do so by your parent(s) or guardian(s), or did you decide to leave yourself? Did any people outside the household, including local leaders, say that they wanted you to leave or stay?
4. (*Whichever is applicable*) Why did you decide to leave the community? Why did your parent(s)/guardian(s) decide that you should leave the community?
5. Did your family members want you to leave? If so, why was this the case?
6. Why did you, and not other household members, leave?
7. Did you leave with a household member, a relative, friend, some other person, or were you sent on your own? Why was this the case?
8. Did any people outside the household arrange or help to arrange transport, a place to stay in the city and work for you there? Did they pay for transport? Why were they asked or allowed to do this?
9. Which urban centre or rural area did you go to? Why did you choose to go to that place?
10. When did you leave? How long did you stay there?
11. What were your expectations of life in the place you went to?
12. Where did you stay there? Did you stay with people you knew from your community or another place in Karamoja?
13. What work did you find there? Did someone from your community or another place in Karamoja help you to find a job?
14. Were you mistreated in any way during your stay there? Who mistreated you? What did they do to you?
15. What contact did you have with your family/household members while you were there?
16. Why did you return? How many times have you been there? Do you return on a regular basis?
17. When you return(ed), do (or did) you bring money, good or other goods to your family? Do you know their value?
18. Do you want to go back to the place from which you have returned?
19. Would you want more children in your household and community to move to urban centres or rural areas? Why would you want that to happen?

III. Parents of migrant children

1. Traditional migration/mobility patterns and practices
 - 1.1 What are the traditions of mobility and movement in this community?
 - 1.2 How often would people traditionally move to *ɲawuyoi*? Would some of these *ɲawuyoi* be in Teso or Lango? Would people go to Teso or Lango for any other reason than grazing cattle? Was it always seasonal migration?
 - 1.3 Did people have established relationships with people to whose lands they would travel? Are you familiar with stock associates? What do you know about them?
 - 1.4 What categories of community members would leave the community to go to any of these places (including *ɲawuyoi*)? Would it be adult or young men, women, boys or girls? How old would a child need to be to be taken to any of these places?
 - 1.5 Would children ever leave the community unaccompanied?
 - 1.6 Did people require elders' approval to leave the community?

2. Changes in migration/mobility patterns and practices
 - 2.1 How have these practices changed in the recent past? Why have they changed?
 - 2.2 Did people stop going to any of the places described above? If so, why?
 - 2.3 Did they start going to new places? If so, why?
 - 2.4 What places are these? Why do they go to these places and not others?
 - 2.5 When did people start going to these places? Is it a recent development, or did people start going to rural Teso and Lango, or urban centres, such as Busia and Namatala, some decades ago? Which places did they initially go to? Are the current destination areas different? If so, why is this the case?
 - 2.6 What categories of community members go to these new places?
 - 2.7 If they are different from the people who traditionally left the community, why is this the case?
 - 2.8 Do people require the permission of elders or the LC1 Chairperson to leave the community?

3. Mobility in the family
 - 3.1 Has your family always followed the same practices as the rest of the community? If not, in what ways has it been different?
 - 3.2 Is there anything different about the history of mobility (in particular, the mobility of children) in your family?

4. Is migration from Karamoja (including child migration) a new phenomenon in your family? When did people from your family start leaving Karamoja?
5. Family condition vis-à-vis that of others in the community
 - 5.1 Why is child outmigration practiced in this household, but not in others? Is your household different from others?
 - 5.2 Is your family female-headed? Does it have more or fewer assets? Does it have better or worse educational attainment?
 - 5.3 Has your family been affected to a greater degree than others by insecurity and violence (including loss of life among former household members) or economic changes (including loss of livestock or erosion of other key livelihood strategies)?
6. Childhood mobility in the family
 - 6.1 How many children from your household have left the community?
 - 6.2 When did they leave?
 - 6.3 How old are they?
 - 6.4 What places did they go to? Why did they go there?
7. Was child outmigration the result of a decision taken by the household head, the entire household, or the child himself or herself?
8. Did the child leave with a household member, was she entrusted to relatives, friends, other people, or was she sent unaccompanied? Why was this the case?
9. Why did this particular child (and not other household members) leave?
10. Assistance from non-household members
 - 10.1 Did any people outside the household arrange or help to arrange for transportation and accommodation and income activities at the destination?
 - 10.2 Did they pay for the child's transport?
 - 10.3 Why were they asked or allowed to play this role?
11. Contact with child migrant
 - 11.1 Do you know what the child does (did) in the city?
 - 11.2 What contact have you had with the child since the outmigration?
12. Do you think that the child has been exploited or mistreated?
13. Return of the child migrant
 - 13.1 Has the child ever returned home? If so, was it through a return programme or was it spontaneous? And how long was she away?

- 13.2 Do you expect her to return?
- 13.3 Does she return home on a regular basis? If so, how much time does she spend in the community and how much time does she spend at her migration destination?
- 14. Child migrant's contribution to the household
 - 14.1 If the child returned (or returns) regularly, did (or does) he or she bring any money, food or other goods with him or her? If so, do you know the value of these items?
 - 14.2 Is such a contribution important to your household budget? Is this contribution a reason why the child left the community?
- 15. Would you want more children in your household and community to migrate to urban centres or rural areas? Why would you want it to happen?

IV. Focus group discussions

- 1. Traditional mobility patterns and customs
 - 1.1 What are the traditions of mobility and movement in this community?
 - 1.2 How often would people traditionally move to *ɲawuyoi*? Would some of these *ɲawuyoi* be in Teso or Lango? Would people go to Teso or Lango for any other reason than grazing cattle? Was it always seasonal migration?
 - 1.3 Did people have established relationships with people to whose lands they would travel? Are you familiar with stock associates? What do you know about them?
 - 1.4 What categories of community members would leave the community to go to any of these places (including *ɲawuyoi*)? Would it be adult or young men, women, boys or girls? How old would a child need to be to be taken to any of these places?
 - 1.5 Would children ever leave the community unaccompanied?
 - 1.6 Did people require elders' approval when they left the community?
- 2. Changes in mobility patterns and practices
 - 2.1 How have these practices changed in recent past? Why have they changed?
 - 2.2 Did people stop going to any of the places described above? If so, why?
 - 2.3 Did they start going to new places? If so, why?
 - 2.4 What places are these? Why do they go to these places and not others?

- 2.5 When did people start going to these places? Is it a recent development, or did people start going to rural Teso and Lango, or urban centres, such as Busia and Namatala, some decades ago? Which places did they initially go to? Are the current destination areas different? If so, why is this the case?
- 2.6 What categories of community members go to these new places?
- 2.7 If they are different from the people who traditionally left the community, why is this the case?
- 2.8 Do people require the permission of elders or the LC1 Chairperson to leave the community?
3. Child mobility in the community
 - 3.1 Is child migration widely practiced in this community?
 - 3.2 Why do children leave this community?
 - 3.3 Why do children leave this community in such numbers, while other similar Bokora and Karimojong communities have either many more or fewer migrant children?
 - 3.4 We know that people leave Napak District more often than other parts of Karamoja. Why is this so?
4. Child migration origins
 - 4.1 When did children start leaving the community? How did this practice start?
 - 4.2 Did the first migrant children from this community copy what children from others did?
 - 4.3 How was information about child migration and its benefits spread across the different communities?
5. Migrant children's destination
 - 5.1 Where do the children go?
 - 5.2 Do more children go to rural areas or urban centres? Why is this the case?
 - 5.3 Which rural areas/urban centres do children go to?
6. Child migration vis-à-vis adult migration
 - 6.1 Do more adults or children leave the community? Why is this the case?
 - 6.2 Do adults go to different places than children? If so, why is this the case?
7. Do more boys or girls leave the community? Why is this the case?

8. What households within the community tend to be involved in child outmigration? Are they richer or poorer, better or worse educated, male- or female-headed, or have a history of outmigration?
9. Types of child migration
 - 9.1 What forms of child outmigration are practiced in this community?
 - 9.2 Do people usually leave with their children? Do they send a child unaccompanied? Do many children run away or do they leave out of their own volition but ask permission from their parents? Why is this the case?
 - 9.3 What proportion of migrants fall under each category?
10. Arrangements for migrant children at the destination
 - 10.1 If children go unaccompanied, are there usually family members, friends or other people known to them awaiting them at the destination?
 - 10.2 If not, how do children find accommodation and work there?
 - 10.3 Are there some people in or outside the community who facilitate child outmigration (arrange for transport, pay for transport, promise to arrange for jobs and accommodation at the destination, etc.)? If so, who are those people? Have you ever heard of such people operating in Karamoja? If so, what do you know about them?
11. Return of migrant children
 - 11.1 When children leave, do they usually stay in the places to which they go, or do they come back? If they come back, how often do they do so? Why do they come back? Do more children stay in destination areas permanently, or do more of them return to the community on a regular basis?
 - 11.2 When children come back, do they bring food and/or money with them? How much food or money do the children usually bring home? Do these contributions from the children form an important component of their families' budgets?
12. View of child migration
 - 12.1 What do you think about child outmigration?
 - 12.2 Do you think that child migration is a violation of children's rights, a survival strategy for the child and his or her household, or a tradition grounded in cultural practices and traditional livelihood strategies (such as movement between *njireria* and *ɲawuyoi* or to grazing areas)?

Appendix III: Research Instrument – Return and Reintegration

I. Interviews with former migrants

1.
 - 1.1 How old are you?
 - 1.2 Where did you migrate?
 - 1.3 How much time did you spend there?
2.
 - 2.1 Why did you decide to migrate?
 - 2.2 Did you make the decision yourself, or were you asked to migrate by your parents/guardians/other people?
 - 2.3 Were you mistreated at home in any way before you migrated? If so, did this mistreatment contribute to the decision to migrate?
3.
 - 3.1 Describe your experiences of migration.
 - 3.2 Did you work? If so, what exactly did you do?
 - 3.3 Did you lack food or shelter?
 - 3.4 Were you mistreated in any way? If so, by whom?
4.
 - 4.1 When did you come back/resettle?
 - 4.2 How did you come back/resettle? Did you decide to come back yourself, or was your return organized?
 - 4.3 If it was not organized, why did you decide to come back?
 - 4.4 If it was organized, did you want to be returned, or was it done against your will? Were you taken to Kamparingisa?
 - 4.5 Would you have stayed in the place to which you migrated if you could?
5.
 - 5.1 Describe your experiences of return.
 - 5.2 Were you mistreated in any way? If so, by whom?
 - 5.3 Did you lack food or shelter at any point during the return process?
 - 5.4 Were you allowed to play?
 - 5.5 Were you able to wash, given clean clothes?
 - 5.6 Were you taught anything?
6.
 - 6.1 When you came back to Karamoja, did you go straight to your home community or resettlement site, or did you stop at other places, for example at a reception centre for former migrant children?

- 6.2 Were you given the option to choose either your home community or resettlement site? If so, why did you choose the place to which you moved?
7.
 - 7.1 Describe your experiences in the first days after you were returned to your home community or resettled.
 - 7.2 Were you afraid of what might happen in the future?
 - 7.3 Were you afraid of any people there?
 - 7.4 How did the people there react to your arrival?
 - 7.5 If you returned to your home community, did your family members or other community members welcome you?
 - 7.6 Was there any difference between the reaction of your family and the reaction of other community members?
8.
 - 8.1 If you have returned to your home community, has the fact that you migrated changed your relationship with your family members? If so, how and why has it changed?
 - 8.2 Do family members treat you well? If not, what do they do and why? Is this because you migrated?
9. Do community members treat you well? If not, what do they do and why?
10.
 - 10.1 If your return was unorganized, did you come back with money, food or other items for your family?
 - 10.2 If it was organized, did the organization which brought you back give you any assistance?
 - 10.3 Did this assistance include items which you brought home, or direct assistance to your parents or community?
 - 10.4 Do you think that the items which you brought or the assistance which was given to you had an impact on the reaction of your family or community members to your arrival?
11.
 - 11.1 If you received some assistance, are you happy with it? If not, why not?
 - 11.2 Has the organization contacted you since return?
12. Is the fact that you migrated important to your friends and other peers in the community? For example, do they admire you, or make fun of you because of it?
13. Have you been going to school since you returned? If not, why?

14.
 - 14.1 Were the reasons because of which you migrated – for example, hunger, lack of work, or mistreatment – addressed when you came back to Karamoja? Have you had to deal with any of them since your return?
 - 14.2 If your return was organized, did you tell or were you asked by the staff of the organization which returned you about these reasons? Did they do anything about it?

15. What difficulties have you experienced since migrating? For example, have you had nightmares about the time when you migrated? have you been afraid of your family members or people in your community? have you been afraid of the future? have you ever been hungry since you returned? do you have your own, comfortable place to sleep?

16. If you have moved to a resettlement site, would you rather return to your home community? If so, why?

17. What do you think about the time when you were away? Do you think that life was better here or there? Why do you think so?

18.
 - 18.1 Have you migrated again since you came back? If so, how many times have you migrated?
 - 18.2 Why did you migrate again after return?

19. Do you want to migrate again? Why?

20. Even if you do not want to migrate again, do you think you would do it if your situation changes? If so, in what ways would your situation have to change?

II. Interviews with parents or guardians

1.
 - 1.1 Would you describe your family as more vulnerable than others?
 - 1.2 Do you have fewer cattle or other assets than other families?
 - 1.3 Is this a female-headed household?

2. If you are a guardian, not a parent, why and how did you become one?

3.
 - 3.1 Why do you think did the interviewed child migrate?
 - 3.2 Did you instruct the child to leave, support the decision which he or she made (if migration was voluntary), or did he or she run away?

4.
 - 4.1 Was the interviewed child your only child who migrated?
 - 4.2 If so, why did only she leave?
 - 4.3 If not, have other children remained in the places to which they migrated, or have they returned as well?
 - 4.4 If they returned, did they do so spontaneously, or was their return organized?
 - 4.5 Have any of these children subsequently migrated again? If so, why did they do so?

5.
 - 5.1 Did you want the child to come back, or do you think it would have been better if he or she had stayed in the place to which she had migrated?
 - 5.2 How did you react when the child returned, or when you found out that he or she would be returning? For example, were you happy to see him or her, or did you worry about having to provide food for her?

6. If the child's return was organized, do you think it is right that the child was returned? If not, why? For example, was the child brought back to Karamoja against his/her or your will?

7.
 - 7.1 If the child's return was organized, did the organization responsible for return contact you? If so, what did they do?
 - 7.2 Did they ask you if you wanted to receive the child migrant?
 - 7.3 Did they ask you if you needed assistance in order to provide food and other necessities to the child?

8. If the child's return was organized, did the organization bring the child to your ere, did the child come on her own, or did you have to travel in order to receive the child?

9.
 - 9.1 If the child's return was organized, did the organization provide you with any assistance? If so, what was this assistance?
 - 9.2 Did you find it useful?
 - 9.3 Do you think it was enough to meet your needs?
 - 9.4 If not, why do you think that the organization should have provided more assistance?
 - 9.5 What further assistance did you require?
 - 9.6 Did the assistance which you receive contribute to your reaction to the child's return?

10.
 - 10.1 If the child's return was organized, what contact, if any, have you had with the responsible organization since return?
 - 10.2 Are you happy with it, or do you think that there should have been more contact? If the latter, why do you think so?
11. When the child returned, how did you welcome him or her?
12.
 - 12.1 What impact, if any, has the child's return had on your family? For example, has there been conflict within the family because of the return?
 - 12.2 Do you think that the causes of the child's migration have been addressed?
13.
 - 13.1 Do you think that migration has had any impact on your relationship with the child?
 - 13.2 Do you think of her or treat her differently to your other children? If so, why?
14. Do you think that migration, and the child's return, has had any impact on your relationship with your community? For example, if you received assistance from the organization responsible for return, has it affected the ways in which other community members treat you or your child?
15. Have you experienced any material or psychological challenges because of the child's return? For example, have you been hungry because you cannot afford to feed all family members? have you been worried about the child's safety?
16. Considering your experiences since the child's return, are you happy that the child is with you, or would you prefer if she had not returned?
17.
 - 17.1 Would you like the child, or your other children, to migrate again? If so, why?
 - 17.2 Even if you do not want it, do you think that they may migrate in the future? If so, why?

III. Focus group discussions

1.
 - 1.1 Do many children in this community migrate outside Karamoja?
 - 1.2 How many of them (nearly all/most/a minority/nearly none) have returned?
 - 1.3 Have more children returned spontaneously, or has return usually been organized?
(Ignore this question if the community is a resettlement site.)
2. Were the community or its leaders (LC1, elders) consulted by the organization(s) responsible for the return? If so, what happened?
3.
 - 3.1 Was the community well prepared to receive returned/resettled children?
 - 3.2 If the return was organized, did the organization(s) support the community in any way?
4. What did you think of returned/resettled children at the time?
5. Has your opinion changed now?
6.
 - 6.1 Has the fact that (some) returned children or their families received assistance following return contribute to your opinion?
 - 6.2 Has this assistance had any other impacts on the community?
7. Has return changed the relationship between the child and her family and community members?
8. Have families whose children returned experienced difficulties because of the return? For example, has it been more difficult for them to find food, or have they experienced domestic disputes?
9.
 - 9.1 Would you like the returned/resettled children to migrate again?
 - 9.2 Even if you do not want it to happen, do you think more children may migrate? If so, why do you think would they do so?

Appendix IV: Informed Consent Script for Adult Research Participants

Introduction

Hello, my name is Lokiru Denis, and I am working with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) on a research project intended to help us to understand better why some children leave Karamoja for urban centres in other parts of Uganda. If you agree to take part in this research project, we will be asking you questions about traditions of movement in your household and community, the reasons why children are sent to or decide to leave for urban centres and the ways in which they do it.

Voluntary participation

Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. You are under no obligation to participate, but your responses will help us to understand the issue of child outmigration in Karamoja.

If you have any questions later, you can contact me at 0777754363. In addition, if you have any issues with the research project or the way in which it was conducted, you can contact the researcher responsible for the project, Karol Czuba, at 0781057444, or the officer in charge of the Moroto Office of IOM, Muwonge Maxie, on 0772707857.

Confidentiality

Participation in the study is anonymous. Your name is collected for administrative purposes only and will not be linked in any way to the information which you provide. You will not be identified in any report or publication of this study or its results. Your personal details will not be shared with any individual or organization. This consent form will be the only form with your name. The interview information, which will only have a study number on it, will be stored separately from your consent form. In addition, you may refuse to answer any questions or ask that the interview be stopped at any time.

Duration

The expected duration of the interview or focus group discussion is between 1.5 to 2 hours. This time will vary according to respondent and may be adjusted.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits to you (the person taking part in the survey). However, the knowledge you share with us will help us better understand the reasons as to why children are sent or decide to move to places outside Karamoja.

Appendix IV: Assent Script for Child Research Participants

Hello, my name is Lokiru Denis, and I am working with the International Organization for Migration (IOM). We are asking you to be in a research study. Research is a way to ask questions and test new ideas. Research helps us to learn new things. We are working on a research project to learn about the reasons why children like you move to cities and towns in other parts of Uganda. Being in research is your choice. You can say YES or NO. Whatever you decide is OK.

If you want to participate, we will ask you to answer some questions about you and your experiences. You will only be asked to participate one time, and it should not take more than one hour. In addition, you may refuse to answer any questions or ask that the interview be stopped at any time.

What we learn in this project will not help you now. When we finish the research, we hope to know more about children who leave Karamoja. We may use this information in the future to make programs to help children in your community or in other communities.

None of the answers that you tell us will have your name on them, so they will be kept secret. We might share the answers that you give us with other people, but no one will know that they were your answers.

Take the time you need to make your choice. Ask us any questions you have. You can ask questions at any time during the interview.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)