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ABSTRACT

In Uganda, goats are currently given in restocking projects as relief, rehabilitation and as a means of development through retention or pass-on basis to individual or members of groups in order to improve the livelihood of the benefiting households. Various government and NGOs use specific ownership systems to restock beneficiaries. No studies had been undertaken to quantify the contribution of the different ownership systems (individual or group) to the improvement of the livelihoods of the benefiting households prior to this study. The purpose of the study was to assess the effects of the different goat ownership systems (individual or group) of restocked goats to the improvement of household livelihoods of benefiting individuals and groups in Sembabule district. The study was carried out in two sub counties of Lwemiyaga and Mijwala because various NGOs and governmental organisations still supply goats to these sub counties. The study was a cross sectional study using questionnaires and focus group discussions. Individuals and members of benefiting groups from the various restocking programs during the study period formed the sampling frame. One hundred households were selected from each sub county using stratified random sampling procedures. All parishes of the two sub counties formed stratas. Data was collected through triangulation of the various methods of data collection and the findings were used to address the specific objectives. The study revealed that most males received goats as individuals and most females received as members of groups. It was further revealed that most members of groups opted to share the goats immediately or after passing on of offspring. There was a significant difference (P<0.001) between the members of benefiting groups who opted to share goats immediately or after passing on of offspring and those who wanted to remain in groups. It can be concluded that ownership systems (individual or group) insignificantly contributed household incomes, household purchasing power and the success of restocking projects between benefiting households. It is recommended that the number of goats given for improvement of household livelihood should be at least five local does and one local buck of breeding age given to groups but managed individually to instil commitments in the benefiting farmers. The passing on of offspring should also be delayed to provide for break even point.