

An Assessment Of The Key Components And Challenges Affecting The Effectiveness Of The Parish Development Model (Pdm) In Improving Socio-Economic Welfare In Migadde Parish Of Katikamu Sub-County, Luwero District In Uganda

Ssenyondo Primo¹, Muhanuzi Geoffrey ²

¹ Social Work and Social Administration Department. Kampala University, Kampala, Uganda

E-mail Address: primosseniyondo@gmail.com

² Social Work and Social Administration Department. Kampala University, Kampala, Uganda

E-mail address: geoffreymuhanuzi@gmail.com

Abstract: *The study assessed the key components and challenges affecting the effectiveness of the Parish Development Model (PDM) in improving socio-economic welfare in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-county, Luwero District. The study employed Cross-sectional, Descriptive, and Case study Designs. A sample size of 168 was used. A total of 152 out of the 168 respondents targeted participated in the study, where the majority were female (60.5%), majority (25.7%) were aged 36-45 years. The study found that the most key components implemented in Migadde Parish are Agricultural Value Chain Activities (Pillar 1) with the highest mean and Standard Deviation (Mean = 4.954, Std = 0.2103) followed by PDMIS registration (Pillar 6) with (Mean = 4.941, Std D. = 0.2633), And Participation in Parish SACCO (Pillar 3) with (Mean = 4.697, Std D. = 0.5022). Delays in PDM fund affects program effectiveness (Mean = 4.868, Std D. = 0.3391) and lack of market for produces of beneficiaries engaged in different enterprises (Mean = 4.855, Std D. 0.4938) were the most challenges to the effectiveness of PDM in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County. The study recommends increased facilitation funds given to the stakeholders implementing the Parish Development Program Activities, and consider increasing the amount of funds disbursed per beneficiary household and parish at large beyond what is given, there should be a timely release of PDM funds, more community sensitization and trainings about PDM be conducted, establish and support structured markets where produce from the Parish Development Model beneficiaries are purchased at stable and fair prices, sub-divide Migadde Parish into smaller administrative units due to its large size, in order to improve service delivery not only in Migadde Parish but also in Uganda at large.*

Keywords: Parish Development Model, Social Welfare, Economic Welfare, Community Participation, Community Development.

1. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic greatly affected both developed and developing countries, including Uganda. Although Uganda recorded relatively fewer cases compared to some nations, the pandemic had devastating effects on the country's economy (Younger et al., 2020). The nationwide lockdown, closure of schools, and loss of jobs left many Ugandans struggling to meet their basic needs, with low-income earners being the most affected.

In response to these socioeconomic challenges, the Government of Uganda introduced the Parish Development model (PDM) as a strategy to accelerate poverty reduction and promote local economic transformation. The PDM aligns with global Local Economic Development(LED) initiatives, focusing on poverty reduction, agricultural sector growth, economic transformation, and the promotion of partnerships between government, the private sector, NGOs, and the local communities(Clark, ST., Namirembe, CK., Kinuthia, J M., Mbabazi, J., Rwengabo, S. and Johnson, 2024a).According to James & Mukiza (2023), the PDM is structured around seven key pillars: Production, storage, Pressing and Marketing (Pillar 1); Infrastructure and economic Development (Pillar 2); Financial Inclusion (Pillar 3); Social Services (Pillar 4); Community Mobilization and mindset change (Pillar 5); Parish-Based Management Information System (Pillar 6); and Governance and Administration (Pillar 7). These pillars are designed to directly address the socioeconomic challenges faced by many Ugandans, particularly in rural areas such as Luwero District

In Uganda, the Parish Development Model (PDM) has been implemented in all the parishes to enable households engage in production, boost their incomes and join the money economy. Basing on the variety of researches conducted about PDM, it has been noted that, the successful implementation of the PDM greatly depends on the participation of people right from the planning up to the implementation of the program, awareness created, and how the resources are coordinated by the government and its implementing partners. According to Luyombya, (2024) in his research, he noted that the perception of people, their involvement in implementing and benefiting from PDM, shapes their willingness to get involved, highlighting the need for increased and continuous community engagement, mobilization, and mindset change among people in Uganda's poor communities.

Since the implementation of PDM in 2021, many people, including the youth, women, people living with Disabilities in both urban and rural areas, have actively participated in it to boost their incomes, savings, and promote the economic growth of their communities. This is supported by the findings from the survey done by (Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), 2024) where households that reported having benefited from the Parish Development Model were 832,746. The majority of the households that reported having benefited from PDM were male-headed households (628,561) as compared to the female-headed households that were 204,185.

The Parish Development Model has attracted attention from many researchers. Therefore, this research aimed to assess the key components of PDM implemented and challenges affecting the effectiveness of the Parish Development Model (PDM) in improving socio-economic welfare in Uganda specifically focusing on Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-county, Luwero District.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Research Design

This research adopted both qualitative and quantitative research designs. Cross-Section Design, Descriptive Research design was used (Akotia et al., 2023). For Qualitative research design, Case study Design was used to understand the key components and challenges affecting the effectiveness of the PDM in improving socio-economic welfare by focusing on Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County as the Case study; explanatory design was also used to obtain more clear explanation in line with the specific objectives of the study.

2.2 Study Area

The study was conducted in Migadde Parish Kamtikamu Sub-County, Luwero District. Luwero District is located in central region within Buganda. Katikamu Sub-County consists of Seven (7) Parishes which include; Bukeeka, Buyuki, Kikoma, Kyalugondo, Migadde, Musaale-Busula and Tweyanze. The Study focused on Katikamu Sub-County where one Parish was selected and this was Migadde Parish with 15 Villages which include; Koojo Propa, Koojo Lutunku, Nsanvu, Gavu, Kalembwe, Netunze, Butanza, Nakyewa, Lukomora, Bulyankuyege, Kubamitwe, Naluvule, Ntangaala, Kirembwe, and Kazinga making the parish the largest in Katikamu Sub-County.

2.3 Study Population

The Targeted population included; local leaders such as Parish Chiefs, PDM Committees Chairperson (LC II Chairperson), Chairpersons LC I, Chairperson PDM SACCO, and PDM beneficiaries (Community members).

2.4 Sample Size

The sample size was determined using Slovin's Formula (1960) which is expressed as:

$$n = \frac{N}{(1 + Ne^2)}$$

Where,

n is the **sample size**,

N is the **population size**

And **e** is the margin of error to be decided by the researcher.

N= 290, $e^2 = (0.05)^2$, n=?

Therefore, the sample size of the study was **168** out of which 152 participated in the study

2.5 Sampling Techniques

Both Sampling and Non-sampling techniques were used in selecting participants to represent the study population. Simple random sampling was used to select the Parish Development Model beneficiaries. Purposive sampling technique was also used where participants mostly the Key Informants selected basing on their knowledge, expertise and understanding of the topic being investigated.

Table 1: Sample size Distribution

Category of respondent	Sample Size	Sampling Technique
LC II Chairperson	1	Purposive Sampling
Parish Chief	1	Purposive Sampling
Chairperson PDM SACCO for Migadde Parish	1	Purposive Sampling
LC I Chairpersons	15	Purposive Sampling
PDM Beneficiaries	150	Simple Random Sampling
Total	168	

The Sample size was for Both Qualitative and Quantitative, and all members who answered the questionnaires also participated in either interviews or focused group discussions.

2.6 Data Collection Methods and Tools

The researcher used both Qualitative and Quantitative data collection methods and tools, which included the questionnaires of Likert scale to collect data from the respondents. The study used the interview method to collect data from the Key informants (Fafunwa & Aisiku, 2022), Focused Group Discussion method was also used to collect information from the respondents, specifically the PDM beneficiaries in the selected case study. The FGD consisted of between 8 and 10 participants, and a total of 14 FGDs were conducted in each of the villages in Migadde Parish in Katikamu Sub-County.

2.7 Validity and Reliability

The Content Validity Index of 0.875 implies that 87.5% of the items used in the research instrument in the study were considered relevant. Therefore, the results indicate a high content Validity (Mandal et al., 2022). The reliability of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach's Alpha (α). The results indicated $\alpha = 0.7$ for the 28 items. Therefore, since $\alpha \geq 0.7$, it indicates acceptable internal consistency, which implies that the questionnaire was reliable and appropriate for use in this study.

2.8 Data analysis

Data was processed and analyzed to draw meaning from the gathered information for the research study. While communicating and displaying analyzed data, text, and tables were used. Quantitative data collected by use of Questionnaires was analyzed using SPSS Version 21. Basically, the SPSS software was used to obtain Frequencies, percentages of the responses, Descriptive statistics. Data collected through interviewing using interview and focused Group Discussion methods was better analyzed using thematic analysis.

2.9 Ethical Considerations

Written and verbal informed consent was first obtained after comprehensive explanation of study and its objectives (Gogoll & Zuber, 2025). Participants were informed of their rights to either participate or refuse/withdraw at any time during interview. During the KIIs or FGDs, respondents were free to respond to questions they want to respond to and were not coerced to answer any question. Anonymity was guaranteed by not writing participants' names and confidentiality was maintained by only researcher having access to information provided by the respondents and not disclosing to anyone.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

This section describes the background information of the respondents selected for this study, which was considered important for understanding the background of the study participants.

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Characteristics		Frequency	Percent
Sex	Female	92	60.5
	Male	60	39.5
Age	18-25 years	19	12.5
	26-35 years	35	23.0
	36-45 years	39	25.7
	46-55 years	31	20.4
	56 years and above	28	18.4
Marital Status	Married	86	56.6
	Separated/Divorced	25	16.4
	Single	29	19.1
	Widowed	12	7.9
Level of Education	Secondary	57	37.5
	Certificate/Diploma	33	21.7
	Primary	33	21.7
	No formal education	17	11.2
	Degree and above	12	7.9
Household size	1-3 members	28	18.4
	4-6 members	58	38.2
	7-9 members	42	27.6
	10 members above	24	15.8
Employment Status	Self-employed	130	85.5
	Employed	19	12.5
	Unemployed	3	2.0
Beneficiary Status	Yes	151	99.3
	No	1	.7
Duration	Less than 1 year	39	25.7
	1-2 years	69	45.4
	More than 2 years	44	28.9

Source: Field Data 2026

From the Table 2 above, majority of the respondents were female 92 (60.5%) while 60 (39.5%) were male. This implies that women were the most represented in this study compared to men. This suggests women greater involvement in the Community Development Programs such as the Parish Development Model in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County. 19 (12.5%) of the respondents were aged between 18-25 years, 35 (23.0%) aged 26-35 years, 39 (25.7%) aged 36-45 years, 31 (20.4%) aged 46-55 years, and 28 (18.4%) aged 56 years and above. that 86 (56.6%) of the respondents participated in this study were Married, 25 (16.4%) Separated/Divorced, 29 (19.1%) were Single, while 12 (7.9%) Widowed. This Marital Distribution suggests that the study largely involved individuals with established family and social responsibilities. 57 (37.5%) of the respondents' secondary education was their highest level of education, 33 (21.7%) had Certificate/Diploma qualifications, 33 (21.7%) Primary education, 17 (11.2%) with no formal education while those with a degree and above were 12 (7.9%) having the smallest proportion. This distribution indicates that majority of the respondents had basics to understand and respond to the research questions. 28 (18.4%) of the respondents their households had 1-3 members, 58 (38.2%) with the largest household size of 4-6 members, followed by 42 (27.6%) with 7-9 members while the least 24 (15.8%) with households of 10 members and above. This distribution indicates that most respondents belonged to medium to large households. The findings reveal that majority of the respondents 130 (85.5%) were self-employed, 19 (12.5%) were employed while the smallest proportion 3 (2.0%) were unemployed. This suggests that most of the respondents were engaged actively in income-generating activities mostly within the informal sector. all most all respondents were beneficiaries of the Parish Development Model as indicated in the table above by 151 respondents making 99.3% proportion and only 1 (0.7%) individual was not a beneficiary. 39 (25.7%) of the respondents had participated in PDM for Less than 1 year, majority with a proportion of 69 (45.4%) had participated

for 1-2 years while 44 (28.9%) had participated for more than 2 years since the implementation of Parish Development Model in Katikamu Sub-county particularly In Migadde Parish.

From the thematic analysis of the Key Informant Interviews conducted with the local leaders, the findings on “*Theme 1: Understanding of the Parish Development Model*”, All respondents demonstrated a clear understanding of PDM as a government program aimed at improving household incomes and reducing chronic poverty. The Parish Chief noted that;

“The PDM targets the quailing poor (abakolera ekidda kyonka), aiming to improve livelihoods through small-scale enterprises and financial support.”

One of the Chairmen echoed that;

“The PDM Program helps low-income households improve existing enterprises such as coffee, dairy and banana farming for the case of Migadde Parish”.

The Chairperson PDM SACCO highlighted that;

“PDM is a community-grounded program promoting both social and economic transformation”.

The above statements from the leaders’ literary mean that people perceive the program as a poverty alleviation and income enhancement initiative.

Participants in the Focused Group Discussions also demonstrated a good understanding of the Parish Development Model describing it as a program that provides financial assistance, agriculture in-puts like seed, drugs and mind set change workshops help households engage in income generating activities and boost their incomes.

3.2 The key components of the Parish Development Model implemented in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County

This research objectives aimed at identifying the components of the Parish Development Model implemented in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-county and below were the findings.

The study investigated first the awareness of the participants about the Parish Development which is considered essential for effective participation and utilization of PDM services and below were the findings.

Table 3: Awareness about the Parish Development Model

Awareness about PDM		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	152	100.0	100.0	
	No	0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	152	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data 2026

The data in (table 3) above, indicates that all respondents 152 (100%) were aware of the Parish Development Model. This means that information about the key components of PDM was gathered from informed people.

From the thematic analysis of the Key Informant Interviews conducted with the local leaders, the findings on “*Theme 1: Understanding of the Parish Development Model*”, All respondents demonstrated a clear understanding of PDM as a government program aimed at improving household incomes and reducing chronic poverty.

The Parish Chief noted that;

“The PDM targets the quailing poor (abakolera ekiddakyonka), aiming to improve livelihoods through small-scale enterprises and financial support.”

One of the Chairmen echoed that;

“The PDM Program helps low-income households improve existing enterprises such as coffee, dairy and banana farming for the case of Migadde Parish”.

The Chairperson PDM SACCO highlighted that;

“PDM is a community-grounded program promoting both social and economic transformation”.

The above statements from the leaders’ literary mean that people of Migadde perceive the program as a poverty alleviation and income enhancement initiative. Hence confirming the findings from the Quantitative data in (table 4.9)

Still under the same *Theme 1*, Participants in the Focused Group Discussions also demonstrated a good understanding of the Parish Development Model describing it as a program that provides financial assistance, agriculture in-puts like seed, drugs and mind set change workshops help households engage in income generating activities and boost their incomes.

One of the Participants said that;

“The PDM program was brought by President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni to help the poor people increase their incomes.”

This implies widespread understanding of PDM and its objectives by people in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-county hence confirming the results from the Questionnaire and KIIs.

The study further investigated the key components of the PDM implemented in Migadde Parish. To obtain data, respondents were asked to indicate how much they agree with the components following the Linkert scale where respondents Strongly agree (SA), Agreed (A), Neither Agree nor Disagreed (N), Disagreed (D) and Strongly Disagreed (SD). Below were the findings;

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of the key components of the Parish Development Model implemented in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County

Components of the Parish Development Model	N	Frequency (Percentage)		Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Community members actively participate in PDM agricultural value-chain activities (production, storage, processing, or marketing).	152	SA	145 (95.4%)	4.954	.2103	1
		A	7 (4.6%)			
		N	-			
		D	-			
		SD	-			
There PDM-supported infrastructure and economic service activities in my community.	152	SA	3 (2.0%)	2.197	1.0167	6
		A	13 (8.6%)			
		N	39 (25.7%)			
		D	53 (34.9%)			
		SD	44 (28.9%)			
Community Members actively participate in Parish SACCO and other PDM financial inclusion activities.	152	SA	108 (71.1%)	4.697	.5022	3
		A	43 (28.3%)			
		N	-			
		D	1 (.7%)			
		SD	-			

PDM-supported social services and community welfare activities are available in my community.	152	SA A N D SD	6 (3.9%) 3 (2.0%) 29 (19.1%) 67 (44.1%) 47 (30.9%)	2.039	.9689	7
PDM community mobilization and mindset change activities are conducted in my community.	152	SA A N D SD	55 (36.2%) 33 (21.7%) 19 (12.5%) 19 (12.5%) 26 (17.1)	3.474	1.5047	5
Members provides personal and household information for registration under the PDM system.	152	SA A N D SD	144 (94.7%) 7 (94.7%) 1 (.7%) - -	4.941	.2633	2
Community members participate in governance, leadership, and decision-making processes under PDM.	152	SA A N D SD	88 (57.9%) 39 (25.7%) 9 (5.9%) 11 (7.2%) 5 (3.3%)	4.276	1.0747	4
Valid N (listwise)	152					

Source: Field Data 2026

Guided by the interpretative framework of Butenko Antony (2025), the findings in the (table 4), above indicate that 145 (95.4%) respondents strongly agreed that community members actively participate in PDM Agricultural Value-chain activities, while only 7 (4.6%) agreed with the statement. However, none of the respondents were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. This item recorded (Mean = 4.954, Std. D = 0.2103). The high mean indicates a very high level of agreement and strong positive perception, and the Standard Deviation, since it is (≤ 0.50) indicates that responses were highly clustered and that there was a high level of consensus among the respondents. These Means that members in Migadde Parish share similar views regarding this component of the PDM.

The results from the (table 4.10), also indicate that only 3 (2.0%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 13 (8.6%) agreed that there PDM-supported infrastructure and economic service activities in my community. However, 39 (25.7%) Neither Agree nor Disagree, 53 (34.9%) disagreed and 44 (28.9%) strongly disagreed. The (Mean = 2.197, Std D = 1.0167) were recorded which according to Butenko Antony (2025), The low mean indicates a low level of agreement and a negative perception; the Standard deviation since its (> 1.00), it indicates a high variability suggesting diverse opinions among respondents regarding the availability Parish Development Model Supported infrastructure and economic services in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County.

In regard to community members actively participating in Parish SACCO and other financial inclusion activities, the findings reveal that 108 (71.1%) respondents strongly agreed and 43 (28.3%) agreed. Only 1 (0.7%) of the respondents disagreed with the component. The item recorded (Mean = 4.697, Std D = 0.5022), where this high Mean indicates a very high level of agreement of financial inclusion participation, which is consistent with Pillar 3 of the Parish Development Model and the standard deviation ranging between (≤ 0.50) showing a high consensus. These findings mean that although most respondents shared similar views about the component, slight variation existed.

Concerning the availability of PDM-supported social services and community welfare activities in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-county, the results show that 6 (3.9%) of the respondents strongly agreed, and 3 (2.0%) agreed. Whereas 29 (19.1%) were neutral, the majority disagreed 67 (44.1%), and 47 (30.9%) strongly disagreed. The Mean and Standard deviation were recorded respectively as (Mean = 2.039, Std D = 0.9689). The mean value according to Butenko Antony (2025) reflects a low level of agreement and a

negative perception, while the Standard deviation, which falls within the range of (0.51-1.00), implies moderate agreement consistency, suggesting that the respondents generally shared similar views regarding the limited availability of social services supported by the Parish Development Model Program in Migadde Parish.

As presented in the table 4.10, above, 55 (36.2%) respondents strongly agreed that PDM community Mobilization and mindset change activities are conducted in Migadde Parish, 33 (21.7%) agreed. In contrast, 19 (12.5%) were neutral, 19 (12.5%) disagreed with the statement and 26 (17.1%) strongly disagreed. The mean and standard deviation (Mean = 3.474, Std D = 1.5047) were obtained. The Mean value suggests a moderate or mixed perception about the item, and the Standard Deviation, since it's (> 1.00), it reflects a high variability; this may be attributed to the wide differences in respondents' experiences and perception of these activities.

Concerning Members providing personal and household information for registration under the PDM system, the descriptive analysis shows that the majority of the respondents, 144 (94.7%), strongly agreed and 7 (4.6%) agreed to get registered on the PDM system (PDMIS). Only 1 respondent (0.7%) neither agreed nor disagreed. None of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. The analysis recorded mean and standard deviation scores of this item as (Mean = 4.941, Std D = 0.2633). The mean score was very high, indicating a very high level of agreement and strong positive perception with a low standard deviation within the range of (≤ 0.50), showing that responses were highly clustered and reflecting a strong consensus among the respondents. This may be attributed to the program's requirement of registering all individuals to benefit from the Parish Development Model.

In regard to the item of community members participating in governance, leadership and decision-making process under PDM, 88 (57.9%) strongly agreed and 39 (25.7%) agreed with the statement. Comparatively, 9 (5.9%) respondents were neutral, 11 (7.2%) Disagreed and 5 (3.3%) strongly disagreed. The Descriptive analysis of this component recorded a mean and standard deviation of (Mean = 4.276, Std D = 1.0747). On average basing on the mean value, there was high level of agreement and positive perception and this may be attributed to that small committees of around 5 members established on every village with beneficiaries to ensure effective implementation and running of the PDM in their respective villages and Parish at large. The small discrepancy in the findings may be attributed to the limited involvement of all the beneficiaries in governance, leadership and decision-making processes under PDM in their respective Villages and parish of Migadde.

From the Key Performant Interviews conducted, the results from the thematic analysis under "*Theme 2: Implementation of PDM Pillars*", respondents consistently reported that Pillar 1 (Agricultural Value-chain Development), Pillar 3 (Financial Inclusion) and Pillar 6 (Parish-Based Management Information System) were the most implemented in Migadde Parish with Coffee enterprises showing the highest uptake. Pilla 7 (governance and Administration was also operation whereas Pillar 2 of infrastructure and economic services was not so much effective as evidences by poor rads and social services.

From the Focused Group Discussions, Agriculture specifically coffee, Diary and Banana and financial inclusion through the Parish SACCO and PDMIS registration were the most recognized components.

The above implies that the active pillars contribute to livelihood and financial access despite the poor infrastructures due to slow effectiveness of the Second Pillar regarding Infrastructures.

4.6 The challenges affecting the effectiveness of the Parish Development Model in improving the Socio-economic welfare of people in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County

This research objective sought to identify the challenges affecting the effectiveness of the Parish Development Model (PDM) in improving the socio-economic welfare of people in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County in Luwero District.

This is another crucial area of investigation as it is important for identifying gaps in Program implementation and for proposing practical and relevant recommendations to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of the Parish Development Model. The findings are presented below.

The Descriptive analysis below presents respondents perceptions of the key challenges affecting the implementation of PDM and effectiveness of the Parish Development Model in Migadde Parish.

To interpret the descriptive statistics, the researcher adopted the interpretive method of Butenko Antony (2025) which uses predefined mean ranges to categorize the level of agreements of disagreements with each of the item used and use standard deviation range to determine the level of consistence that the responses were.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of the challenges affecting the effectiveness of the Parish Development Model in improving the Socio-economic welfare of people in Migadde Parish

Challenges affecting the effectiveness of PDM	N	Frequency (Percentage)		Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Delays in PDM funds affect program effectiveness.	152	SA	132 (86.8%)	4.868	.3391	1
		A	20 (13.2%)			
		N	-			
		D	-			
		SD	-			
Limited information affects people's participation in PDM.	152	SA	114 (75.0%)	4.474	1.1036	3
		A	20 (13.2%)			
		N	1 (.7%)			
		D	10 (6.6%)			
		SD	7 (4.6 %)			
Some people miss PDM benefits due to leadership challenges.	152	SA	111 (73.0%)	4.395	1.2134	4
		A	21 (13.8%)			
		N	-			
		D	9 (5.9%)			
		SD	11 (7.2%)			
Lack of skills affects the effective use of PDM support.	152	SA	81 (53.3%)	3.743	1.5590	5
		A	18 (11.8%)			
		N	7 (4.6%)			
		D	25 (16.4%)			
		SD	21 (13.8%)			
Market challenges reduce the benefits of PDM activities.	152	SA	135 (88.8%)	4.855	.4938	2
		A	15 (9.9%)			
		N	-			
		D	1 (.7%)			
		SD	1 (.7%)			
Valid N (listwise)	152					

Source: Field Data 2026

The findings in the (table 5) above reveal that majority of the respondents 132 (86.8%) strongly agreed and 20 (13.2%) agreed that delays in the disbursement of PDM funds affect the effectiveness of the program. None of the respondents were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. The mean and Standard scores (Mean = 4.868, Std D. = 03391) according to Butenko Antony (2025) implies a very high level of agreement with a strong positive perception since the mean fall in the range (4.50-5.00) and clustered responses with high consensus of the respondents' views suggesting that delays In funding are a widely shared concern among respondents.

In regard to limited information affecting peoples' participation in PDM, the results indicate that majority of the respondents 114 (75.0%) strongly agreed and 20 (13.2%) agreed with the challenge. Meanwhile, 1 (0.7%) of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, 10 (6.6%) disagreed and 7 (4.6%) strongly disagreed. The Mean score and Standard Deviation were recorded (Mean = 4.474, Std D. = 1.1036). This mean Value implies high and positive agreement as well as perception and high variability were respondents had diverse opinions hence lacking consistency. This also implies differences in access to PDM information among community members.

Concerning challenge of poor leadership, majority of the respondents 111 (73.0%) strongly agreed and 21 (13.8%) agreed that some people miss PDM benefits due to leadership challenges. Whereas, 9 (5.9%) disagreed with this and 11 (7.2%) strongly disagreed. The Mean score of 4.395 indicate moderate agreement of the respondents with positive perception and the high standard deviation of 1.5590 indicate a high variability hence diverse opinions of the respondents concerning the challenge. This Variability can be attributed to the various features of poor leadership such as lack of transparency, unfair selection of the beneficiaries, dissemination of information about PDM, lobbying ability among others.

The results also indicate that 81 (53.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 15 (9.9%) agreed that lack of skills affects the effective use of PDM Support. In contrast 7 (4.6%) neither agreed nor disagreed, 25 (16.4%) disagreed and 21 (13.8%) strongly disagreed. The mean and Standard deviation scores were recorded as (Mean = 3.743, Std D. = 1.5590) implying high level of agreement among respondents and high level of variability of the respondents' opinions suggesting that skills gap affect some beneficiaries more than others.

Lastly, the findings reveal that majority of the respondents 135 (88.8%) strongly agreed and 15 (9.9%) agreed that Market challenges reduce the benefits of PDM activities attributed to lack of markets for the produce of those who participate in PDM activities. However, a very small proportion of the respondents 1 (0.7%) disagreed and 1 (0.7%) strongly disagreed. The mean and Standard Deviation scores (Mean = 4.855, Std D. 0.4938) were recorded. The high mean value indicates a very high level of agreement with positive perception of the challenge. The low Standard deviation indicates very high level of consensus of the respondents' views highlighting market access as a major challenge affecting PDM outcomes.

From the KII's conducted, it was noted under the "Theme 7: Challenges in PDM Implementation", that the challenges most reported include; Insufficient facilitation for committee and leaders implementing the Program, lack of transparency by some leaders when it comes to who to receive the money since is not always enough compared to the high number of people registered, Delayed fund disbursement for beneficiaries, political interference during the selection of the participants in communities, lack of infrastructures to facilitate transportation of good and services, lack of markets where produces can be sold at a fair price, the Parish is too big with many households, Insecurity Issues affecting produce and lastly limited and irregular trainings given to beneficiaries and community members.

One of the LC I Chairperson concerning insecurity said that;

"Obubbi mu Parish yaffe bunginnyo, wesanga nti ebirime ebiba birimiddwa ne'ebyo ebiba bikungudwa bibibwa ate nga byetubeera tulinamu esuubi okufunamu kuba byetuba twatekamu sente zetwaafuna mu PDM. Kino tekiri mubalimi boka, wabula nabali mu byobulunzi. Nze nalina emwaanyi zange zenakungula mu sizoni, nenzaanika naye olumu ababi bajja ewaka mu store yangenebazibba Zonna obutandekerawoyadde".

Translated in English as;

"Theft is very rampant in our parish. Sometimes crops that have been planted and even those that have already been harvested are stolen, yet these are the crops we depend on and have hope of benefiting from, because they are the ones we invested in using the money received from PDM. This problem affects not only crop farmers but also those engaged in livestock farming. Personally, I harvested my coffee during the season and stored it, but at one time thieves came to my home and stole all of it, leaving me with nothing to start with again."

Another Leader Said that;

"Abantu abasinga okugeza nga kukyaalo kyange bawulira buwulizi nti waliwo abafunye sente za PDM naye ngabo tezibatuuseko. Kino Kimaliramu dala abantu betukulemba amaanyi kunkolaya PDM"

Another respondent said that;

“Because the Parish is too big, when it comes to giving out the money, the leaders first select their own preferred people to receive it. There is no transparency at all”

The Chairperson PDM SACCO said also that;

“Migadde Parish is too big actually the biggest Parish in Luwero District with 15 Villages but getting the same share like those Parishes with few Villages making people not to get satisfied with the funds (Making many miss getting funds in case if they are sent since they are many)”.

Responses from the Focused Group Discussions conducted with the community members who are beneficiaries of PDM, findings on “Theme 6: Challenges affecting PDM Participation”, Delays in fund disbursement is a big challenge which causes frustration among those who register but have not received money. Inconsistent information about the repayments, and availability of funds, Limited loan amounts, especially for larger households was also raised, inaccessible markets and poor infrastructures were noted. Political interference where people who do not belong to National Resistance Movement (NRM) may not be selected.

These challenges therefore indicate structural, Political, socio-economic, administrative and logistical gaps that hinder participation and effectiveness of the Parish Development Model objectives which affects its sustainability.

4. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

Basing on the findings of this study therefore;

The most key components implemented in Migadde Parish are Agricultural Value Chain Activities (Pillar 1) with the highest mean and Standard Deviation (Mean = 4.954, Std D. = 0.2103) followed by PDMIS registration (Pillar 6) with (Mean = 4.941, Std D. = 0.2633), And Participation in Parish SACCO (Pillar 3) with (Mean = 4.697, Std D. = 0.5022). Agriculture Value-chain development as the first pillar being the most active component of PDM in Migadde Parish, is explained by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics estimates that 68% of Uganda’s working population is employed in agriculture (International Trade Administration, 2025). The 2024 Census reaffirmed that agriculture remains the primary source of income and sustenance for most Ugandans. Approximately 61% of households are engaged in crop production, while 37% are involved in livestock farming.

Delays in PDM fund affect program effectiveness (Mean = 4.868, Std D. = 0.3391), followed by lack of market for produce of beneficiaries engaged in different enterprises (Mean = 4.855, Std D. 0.4938), were the most significant challenges to the effectiveness of PDM in Migadde Parish, Katikamu Sub-County. In Addition, there are many things that raise concern such as the political interference, misinformation about the sources and nature of funds, and skepticism about the uniqueness of the initiative. There is a misconception among the public that the Parish Revolving Funds (PRF) is a gift rather than a loan for investment which pose a significant obstacle (Jonas Mbabazi & Chris Nkwatsibwe, 2024).

Overall conclusion: *“For any Development Program such as the Parish Development Model, challenges during implementation are inevitable; the effectiveness largely depends on how promptly and effectively these identified challenges are addressed”.*

4.2 Recommendations

The Government should increase the facilitation funds it gives to the stakeholders implementing the Parish Development Program Activities. This will enable them remain motivated and perform their duties with high level of commitment.

The Government should consider increasing the amount of funds disbursed per beneficiary household and parish at large beyond what is given. This is due to the fact that many Household Sizes in Uganda and Migadde in Particular are relatively large and the funds may not be all that sufficient to support them start or expand their income-generating activities meaningfully.

The funds under the Parish Development Model should be released to beneficiaries on time to avoid delays that may disrupt planned income-generating activities since most of people in Katikamu Sub-county are engaged in Agriculture sector, which is widely affected by climate change challenges.

More community sensitization on the Parish Development Model is necessary to improves awareness, understanding of program objectives, eligibility criteria and effective utilization of the support provided.

Monitoring and supervision of PDM beneficiaries should be strengthen to ensure that funds received are used for the intended purposes and invested in the agreed-upon income-generating enterprises.

The Government should establish or support structured markets where produce from the Parish Development Model beneficiaries can be purchased at stable and fair prices thereby reducing exploitation by middlemen and improving household incomes hence improving income security.

There is need to sub-divide Migadde Parish into smaller administrative units due to its large size, in order to improve service delivery and enhance the effective implementation of the Parish Development Model and other development Programs.

Regular and continuous training should be provided to PDM beneficiaries to enhance their skills and knowledge. These trainings should also be extended to community members who are not yet enrolled in PDM but have an interest in joining, since they are potential future beneficiaries.

Resident and Parish-based trainers should be deployed to provide regular, on-the ground training and technical support to community members, rather than relying only on short-term or externally hired trainers.

5. REFERENCES

- Younger, S. D., Musisi, A., Asiimwe, W., Ntungire, N., Rauschendorfer, J., & Manwaring, P. (2020). Estimating income losses and consequences of the COVID-19 crisis in Uganda. IGC, Wwww. Theigc. Org/Publication/Estimating-Income-Losses-and-Consequencesof-the-Covid-19-Crisis-in-Uganda-2, 2(November), 2–38.
- Clark, ST., Namirembe, CK., Kinuthia, J M., Mbabazi, J., Rwengabo, S. and Johnson, LC. (2024a). Uganda’s Parish Development Model: An Ambitious and Worthwhile Initiative if Implemented well. [Http://Documents.Worldbank.Org/Curated/En/099062124022028331/P1797941000fc9011937b15fa669752d99,7](http://Documents.Worldbank.Org/Curated/En/099062124022028331/P1797941000fc9011937b15fa669752d99,7).
- James, M. M., & Mukiza, C. N. (2023). Statistics-A Key Resource for Transformation from Subsistence to Money Economy.
- Luyombya, J. (2024). The effect of Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions on Farmers’ Participation in the Parish Development Model. <http://dissertations.mak.ac.ug/handle/20.500.12281/20138>
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). (2024, December). National Population and Housing Census 2024 - Final Report. <https://www.ubos.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/National-Population-and-Housing-Census-2024-Final-Report-Volume-1-Main.pdf>.
- Akotia, J., Awuzie, B. O., & Egbu, C. (2023). Mixed Methods Research Design for the Built Environment. Taylor & Francis.
- Fafunwa, A. B., & Aisiku, J. U. (2022). Education in Africa: A Comparative survey. Taylor & Francis
- Gogoll, J., & Zuber, N. (2025). Introduction to Ethical Software Development. Springer Nature.
- International Trade Administration. (2025, December 18). Uganda - Agricultural Sector. <https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/uganda-agricultural-sector>
- Jonas Mbabazi, & Chris Nkwatsibwe. (2024). A CSO Position Paper on the Implementation of the Parish Development Model in Uganda. <https://ngoforum.or.ug/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/The-Parish-Development-Model-Two-Years-Later.pdf?>