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Executive Summary

Background: Securing Your Family's Future (SYFF) course for men is an interactive, gender-transformative course aimed at changing behaviors and mediating social norms related to women's land and property rights. This pilot course was designed to facilitate a shift in peer norms among men on women's land and property rights, particularly men's knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, future intentions, and perceptions. Wellspring Philanthropic Fund initiated this effort in 2016 to improve women's land tenure in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. The SYFF Course for Men was developed in partnership with the Kenya Legal and Ethical Issues Network on HIV & AIDS (KELIN), the Pastoral Women's Council in Tanzania, the Uganda Community Based Association for Women and Children's Welfare (UCOBAC), and Lori Roller Consulting, Inc. based in New York. The course includes a series of six two-hour sessions over three to six weeks using a variety of interactive teaching methods. This training was conducted in Namungo Sub County in Mityana district, Uganda. A total of 120 men voluntarily attended this the SYFF Course for Men, delivered between September and October 2018.

Purpose of the endline evaluation: The SYFF course was evaluated at baseline and endline to ascertain men's knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, future intentions, and perceptions of peer norms related to women's land and property rights.

Evaluation Design and Methodology: The assessment was exclusively qualitative. At endline, 15 phone in-depth interviews and five in-person focus group discussions (with a total of 30 participants) were conducted. Study participants were men who participated in the baseline and attended the course. All interviews and focus group discussions were translated to English and transcribed verbatim and analyzed thematically using NVivo 12. Multilevel ethical approval was obtained.

Study results

Knowledge on formal land laws and customary practices: Knowledge about customary practice on land ownership, purchasing, inheriting land, and transferring or selling land was generally high at baseline. The course raised men's awareness of the theory behind the customary practices and helped them understand the rights of both men and women to access justice on land matters. The men noted that some of the land laws and customary practices have negative implications on women's access to land and property rights.

Attitude and perceptions: The course improved men's attitudes toward joint ownership of land with women. Compared to the baseline, the proportion of men that said that both men and women should own land should was higher at endline. The proportion of men with the perception only men should own land dropped between baseline and endline. None of the men perceived that land should be owned by women only. Joint ownership of land was associated with minimizing misappropriation of land by men, promoting joint and consultative decision-making on land use, security of tenure on land for women, and harmonious living among husband, wife and children. More men at endline than at baseline were supportive of joint land management between men and women. Almost all the men at endline perceived that both men and women should make decisions on land, including land use, managing proceeds from activities done on land, and selling land. Unlike at baseline, at endline, all men held the opinion that land should be inherited by both sons and daughters because all are children. However, some opined that sons should get a bigger share than girls given the family responsibilities ahead of them as heads of their families.

Self-efficacy: At endline, most men indicated that they jointly owned their land with their spouses, although documents on land ownership were still the men's names. Changing names on documents was said to be a gradual process. Most men also indicated that decisions on what and how to use their land were jointly taken (with their spouses and/or children) within the household. Some men noted that they had disclosed that they had land to their spouses and older children.

Peer norms: The course led to a positive shift in peer norms on women owning land; women making decisions about how to use land or what to do with proceeds from land; and daughters inheriting land.

Future intentions: Several men indicated that they intended to make a will. The attitude toward will-making was positive among all men, though most had not yet taken this step. Various barriers need to be addressed to ensure that men's positive intentions can translate into action. Some men also indicated that they intend to bequeath land to both sons and daughter. Other expressed intentions included giving their children equal land shares, bequeathing land to their spouses, joint land management, joint land ownership, and disclosing to their spouses any land that they own that their spouses had previously not known existed.

Conclusion: The SYFF course for men served as a wakeup call about women's unequal treatment with respect to land ownership and rights and as a call to action; it helped to challenge men to rethink their attitude and practices. Overall, the course had a positive impact on men's knowledge, attitude, self-efficacy, peer norms and future intentions. However, it remains to be seen whether positive change in knowledge and practice will lead to a change in practice in many areas. In addition, some men were left with outstanding questions after completing the course due to the absence of continuous engagement after the training and a graduation strategy.
Recommendations

To UCOBAC:
• Maintain contact with the trainees.
• Integrate the gains realized from the pilot phase of SYFF course for men into other women land and property rights interventions for sustainability.
• Embed sustainability components in the intervention design to avoid reliance on the donor or implementing partners.
• Ensure that women (individuals or through groups) have full and accurate information about women’s land and property rights (WLPR) around ownership and acquisition for their participation in decision-making on land matters.

To women land rights implementing partners:
• Engage community leaders and members about benefits of both men and women owning land, being mindful of the normative barriers to embracing the women’s land rights.
• Engage with local and cultural leaders on cultural barriers to women’s land and property rights.
• Implement follow-up activities to the one-off six-week curriculum-based training to nurture the process of translating the knowledge acquired into action.
• Identify and help address cultural inhibitions to women’s access to land and property rights during the training.
• Continuously engage at the policy level by contributing to the review/development of legislative frameworks on land to promote women’s land rights and gender equality.
• Work closely with relevant stakeholders to create law enforcement and protection mechanisms that offer safeguards for women.
• Collate an evidence base on what works in shifting peer norms and change in men’s behavior on WLPR.
• Foster a well-developed and sound monitoring, evaluation and learning system for tracking systemic and behavior outcomes on WLPR based on clear and realistic outcome indicators.
• Highlight and document the learnings from WLPR interventions for application in the WLPR program and policy development.

To curriculum developers:
• Incorporate sessions on men’s effective communication with partners in the SYFF course.
• Design the SYFF course for women to run concurrently with the SYFF course for men, or to follow immediately after the men’s SYFF course.

To donors:
• Consider leveraging resources for complementary activities to the core SYFF interventions.
• Support scaling up this intervention for greater reach and impact.
• Provide funding to support research uptake initiatives through stakeholder engagement and advocacy.
• Develop funding streams that can ensure long-term follow up and evaluation of SYFF project outcomes and cover core costs of organizations undertaking the follow up.
• Fund evaluation of other SYFF curricula to establish areas that require strengthening.
• SYFF curricula interventions to establish areas that require strengthening.
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Background
MEN AND WOMEN HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS TO ENJOYMENT OF ALL ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 (Article 17) guarantees everyone, including women, the right to own property alone and in association with others and protection from arbitrary deprivation of their property. The International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights 1966 (ratified by Uganda) under Article 1 guarantees all people, including women, the right to self-determination. This is interpreted to mean women’s right to determine (make decisions about) how they want to use their economic resources, including land and the proceeds from activities on their land and property. Article 3 of this convention provides that men and women have equal rights to the enjoyment of all economic, social and cultural rights, which would include equal rights to land and property.

Article 5 of the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) calls upon States Parties to take appropriate measures to modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women, with a view to eliminating prejudices and customary and all other practices based on the idea of the inferiority or superiority of either of the sexes or on stereotyped roles for men and women. Article 13 of CEDAW obliges States Parties to take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in other areas of economic and social life. Article 14 of CEDAW calls for recognition of the problems rural women face and their significant roles in the economic survival of their families, including their work in the non-monetized sectors of the economy. In Uganda, realization of women’s right to land and property is central to ameliorating the problems rural women face and would be indispensable to sustaining their pivotal role in ensuring the economic survival of their families and their ability to contribute to the non-monetized sectors. Realization of women’s land and property
rights also contributes directly or indirectly to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, and 15.

Other international instruments with a bearing on women’s economic rights and elimination of economic violence against women include: The UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women (1993); The Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action), 1995; and Vienna Declaration and Program of Action (adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights in 1993), among others.

At the national level in Uganda, women’s land and property rights are safeguarded in a number of laws including the Constitution under Article 26 (everyone’s right to own property either individually or in association with others as well as protection from undue deprivation of his/her property); and Article 33(4) (women to enjoy equal right as men to political, economic and social opportunities). The Land (Amendment) Act 2010, the National Land Policy (2013), the Uganda Gender Policy (2016), and the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) Act 2007, among other laws/policies, provide safeguards for women’s land and property rights.

However, notwithstanding these various international and national provisions protecting women’s land and property rights, Uganda’s sociocultural environment (characterized by male chauvinism, gender inequities, skewed stereotypes, and gender and social cultural norms that favor men and boys over women and girls) presents a significant obstacle to women’s realization of their land and property rights. Peer norms among men are often centered around maintaining the status quo of male dominance and female marginalization. Consequently, targeted interventions such as Securing Your Family’s Future (SYFF) Course for men, which contribute to shifting such peer norms among men, are a critical step toward enabling women to realize their rights to land and property.
2. Literature Review
2.1 Why focus on women’s land rights

Particularly for rural women and men, land is an indispensable resource through which they derive generational livelihood and food security (FAO, 2018; Tibenkana, 2019; Kemigisha, 2021; Kabahinda, 2018). As a household asset, land not only supports agricultural production, food security and nutrition but also offers dependable livelihood, dignity, an adequate standard of living, identity and status (Kemigisha, 2021), and a source of collateral in case of need for financial capital. The Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) particularly presents the relationship between secure land tenure and higher levels of investment and productivity in agriculture, which results in higher incomes and greater economic well-being (ibid). UN Women (2020) sums up the value of women’s land rights this way:

> Women’s rights to land and other productive resources are essential for realizing their rights to equality and to an adequate standard of living, among many other rights. Women’s secure access to land and resources supports their independence and autonomy, provides for their day-to-day needs and those of their families and allows them to weather some of life’s most difficult challenges. Realizing women’s land rights is an integral part of the gender-responsive implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN Women, 2020).

FAO (n.d) contends that the eradication of hunger and poverty largely depends on how people, communities and others gain access to land and that the livelihoods of many, particularly the rural poor including women, are based on secure and equitable access to and control over land, among other resources. According to FAO, land is a source of food and shelter and a central factor in economic growth. Thus, secure access to land is a prerequisite for all people who participate in food production at the household or subsistence levels and for women to contribute to economic growth. However, evidence suggests that there are significantly fewer women than men who are landholders in all regions of the world. Where women hold land, they generally have smaller plots of inferior quality and with less secure rights (FAO, n.d). In sub-Saharan Africa, female landholders are estimated at approximately 15 percent (ibid). Moreover, women landholders are said to be less likely than men to have a legal document proving ownership of their plots or to have their names on the land ownership document (FAO, 2018). Moreover, even when women own land, they often own less land than men (ibid).

2.2 Gender, social norms and women’s land rights in Africa at a glance

According to FAO (n.d), women on average comprise 43 percent of the agricultural labor force food and cash crops production combined in developing countries. Kimani (2012) distinguishes between these two categories of income generation, observing that without consideration of cash crops, women account for 70 percent of Africa’s food production. FAO (n.d), Kimani (2012) and ActionAid Kenya, GROOTS Kenya and LANDac (2018) all document that despite women having a central role in agricultural production, they often do not have secure access and ownership rights to land. This is the case notwithstanding the documented necessity for women to have secure tenure.

In many African societies, land rights are largely a preserve of men or kinship groups controlled by men. Thus, women’s access to land predominantly occurs through their relationship to men as their husbands, fathers, brothers or sons who own and control land (Kimani, 2012; ActionAid Kenya, GROOTS Kenya and LANDac, 2018). This implies that if a woman is single, divorced or widowed, she may easily lose access to land (Enda Pronat and LANDac, 2018). The situation is different in matrilineal societies or duo matrilineal and patrilineal systems. For example, Malawi has both a matrilineal and patrilineal system. Malawi’s matrilineal system implies that land ownership is identified and passed on through women’s lineage. The matrilineal system of marriage is more widespread than the patrilineal system, which explains why relatively more women own land there compared to most other countries in sub-Sahara Africa (Oxfam in Malawi and LANDac, 2018). Making reference to Malawi demographic and health surveys, Oxfam in Malawi and LANDac, 2018 note that 48 percent of women in Malawi own a piece of land (solely or jointly) and 23 percent own land solely. FAO (2018) estimates the proportion of women landholders in Malawi at 50 percent. However, in both matrilineal and patrilineal systems, decisions regarding access and control over land are often made by men (either the husband, the maternal uncle or both) (Oxfam in Malawi and LANDac, 2018 citing Kathewera-Banda et al. 2011). This offers insight into underlying male dominance even in matrilineal societies. This threatens women’s position on land.

Hillenbrand and Miruka (2019) argue that in Sub-Saharan Africa informal institutions such as lineage systems, as well as social norms (in this case, women’s land rights), pose major systemic challenges that explain the gap in women’s economic achievements and overall equality. This is typical given that women whose access to land is often through men are “routinely obliged to hand over the proceeds of any farm sales to a male and have little say over how those earnings are used” (Kimani, 2012). LANDac (2018) describes all this as a “gender discrimination in land ownership, rights and access” which in turn prevents women and their communities from realizing their full potential and hinders their ability to contribute to
sustainable development in Africa. Such gender discrimination accordingly is in part manifested through “women owning less land, and often only having access through male relatives or joint ownership with reduced decision making power; women having reduced ability to inherit land in case of divorce or death of a male family member; and women who are young, single or less educated being especially disadvantaged” (ibid, 2018, p.1).

It is a common phenomenon in Africa for women to lose access or rights to matrimonial land after divorce or the death of a spouse (Kimani, 2012; Enda Pronat and LANDac, 2018). Indeed, women’s access to land has been described as tenuous and can be quickly lost (ibid). Kimani (2012) adds that HIV makes women’s situation more intricate. Where the husband dies of complications from AIDS, his widow is often at the center of false accusation and blame for having been the cause. In this circumstance, the kin relatives cannot let the widow retain access to, control over and ownership of the family land and other valuable property. The traditional land ownership/management system where ownership and access are largely vested in lineages, clans and families with male leaders exercising day-to-day control constitute part of the problem (ibid, 2012).

Social norms and practices such as land rights being typically inherited only by sons in many African societies essentially obstruct women’s secure access to and ownership of land. Sociocultural norms account for many men being unready to share land with women or bequeath land to them and their daughters, let alone holding discussing this topic. Once again, social norms dictate that women are less represented in land administration and decision-making about land, which consequently affects their access, use and control over agricultural land. (FAO, n.d; LANDac, 2018; Enda Pronat and LANDac, 2018). According to LANDac (2018), gender discrimination in land ownership, rights and access driven largely by social norms is sustained especially by men who do not recognize the many potential benefits to society at large of strengthened land rights for women. Some of these benefits, for example, are that women with stronger property rights earn more money, have more savings, and are less likely to experience domestic violence; women who own land have more resilient families; more of their money is dedicated to their children’s education; and their children are less likely to be sick and severely underweight (ibid, 2018). Similarly, FAO (2018) associates secure land rights for women with better outcomes for them and their families, including among other things: greater bargaining power at household and community levels, better child nutrition and lower levels of gender-based violence. FAO however, points out that while both men and women face inadequate access to secure rights over land in many parts of the world, women remain particularly disadvantaged. Hillenbrand and Miruka (2019) further allude to the effect of harmful social and gender norms, noting that they greatly harm women’s individual self-confidence, self-efficacy and agency regardless of their particular skills or potential.

In the wake of the injustices (woven in social and gender norms) against women and girls, some measures are attempting to overcome the shortcomings of customary law. One of such measures is land titling, where land titles are issued to individual owners of land (Kimani, 2012). Land titling ensures that individuals have legal power over their land; this helps women secure legal rights to land that they acquired on their own or that was bequeathed to them. The challenge remains, however, that when a family or a couple acquires land, men are generally named on the title deeds partly because they are deemed to be the “household heads” (ibid). Furthermore, some women are inadequately vigilant in ensuring their rights with respect to legal documentation of land, perhaps failing to question having land in the names of their husbands as long as they are married. This is partly due to the low levels of education, limited access to capital, and entrenched and pronounced customary practices in determining land ownership, rights and access (Enda Pronat and LANDac, 2018). The last category assumes that marriage automatically guarantees them co-ownership rights. Unfortunately, when the husband marries another wife or considers selling land, their marginalization takes effect. They are told that because their names are not on the land title deeds, they are not recognized co-owners. In the event of death of the husband, Kimani (2012) contends that widows lucky enough to get a share of the family land are allocated the smallest plots. FAO (2018) contends that in many parts of the world, even when men and women own land jointly, the land rights and benefits are not necessarily shared equally. Women thus remain victims of gender discrimination in land ownership, rights and access.

2.3 The case of Uganda

Land is critical resource for both men’s and women’s generational livelihood, food security, dignity, adequate standard of living, identity and status, and investment, and is a source of collateral in case of need for financial capital. Ownership of, access to and control over land resources is also a basic economic right. In Uganda, land is fundamentally necessary for agriculture. According to Hannay (2014), agriculture accounts for an estimated 80 percent of employment nationwide in Uganda with approximately 85 percent of the estimated 87 percent of Uganda’s population residing in rural areas involved in subsistence agriculture. Hannay further remarks that 90 percent of all rural women work in agriculture, and women produce an estimated 80 percent of food crops and contribute 90 percent of all labor for food production (citing Forum for Women and Democracy, 2012). Tibenkana (2019), citing the Agricultural Sector Gender Statistics Profile by Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) (2012), observes that agriculture, which is the backbone of Uganda’s economy, employs about 69 percent of the country’s population, of which over 50 percent are women. While these figures indicate an equal share of employment in the agricultural sector between men and women, there is a gender gap in land ownership, use and control skewed in favor of men. Tibenkana (2019), citing UBOS (2013), reports that only 28 percent of women are said to own land in Uganda. Care et al. (2016) similarly estimates the proportion of women owning land in Uganda at 27 percent, with only 20 percent controlling the outputs of their efforts (ibid., citing the Uganda National Housing Survey 2012/13).

Evidence shows that the pluralist legal system (combining customary law and the formal colonial legal system) is a key constraint to women’s land rights in Uganda (Tibenkana, 2019; Hannay, 2014). Under the pluralist legal system, a country
adopts various sources of law, with no clear path forward when the sources conflict; when particular cases are ambiguous, the interpretation tends to disfavor women. Tibenkana (2019), for instance, notes that while the Constitution of Uganda provides for women’s property rights during and after marriage (recognized under the formal laws of Uganda), this right is not recognized the same way under customary law/practice, and the latter often takes precedence. For example, many women who divorce "lose personal property rights even if they were the owner of property before marriage."(ibid, 2019, p. 2) According to Women, Business and Law, “in the case of the death of the male spouse, customary law stipulates that the widow is only entitled to rights over the residence in which she lived before the demise of her husband, and this right ceases in cases of remarrying, contrary to the widower’s rights” (World Bank Group, 2016, p.13). For the widow, even when she does not remarry, she faces eviction from the land that is normally grabbed from her by the deceased husband’s relatives (ibid). Kemigisha (2021) describes the position of women as precarious with respect to land accessibility, control and ownership in Uganda under the different tenure regimes. Women’s right to land under the land holding systems are characterized to be largely limited to access rights but not ownership rights. This even complicates any attempts by Ugandan women to access justice in the event that their rights are violated (which is common) (ibid). The customary land tenure system is documented as one of the causes of the disadvantaged situations women often face. Tibenkana (2019), citing the Food Security and Governance Land Fact Sheet (2016), indicates that about 75 percent of Ugandan land is held under customary land tenure, which normatively grants land ownership to men in their roles as the heads of the family. Under this tenure system, married women and daughters enjoy secondary rights through their husbands or fathers, something that marginalizes them. Yet the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda and the Uganda Land (amendment) Act, 2010 recognize the customary land tenure system as it is, despite its inherent gender discrimination in land ownership, rights and access. Against such a backdrop, Kemigisha (2021), in her study, Land Tenure Regimes and Women’s Land Rights in Uganda; Legality and the Land Legal Framework, observed that “a combination of contemporary and customary law still restricts land rights of women in that the statutory instruments in place have failed to grant women the right to land.” Thus, the answer to this women’s land rights question lies in narrowing the gender gap in land rights attainable through shifting social norms.

2.4 Necessity of interventions on shifting social and peer norms

According to Kimani (2012), the men who are often at the center of deciding land allocations have particular cultural understandings of the role of women and they don’t seem very sensitized to the idea that women can be decision-makers when it pertains to land. This argument validates the need for interventions on shifting social norms, including the SYFF Course for men. Studies indicate that even countries with progressive legal and policy regime on women’s land rights such as Kenya (ActionAid Kenya, GROOTS Kenya and LANDac, 2018); and Uganda (Kemigisha, 2021; Tibenkana, 2019; Kabahinda, 2018) experience practical gender discrimination in land ownership, rights and access skewed in favor of men. In Senegal, Guénètte (2011) report that while Senegalese law provides for women’s equal access to and control over land and natural resources, in practice, “decisions about land are taken...
at a local level in line with customary and traditional practices in which women rarely inherit land” (Guénette, 2011, p. 1) and land is normally family property managed by the family head, which is usually a man. Women in these countries continue to grapple with lack of access to and control over land in contexts with “a substantial gap between formal land laws and the reality on the ground, slow implementation of the land legal reforms and where cultural practices and patriarchal systems still have a severe impact on women's access to land and natural resources” (ActionAid Kenya, GROOTS Kenya and LANDac, 2018). The entrenched social norms around women’s land rights thus play a big part in accounting for the prevailing reality characterized by land often being governed through male-dominated decision-making systems and structures.

A number of interventions on shifting social and gender norms have been developed, implemented, researched and their relevance and effectiveness assessed. For example, Raising Voices’ SASA! Model, a groundbreaking community mobilization approach for preventing violence against women, addresses the imbalance of power between women and men, girls and boys. This imbalance is acknowledged as a core driver of violence against women and HIV (Raising Voices, 2020). The model, through its four phases of Start, Awareness, Support, and Action (SASA!), has been found to be effective in inspiring and enabling communities to rethink and reshape social norms around violence against women and HIV (ibid). Lutheran World Federation developed and implemented the Youth Pyramid Structure as a community-based intervention which positions youth as change agents (Mirghani et al., 2017). The model empowers community members to realize their potential to identify sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) and devise sustainable solutions through youth-led anti-violence activities (ibid). The Zero Tolerance Village Alliance (ZTVA) Model, pioneered in rural South Africa by the Thohoyandou Victim Empowerment Program, was found to be effective as an intensive community-mobilization intervention geared toward community-led and community-owned SGBV prevention and response (Mirghani et al., 2017). The model inspires communities to brand themselves as “zero tolerance” zones for SGBV (ibid). Other social and gender norms change programs such as ‘Men Engage’ have proven to be effective.

However, these interventions have generally not focused on women’s land and property rights. They have not directly engaged men about the imbalance of power between women and men, girls and boys, nor about the discrimination, exclusion and alienation of women by men on land. The SYFF course for men makes is one of the first to address these particular needs. SYFF course for men focuses on shifting peers norms around gender as a means to promoting women’s land and property rights.

Interventions on shifting social norms and peer norms constitute part of gender transformative approaches that serve to propel a shift toward equitable gender norms while at the same time enabling boys and young men to critically question their (perceived/actual) dominant position over girls and women at household, community and organizational levels as well as in all their relations with girls/women. These interventions further challenge men to question unequal power relations between them and women skewed in men’s favor, and to question and recognize “toxic” masculinity that is...
4. Overview of the SYFF Course for Men
Securing Your Family’s Future (SYFF) Course for men is one in a package of a multi-intervention project, Women's Land Rights Social Norms, initiated by Wellspring Philanthropic Fund in 2016 to improve women's land tenure in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. This multi-intervention project aims to change the behaviors of men, women and land management organizations to enable women to realize their rights.

SYFF is “an interactive, gender-transformative course for men aimed at changing behaviors and mediating social norms related to women's land and property rights, such as women’s access to, use, ownership and control of and decision-making about land. (ICRW, 2018). The course was designed to facilitate a shift in peer norms among men on women’s land and property rights, improving men’s knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, future intentions and perceptions related to women’s land and property rights.

The SYFF Course for Men was developed in partnership with the Kenya Legal and Ethical Issues Network on HIV & AIDS (KELIN), the Pastoral Women’s Council in Tanzania, the Uganda Community-Based Association for Women and Children’s Welfare (UCOBAC) in Uganda, and Lori Rolleri Consulting, Inc based in New York. The course design is a series of six two-hour sessions over three to six weeks using a variety of interactive teaching methods including storytelling, role plays and group discussions to impart information, clarify values and beliefs, change peer norms, and teach skills related to gender equality and women’s land rights. In Uganda, a total of 120 men voluntarily attended the SYFF Course for men. The course was delivered between September and October 2018. Ten learning objectives underpin the SYFF curriculum. Upon completion of the course, participating men should be able to:

a. Identify inequitable gender norms that exist in their community, especially those norms that contribute to inequitable land rights;

b. Explain how abiding to inequitable gender norms has social, financial and health costs to women, men, families and the community;

c. Redefine inequitable gender norms into equitable alternatives;

d. Resist and challenge social pressure to conform to inequitable gender norms that support inequitable land rights;

e. Briefly describe international conventions, national laws and customary laws related to land rights;

f. Describe the benefits of equitable land rights to women, men, children and communities;

g. Describe and use joint decision-making strategies with their wives, especially with regard to land decisions;

h. Prepare to make a will;

i. Use land management services and resources to achieve equitable land rights; and

j. Envision and plan for a successful and secure future for their families.

This study sought to assess whether and the extent to which these intended learning objectives were achieved.

4.1 Purpose and objective of the assessment

The course was evaluated at baseline and endline with the male participants to ascertain their knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, future intentions and perceptions of peer norms related to women's land and property rights. At endline, the focus was on establishing changes observed in the men 33 months after completion of the course.
5. Evaluation Design and Methodology
Design: This study was in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. It included two methods of data collection: interviews and focus group discussions.

Sample and recruitment: A total of 45 men participated in the endline evaluation. Study participants were men who had participated in the SYFF course and also in the baseline study. The research team obtained the list of the pre-sampled study participants, including their contacts and locations (sub county, parish and village) from the ICRW research team and compared it with the list of men who actually attended the SYFF course. The latter list was obtained from the SYFF course implementing partner, UCOBAC. A comparison between the two lists helped ascertain that the pre-sampled men had actually attended the course and thus qualified for the endline assessment. The research team then contacted the study participants by phone. However, for focus group discussion (FGD) participants, both phone tracing and physical tracing were conducted. Study participants whose phone contacts were available were reached on phone; otherwise, they were mobilized through their peers who had phones, or the research team physically reached out to them in their homes. Each FGD participant was guided to the meet venue for the focus group discussion.

Profiles of study participants: Participants’ ages ranged from their 20s to 70s. The median age was 52 years. Most of the men were either peasant farmers or a mix of peasantry and animal growing. A few were commercial farmers and/or business men. Only two worked in the formal employment sector. This is explained by their general low levels of education, with most having completed only primary school. One of the men was a sub county chairperson. All the men owned land predominantly as squatters (bibanja holders) and a few with land titles. Squatters had land agreements that confirm them as rightfully occupying the land. The following table summarizes the profiles of study participants.

Data collection: A total of 15 in-depth phone interviews (IDIs) and five in-person FGDs were conducted, exclusively with SYFF course participants who had also participated in the baseline study. Thus, they were pre-sampled. While the plan was to conduct 20 IDIs, only 15 were conducted. Of the five that were missed at endline, one had passed on, one was bedridden and thus unable to participate, and three failed to respond. A total of 30 men participated in the five FGDs, with each FGD having five to seven participants. The focus areas of inquiry were: current practices or future intentions in regard to land ownership, land management and land inheritance; knowledge and attitudes toward formal laws and customary practices/systems; gender norms; and peer norms. The same tools were used to collect data at baseline and endline.

Protection measures in place: The research team and study participants adhered to the COVID-19 prevention measures including wearing masks during FGDs, sanitizing hands and keeping social distance. The COVID-19 pandemic affected the data collection strategy. The in-person approach used at baseline had been envisaged at endline. However, in response to the pandemic, the IDIs were conducted by phone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Profiles of Study Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Analysis:** All interviews and FGDs were translated to English and transcribed verbatim. Coding of the transcripts was completed in Nvivo using a master set of parent codes as well as child codes. Coding reports for key codes were extracted and summarized into key themes using code summaries. Ultimately, the results of the study were categorized into the themes of knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, future intentions, and perceptions of peer norms related to women’s land and property rights.

**Ethical Approval:** Ethical approval was obtained from ICRW’s Institutional Review Board, Makerere University College of Health Sciences, School of Public Health Higher Degrees Research and Ethics Committee, and the Uganda National Council of Science and Technology (UNCST). The research team obtained informed consent from each participant upon provision of detailed information on the study and data collection approaches; used de-identified data, used venues that allowed for privacy and safety; and restricted access to the consent forms and interview material to the research team.
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For a squatter to acquire full ownership rights from landlords, who also accommodate squatters. Both landlords and squatters have rights and responsibilities to the other. For instance, landlords have the right to sell or not to sell land to squatters, thereby granting or denying them full ownership of land. For a squatter to acquire full ownership rights from the landlord, he/she may have to relinquish to the landlord of land. For a squatter to acquire full ownership rights from landlords, thereby granting or denying them full ownership.

6.2 Knowledge on formal land laws and customary practices

Study participants reported that the SYFF sessions on land laws improved their knowledge in this domain, including the types of land tenure and their responsibilities under each of the land tenure arrangements. They said that the course empowered them with knowledge on a number of critical issues; for example, one of the evaluation participants noted:

That course was good. First we didn’t know the government laws and where the person stands about land, the woman’s ownership. A woman can have ownership on the land? We got to know all that. The issue of wills, the girl child shares equally. We didn’t know all that but the training changed us. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Participants were generally knowledgeable about the customary practices related to land ownership, purchasing land, inheriting land and transferring or selling land. Although they did not specifically refer to any specific law, they were able to explain the customary practices.

6.2.1 Knowledge on procedure for owning, buying and selling land

Study participants explained that customarily, land is owned by landlords, who also accommodate squatters. Both landlords and squatters have rights and responsibilities to the other. For instance, landlords have the right to sell or not to sell land to squatters, thereby granting or denying them full ownership of land. For a squatter to acquire full ownership rights from the landlord, he/she may have to relinquish to the landlord some of the land they are squatting on, in which case the landlord transfers ownership of the agreed upon (remaining) piece of land to the squatter. Land title or land transfer forms would then be issued to the squatter to effect the transfer. It was reported that, as a practice, whenever a landlord intends to sell his/her land, a squatter has first rights to purchase. Likewise, first priority is given to the landlord to buy land back from a squatter. The men further noted that only when the landlord is unable does the squatter consider other buyers. When other buyers are considered, the outgoing squatter must introduce the new squatter to the landlord to ensure the landlord will know the person who will be paying annual land dues (obusuulu) moving forward.

The steps that are followed in buying land are: the kibanja owner (squatter) comes and tells you that I am selling this kibanja (land I am squatting on). But before the squatter approaches anyone to buy his kibanja, he first goes to the landlord... When the landlord is not interested in buying it, then he tells you (grants you permission) to go and sell to any interested buyer. So the squatter looks for the buyer. After that, the likely buyer comes and check on the land. If he/she is pleased, the seller and the buyer go to LC1 chairman to preside over the transaction. The chairman starts by asking whether the seller has agreed to sell and whether the wife to the seller also agrees. The Chairman also asks whether the landlord is aware of this transaction and if the squatter gave the landlord the opportunity to buy back this land. After confirming all that, the LC1 chairman gets up with the committee members (they are supposed to be 9), they go to the site that the seller is selling, and they call the seller’s wife and the older children. They ask the wife whether she agrees to the selling of land. If [she] refuses and says I don’t agree or if the son(s) aged above 18 years disagrees, then the land is not sold. When they all agree, the transaction takes place. After, we make an agreement with the LC1 executive members. The buyer—now the new kibanja owner—goes to the landlord and gives him ekanzu [a traditional outfit for important ceremonies]. In the past, the Kanzu used to be a physical one but nowadays the landlord may ask for an equivalent of UGX 50,000 or 100,000 from the new squatter. So the buyer becomes a recognized/official squatter. Henceforth, he starts paying annual levy to the landlord. That is how it is done. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

Land dues legally signify rightful occupancy of land by a squatter. The landlord issues receipts of payment for land dues to the squatter. Any transaction on land involving a landlord and squatter is expected to involve local leaders and community members who help to guarantee to the buyer and seller as well as the people squatting on the land that everything is done within the bounds of the law.

In the event that one wants to buy or sell already titled land which is not occupied by any squatters, the transaction takes place between the buyer and the seller as the central parties. The local leaders and community members are also critical to make the transaction official. The seller then issues the buyer the land title and the transfer forms once the transaction is complete.
Besides buying land, SYFF participants indicated that land ownership can be acquired through being given land or inheriting it. Study participants were asked about how they acquired the land they owned individually, jointly or both individually and jointly. The few that owned titled land had mainly acquired it through purchase. They either bought it from individual owners who issued them transfer forms to change the ownership, or they negotiated with their landlords to fully sell the land on which they were initially squatting. The majority of the men said they owned bibanja, meaning they were squatters on land with known landlords. These men acquired this land either as inheritance from their fathers or they bought the bibanja from landlords.

The others are under my names except the one on which I constructed a house, at home, that was given to me by my father before he died but others, I worked for them. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

That bibanja was for our father, but then our father died and later also our mother died and then I stayed on it because my other siblings used to have their homes a bit far away from this land. Let me say I am the only person who used to stay near our parents, and it turned out that I was the heir to my father and am the one who stayed here and I am taking care of this land. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

My father bequeathed it to me and even put it in writing in the presence of the Local Council 1 committee. So I have an agreement for that land. (3003_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

My parent bought it for me. He was still alive and he bought it for me but now he is late [deceased]. (3006_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

The process of acquiring land was found to correlate to the ease or difficulty with which men determine whether land is jointly owned with their wives or bequeathed to their wives and/or daughters. Most men observed that it was easier to bequeath land acquired independently using one's own money to the wife or daughters as opposed to land acquired as inheritance. In the latter case, the normative expectations remain prohibitive.

6.2.2 Knowledge on resolving conflict on land

Study participants noted that conflicts on land are common, arising from contested ownership of land, people selling land that is not theirs, land administrators overstepping their powers and assuming ownership powers, and many other reasons. Most study participants knew procedures for seeking and accessing justice, noting that they know the different offices including the Local Councils I through IV that can offer help in case of land-related conflict or injustice.

The course empowered some men to deal with challenges in their personal/family life:

...after we were done with the course, I got a challenge with the land I bought in Zigoti (a place in Mityana). The landlord came, took measurements of my land which I occupied as a squatter, and even took pictures of it. He has a school there on part of the same land. He brought the bank people and they took pictures of his school but they went beyond and took pictures of our houses as well. I called him and expressed my concern. Instead, he was not remorseful when he told me that he even helped me. I asked him how he had helped and he told me by selling to me occupancy rights on his land and so it was okay to take pictures of my house. I told him true this land is yours but the house is mine, and you have no right to take pictures of my house or use it as collateral. It was not easy for me as he remained adamant. I reported to the RDC [Resident District Commissioner] who intervened in the matter. Whatever he [the landlord] wanted to do did not go through and he told me I was a hard person. But I had saved my asset. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

In helping study participants better understand land laws, the SYFF course contributed to participants' abilities to mitigate and prevent conflict:

There is a place where we went, there were fights but the good thing is that the LC3 chairperson of this sub county appointed and assigned us to support the family to resolve the conflict. He said that we know the law, so you help out. The case involved a person who had died and the family members were fighting over how to share the assets of the deceased. So the sub-county chairperson entrusted us to handle the matter... we ensured that even the girl children got a share from the father's property including land. (3004_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

Women always come here at my place when they get misunderstandings with their husbands and we talk about those issues and they get back together. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

6.2.3 Knowledge on procedure for inheriting land

Study participants knew the procedure for inheriting land. Specifically, they cited land being bequeathed to sons, daughters and other dependents when the person bequeathing the land is still living or through the will. The will is read to the beneficiaries upon death of the land owner (a parent, grandparent, or friend). Study participants noted that this course particularly made them aware of and appreciate that like sons, daughters as well as female spouses should be entitled to land inheritance.

It taught me that children, especially girls, deserve to have a share of their parents’ properties, especially land. Before we didn’t know it and we used to say that women/girls don’t have share on the properties because for them they are girls/women, but... now we know it, and understand that they are also children and equal like boy children. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

It was noted that in some cases, parents neglect to bequeath land to their beneficiaries while still alive or through a will. In that case, the customary practice grants the powers to the kinsmen/clan leaders to divide the deceased’s estate among those they believe should benefit from it. However, study participants said that this practice is widely seen as
being unfair, as clan leaders often do not know the law on land inheritance; and some have ulterior motives and do not necessarily distribute the deceased’s estate as the deceased likely would have desired. Some study participants noted that even if the deceased had verbally discussed his intentions for the estate with family members, the outcome may easily deviate from his wishes, and there is no protection against this without written documentation.

6.2.4 Downside of the land laws and customary practices: Challenges to women’s access to land and property rights.

Study participants noted some of the benefits of the current land laws and customary practices. They emphasized that the intentions of land laws and customary practices are good and, in the latter case, they clarify the relationship between the landlord and the squatters, safeguarding them both and granting protection to the buyer and seller. However, participants also expressed numerous concerns about both these types of law. Some explained that though the laws themselves are fair, their execution is often characterized by corruption, effectively guaranteeing justice to the “haves” and injustice to the “have-nots.” These are described in further detail below;

- **a. Ineffective implementation of existing laws**
  Implementation of laws was characterized by corruption, undermining their effectiveness.

  The laws are not weak but the implementation is weak. You find some people doing what ought not to be done instead of following what the law says. Usually this is fueled by corruption and this is why the laws have lost some value. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

  Our government should first look at the land law, what it says is what is in the country. Because the laws were made, they are good and can help us but they are not put into practice or our judges are also hungry? (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

- **b. Corruption in land processes**
  The following remarks demonstrate perceived corruption with differential treatment of the poor and the rich.

  When anyone is not satisfied and the land issues surpass the local leaders, the poor will never win a case. When things reach the district level the rich will win. That is why our local people want things to end at the local level where they can access justice. But for the rich they want things to be escalated to the district because they know they will benefit from the verdict after corruption. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

  There are some leaders who are also land dealers. That causes some problems here and there. Also, when it comes to the sub county the land committee, it has members who are not straightforward. (3051_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

  The weaknesses are lying among the implementers because they are corrupt and that makes the laws fail to serve the purpose. Implementers use laws to benefit landowners and those who want to buy and that is where I see the weakness. (3051_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

  Some study participants noted that for land cases that come before the land office at the sub county or district, the officials to pay a fact finding visit to ensure that the law is executed appropriately. However, this does not happen easily, as it requires motivating these officials (generally through bribery) to come over. Essentially, a person is unlikely to secure justice if he/she has inadequate financial resources in this case.

  It was also reported that the process of getting a land title from the lands office can be a nightmare without paying bribes.

    …so the corruption that is involved in order to get the ownership is too much... You have to bribe in the lands office to get the land title, because now to acquire a title is like you are buying land altogether. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

  The processes involved in acquiring land and documentations on land was said to be bureaucratic and oppressive.

    These processes that are followed oppress people. For example, if you want to change administrative powers over land, for the Administrator General to grant you this can be very difficult. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa).

- **c. The perception that laws protect the woman more than men**
  Some study participants perceived that when conflict on land involves a woman (wife) and a man (husband), the man may not be given a balanced hearing because women are sympathized with more than men.

    Like the woman has her own land that she bought and I bought mine. For her, she wants to encroach on mine yet for her she doesn’t want me to jointly use hers. (3003_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu).
d. Excessive powers exercised by landlords

Many study participants who were squatters expressed concern that while the customary practices regulating relations between landlords and squatters are clear, sometimes these are flawed by the landlords to their benefit. For instance, sometimes landlords refuse to accept the land dues (busuulu) from the squatters because the amount is so low; and then, lacking a payment receipt, the squatter’s rightful occupancy of that land may face scrutiny.

*Sometimes they refuse what you give them. You are supposed to give busuulu but sometimes they refuse it; the government laws are clear about busuulu but they don't want it because it is very little money.* (3029_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Some study participants noted that some landlords sell land occupied by squatters without the squatters’ knowledge, which is illegal. However, the squatters are ill-positioned to prevail because the landlord and the buyer of land have money to facilitate the legal process against the vulnerable and at times voiceless squatters.

*There are some land owners who have too much dictatorial [power] towards their squatters. Like a squatter can be there and suddenly hears that there are people who are checking on your land (kibanja). These are often buyers without the squatters’ knowledge. This is making people cry a lot these days like you hear in most of the places.* (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

The respondents also mentioned that in some instances, landlords collude with buyers to evict squatters without giving squatters the chance to buy the land first. In fact, landlords might hike the value of the land beyond the market price, making it challenging for squatters to buy it. The landlord then can claim that “I gave you a chance and the law requires but you failed.”

*In (...), they forcefully evicted all the squatters without leaving anyone and they were just thinking for them the money they were to get like, 'this one will get UGX 800,000, for you UGX 1million’ and the squatters were evicted without being helped.* (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

The practice by landlords of asking squatters to return some of the land to them in order to be issued with land titles to return to them and the squatter is given a land title for only the other half. According to the study participants, the landlords ignore the initial amount that the squatters paid to them for occupancy rights as well as the land dues they have been paying annually. Some decried that at times, even after consensus is reached, the landlords fail to issue the land title to the squatters for the land agreed upon. The landlords also do not give them transfer forms and the mother land title for them (squatters) to do the subdivision on their own (at their cost).

6.2.5 Source of information on land laws

Study participants partly attributed their knowledge on land laws to the SYFF course they attended. In particular, many indicated that this course helped them understand the different land structures at the local levels (village, sub county and district) as well national levels. In addition, some study participants pointed out that sometimes, some local leaders hold community meetings at the sub county about land. Some of those cited included local leaders including Sub County Chiefs, Community Development Officers, Area Land Committee members, LC III Chairperson, GISO (Gombolola Internal Security Officer), RDC-Resident District Commissioner, and District Chairperson. Participants also noted that land-related cases in the community present an opportunity for community members to listen and learn new information about land laws. The media was another reported source of information. A few study participants indicated that learned about land laws through their attendance at a land court session.

Overall, the project’s greatest impact on men’s knowledge on formal land laws and customary practices was improving their understanding of available mechanisms for resolving land conflicts and access justice on land, and their knowledge about entitlement of both sons and daughters to inheriting their parents' land and estate at large. In the other areas including procedures for owning, buying and selling land; procedures for inheriting land; the benefits of land laws, and the downside of the known laws and customary practices, men’s knowledge levels were already high at baseline, and the course served to reinforce their understanding on those issues. Their knowledge was polished, grey areas clarified, and they received reference materials.

6.3 Attitude and held perceptions

6.3.1 Perception on land ownership

Like at baseline, FGD participants at endline shared their views on who between women and men should own land in their community. Their endline opinions are summarized in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Perception on who should own land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/s only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 1 - Kisaana (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 2 - Kiteete (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 3 - Namungo (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 4 - Kasanula (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 5 - Mrsirigwa (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the FGD participants had not arrived by the time of this activity.
A total of 21 men (out of 28 that responded to this question) opined that land should be owned by both men and women, while seven men held the view that men only should own land. None of the men said land should be owned by women only. While there was relative consensus among male participants in Kisaana, Kiteete, Namungo and Kasangula, where most men said both men and women should own land, in Mpiriggwa, most men (four out of five) felt that land should be owned by men only. Mpiriggwa FGD participants indicated that they had recently observed a case in their community where a couple that jointly owned land had separated contentiously. The woman requested half of their joint assets. According to the men, this woman was insensitive to the fact that she was leaving the children with the man, and that the family estate was needed to enable the man continue with his care and provision roles for the children. This case appeared to influence their attitudes about women owning land jointly with men.

Compared to the baseline status, at endline, men were more receptive to both men and women owning land. At baseline, 19 out of 40 men in the FGDs said that land should be owned by only men, and the other 21 said it should be owned by both men and women. This reflects an improvement from 52.5 percent (21/40) to 75 percent (21/28).

**Arguments for both men and women owning land**

Men offered a variety of reasons for supporting men's and women's joint ownership of land. These include the following:

a. **Minimizes misappropriation of land by men**

Study participants indicated that as long as land is individually owned by men only, chances of misappropriating it are high. The men noted that it is often easy for the men to put the land to uses that benefit themselves rather than the entire household. Misuse or misappropriation was described in terms of unnecessarily hiring out family land, selling part of or all the land, or using land as collateral for a loan from money lenders without the knowledge of the wife, children and other family members.

b. **Joint ownership promotes joint and consultative decision making on land use**

Joint ownership of land between women and men was associated with promoting joint and consultative decision-making between partners.

Both men and women need to have ownership on land because if you get that land, you are not going to just keep it. You are going to use it to move forward, and moving forward, you cannot move alone, you move together as the man, wife, and children. If you both have shared ownership of that land, both of you will bring ideas that can develop you using that land. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

c. **Security of tenure on land for the woman/wife in case of death of the man/husband**

A number of study participants emphasized that joint ownership of land helps guarantee the woman secure tenure on land, especially when the man predeceases her. Customarily, relatives and kinsmen perceive that land is a cultural resource that they should control in the event of the death of the primary landowner. This means that widows and daughters risk losing tenure on land if it is not secured prior to the death of their husbands. On such grounds, most men agreed that land should be jointly owned by both men and women.

If the land title/agreement has both names of the wife and husband, it is good for safety of both. It is hard for that land to be stolen, because it would be clear that if one dies, one stays and retains full ownership rights…. Even if the man had kept the land title/agreement somewhere (with an entrusted party), he couldn’t have kept it without the wife’s knowledge. This gives the wife safety of land. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

The truth is that we the aged men have taken time to know our wives and our family. If you decide that you alone should have ownership over land, [it is certain] that when
you die, your family will come and disturb your wife and children. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

To have enough security on my land, I like it that I and my wife have ownership on the land title/agreement because if I die, my wife has responsibility over that land and can take care of our children. no one can love the children more than their mother. My relatives can take my assets, and my children and their mother remain in suffering. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

What I can say is that if the land documents have only one name, if that person dies, it is easy to change those papers. But if the land title/agreement has names of several owners such as my name, wife and children, it is very hard to steal it when I die. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

The reason why I say that both of us should have ownership is because if I die today without granting her joint ownership, they [the man’s relatives] may disturb her. But if I give her joint ownership, she will be more secure and together with my children will take responsibility for the estate without any disturbances from my relatives. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

In relation to security of tenure on land for women, some men opined that granting women joint ownership to land is a pathway to having daughters get a share of family land, rather than relying on the traditional assumption that she would get land through a future husband.

Why I want both of us to have ownership on land, most times girl children are not recognized as children with entitlement to a share of family land. Many people expect the girl child to get her share from where she got married, that is why I leave everything prepared because anytime the girl can be chased away from where she got married. And if you had not given her mother or even herself directly a share, they [man’s relatives] will send her away. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

d. Harmonious living between husband, wife and children

Owning land jointly was described as key to securing a harmonious household. A few men with other children from previous relationships felt that their current wives became more accepting of those children when they proposed joint ownership of land.

The reason why I say that the land should be owned by me as a man, I may have a wife but when I have children from different women, if I show the woman that we both own the land, she will accept the idea of bringing in my other children. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa).

e. Perceived responsibility towards the wellbeing of their wives

Some men noted that they have a responsibility toward their wives. Once married, responsibility of care is transferred from the women’s parents to her husband. This is assumed to include responsibility for sharing distribution of family resources, including land as a means of production. Some men also acknowledged women are expected to get their share of land upon marriage.

Ever since I got married and I got to know that the share she would have gotten from her parents, now has to come from me. I decided that the responsibilities her people had over her is now mine, that is why I decided to share with her all that I buy including land. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mityana_Kasangula)

f. Negative experiences associated with individual land ownership

At the endline, men reflected on some negative and costly experiences associated with failure to embrace joint ownership of land between men and women, such as making irresponsible or non-consensual decisions on land and risk facing legal consequences. To them, agreeing to joint land ownership is better than assuming these types of risks.

The issue of shared ownership of land is serious. Those who are selfish have not gained much. Instead, it has brought them problems and landed them into crimes. I have my elder brother who sold land [which he claimed was his individually] without letting his wife know and he was taken to police. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Study participants cited circumstances under which joint ownership of land should not be compromised. These included cases where the couple has worked together and bought land using proceeds from their shared labor, they have lived together long enough know each other very well, neither holds selfish motives, and where the couple is formally/legally married.

I say that ownership should belong to both men and women because if we work together, earn money, and we use that same money to buy land, it is not transparent to put only one name on the land ownership documents. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Notwithstanding the men’s positive attitudes about joint ownership of land with women, they also conceded that this is still relatively rare.

Those [who co-own] are still few. we cannot lie, most still have separate ownership, those [women] who have taken it up are those with high education status, but those whose education is low, they have not seen further. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

Nonetheless, the perception that both women and men should own land is helpful to begin dismantling the normative belief and practice of women and girls accessing land rights only through their relation to men (fathers, husbands and brothers).

Arguments for men only owning land

As noted earlier, seven of twenty-eight men (25 percent) that participated in FGDs felt that men alone should own land, with the highest proportion of these coming from Mpirigwa. Some of the arguments advanced for this position are presented as follows.
a. Women don’t declare their own personal property
Some of these men stated that women are very secretive when it comes to personal property. They noted that some women who get a share of land from their parents or who acquire land through individual purchase are reluctant to declare such property, much less being willing to consider their husbands as co-owners. This perception led some men to feel that only men should own their family land.

The woman can get her own money and can buy her own land but I don’t think she can share the ownership with the husband. I don’t think she can call me and tell me about it and accept that we share ownership. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

If a woman had a share of land from her side, she keeps it a secret and doesn’t tell the man about it and because of that a man gets a heart of dictatorship because she as well doesn’t want to share ownership over her land. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

b. Perceived easy decision making on land use and disposal
Some said that having sole land ownership facilitates decision-making on matters such as using land as collateral or sale of land. If the land ownership is shared, they pointed out that women may not agree to the man using land as collateral for a loan, or hiring it out for a season or two. On the other hand, if ownership is individual, the decision is easy and can be made quickly.

It is easy to sell land to invest in other projects. Because if I have ownership as a man, am free to ask someone that I need some money, if he asks whether I have something to sell, I tell him that I have my one acre. In the end I can sell it from there because ownership is mine and no one decides for me. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

…I may be a business person, I may want to get money but when I have to use the land as collateral to get what I need, the wife can refuse to sign the agreement with the bank and once you fight, she can leave you, running away with the land agreement. Yet you did all you did to include her on the land title to see that there is equality in the home but the wife does not appreciate all that. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

However, men who believed that land should be owned by both men and women maintained that if the intended use of money is truly in best interest of the household, the wife would likely buy into the idea even when the land was jointly owned. Some further argued that making such critical decisions without involving the woman leaves feeling worthless and discouraged.

c. Fear of isolation of children from extra marital affair or from previous relationships
Study participants in favor of land being owned by men only observed that many men marry after having had failed relationships, or some have children from extramarital relationships. Some of these men said that for these children to be assured of a share of their fathers’ property, the father should have overall ownership of such property and land.

I say the ownership should be for a man only because you may not have been able to buy other land as you have managed to get children from different women. So you have to retain the ownership of the only land you have and see how you can divide it among your children when you die. If you leave it to one woman, other children remain with nothing. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpigrigwa)

We men have a problem, the problem of having children who are not of the same wife. So that problem of having children with different women brings a problem. If the current wife gets to know that the land we have is jointly owned with her and the land title/agreements states so, those other children I gave birth to before marrying this woman may not benefit. But if it is mine alone, even if I am to divide it, I do with the knowledge that I have such and such a number of children… the woman doesn’t have to know because if she does, it may cause a problem. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

d. Land bought by the man alone before marriage
Young study participants felt that they should retain sole ownership for land they acquired before marriage. They explained that they struggled to acquire the land, and it is an asset which they were reluctant to share with their wives for fear of losing some control over it. Those who had not been married long also felt that they needed more time living together to solidify their commitment to the relationship before sharing ownership of land.

Some people say that they are the ones who worked for those things alone, I have just brought you here, how can you give me rules on my things. The same applies to the women whom you might have found you with acres of land, if you try to advise her, she may ask whether the land is yours or belonged to your grandfather. She can tell you that the things are hers and she will do whatever she wants. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

e. Age-a key factor
Study participants observed that age was a critical factor in influencing the opinions of land being owned by men only. Some of the relatively young men were unsure of whether their current wives would be their partners for life and thus could not contemplate sharing land ownership with them.

It is different among youth because you cannot tell a youth of 25 years to share ownership with the wife yet he bought the property alone…. When he is still young, he is thinking about doing his own things, he thinks about marrying another woman, and he thinks if he adds her on the documents, the wife may refuse him to marry another wife (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Another thing is that way back whenever we married, women would stay [married] until death. But these young people here aged 40, 30, 20 they get women from bars or at a port, interact a little and they become married partners. These are hardly expected to keep in marriage. So it is difficult to trust easily such women with joint land ownership. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)
Some men, particularly the land owners (as opposed to squatters), are still far from readily accepting the possibility of owning land together with women. Being omutaka (land owner) comes with high status in the form of power, privileges and inflow of annual levy (obusuulu) from the squatters as they reaffirm their occupancy of the land they are on. Some of the land owners are also clan leaders. This viewpoint was associated with the socialization around male entitlement to property, thus making it challenging for some men to embrace the view that land should be owned by both men and women.

Men who have aged, for example in the 70s or beyond have that thinking that he own the land, not they own it. Therefore to change that mindset among them and telling them about equality is not easy. For them they think that it is only them to own the land because those were the ideas that their first grandfathers had. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

f. Land as a tool of male control over women
Some men that perceived that granting women joint ownership of land equates to elevating their status as equals and were concerned that some women may abuse that status and disrespect their husbands. Thus, to keep them in check, men exclude them from land ownership but grant them user rights.

…giving ownership rights to women can lead to women disrespecting men. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

…that is why I remain with the ownership. She is free to work on the land; we can use it together but when the ownership is mine (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

…when a woman knows that you are equal there is a way they start conducting themselves. They are elevating themselves thinking that they are now at the same level with the man. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

For some men, there was no better justification for their sole right to on land other than male chauvinism. They perceived that there should be a head in the household who should be defined by superiority. Land ownership was perceived as a key factor in distinguishing men from women and positioning them as superior to women.

The Baganda say that “Nnanyinimu yaoni” (literally translated as ‘who is the head)? We cannot all be “nnanyinimu” (heads). (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

g. Mistrust
Some men emphasized that living with a partner does not automatically confer trust.

From the training session we had here, I learnt a lot and when I went back home, I shared with my partner. I opened up to her about the land I owned and the documents to that land. I did all this thinking we would be one as husband and wife. I thought we would have unity at home but I was wrong. There are things that happened to me. When she learnt of the land I owned after opening up to her, she became a problem and we got misunderstandings, she started hiding land titles and agreements. We had to part ways. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

The women of these days are hard, one can come with a motive to steal all these things. That is why I rather give her her own things. So her things are hers and mine are mine. So for me I gave her a share of her own that she owns alone. She decides whatever she wants to do with it. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo).

…if women are given the right to own land, and tomorrow she gets pregnant [by] the neighbor, will you not have misunderstandings over the things you own together? That is why I am saying it is better I give her, her own such that if we fail to agree when I have given her, her own land, then let her go to her kibanja. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo).

h. Fear of women’s misuse of co-ownership rights
Some men’s reservations about co-owning land arose from concerns that women with bad intentions or who have been negatively influenced might abuse the right granted them by their husbands to co-own land.

I can buy land and I include my wife on the agreement, when she sees where I have kept it, she gets it and hides it, once you get misunderstandings, and she leaves, she goes with it. She can even create an atmosphere of misunderstanding because she knows the agreement is not with you but with her already such that when you break up, she has a basis to claim her share and that is her goal. It is after she has left that you realize the land agreement is nowhere to be seen. Women have started stealing from the husbands taking advantage of the right they were given to co-own property with their husbands and having this documented. When you educate us, counsel us on how to keep peace in our homes, this will help… Yes, this scares men to include women on land agreements on land titles as co-owners because we have seen that happen. At least for us we have been trained about this, but many women use that chance to steal from the husbands. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Circumstances under which women only could be justified to own land
Although no men said land should be owned by women only, they were asked to share any possible circumstance that might warrant an exception. Men responded that when the woman gets a share of her parents’ land, she can decide to own it alone or share ownership with whomever she chooses but is not being compelled to do so. Some further emphasized that girls/daughters to whom parents have bequeathed land can own it alone. Men also said that sole ownership was justified for women who have acquired land using their own resources.

6.3.2 Land management
Men shared their opinions on who in their community should make decisions on land, whether men, women or both. They considered decisions on land related to land use, management of proceeds from activities done on land, and
sitting land. The majority of the men that participated in FGDs (90.6 percent) said that both men and women should make decisions on land. Just 9.4 percent said only men should make land decisions, and none thought that women alone should be able these decisions. See Table 3 below.

Compared to baseline, there was some improvement in the proportion of men that felt decisions on land should be made by both men and women. At baseline, 82.5 percent (n=40) of men held that opinion, compared to 90.6 percent at endline.

**Justification for joint decision making**

Men noted that joint decision-making improves the image of the man before his wife, and it encourages them to work because their activities on their shared land help them both.

> We discuss and decide together. Like we discuss and agree that this banana plantation is no longer good, we replace it with coffee, or we do this or that. But if you can bring your dictatorship and say that one’s banana plantation should be removed and replaced with coffee, it doesn’t make her happy. So it is not good. You just discuss like am proposing we do this or that. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

> We sit and decide jointly so that you don’t look to be a dictator. And the love for development makes us decide jointly because when you decide alone, she may not like what you decided because it oppressed her. And sometimes the project may fail because there’s someone who doesn’t like it. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

> Because the woman gets to know that she was part of making the decision on the land use activities, she takes care of the activities/project very well. If you are away, you are comfortable and confident that there is somebody caretaking because she knows she is doing that activity for both of you and your children. And when you involve her, whatever you decide to do, you do it in happiness. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula).

Men associated joint decision-making on land use with women’s motivation to be involved in agreed upon land use activities because their work will contribute to their shared goals for the land, which presumably will also contribute to their family’s well-being.

> We both need to decide together because we may both have goals to be achieved every year, for example this year we may have a goal of buying a motorcycle, the children will work hard and the wife as well because they all know you have a goal and because you decided jointly. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

> You have to know that what she is doing helps all of you in your household, you the man, woman and your children. For example, I have explained to you that all our children are still in school, so if we don’t work jointly, we may fail to take these children far… (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

**Table 3: Perception on who should make decisions on land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men/sons only</th>
<th>Women/ daughters only</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGD 1 – Kisaana (n=7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 2- Kiteete (n=7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 3 - Namungo (n=7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 4 – Kasanhuia (n=6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 5 – Mpiriggwa (n=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most times whatever we do on land benefits our family as a whole so whenever she wants to do something on the land, she asks me and we talk about it. For example if we want to renovate our house we sit down and talk about it then we make a plan on whether and how we should use our land for a project that will help us. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

I learned that when a husband and wife work together, they are bound to develop because everyone adds value to the family, because we know we are working together as one. (3051_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

The desire to have peace, harmonious living, and complementarity in the family stood out as a justification for joint land use decision-making.

It is a good thing to decide jointly on what to do because it helps you to know what each other wants to do. A woman may want to plant ground nuts and you may want to plant maize so you can decide to divide the acre into two parts, she gets a part for ground nuts, and the other part is used by you to plant maize. This brings peace and harmony. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

Some men described women as very practical. Thus, not involving them implies missing out on their counsel and contribution.

It is right to sit together and decide what to do and where, like should we rear chicken from here, or pigs? The woman can tell you that let us not rear pigs, they will cause misunderstandings with the neighbor, let us rear chicken that we can keep in the mesh (perimeter fence). That is why I agree that we need to decide together. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo).

It also emerged that joint decision-making helps couples make amends in case of any prevailing differences.

Some women don't care when they discover that a man is seeing other women. They know/perceive that the man will marry another woman and all their efforts may go down the drain. They prefer to do their own things... And when they hear that you have a child outside marriage, they can leave your cow to die on the rope without taking it to graze. But when you sit together, make joint decisions and work together, that misunderstanding fades away. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Notably, joint decision-making on land use appealed even to men who were opposed to joint ownership of land by men and women.

By me having a doubt that the woman can go anytime, I don’t see how that stops us from deciding jointly on land use because even if she leaves after we have worked together, she leaves me with those things (projects) we would have achieved together, she leaves me with good things because I will have joined [her] knowledge with mine. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

6.3.3 Land inheritance

Study participants were asked to share their opinions on who should inherit land in their community, whether sons only, daughters only or both sons and daughters. FGD participants unanimously agreed that both sons and daughters should inherit land, as shown in Table 4 below.

Men’s unanimous belief at endline (n=32) that sons and daughters should inherit land compares to just 72.5 percent (n= 40) saying the same at baseline, with 25 percent saying that only sons should inherit land and 2.5 percent saying only daughters.

Men at the endline offered some of the following reasons for their opinion that both boys and girls should inherit land:

a. Both sons and daughters are “my own blood, my children”

The men were emphatic that the fact that both males and females are children and they ought to be treated as so rather than distinguishing one gender as deserving and the other as undeserving.

The reason why both girls and boys have to get a share of [inherit] the parents’ land is they are all your children and any child you have given birth to is supposed to have a share of your property. You worked for those things together with your wife and the children. Even though the daughter has gone into marriage, she still has a share. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

### Table 4: Perception on who should inherit land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sons only</th>
<th>Daughters only</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGD 1 – Kisaana (n=7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 2- Kiteete (n=7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 3 - Namungo (n=7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 4 - Kasanhula (n=6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD 5 - Mpiriggwa (n=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They all have to get a share because I am the one who gave birth to all of them although some people think a girl is not supposed to get a share yet it is you who gave birth to her. Recently, we had an issue in the community, one person came to me and told me that his daughters were complaining that they also want to get a share. I told him that they are right because they are also your children. They have to get a share. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

Because they are all children. You may give birth to the boy and he doesn't help you and when you give birth to a female, she helps you more than a boy. So they are all children. We give birth to bodies and not souls. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

They are both children; if you discriminate against them, you may cause separation amongst them. ...(they) have to share equal parts because they are all your children (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Children are children and yours. They concern you because even the Bible says that a man gives birth to a boy and a girl. Why would you discriminate between them yet God created a man and a woman, who are you to give only boys and leave the girls? (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasaana)

b. Girl children are responsible and caring towards their parents

Study participants reflected upon experiences in their communities and said that female children deserve a share of their parents’ land because many have proven responsible and supportive of their parents’ well-being, regardless of whether they were married and living far from the parents.

...and they are also always responsible. That is why you see that when a girl child gets money, she still remembers her parents, she provides for them. Then would you deny her a share? She is also supposed to get a share. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasaana)

Nowadays, women are hard working as men, she can plant an acre of maize, coffee. You also find that they are more important than us men. I may spend a week without knowing how my father is but my sister cannot take two days without calling him. Sons and daughters are all equal and deserve a share. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

Do you know who will help you later in life? These days it is the girls who take care of their parents. A boy can even kill you so he [can] sell your property [and] get easy money. Children are all children. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasaana)

I also admit that the girls should also get a share. They love and care for their parents so much. Even if it comes to constructing a new house at the father’s home, the daughters put more effort than the sons and it is easy for the boy to take years without returning home which is not the case with the girls, so they should also get a share. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

Another reason is that these days it is the girls who take care of their parents, and if they take care of you and you discriminate against them, it is not fair and for that reason, all children are supposed to get a share of their parent’s property. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasaana)

... if you give shares to only boys, they can say that why not sell, I want a car. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasaana)

Females (daughters) were also said to be more responsible when it comes to maintaining the estate of their parents upon their death.

What I want to add is, girls keep the estate more than boys. My grandmother gave birth to girls and one boy but the boy sold my grandmother’s home. After that, he came pressurizing my mother to sell her part that she was given near to the burial grounds. She said she doesn't sell and she had to give him a part at the down end. But he sold it as well. Up to now the piece of land for my mother is still there, the male children don’t keep things. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasaana)

As we have realized, the girl children keep well/maintain their inheritance [better] than the boys. The boy can see someone driving a motorcycle and he sells part of the land buy one. But a girl cannot sell to buy a motorcycle. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

This implies that despite the customary practice of male children largely being inheritors of their parents’ land, female children have proven their worth in the minds of several men and have earned the right to inherit land.

c. Security reasons

Some men said that it is safer and in the interest of the entire family to have both sons and daughters inherit land. This was premised on the view that sons are good at selling their share while daughters are conservative. In the event that sons make a poor decision in selling, they have a fallback position in case they fail to make a fortune out of the sales made from their land. Their sisters can easily grant them space where they can squat, as opposed to paternal uncles.

d. Uncertainty about daughters’ fate in marriage

Some men said that the days when girl children could count on getting their fair share property upon marriage are long over and that consequently, it no longer makes sense to exclude girls from inheriting their parents’ estate. Furthermore, inheritance would provide girls a fallback in case their marriage fails. Lacking this, they would remain squatters at the mercy of whomever cares to help.

If you leave the girl child aside, where is she going to go? What if she fails in marriage? (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

From way back, the girl child would be ignored but now things changed and she also has to get a share. In the past, parents used to think that she will go and get married and stay with her husband. But now things have changed. It is
husband’s name. To him, this was unthinkable.

It should be that both male and female children get equal shares because if the females don’t get the same share, what if they are not given anywhere they are married? So they should all have equal shares. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpirigwa)

e. To check on laziness among male children

Some men reported that whenever male children learn that they are the only ones to inherit their parents’ land and estate, they become lazy as they perceive that have enough to make it in life. However, when the land is to be inherited by all children irrespective of gender, the boys in particular realize that they have to work harder because they cannot put all their hopes in the share of land they hope to inherit.

If you have two boys and they get to know that you have eight acres of land, they automatically know that each has four acres. But when they get to know that you have six girls and two boys, they work hard especially when they know that they will share that land equally. But when they get to know that girls will not get a share, they will become lazy. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

f. Important for ensuring equality

Some men noted that according inheritance rights to one gender and disenfranchising the other is a gateway to promoting inequality and leading to oppression. Thus, both males and females should inherit land.

If you give only boys, they can step on the girls and if you give the girls only, they have the power to step on the boys as well. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

I have to give all of them because they are all my children. If I discriminate and give only to male children, that means I have drawn a line between them and even if I die, that division may never be erased. So to avoid all that, okay I may give a boy more but at least I give all of them. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

g. Personal experience

Some men shared their personal lived experiences that challenged their previously held notions, saying that they have come to believe that both sons and daughters should inherit land. One study participant shared that his wife had received an inheritance from her father, and the wife told her husband that land ownership was transferred into both the wife and husband’s name. To him, this was unthinkable.

I used to think that girl children are not supposed to get a share but I changed because of my wife. She got a share from her parents, she was given titled land yet me I have I (is a squatter). I felt happy and even the land title is in both our names. I felt happy about that. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

h. Giving birth to only female children

The men contended that in the event that a couple has given birth to only female children, land should be bequeathed to all of them.

Why I would like all of them to get is because, like me, I have girl children only. If I die now should I leave my land and other properties in the air because I have no male child yet? That is why I say that they all need to inherit land. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

...secondly you may have given birth to girl children only, but because you say that only boys inherit land, do you see how the sons of your brother come and take these all your land and property? (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Notably, the perception that both sons and daughters should inherit land was not necessarily held by men at baseline. At baseline, most men felt that only boys should inherit land. However, the course changed this perception for many.

I also had the same view that the girl child is not supposed to get a share of my land. I was of the view that if I take the girl child to school and after getting her a job, she can go and develop her husband’s side but following the course we attend that was offered by UCObAC, it has made me change my thinking. I appreciate that even girl children are my children and they are supposed to get a share of my property. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

I used to be against it and I would not even allow the girl child to be my heir, but now I can allow my girl child to be my successor. Even now when I am going to buy a plot, I go with my wife and she is included in the agreement but way back I used not to allow my wife to follow me, and I would decide on things alone. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

Equitable land allocation to sons and daughters

Though study participants agreed that both sons and daughters should inherit land, some men believed that under certain circumstances, sons should be given a bigger share. Some men explained that sons will likely live on the land bequeathed to them, marry and thus more likely look upon this land as the prime resource for their families’ survival. This may not be the case for women, especially when they get married and the marriage works out.

If this boy is sensible, he may stay here, keep the land, marry from here, and ensure continuity of lineage. But when the woman gets married, she will not stay here. Even if the father’s house is good, she will leave it...because she cannot marry from here. It is natural that a girl has to get married away from her parent’s home. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

I would like to give all the children because they are all mine, but I give more to a boy. Out of 100, I give 60 percent to the boy and 40 percent to the girl because when she gets married, she has a share where she is married yet the boy has nowhere to get more shares. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)
To be honest, way back the girls have been marginalized. They were not being given a share of their parents’ land but now there is a change. For instance, if there are three acres and the children are two, male and female... a girl is given an acre and the boy takes more, but at least even the girl is given something which was not happening before. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

Sons were also identified with more responsibilities than daughters. For sons, fulfilling their responsibilities calls for relatively more resources and land.

Because they are all my children, I gave birth to them and they were given to me by God, they have to get equal shares, if not, I give a smaller part to the girl and a bigger part to the boy because of the responsibility of caring for his children but they all have to get. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

To some men, while they acknowledged that both males and females should get a share, religion remains an important factor in determining how the inheritance is to be distributed.

They are all children and they have a right to inherit land but there are religious determinants. For example, Muslims who have children, the sharia law doesn’t support equal shares. It says boys get a bigger share than girls. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Some men also felt that sons should get a bigger share than daughters because they are expected to pass on their inheritance to the next generation. For the daughters, it was noted that their inheritance goes to one person that is selected as their heir. Thus, they were presumed to deserve less than the sons.

Both male and female children are both children and fit to have a share but out of 50, let the boys get 30 and the girls get 20 because the boy will remain here and the girl will go and get married, the boy is also going to produce children whom he has to give a share of the same land. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

Perception of the wider community at large

Study participants indicated that following the training received, they returned to their respective communities and shared what they learned with others in their communities. This gave them the opportunity to interact with the community members and to understand their perception about who should inherit land. Participants reported that most male peers generally hold the view that both male and female children should inherit land but in unequal proportions in favor of the males. Study participants applauded the SYFF course for contributing to a broader gradual shift in perceptions regarding the value of males versus females.

I am happy about this course because it has opened our eyes. In the past, people never used to take the girl child as important. We would count her on the husband’s side. We would say that when she gives birth, she takes the children to the man's side. So that is where she adds value. But now both male and female children get a share. This also ensures that your daughter doesn’t suffer much when she goes into marriage. If she fails, she comes back here, takes up and develops her land. That is what has made me happy with this course (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Nonetheless, there were concerns that some men in the community are discouraged from bequeathing land to their daughters, especially when they recount experiences within their communities where some women sell off the land to people that are non-clan members. This was described as attracting strangers into the family/clan.

What makes some people to have such a view that girls should not inherit land is because when the girls are given land, when they are/get married, they come back and sell the land. They use the proceeds to buy land elsewhere near where they are married or they give the proceeds to their husbands. So if the girls are five and boys are only two, it means that the biggest part is gone. Thus, many parents think that if they give land to the girls, they will sell it and leave because they will see that this side does not benefit them. Or also she will bring her children belonging to another clan to occupy this land and many don’t like such a thing. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

For example, when my sisters got their inheritance, they sold the land slowly and now our father’s land that they got is over. Their husbands persuade them to sell and after selling, the husbands take the money and abandon/dump them. Things have unfolded that that way. We have not benefited, neither have they. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

...I have seen that in my family, my grandfather pronounced himself on this issue. He said that his daughter should be given a share of his land. But their brothers refused give them their share. They say that the women are not supposed to get a share, and if they are to be given, then there has to be conditions that when she is to sell, she should sell to the brother. This practice has existed for long. It is only changing now that even women should get a share. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

...now to say that my girl child has got a share of my land and then goes and produces children from the Ndiga [sheep] clan, then the Ndiga clan benefit from my sweat? It is not okay. This also brought some problems. Nothing to do about it but you know that, it is not ok. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Some noted that while their brothers and uncles would be given the priority to buy from their sisters/nieces, they often cannot afford this transaction, compelling the sellers to find another buyer.

It was also reported that in some cases, even when the man is willing to bequeath land to both his sons and daughters, the amount of land is too small to divide, in which case it goes to the son.

Some give shares to girls also but it depends on the size of the land. If it is small, sometimes the girls don’t get, they just give to boys. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)
As a whole, however, study participants reported a general improvement in community practices regarding bequeathing land to both their sons and daughters. Community members were said to be increasingly willing to include the girl child among those to inherit land, though not in equal proportion to boys.

**Circumstances under which only daughters may be justified to inherit land**

Study participants also presented cases where daughters only are justified to inherit land. The main circumstance cited was if the couple does not have any sons.

... you may have given birth to girl children only, but because you say that only boys should inherit land, do you see how the sons of your brother come and take all the land that should have helped your children to develop. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

A few men noted some parents’ relationships with their son(s) have deteriorated to the point that they may bequeathing land to their daughters instead; or they fear that the sons may sell the land and squander the money. Some parents feel neglected by their sons and thus consider them unworthy of inheritance.

Some people hold the view that boys should not be given land by their parents. This comes after the male children getting spoilt and not thinking about developing this land, and they are only thinking about selling it. You realize that only girls have good ideas, they are developmental, and they have built for their parents. So after seeing that the boy children have got spoilt, some parents painfully develop that thinking that they should not inherit land. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

What brings that is the parent sits and looks at his children. The daughters care about her parents’ side while the sonsfocuses on the parents of the woman he married. When the wife comes crying, he [the son] gets money and builds for the wife's parents yet he cannot do the same for his parents. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Overall, this project intervention had a positive impact on men's attitudes and perceptions toward joint land ownership by men and women, joint land management, and the bequeathing land to both sons and daughters. Most men embraced the insights that the course offered about the benefits of joint land ownership and management as well as land inheritance. The course empowered most men to go against the prevailing inheritance norms. Indeed men’s narratives at endline were markedly different from those at baseline. At baseline, most men were skeptical about the value of allowing women to own land, jointly own family land with the man, or jointly manage land use and the proceeds from activities done on land. Some men at baseline refused to consider the possibility of daughters inheriting land. At endline, most men had really softened their stances and were much more open-minded in these attitudes. The course's emphasis on the benefits and the costs of land-related practices that discriminate against women and girls were cited as key factors in influencing perceptions. In addition, the course helped the men to reflect on scenarios in their communities where some men reserved all the powers and rights, failing to secure the support of their spouses and children in managing activities on land. Moreover, when they died, the women and the children did not have security of tenure and thus lost the land to the man’s family members.

### 6.4 Self-efficacy

#### 6.4.1 Current land ownership

All of the 45 men that participated in the endline evaluation indicated that they owned land, some with land titles and others as squatters (bibanja owners). In Uganda, squatters have land agreements giving them the rights over that land, including the right to sell and to use it for any intended purpose.

The majority of the men reported that they jointly owned land. A few said they owned land individually. In isolated cases, some men reported that they had land which they jointly owned as well as land that they individually owned. Men’s joint ownership of land was mainly with their wives and/or children. Only two men said they jointly owned it with their brothers. They had inherited the land from their fathers and the land was not divided among individual beneficiaries. Thus, it was kept as a joint family estate. While this minimizes land fragmentation, it presents enormous challenges for women (wives and daughters to these men) to have decision-making powers, let alone ownership rights, over such land. Even when the individual men have a positive attitude toward women's land ownership, management and inheritance, the course participants reported that other men with shared ownership of this land in the extended who did not participate in the SYFF course were a key barrier to the realization of the desired shift toward realization of women's and girls' land rights.

While most of the men indicated that they jointly owned land with their wives and/or children, for many, the documents defining land ownership were in the men's names. Most men indicated the SYFF course helped them change their perception about land ownership and that they had come to embrace the idea of joint ownership. However, they indicated the process of changing the land agreements or land titles to include the names of their wives and children was not easy. It involves costs of changing the names on the land titles (transferring ownership) for titled land, and for squatters, it requires convening a meeting with key persons including the landlord (omutaka), family members, neighbors and some community members to effect the change in land agreement. This was described as expensive besides being bureaucratic. Some men emphasized that such a decision requires that their spouses clearly understand the whole shift in practice and rationale behind it. If men perceive that their spouses might not fully comprehend this, the men postpone the idea.

There was one case where one of the study (IDI) participants reported having added his wife's name on the land agreement after he attended this course. He explained:

_I bought the land [kibanja] myself and the land agreement had my names as the buyer. But after attending this training, I was touched, I felt guided and now I say we own it jointly, I called her, explained to her what we had studied and I ensured her name was added on the land agreement._
as a joint land owner... I did not call any other people but we did it, two of us... (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

However, there were some dissenting voices among relatively young men, men in polygamous marriages and men who were not formally/legally married. They felt that changing land documents may place them at a high risk. They reasoned that it was safer to tell their wives and children that they owned the land jointly but without necessarily altering the land ownership documents.

6.4.2 Disclosing land owned by men without the knowledge of the spouses and children

Some men reported that a long-held norm was to own some land and property secretly without the knowledge of their spouses. However, this training helped to appreciate the importance of their partners and the older sons and daughter being aware about such land. Thus, they opened up and showed the land to them. The men associated such disclosure with security of tenure for the whole family.

I thought land ownership was supposed to belong to me only but I realized we are supposed to own it as a family and all the land I have, my wife and children should know where it is... Currently they know. I showed it to them after attending this course. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

6.4.3 Joint decisions on land management

At endline, 14 out of 15 men who participated in IDIs indicated that decisions on how to use their land were jointly taken within the household. The participants noted that joint decision-making on land use and management of proceeds from activities on land guaranteed household cooperation, mutual support, harmonious living and effective utilization of the available land. According to the men, this leaves both parties (men and their spouses) satisfied with each other.

Decision making on land use

Based on what the men reported for the endline study, their widely held opinion that decisions on land use should be jointly made by both men and women was clearly being translated into practice.

We decide jointly. As I told you that I am a farmer, we always plant maize, coffee and all that but we decide together on what to plant where. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

We sit two of us and decide what to do. We sit and decide jointly. If we want to grow beans, we have to decide that together. We sit together and agree, and become one person. Do you get me? That's how we work (3003_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

We both sit together and discuss, and say I would want... for example there is one piece of land where we put a chicken project for all of us. There is also a banana plantation on the side which I cut from the piece of land for coffee plantation. But I first asked my partner. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

for coffee plantation. But I first asked my partner (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

I sit with my wife and agree that let us use this portion of land for this or that. If she says no let us use it for something else since that is what will help us most, we look into the different options and decide together. (3027_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Some men with adult children felt that it is reasonable to include them in making decisions on land use.

The husband and wife with the grown up children with capacity to reason do come together, discuss and decide together... ooh how do we use this portion of land? They share ideas like, maybe we plant maize or we plant G-nuts until you reach an agreement and do what you have agreed on. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Because most men were in favor of joint decision-making between men and women in regard to land use, they were further asked whether their opinions and practices cut across the entire community. Reactions were mixed, with some saying that other men not exposed to idea such as those presented in the SYFF course had not embraced a shift in mindset and practice.

Most men decide on their own. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Other study participants noted that while males traditionally have always made decisions on land use without involving their wives and without concern of how this practice might affect the well-being of their partners, the trend was said to be changing for the better.

There is a change in people's behavior. You may wake up in the morning and see a young couple going to the garden together and the man is the one carrying their baby on the back... There are still those selfish ones but this view of working jointly has gone wide. And most people in this community have the same thinking. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

The change in practice was attributed to some factors such as women's realization of their rights, including the right to make decisions; interaction between men who had attended the SYFF course and those who did not, and the influence of the former on the latter; increasing male tolerance; shared family goals such as achieving children's education, which is dependent on joint effort between women and men; and the desire for peace and harmony in the family.

Decision making on managing land proceeds

The men emphasized that joint decision-making with women is not restricted to land use but also applies to managing proceeds from the activities on land.

We discuss jointly... By the time of harvest, we have already decided on how to use the proceeds. By that time, we already know that children are going to take this much
on fees and other needs, and the small balance we remain with, we buy soap, salt and paraffin at home. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Still when we have harvested, say beans, we sit on a table and become one person. Then we decide on what to do. (3003_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

Even when we harvest, everyone knows how much we have got. Then you consult her on what to do. She tells you that let us take off 100 kilograms of maize, keep it aside, we shall use that for porridge and food. What has remained, we buy this and that. And even the children we buy for them this and this. (3027_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana).

You don’t have to be a dictator as a person and say let me go and drink alcohol with my money. No! We work together and say what can we do? Can we eat some meat on our money? Which kind of meat? And she decides, let us do like this, even children if they are able to contribute to decision-making. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

It needs both of you sitting down and decide jointly, you may have school-going children whom you have not paid school fees for and you decide to first pay school fees so they can go to school instead of buying TV first. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

These testimonials together indicate that children's schooling and family well-being are key factors in influencing men and women to decide jointly on managing farm produce and any other proceeds from land use activities.

Some men reported that they even relinquish the power to sell produce to their spouses, noting that they do not have to be physically present for the produce to be sold.

Even when it comes to selling, she sells when am not around and when I come back she tells me this is how much we got, and we decide to buy food or to help us here and there. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Some men noted that the involvement of women and children is necessary in families operating labor-intensive projects such as coffee growing, which is very demanding in terms of weeding, mulching, and harvesting. Thus, after harvest, it is logical that the proceeds are made known to the partners and the plan for how to use the proceeds is executed jointly.

Since I have told you our piece of land has only banana and coffee, these are labor-intensive, especially coffee. It is not easy to harvest coffee alone, it needs many people. So after harvesting it when you are many, do you hide the money got from selling it? (3004_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

That said, some men still maintained that the final decision on how to use the proceeds from activities on the family land remains a preserve of the household head. However, the few men that held this opinion concurred that while men reserve the power to decide how to manage proceeds, women can still have a role in making that decision.

The truth is necessary, for example when we have harvested coffee, there are things which are natural and responsibilities that are natural. Our ancestors for example also knew that it’s men who should make the final decision. Even when a woman is thinking about doing something, she asks me and when you are also human, you also bring your suggestion on the table and then you discuss and agree jointly because at the end of the day, it is about working together and deciding jointly. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Men were also asked about their satisfaction (or lack thereof) with the land management responsibilities held between them and the women. The response was largely positive.

I have no problem with my wife and there is nothing that I can do without discussing with her. (3006_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kiteete)

I feel it gives me peace because, there is no pulling of ropes... and when there's no pulling of ropes with your partner, it gives you peace and you don't get problems. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Yes, am satisfied because it helps us not to have any doubts of the other, for instance, that the money may be spent in wrong priorities or taken to wrong routes. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Am satisfied because even if she tells me that she wants to use part of it [the land], I have to believe in what she tells me. (3029_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Yes, am satisfied. You know... being a dictator sometimes is not good because in case you are away or in case of your death, they will not know how to run the family things [estate]. That is bad. It is better they also get involved. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

It was also reported that with shared land management and ownership responsibility between the men and women, the latter complement the former in defending and safeguarding the land.

It is not bad because already it is theirs with the children, though I am also part but when I go [die], it remains theirs. It is good for her to be part of it, to partly own it. In that case, if you try to encroach on it illegally, by the time I come she is already there fighting to defend it. You find her quarrelling defending the land. This means she shows ownership. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Essentially, the men’s satisfaction is grounded in the benefits of joint decision-making on land use and managing proceeds from land use activities.

Decision making on selling land

Most men observed that the decision to sell land is very sensitive and thus should be undertaken jointly by the wife and husband as well as the children if they are old enough. This is because the land offers a habitat and a livelihood
According to the study participants, if the man attempted to sell family land, even where men derive a livelihood, the transaction would be highly contested and they would stand to lose their money. Some men shared that the SYFF course played a fundamental role in shifting their mindset and changing their practices.

After getting this course, now we have to discuss it [the decision to sell land] jointly but before these trainings, you knew that you are the man. As a man you could discuss the matter with your fellow men at drinking joint. That is where you would get the buyer from and the wife and children would just see the demarcations being drawn but now it is no longer the case. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

Overall, the men emphasized that trust, unity and harmonious living are important to maintain stability of marital relationships. They noted that decisions by men alone to sell family land would very likely kill the trust bestowed upon the man by the woman and children.

Perception of the wider community

Study participants shared their views about whether the roles that they and their partners were taking in managing their land were typical of what happens in their respective communities. Most men noted that there was a visible difference between men that had attended the SYFF course and their counterparts that had not. Men who attended this course echoed that the course tamed moderated their views, and that they learned to prioritize peace in the family, harmonious relationships and respect for each other’s views. Many captured these sentiments with this phrase:

The strength of a [bicycle or motorcycle] chain lies in its softness.

They learned that being flexible, involving the wife and children in family matters including in decisions on land use, management of proceeds and sale of land does not take away the fact that they are men and household heads. Instead, they become stronger as men.

The study participants observed that many of their counterparts that did not attend this course have yet to experience such change.

Still the negativity is there among them. For them they perceive sharing land management responsibilities with women as a way of taking away authority from them. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

There are some men who want to do their things secretly without involving their wives…. They say they don’t want women to reason for them yet they can reason on their own. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

6.5 Perception of peer norms

Study participants were asked to share their views about what their male reference groups and peers in the community who

Something which is not yours alone, how can you decide to sell it alone? Because even while deciding on land use (digging) we first sit and decide, how will I sell when I have not discussed it with her? So we have to first sit and talk and agree that the situation has failed, therefore let us sell here, maybe we buy somewhere bigger. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Most men concurred that the circumstances under which land is being sold must be clear and agreed upon both the man and women to maintain harmony in the household.

Where there is no dialogue, there cannot be development in the household. Any good thing has to be agreed on and it is acted upon after knowing why you are going to do it... it is good to work together, advise each other on what you are going to do after selling, what is going to happen, there has to be advice for each other. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

You need to start from the start where you both agree and become one person. You all agree to sell and possibly buy another piece of land that is cheaper or commands a higher value. You need to agree on things like: here how much money do we get from if we sell? Five million? What about there where we are planning to buy, how much money do they sell? That's four million. Then you sit on a table and discuss because you cannot sell when the woman has not appended her signature. After selling, you go together and buy a new place. (3003_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

It is both of you with the authority and so we first sit and agree. (3029_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

As you see, the children are still young and they are a priority. So we agree with the wife, I agree with the mother of the children. If there is a need, I ask her that: can we sell here? If she agrees, well and good. If she refuses, we think about something else. She may also say that to address this problem, we do this and that. But it’s the mother of the children who can have a final say. If she agrees, we sell. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa).

It depends. If you want to sell land and the idea is brought by a man for example, the woman might take time to think about it and then you discuss. In the similar manner if it is the wife that has brought the idea, I also give myself time to think about it and see whether suggestion will benefit us with our children and if yes, there is no reason why I should hesitate. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Many men observed that for family land, even where men may claim individual ownership, when it comes to selling, they may not succeed without the consent and approval of the woman. This was said to be the case for the land where the family is living and from which the family derives a livelihood. According to the study participants, if the man attempted to sell without the consent of the wife and older sons/daughters, the transaction would be considered invalid. They further noted that it is common knowledge among would-be buyers that such a transaction would be highly contested and they would stand to lose their money.

Study participants were asked to share their views about what their male reference groups and peers in the community who
did not participate in the course thought about women owning land, women making decisions about how to use land or what to do with proceeds from land as well as what they think about their daughters inheriting land. Most men indicated their peers were generally positive. They cited a positive shift in peer norms. Some were said to have become role models and many had experienced the benefits of equitable gender relations. Essentially, the men were said to be translating the shift in norms into practice.

6.5.1 Peer norms on women owning land
The men indicated that most of their peers believe women should also own land. Besides the perception that women, like men, can buy and own their land, men noted that most of their peers had appreciated that for family land, women should be co-owners to help guard against any eventualities such as what might likely follow in the event of untimely death of the man. Thus, women owning land was perceived as a guarantee of security of tenure on land.

6.5.2 Peer norms on women making decisions about how to use land or what to do with proceeds from land.
Study participants more or less agreed that men in their groups were very positive about women making decisions about how to use land or what to do with proceeds from land. Men were said to be actively involving women in decision-making.

Some that we trained together with, when you visit them and have a conversation with them, you realize that the way they handle their things is promising. He tells you that I discuss with my wife. You see she is even the one who dug that soil for making bricks when it should have been a job for men. (3027_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

They think about it as a good thing because we used to see that women used to cultivate like say coffee, harvest and dry them but at the end women used to be left out when it came to selling and determining use of the money. They used not know how the money was spent. But everyone who was in this course knows that it is very good for a woman is involved in making decisions about the money that has come from the proceeds of the land. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

6.5.3 Peer norms about daughters inheriting land
The men similarly concurred that their peers were very positive about the idea of bequeathing land to their daughters.

Some have even made their wills and they want to divide their land (bibanja) among all their children including girls. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

The training, coupled with experiences encountered in their communities, has influenced a positive shift in thinking about girls inheriting land.

However, study participants noted that some of their peers were still struggling to adopt to new behaviors.

Some people are big headed, when someone is trained about this, he gets to know what is right to do but when you tell him to share the proceeds from coffee harvests at home with the wife, he doesn’t accept it. But also there are women who have participated in a similar course but are also big headed. When you ask her about where she put the money she sold from the harvests that the man shared with her, she doesn’t tell you. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

6.6 Future intentions
6.6.1 Will making
A shift in attitude and practice of men with respect to will making was one of the intended outcomes of SYFF. Study participants were thus asked whether they had made plans for who would inherit their land. Most men indicated that while agreed with the need to make a will in principle, they had yet to do so in practice. They indicated that they had in mind the individuals that would inherit their land and they had plans to put this in writing, but they had not yet documented those plans. This was similar to baseline findings (for the few men that by then expressed interest in having a will). The difference at endline was that almost all men were positive about the benefit of will making. Very few men, such as clan leaders and some local leaders, reported having made wills. The majority had yet to do so. Though this course influenced many men to seriously consider making a formal will, they cited a number of barriers for translating this intention into practice.

Barriers to will making
a. The perception that the will must include an heir.
For some men were delaying making a will because they had not yet determined who among their children would be the (chosen) heir.

I haven't done it because am still trying to understand these children. For instance, this younger one maybe the one to...sit in your chair as the heir. It is not just about considering the brain or age of the child but an heir needs to be someone who will be able to steer the other siblings. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

b. The perception that will making communicates imminent death
While this perception was very dominant at baseline, at endline it was not very pronounced. Nonetheless, the few men who associated making a will to looming death were reluctant, saying that they did not want to “cause themselves death” and preferred to postpone will making.

...and also, it's hard to think about dying tomorrow. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

The problem is that you know in the African tradition, we are arrogant. We keep saying that I still have life. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

c. The perception that will making should come after generating reasonable amount of assets (material wealth/resources)
Some men felt that with few assets, making a will was not necessary because they had nothing to bequeath. Others misunderstood how a will works, fearing that if they committed
through the will to bequeath their little land and a few possessions, they would remain with nothing for themselves.

I don’t have many things as I told you. If I give those few things to the children who are aged 18 years as I told you, I will not be able to take these young ones to school that is why I still use all my land to take care of the young ones. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu).

Some men also did not realize that it was possible to make a will and keep it confidential, and that they could entrust it with a confidant until their death.

d. Laziness
Some men indicated that following their participation in the SYFF course, they understood and appreciated the essence of will making, and that the training helped dispel misperceptions such as associating it with death. Some even noted that in their communities, where a deceased left a will, it addressed the possible misunderstandings and chaos that would have otherwise engulfed the family. That notwithstanding, most men that attended this course had not made wills, mainly because they simply did not feel like making the effort.

No, it’s just laziness... and because I trust the people am living with. But it is laziness though I want to write it. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

I think it is just laziness and not considering it as a big issue but I can now realize that it is very good to do it. (3051_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

I’m sorry for laughing but I will tell you that there is no stumbling block but I’m just lazy and also, it’s hard to think about dying tomorrow. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

e. Challenge of revising the will to add new assets and new beneficiaries
Some men noted that though the SYFF course made them aware of the benefit of making a will, they did not want to put time into creating one when there was a good chance their circumstances would change, necessitating amendments—for example, to account for new assets and beneficiaries. These men felt it would make more sense to wait to make the will at a future point in time.

The other reason would be maybe if we get another child. If he/she is born, you need to add him or her as another beneficiary in the will. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula).

Also another thing that prevent us, you can say I make a will now...again I disturb the same people that come and we write another one, if I buy another plot I also add on it, when I build on it again I cut it. 3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu

f. The effect of COVID-19
Some study participants noted that while they had embraced the idea of will making, they needed help to draft them. They emphasized that given the sensitivity of the matter, help cannot be sought from anyone but trusted friends.

Just that this COVID brought us problems and we no longer gather together and everyone is where they are but I wanted us to meet as a family to first solve it as a family so that everyone gets his/her own part then I would make a will based on my own share. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

g. Land owned as a family estate handed down from the grandparents or parents
One study participants indicated that the land he and his family are settled on is co-owned with his brothers and sisters. In such a case, it is difficult to make a will on land that is not owned by his family as husband, wife and children but co-owned by him and the brothers/sisters.

Up to this time I am firm because the property that we have she has a stake in it and she signed on the agreement. Her names are on the agreement and that means when I’m not available, she will be available and it means even if I die now that agreement can defend her. Also, apart from the wife, the laws also stipulate how children have to benefit from the property of the father. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo).

As this testimonial shows, some men feel confident that including their wives in the land ownership documents, along with existing laws on protection of the deceased’s dependents, is adequate to protect their assets. However, these actions do not substitute the role played by the will. For instance, if family members challenge the widow’s and children’s rights over land left by the deceased, the cost of accessing justice can be prohibitive: a will that sets out the intentions of the deceased would preclude this from happening. Indeed, some study participants were emphatic that the training session they attended on will making, coupled with experiences within and outside their communities related to battles that follow after death of men that did not write wills, should be adequate to make a convincing case for the practice of will writing.

True we need the girls/daughters also to get a share but it needs the will to show this clearly, that I have given this part of land to the girls and that one belongs to the boys. We have also seen circumstances where the girl child goes to court to dispose the boys but it needs to be in writing that this belongs to the girls and that one is for the boys so that no one will disturb the other. This also helps to ensure the clan members do not disturb the children and their mother. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

The SYFF course clearly had a positive influence on men’s knowledge with respect to the benefits of having a will.
However, a gap was seen between their stated intention to make a will and their taking action to this end. This implies that continuous engagement following the training is critical to support men to follow through on their intentions as well as to help continue the process of allaying fears, debunking negative myths and addressing any glaring knowledge gaps.

### 6.6.2 Other future intentions

Having learned valuable new information regarding land and property rights in the SYFF course, the study participants shared their future intentions. These included:

**a. Bequeathing land to both sons and daughter.**

All men who had yet to make wills and/or share out their land and other properties indicated that they intend to bequeath land to both their sons and daughters. Although some said that the sons and daughters may not get an equal share, both getting a share was emphasized. Bequeathing land to their spouses.

Most men further reported that they intend to bequeath land to their spouses. These men explained that while in the past women were often written off from the husband’s estate under the pretext that “they are mere women, they cannot own land and what matters is that it goes to their children,” they were ready to rewrite this normative practice. To these men, their spouses deserved consideration for their support of the household through land activities. Thus, where the land documents did not spell out joint ownership by the man and spouse, the men were planning to bequeath part of the land to the wives through the will.

**b. Joint land management.**

Most men indicated that having attended the SYFF course for men, they now embrace joint decision-making on land use and management of proceeds. These men emphasized that moving forward, this will be the practice. They did not consider turning back to their previous tendency to be the sole decision-maker with a newfound appreciation of the benefits of joint management of land.

**c. Joint land management**

Most men indicated that they jointly owned their land with their spouses. At the same time, however, they noted that documents on land ownership were in the men’s names. Some noted that even if they would have considered including their spouses’ names on the land ownership documents, they process is bureaucratic and costly, among other barriers. Thus, the men indicated that in future, during any transaction (purchase) of land, their spouses would be included as co-buyers/owners. Instead of having the spouses as witnesses, they intend to elevate them to joint owners.

**d. Disclosing all land owned to their spouses**

The men noted that they have a newfound understanding that it is in the best interest of their spouses and children to know about all the land they possess. Confiding in friends and relatives is good, but doing so with spouses and older children is better, as this helps ensure secure tenure for the family, giving them more leverage in case other relatives or friends do not have their best intentions in mind. Recognizing this, many men said that they intend to disclose their land and other assets to their spouses and older sons and daughters.

Exceptions were found, however, in cases where the man has children from multiple partners. In those cases, each partner and their respective children get to know what is planned for them. Other men also indicated that they were only delaying disclosure to ascertain that their partners can be trusted once they get information about their land and other property. Once they clear such doubts, they intend to declare the assets.

### 6.7 Gender norms

Though not one of the intended outcomes of this project intervention (SYFF Course for men), this evaluation sought to establish men's knowledge on gender norms and how adherence to inequitable gender norms has social, financial and health costs to women, men, families and the community. This was to assess the impact of the knowledge gained through the ‘gender boxes’ module within the curriculum. The course participants shared details about the roles they usually perform in the household. According to them, the project fostered a shift in men's perception of women's versus men's gender roles.

#### 6.7.1 Roles that men are usually responsible for

Study participants shared their typical household roles, described in this section.

**a. Provide family leadership**

This was identified as the principal role of men in the family. In this role, men said they have to be visionary to guide the family to a better future.

...you have to see things from far, the leader has to see from far, and show other people light at the end of the day. (3004_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

The responsibilities of a husband in the household is leadership. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

**b. Provision of basic household needs**

All men mentioned this. It includes ensuring that basic amenities are available. Though this role was said to be
shared with women, the men indicated that it is primarily a man’s role, along with others of a financial nature.

My role is to ensure that all the things we use at home like soap, sugar, salt, paraffin and food are available. I have to ensure that those things don’t miss. (3027_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Some men noted that upon harvest or whenever the man or woman gets money from other sources, the couple together makes a budget and allocates money to household basic needs, and sometimes the women assumes responsibility for deciding how to allocate money to meet basic household needs. The latter was due to the fact that women are more generally monitor direct consumption at the household and therefore know when the stock is almost running out and can plan to replenish as needed.

**c. Providing or ensuring availability of food**

The men noted that most of the food consumed at home is home grown. However, they emphasized that it is the responsibility of the man to ensure regular availability of food. They explained that while they always think about growing cash crops, they equally prioritize food crops for food security. As such, most men said that at the onset of the planting season, they are always open to the ideas of women in the household regarding what food crops to plant, and decisions are usually made together. This was stated as a contributor to why men continue to make majority decisions over the use of land and its proceeds.

Things which concern money, I think it would be a husband’s responsibility, children’s schooling would be the husband’s responsibility. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

However, while it was emphasized that men ought to take lead in addressing roles that are financial in nature, the men also noted that women also contribute to household income through agriculture-related work on family land.

**d. Support education of the children**

Men cited paying school fees for children as one of their key responsibilities. Most men indicated that school fees often tops the planning list for the household. For instance, whenever discussions are held with spouses on which crops to plant in a given season and how to utilize the proceeds from activities done on land, school fees is always on top of the priority list.

The father is responsible for that. 100 percent! But there are situations that come and you are financially not okay. So you talk to the wife that you need UGX 1 million but you only have UGX 700,000. Like you may tell her that you need to pay fees for the children but what you have is not enough. Then she can tell you that she has her pig, you can sell that…. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

The way we handle some things…. if we rear and sell our cow, still we discuss how to spend the money. We say to each other that we have sold our cow but they are demanding this child school fees, what do we do? But the biggest percentage is met by the husband. (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Overall, financial welfare of the family was largely perceived to be the responsibility of the man as the head of household. The contribution of women was seen as complementary and supportive. However, men emphasized that the wife and older children can contribute to household income and should participate in decisions on how to spend household money.

**e. Perfoming household chores**

Men defined most household chores as traditionally women’s roles. However, some noted that this is changing somewhat and that men now support women more than they used to. Some described offering to support women as being healthy, in that it reduces the care burden of women and also enables men to appreciate what women manage on a daily basis.

It also doesn’t stop me from helping her with cooking if she has put food on fire and I say let me come and we cook together, I can put in fire. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa).

...most of the time when I am coming from the garden, I bring for her food and also water. When I have money, I call a boda-boda to bring like 10 Jerry cans and [pay him]. If I have no money, I get my bicycle and go to fetch the water. (3027_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana).

The mother cannot be cooking or doing some other work and the child defecates there and you call the mother, it is you who does that. And also the other elder children have to take care of the young ones. We all have to take care of the children. Because for instance, if the mother dies, you will remain with the children and likewise. So it means we have to take care of them equally as long as we are living. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

The one who is around is the one that takes responsibility because I can’t see my child dirty and I don’t bathe him. But in most cases these women do these responsibilities … But if am around, we both take care of them but women do more. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

If I reach home and find something for example water is lacking [and] I have time, I can fetch it and it is not a problem because me I grew up with my parents and I used to fetch water and I think there is no problem if I continue doing that. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Some men noted men often seek income-generating activities outside the home, in addition to earnings realized from activities at home (on land). However, they often still appreciate the contributions that their wives make such as taking care of the household and the children as well as being responsible for the home and family in the absence of the man. As such, they believe women deserve to be involved in decisions on how to allocate income.

About finances, if you are working and making money jointly, you are both equally responsible because you work together. But even if the man has to move out of home to look for that money and the wife stays at home and takes care of the household, still I see that you are both working together for that money. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)
6.7.2 SYFF participants’ perceptions of prevailing community attitudes about gender roles

The men were asked whether the household roles they described were typical in their communities. Most men reported that other men who had not participated in SYFF continued to retain conventionally feminine and masculine roles. The study participants noted that some men, even when they felt they should support their spouses with some roles, were concerned about how this would reflect on them among their peers. For instance, when men carry on roles that are socially ascribed for women, they are perceived to be bewitched by women, or having lost their position as “men” in the family and community, which undermines their status.

Many people even think that women bewitched us because someone may find you washing plates and asks that even you who has a wife washes plates? And then you tell him that the wife is not around and yet children need to eat. You realize that he has encountered something strange. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

They find you doing it and say they can’t reach that point.... Like they may find you doing those roles of the kitchen, they disagree with you straight away. (3029_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

They find you doing it and say they can’t reach that point.... Like they may find you doing those roles of the kitchen, they disagree with you straight away. (3029_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

Many of the study participants noted that this reflected their way of thinking prior to their participation in the training.

There were some of us who were seeing it as a bad thing... when I try to help my wife with house chores, I used to see it as something that puts me down and I used to do them in hiding, but now even if I do house chores in public, I don’t get ashamed. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Male participants in this course felt the course helped them to overcome such perceptions and fears. They are no longer preoccupied with conforming to societal expectations and are instead focusing on offering spousal support and what they perceive as right and instrumental in making their families harmonious and progressive.

This change has come after being trained about equality... before the training, men were selfish and they would decide on their own and say I have given my final decision. But as we have been trained about equality, now we know that we have to change in this era. (FGD_Endline_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

The course helped us so much. That thinking changed after attending the course and others have started to copy. Those who didn’t know that you can have a good relationship with your wife, now they see it as easy and they are working well with them. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa).

6.7.3 Men’s satisfaction with their gender roles

The men indicated satisfaction with the current gender roles they play in their households. The satisfaction was attributed increased dialogue with their spouses and children, joint planning, joint decision-making, collective execution of duties within the household and living peacefully within the household.

However, a few men felt there was need for women to be more supportive when it comes to some financial responsibilities in the household.

I would have been satisfied but as you know now there are times when what you have is little... and sometimes the woman has more resources than what you have but she will tell that I don’t have. So you have to buy what is needed yet you know that she has more money than you do. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

6.7.4 Responsibilities assigned to children

Most men reported assigning children various tasks with less emphasis on what traditionally has been defined as gender-specific roles. Some of the activities that were reported to be performed by both boys and girls included farm work, laying bricks, washing household utensils, cooking and taking care of animals at home. The responsibilities assigned to children after men’s participation in the SYFF course expanded to include participation in decision-making at home and management of household assets.

The first responsibility of the children is to help in taking care of the animals we have at home.
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Most men reported assigning children various tasks with less emphasis on what traditionally has been defined as gender-specific roles. Some of the activities that were reported to be performed by both boys and girls included farm work, laying bricks, washing household utensils, cooking and taking care of animals at home. The responsibilities assigned to children after men’s participation in the SYFF course expanded to include participation in decision-making at home and management of household assets.

The first responsibility of the children is to help in taking care of the animals we have at home. They have to help in removing or putting coffee under the sun... Washing dishes, they know it is their responsibility, they sit and decide among themselves who washes today and who will be washing tomorrow. Another responsibility is fetching water... (3004_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)
It also depends on the timing because sometimes responsibilities have to be done at the same time for example you might find that if it is going to fetch water, that would be work for boys while daily cooking and peeling is a role for the girls. Sometimes if it is only fetching water that is to be done, they do it together, and if it is only peeling as the pending activity, they do it together. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Specific roles assigned to boys included fetching water, fetching firewood, grazing animals and monitoring of farm activities.

These boys when we have livestock to look after, they do it. They also fetch water. When we have chickens, they take care of them, so whatever their father does, boys also learn how to do. (3051_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Yes, there are some responsibilities you see and the girl can't do them, for example grazing the animals like cows except these small ones from home, the girl can do them. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

The boys also, because we are farmers they do garden work, from the garden they fetch some water, they like fetching firewood, cutting pastures for animals, like that. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

...you will get to see that boys are not involving themselves in cooking and it is the girls cooking but for them... responsibilities of fetching water, cutting grass for cows. Those are the ones they [boys] want. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

Specific roles assigned to girls included cooking, weaving baskets and washing, among other roles.

Girls know how to dig, how to weave baskets, making table clothes, they can also go help their brothers to lay bricks, they can even try it. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

Girls clean and they wash clothes, they also cook food. (3051_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Fetching water, washing utensils and also going to the gardens with their mother to dig. (3003_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

Children’s responsibilities were said to be assigned based on their age.

Ages, yes the young ones do small ones and the adults do the more demanding roles. Like the young ones don't dig a lot yet the adults dig a lot. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa).

The responsibilities they can and which she normally gives them are digging and kitchen work. (3040_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula).

Who between men and women allocates children household roles

The roles performed by children are largely allocated by the women because they spend more time in the home than men.

It is the mother most times who is with the children and tells them what to do the next day, and I also tell them that after doing that they can pass where I will be and do this or that. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu).

Most times it is the woman. Because you the man wake up and go for your own things and she remains at home with the children. (3003_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

Some men, however, noted that women and men take an equal share in allocating children roles.

The mother of children mostly decides on the side of the girls. But for me I decide on the boys that let this one do this... (3027_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kisaana)

We both decide. (3050_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

The program is daily or weekly, we bring it at the table and we decide that this week we are going to do and so. (3004_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

When the man was single, it was assumed that he would assign roles to the children. In his absence, the older children guide the young ones.

After the garden work, I can tell one to wash the utensils, another one to wash clothes. As I told you that their mother died, we always combine ideas and see how to go about the house chores with them. Now me I can't wash utensils when the children are there, I do what am supposed to do and they also do what they are supposed to do. I can tell one to sweep the compound and another one do something else. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula)

6.8 Men’s reflections about SYFF Course

Study participants shared their impressions about the SYFF course for men. All men spoke positively about this course. A selection of men’s impressions are presented below.

I thought land ownership was supposed to belong to me only but I realized we are supposed to own it as a family and all the land I have, my wife and children should know where it is... Currently they know. I showed it to them after attending this course. (3001_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mugulu)

...before this training, we used to have a thinking that for us [men] we just give orders but these training sessions showed us that we need to work jointly slowly by slowly and we’re now working together. The trainings have helped a lot and even what we see among our peers shows that we moving on well. (3018_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)
That course was good, first we didn't know the government laws and where the person stands about land, the woman's ownership. A woman can have ownership on the land? We got to know all that. The issue of wills, the girl child shares equally. We didn't know all that but the training changed us, helped us to know... (3016_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Mpiriggwa)

It taught me that children, especially girls, deserve to have a share of their parents' properties especially land. Before we didn't know it and we used to say that women/girls don't have share on the properties because for them they are girls/women but we learnt, and now we know it, and understand that they are also children and equal like boy children. (3039_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Kasangula).

Whoever attended that training and completed got to learn what we did not know especially about equality between men and women. (3051_IDI_Uganda_Mityana_Namungo)

Some men felt that the course would have registered much higher impact if the SYFF course for men and for women (not the scope of this evaluation) were implemented concurrently. They felt that this would help the spouses, on their return home, to reflect on and share what they learned and provide mutual support as each works toward realizing desired change. This would also reduce the extent to which men would need to explain to their wives (or other women who had participated in the course) what was driving their change in behavior.
Discussion of Findings
The project had its desired positive impact in shifting men’s attitudes toward greater acceptance of women alongside men owning and managing land (land use decisions and managing proceeds from land use activities), as well as a shift in their behaviors. This is an essential step toward addressing a long-held oppressive normative practice where women’s access to land is through their relationship to men, which not only denies women land rights, but also their right to control any proceeds from that land; in fact, lacking this right, women are “routinely obliged to hand over the proceeds of any farm sales to a male and have little say over how those earnings are used.” (Kimani, 2012). Furthermore, as men’s attitudes and practices evolve to recognize women’s rights to secure land tenure, women’s ability to enjoy some of the related benefits become more likely. These include, for example, higher levels of investment and productivity in agriculture—in turn with higher incomes and greater economic well-being (FAO, 2018); realizing their rights to equality and to an adequate standard of living; greater independence and autonomy; ability to provide for their day-to-day needs and those of their families (UN Women, 2020); and eradication of hunger and poverty, especially if rural poor women have secure access to land (FAO, n.d).
Conclusions
The SYFF course for men was relevant on many fronts. First, the course empowered men to appreciate the benefits of women (co)owning land, women making decisions about how to use land or what to do with proceeds from land use, and daughters inheriting land. It provided a platform for the men to reflect on the predicament they would leave their wives and daughters in (in case of death) if they excluded them.

The course also served as a wakeup call and a call to action. It opened doors for peace and harmony within families of participating men while at the same time moving closer to guaranteeing security of land tenure for women and girls. Its emphasis on couple communication, joint decision-making and peaceful resolution of conflict was invaluable. Given that some of the men that took part in this course were leaders at different levels, the course was very timely. Some of the men were Local Council I, II and III leaders while a few were clan leaders, putting them in a position of handling or presiding over land matters/cases. The course greatly empowered these leaders to execute their land-related duties with a much more solid knowledge base grounded in law.

The course was equally relevant in creating a cadre of trained men that serve as change agents in their respective communities.

The course also challenged men to rethink the gender division of roles at home and empowered them to go against socially defined gender roles of women and men which tend to be oppressive to women.

Overall, a shift in men’s attitude toward joint ownership of land, joint management of land, and both daughters and sons inheriting land was evident. The shift in attitude in many ways influenced a shift in behaviors as illustrated under the self-efficacy section. To this end, these are successes to celebrate. However, gaps remained in some outcome areas. A shift in attitude and peer norms alongside acquisition of knowledge did not necessarily translate into the planned/intended changed. For example, despite having learned the significant benefits of will making and the cost of not making one, most men remained reluctant to do so. Similarly, a few men remained unsure of whether they should put what they learned from the SYFF course into practice, concerned putting these ideas into practice would be counterproductive. The one-time six-week training by design ultimately was inadequate and would have been more effective had it also included post-training continuous engagement activities with the men. The absence of this meant that some men remained with unanswered questions, personal challenges and uncertainties with no means to discuss them or find answers. The course also would have benefited from having a graduation strategy to show that participants had achieved a given standard set of milestones, rather than assuming that participants internalized the course material and would effect changes accordingly the same way, at the same time. Nonetheless, it is a notable achievement that the intervention was able to make a difference despite the sensitivity of the issue (land). It is also reasonable to acknowledge that shifting social norms takes some time.
Recommendations

Based on the findings of this evaluation of the SYFF course for men, the following actions are recommended to different categories of stakeholders involved in women’s land and property rights work in Uganda.

To UCOBAC
- Maintain contact with the trainees
- Integrate the gains realized from the pilot phase of SYFF course for men into other women land and property rights interventions for sustainability
- Embed sustainability components in the intervention design to avoid reliance on the donor or implementing partners
- Ensure that women (individuals or through groups) have full and accurate information about women’s land and property rights (WLPR) around ownership and acquisition for their participation in decision-making on land matters

To curriculum developers
- Incorporate sessions on men’s effective communication with partners in the SYFF course
- Design the SYFF course for women to run concurrently with the SYFF course for men, or to follow immediately after the men’s SYFF course
- Include a graduation strategy in the course design based on indicators on readiness to graduate.

To the donors
- Consider leveraging resources for complementary activities to the core SYFF interventions
- Support scaling up this intervention for greater reach and impact
- Develop funding streams that can ensure long-term follow up and evaluation of SYFF project outcomes and cover core costs of community service organizations undertaking the follow up
- Fund evaluation of other SYFF curricula to establish areas that require strengthening

To women land rights implementing partners
- Engage community leaders and members about benefits of both men and women owning land, being mindful of the normative barriers to embracing the women’s land rights
- Engage with local and cultural leaders on cultural barriers to women’s land and property rights
- Implement follow-up activities to the one-off six-week curriculum-based training to nurture the process of translating the knowledge acquired into action
- Identify and help address cultural inhibitions to women’s access to land and property rights during the training
- Continuously engage at the policy level by contributing to the review/development of legislative frameworks on land to promote women’s land rights and gender equality
- Work closely with relevant stakeholders to create law enforcement and protection mechanisms that offer safeguards for women
- Collate an evidence base on what works in shifting peer norms and change in men’s behavior on WLPR
- Foster a well-developed and sound monitoring, evaluation and learning system for tracking systemic and behavior outcomes on WLPR based on clear and realistic outcome indicators
- Highlight and document the learnings from WLPR interventions for application in the WLPR program and policy development
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