



# **Sebei National Youth Movement**

## **Voices of Sebei:**

### **Community Experiences of Development, Governance, and Survival Data Collection Report**

#### **About Sebei National Youth Movement**

Sebei National Youth Movement (SNYM) is a community-based youth-led movement working across the Sebei sub-region, including Kween, Bukwo, and Kapchorwa districts. The movement is dedicated to amplifying community voices, promoting inclusive development, and advocating for equitable governance, security, and access to basic services. Grounded in grassroots engagement, SNYM works closely with local communities particularly youth, farmers, women, men, and vulnerable households to document lived experiences, raise awareness of pressing challenges, and engage duty bearers at local, national and international levels.

Through research, civic engagement, and community mobilization, Sebei National Youth Movement seeks to ensure that development policies and interventions are informed by evidence from the ground and reflect the real priorities of the Sebei people. The movement positions community voices as a central pillar for accountability, peace, resilience, and sustainable development in the sub-region.

#### **Purpose of the Study**

This study was conducted by Sebei National Youth Movement to give voice to local communities in the Sebei sub-region by systematically documenting their experiences, concerns, and priorities. A total of 1,963 community members from Kween, Bukwo, and Kapchorwa districts were interviewed, representing diverse households, livelihoods, age groups, and social backgrounds. The evidence generated is intended to inform government institutions,

development partners, and other stakeholders about critical needs related to security, disaster response, land access, service delivery, livelihoods, governance, and regional inclusion. The findings aim to support evidence-based planning, promote equitable development, and guide targeted interventions that directly respond to the realities and aspirations of the Sebei people.

### **Why This Evidence Matters**

Decisions about development, security, disaster response, and service delivery in the Sebei sub-region are often made with limited direct input from affected communities. This study provides large-scale, community-generated evidence from 1,963 respondents, ensuring that policies and programs are grounded in the lived realities of the Sebei people rather than assumptions. The findings highlight priority gaps, reveal areas of systemic neglect and inequality, and identify where interventions are failing or succeeding. By centering citizen voices, this evidence strengthens accountability, supports more targeted and equitable investment, and offers a credible basis for government and development partners to design responses that are relevant, effective, and trusted by local communities.

### **Sampling Technique and Data Collection**

#### **Data Collection Period: November 2025**

The study used a quantitative research approach and employed purposive sampling to capture perspectives from a wide range of community members across the Sebei sub-region. Data were collected during November 2025 through a combination of physical (face-to-face) interviews and online interviews, allowing participation from respondents in both remote rural locations and those with internet access.

The study used a quantitative research approach and employed purposive sampling to capture perspectives from a wide range of community members across the Sebei sub-region. Data were collected through a combination of physical (face-to-face) interviews and online interviews, allowing participation from respondents in both remote rural locations and those with internet access.

Purposive sampling was applied to ensure inclusion of key population groups such as youth, women, elders, farmers, business owners, and other community members directly affected by issues of security, disasters, land access, service delivery, and livelihoods. This approach was appropriate given the study's objective of documenting lived experiences and priority concerns rather than producing statistically representative estimates.

The combined use of physical and online interviews increased coverage, improved accessibility, and strengthened the diversity of responses, resulting in a total sample of **1,963 respondents** from Kween, Bukwo, and Kapchorwa districts.

### **Methodology Note**

All attitudinal questions used a 1–5 Likert scale where: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral/Unsure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree. Interpretations group responses as: -

Disagreement: 1–2 - Neutral: 3 - Agreement: 4–5

Percentages are used to indicate the dominant perception.

### **Presentation of Findings**

The sections that follow present the key findings of the study, organized by thematic areas aligned to the questionnaire. Each subsection summarizes community responses and provides clear interpretations based on the proportion of agreement, neutrality, or disagreement. The findings reflect the perceptions and lived experiences reported by respondents at the time of data collection and are intended to highlight priority issues requiring policy and programmatic attention.

## **1. Disasters and Emergency Response**

### **Exposure to Disasters**

About 20.4% of households reported being directly affected by floods or mudslides in the last five years. This indicates that one in five households faces direct disaster risk, confirming the region's vulnerability.

### **Government Disaster Response**

Across all indicators timely rescue, aid delivery, preparedness, fairness of attention, and local coordination over 95% of respondents disagreed that government response is adequate. This reflects near-universal dissatisfaction and suggests that disaster management systems are either absent or ineffective at community level.

Overall interpretation: Disaster risk is significant, but institutional response capacity is perceived as extremely weak, leaving communities largely to cope on their own.

## **2. Security Around Mount Elgon**

### **Fear and Safety**

Approximately 65% of respondents agreed that people live in fear of being attacked or shot near Mount Elgon Park. At the same time, over 98% disagreed that families feel safe farming or moving near park boundaries.

### **Conduct of Security Agencies**

More than 90% disagreed that UWA and security officers treat residents fairly, and 98% disagreed that government has done enough to prevent shootings and violence.

Overall interpretation: The park boundary is widely perceived as a zone of fear and insecurity, with deep mistrust toward security agencies and government protection mechanisms.

## **3. Cattle Raids and Cross-Border Insecurity**

### **Impact of Raids**

Nearly 69% agreed that their households have lost cattle or property due to raids, and 61% agreed that raids have made families poorer and more vulnerable.

### **Response and Recovery**

A majority (55–59%) disagreed that security agencies respond quickly, that raids have reduced, or that compensation programs exist.

Overall interpretation: Cattle raiding remains a major driver of poverty and insecurity, with limited confidence in prevention, response, or recovery support.

## **4. Land Access and Disputes**

### **Access to Land**

While 56% agreed they can access ancestral land, substantial minorities reported unfair land taking, unclear boundaries, and demarcation-related conflict.

## **Government Role**

Notably, 56% agreed that government has provided fair solutions to land disputes, suggesting mixed experiences some progress alongside persistent grievances.

## **Livelihood Impact**

About 55% agreed that land loss has negatively affected farming and food security.

Overall interpretation: Land issues are widespread but uneven, with ongoing conflict affecting livelihoods despite partial government intervention.

## **5. Service Delivery and Infrastructure**

Across health, water, electricity, roads, education, markets, and recreation, responses consistently cluster around:

Agreement: ~33–37%

Neutral: ~26–31%

Disagreement: ~33–37%

Overall interpretation: Access to basic services is moderate but unreliable, with no service area receiving strong majority approval. This reflects stagnation rather than progress.

## **6. Employment and Livelihoods**

### **Jobs and Economic Support**

Between 38–41% agreed that jobs, business support, skills training, and future opportunities exist, while roughly one-third disagreed.

### **Youth Migration**

About 40% agreed that youth leave due to lack of employment.

Overall interpretation: Economic opportunities exist for some, but insufficient scale and consistency push many young people to migrate.

## **7. Governance, Trust, and Corruption**

### **Accountability and Trust**

Between 43–46% disagreed that leaders are accountable, public funds are well used, or government listens to citizens.

### **Corruption and Fairness**

Only 28–30% agreed that corruption is being addressed or that aid is distributed fairly.

### **Voice and Participation**

Nearly 47% disagreed that their voice matters in decision-making.

Overall interpretation: Governance is characterized by low trust, weak accountability, and limited citizen influence.

## **8. Regional Marginalization and Identity**

### **Perceived Neglect**

Around 50–52% agreed that Sebei receives less attention, waits longer for aid, and experiences slower development than other regions.

### **Identity and Belonging**

Despite grievances, 49% expressed pride in being Sebei, and 51% agreed that unity and fair treatment within Uganda can solve regional problems.

### **Secession Sentiment**

A notable 69% indicated preference to join Kenya if given the option, reflecting deep frustration rather than simple political preference.

Overall interpretation: Strong regional identity coexists with feelings of exclusion and marginalization, driving radical expressions of discontent.

## **Overall Conclusion**

The Voices of Sebei survey reveals a region facing systemic insecurity, weak disaster response, land and livelihood pressures, and low trust in governance. While community resilience, pride, and hope remain, the dominant narrative is one of neglect and unequal treatment. Addressing these challenges requires visible improvements in security, disaster preparedness, land justice, service delivery, and inclusive governance to restore trust and stability.

## **Authorship**

This study and report were prepared by the leadership of Sebei National Youth Movement (SNYM). SNYM holds full responsibility for the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and presentation of findings. The views expressed in this report reflect the voices and perceptions of community respondents and do not necessarily represent the positions of any government institution or development partner.

## **Contact Information**

**Organization:** Sebei National Youth Movement (SNYM)

**Website:** [www.nationalyouthmovement.org](http://www.nationalyouthmovement.org)

**Email:** [ignoredsebei@nationalyouthmovement.org](mailto:ignoredsebei@nationalyouthmovement.org)