

Grassroots Organizations and Women's Empowerment in a Post-Conflict Region:

Evidence from Women Organizations in Northern Uganda

Lupe Davidson
West Virginia University
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
201 Woodburn Hall
Morgantown, WV 26506-6286
Lupe.davidson@mail.wvu.edu

Firat Demir¹
University of Oklahoma
Department of Economics
436 CCD1, 308 Cate Center Drive
Norman, OK 73072
E-mail: fdemir@ou.edu

John Harris
University of Oklahoma
Division of Regional and City Planning
830 Van Vleet Oval
Norman, OK 73019
johncharris@ou.edu

¹ Corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

This research is conducted as a part of a research track of the OU Center for Peace and Development (OUCPD) in northern Uganda. We would like to thank University of Oklahoma students who helped with the field work in 2019, and Caleigh Penn for excellent research support. We also would like to thank Sr. Rosemary Nyirumbe, Grace Acan, Catherine Awor, Evelyn Amony, Rosalba Oywa, and Brenda Kakanyero for comments and suggestions with the survey preparation, and for logistical support. For financial support, we would like to thank an OU Research Council grant and the College of Architecture Program for Research Enhancement Grant. Firat Demir is thankful for the University of Oklahoma's Senior Faculty Summer Fellowship, the Carnegie Corporation of New York Grant (G-20-57642), the Fulbright Commission, and the Vilnius University Faculty of Economics and Business Administration for his Fulbright visit in 2022. The research was approved by the University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, IRB#6853. Author names are in alphabetical order and do not represent seniority. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the authors.

**Grassroots Organizations and Women's Empowerment in a Post-Conflict Region:
Evidence from Women Organizations in Northern Uganda**

Abstract

This paper examines the effects of participation in women's grassroots organizations (WGOs) on women's empowerment in a post-conflict context. The analysis is based on cross-sectional survey data from northern Uganda. We study multiple dimensions of empowerment including economic and health care decisions, attitudes towards domestic violence, decision-making over functionings, political and civic participation, personal agency, and leadership. The empirical results suggest no significant effect of WGO membership, participation or satisfaction on empowerment. We argue that these findings raise new questions about why women join WGOs in post-conflict contexts and what the mechanics of individual and collective empowerment are.

Keywords: Women's empowerment; Women's grassroots organizations; Political participation; Post-conflict; Northern Uganda

JEL Classification: J16; D74; L31

1. Introduction

Women's empowerment and gender equality is a primary goal of economic, social and human development and is one of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations. Previous studies have already identified a variety of channels through which women's empowerment improve development outcomes, including children's education, health and nutrition (Hatilebakk and Gurung, 2016); Pratley, 2016), household well-being (Annan et al., 2021), maternal health, (Bloom et al., 2001), political participation (Bargain et al., 2019), and improved education and entrepreneurship (Beaman et al., 2009, 2012; Ghani, 2014). Empowerment is also a function of gender equality and social justice with significant spillover effects to other aspects of human development and social wellbeing. As a result, there has been a growing attention to identify the drivers of women's empowerment and ways in which it can be achieved. In this paper, we explore the role of women's grassroots organizations (WGOs) on women's empowerment using a field survey that was conducted in northern Uganda in 2019. WGOs are women-led civil society groups whose membership is composed of low-income or otherwise marginalized individuals engaged in a wide variety of social, political, and economic activities aimed at improving life for women and their communities.

We build on previous research for the measurement of women's empowerment, which, as further discussed in section 2, is a multidimensional concept. The attempts to measure the degree of women's empowerment across different communities have been inhibited by the lack of data, which is available only for few countries and only at the country level. The data issue becomes even more restrictive when it comes to minority populations within a country.¹ Another limitation with the national data is that aggregate measures of empowerment cannot capture the degree of empowerment at the individual level within the context of household and societal dynamics (Klein and Ballon, 2017; Pradhan et al., 2019; Dickin, 2021). The same is true for research on the effects of WGOs. The group of studies that rely on Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) can address these issues but then they

are restricted with the choice of variables that are available, particularly different dimensions of communal agency (Laszlo et al., 2020). These limitations explain the limited number of studies on WGOs and women's empowerment. Empowerment is defined in a multitude of ways, often involving theories of agency, capabilities and functionings and power (Rowlands, 1995, 1998; Sen, 1999; Malhotra et al., 2002; Ibrahim and Alkire, 2007; lein and Ballon, 2017; Dickin et al., 2021). In this paper, like Annan et al. (2021), we use definition of women's empowerment that are related to theories of power, capturing the degree of agency and autonomy women have in personal and intra-household decisions. Furthermore, we consider women's agency over political participation, leadership, and gender roles.

The degree of women's empowerment and the role(s) of WGOs in post-conflict situations remain understudied in previous research even though WGOs are often shown to be important providers of social and human capital and political awareness. Northern Uganda has a long history of ethnic and religious violence including, but not limited to the conflict between the government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). WGOs have played a critical role in providing support and solidarity for women and children who are affected by the war (Acan et al., 2020). However, we still do not much about the impact of these WGOs on women's empowerment.

Our empirical results from the regression analysis using cross section survey data suggest that the WGO membership, participation or satisfaction has no detectable effect on women's empowerment through income, expenditure, or health care decisions. We also find no strong evidence that WGO involvement has any significant effect on the likelihood of opposing domestic violence. Likewise, WGO involvement does not appear to significantly affect respondents' willingness to attend school, their attitudes towards leadership and decision making, or political and civic participation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a brief literature review and introduces the theoretical channels. Section 3 presents the empirical analysis, including the data, and empirical methodology. Section 3 discusses the empirical results and section 5 concludes.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Connections

Power is an integral part of empowerment. As noted by O'Hara and Clement (2018) and Annan et al. (2021, p.2), studies on power emphasize “the importance of an individual’s recognition and claiming of their rights and influence.” Thus, recognizing the agency to make a decision, and using it for making decisions is at the core of the concept of empowerment. People who can exercise this right using their own agency are assumed to be more empowered than others. Kabeer’s (1999) and Richardson (2018) argue that the concept of women’s empowerment has three interacting dimensions: Resources, including economic, human, and social resources; Agency, or the ability to define and act on one’s own goals; and Achievements, or the capacity to make choices to achieve outcomes. Kabeer (1999) and Richardson (2018) are critical of research on women’s empowerment that ignore the structural and individual context of everyday life; that include arbitrary cut points on indices developed by outsider researchers; or which fail to weigh measures on relative local importance, points which we take seriously in our research design.

Here, we are interested in the effect of WGO membership on women’s empowerment. WGOs include a host of community-based civil society organizations largely run *by* and *for* women. They are created either through women’s self-organization, governmental action or NGO involvement and their membership is mostly composed of low-income or otherwise marginalized women engaged in a large spectrum of social, political, and economic activities. WGOs are formed as mutual aid societies, saving and loan groups, or for other reasons that are specific to the local context such as maternal support or local peacebuilding. WGOs are theorized and observed to lead to women’s empowerment by contributing to individual capacity, social and financial capital, and individual and collective agency.

WGOs are deemed essential for global democratization because they are argued to increase women's agency, self-determination, and participation in decision-making (Bystydzien and Sekhon, 1999). In fact, WGOs have been cited as the building blocks of "deep democracy"; capable of not only leading to positive changes in individual lives, but even to national or global transformation (Appadurai, 2001). Individual members of WGOs are frequently observed to have increases in leadership skills, sense of community, interest in women's advocacy, businesses opportunities, legal knowledge, financial access, a greater role in household decision making, and lower sense of powerlessness, substance abuse, child abuse, and child labor (Lowicki-Zucca et al., 2014; Dutt, 2018).

However, questions remain about how and if WGO membership can facilitate women's empowerment. These questions are especially pertinent if WGO membership is set in a larger context of widespread social and governmental failure to support women. WGOs can hardly be expected to fill the gap left by ineffective or unresponsive social and governmental institutions and, at best, WGO effectiveness depends on the ability to respond to opportunities in their local context (Bernasek, 2003). For example, when WGOs are focused on providing short term gains in low opportunity environments, they may fail to translate collective action into individual capacity or empowerment (Flynn and Sumberg, 2018). Within certain contexts, WGOs can provide women with opportunities to exercise agency and autonomy leading to increased control of household decisions (Goldman and Little, 2015; Musinguzi, 2016). But even then, empowerment is mediated through preexisting relationships to family and community. For some women, for example, increased autonomy gained through WGOs relates to increased risk of intimate partner violence (Koenig et al., 2003). WGOs face significant internal challenges too, and can even produce forms of negative empowerment, social capital, and other externalities (Mayoux, 2001; Adhikari and Goldey, 2010; Mutebi et al., 2017).

Post-conflict situations, as in our study here, are highly gendered contexts that not only heighten gender-based violence and insecurity but also offer unique opportunities for social

transformation that can improve women's ability to participate fully in society (Porter, 2016; Bargain et al., 2019). While preexisting local cultural gender norms and the legal context of women's political participation highly impacts the opportunities for and efficacy of women's roles in post conflict peacebuilding and development, the required social and physical reconstruction of communities opens space for women to make new claims on patriarchal power structures and cultural norms (Gizelis, 2011; Pospieszna, 2015).

This research also relates to the literature on women's empowerment through civic participation (Goldman and Little, 2015). Previous research has identified several channels through which this empowerment occurs, including changing public attitudes through increased presence of women in previously male-dominated areas. Beaman et al. (2009) shows that improved political representation of women positively affects the electorate's opinion about female leaders. There is also the role-model effect, which works through supply side factors as more young women decide to have education, start their own businesses, and question gender based domestic division of labor (Beaman et al., 2009, 2012; Ghani et al., 2014). Increased political participation and representation are also shown to increase the likelihood of women reporting sex crimes (Iyer et al., 2012). Having role models, even when they are fictional such as on TV shows, are found to have a positive effect on women's empowerment and increase their bargaining power in decision making and fertility choice while reducing their acceptance of domestic violence (Jensen and Oster, 2009; La Ferrara et al., 2012).

However, WGO's role and impact on women's empowerment and community change in post-conflict communities are often limited for several reasons. First, international and local governmental and non-governmental actors pay limited attention to women and women organizations in the decision-making process over socio-political and economic reconstruction in post-conflict environments. Instead, they prioritize other interests that are seen as more important for peace and reconstruction, including soldiers, guerillas, and political and economic elites (Deiana, 2016; Goetz

and Jenkins, 2016). Second, WGOs are usually subject to major cultural constraints, including patriarchal norms, which undermine women as legitimate political actors (Tagoe and Abakah, 2015; Adeogun and Muthuki, 2018). Third, particularly in the developing world, WGOs are often prevented from playing a meaningful role in social transformation due to low group and individual capacity, high rates of poverty and illiteracy (Tagoe and Abakah, 2015). Fourth, international actors in post conflict communities, such as international NGOs, sometimes partner with WGOs in ways that constrain the transformational potential of WGOs. NGOs often do not understand the practical capacities of WGOs and end programming, engagement, and financial support before members are able to ask critical questions about their lives, and before WGOs at the organizational level can contend effectively with local power structures (Gizelis and Joseph, 2016; Ochen, 2017; Isgren, 2018). Fifth, the leadership and organizational structure of WGOs can undermine the potential for long-term societal impacts. As WGOs evolve, structural and leadership changes highly impact the political empowerment of members and leaders often depoliticize over time to focus on programmatic or service provision opportunities (Jenkins, 2011). WGOs are often undermined by interpersonal infighting and can be weakened by class differences, elite capture, and mismanagement, which all lead to distrust (Adhikari and Goldey, 2010; Mutebi, 2017).

Taken together, the literature on WGOs in post-conflict contexts suggests that WGOs can be important contributors to women's empowerment and can be essential to community reconstruction and democratization but are often limited by patriarchal cultural expectations and the precarity of their members and organizational structures. Further, we still know very little about the effects of WGOs on women's empowerment or the mechanics that create change. Quantitative evidence is lacking, especially in Sub Saharan Africa where limited data exist on post-conflict conditions and political or peacebuilding participation of women. Most studies are limited to studying the effects of gender based affirmative action policies through quotas, or similar policies. Among the few, Chhibber (2002)

examined the relationship between political participation and various dimensions of women's empowerment. Prillaman (2021) studied the effect of political participation on women's access to economic networks, and Bargain et al. (2019) analyze the effects of women's participation in political protests during the Egyptian Uprising on women's empowerment along various dimensions.

3. Empirical Analysis

3.1. Data

The data for this study was collected as a part of a broader research examining WGOs in northern Uganda. The authors have conducted three rounds of surveys and focus group interviews between January and November 2019 in six locations: the villages of Unyama and Palaro, Gulu district; Atiak, Amuru district; Bar and Agweng, Lira district; Namokora, Kitgum district; and Lukung, Lamwo district. These locations were chosen because of the presence of WGOs in these areas, thus allowing for collection of responses from members and non-members of WGOs. In total, we interviewed 240 women and conducted 16 focus group interviews with women.² We used qualitative data from group interviews to supplement the survey data and to motivate the statistical model while providing a more nuanced analysis of women's empowerment and individual and social change.

The interview questions were prepared in multiple steps. Once we have identified main research questions, we submitted them to a panel of experts and leaders from local women organizations, who confirmed the validity and applicability of questions to local community. We also asked for suggestions for any errors or omissions in the survey questions to ensure contextual relevancy and cultural appropriateness. Next, we pilot tested these questions with members of WGOs and revised them further. We also confirmed the questions with the translators, who were all women, for consistency and translatability from English to Acholi.

The location choice for this study was not random as Northern Uganda occupies a central position to expand our understanding of WGOs and to answer our main research questions. Northern

Uganda was at the center of an intense civil war between the Government of Uganda and the LRA between 1987 and 2006 and suffered significantly from ethnic violence, collapse of social order, discrimination, and loss of basic public services. In fact, 97% of the respondents in our sample stated that they were affected by the war, 24% had to relocate to displacement camps, 24% had a family member killed during the conflict, and 17% were abducted by LRA. As a result, the region attracted significant international attention during and immediately after the end of the conflict and received substantial humanitarian aid and NGO involvement for basic services provision in health care, education, water, and infrastructure. However, since the cessation of hostilities in 2006, there has been a significant departure of NGO activity from the region and an extensive scaling back of long-term peace, justice, and reconciliation activities. The WGOs we examined have a long and deep-rooted history in Northern Uganda, dating back to the civil war. These are bottom-up organizations born out of necessity for women affected by the civil war, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and displacement. The end of the war in 2006 led to a new wave of problems for the reintegration of women who were directly or indirectly affected by the war through abductions, forced displacement, sexual violence, collapse of local economy and economic networks, as well as ethnic discrimination.

As for the measurement of empowerment, as discussed earlier, we follow Kabeer (1999) and Richardson (2018) in explaining empowerment through three overlapping dimensions: resources, personal agency, and outcomes. We define agency and outcome variables using variables that capture the decision-making ability of women over personal and household matters, including individual and household level financial decisions, individual health decisions and social and political participation and activism.

Individual level empowerment variables are linked to intrinsic agency, defined as the ability and power (i.e., functionings) to develop desired capabilities (Rowlands, 1995; Goldman and Little, 2015; Dickin et al., 2021). They capture the extent to which the respondents have agency to make their

own decisions. Women's ability to influence household level decisions such as purchases involve instrumental agency and is shown to be a significant source of empowerment (Miedema et al., 2018; Annan, 2021; Dickin et al., 2021). The same is true regarding agency over one's own health. We also include variables that measure community level empowerment, including whether respondents can or would like to raise their voices within their communities, participate in communal decision making, and to advocate for their views.

We include the following categories as our main dependent variables, which capture empowerment through the use and control of resources and income, decisions over one's health, attitudes towards domestic violence, leadership, and political/community participation:

Decision making over financial matters: This set of questions include decision-making over who decides how to spend the money the respondent earns as well as who makes the decision over major household purchases.³ These questions are adopted from the Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) (UBS, 2018). They are coded as 1 for the respondent herself, and 0 for all other. In the robustness section, we also grouped the joint decisions separately.

Decision making over one's personal health: This question asks who makes the decision over important healthcare decisions of the respondent. It is codes as 1 for the respondent herself, and 0 for all others. In the robustness section, we also grouped the joint decisions separately.

These three aspects of the intrinsic agency in financial decisions and personal health appear to be highly correlated, being 0.569 between income and expenditure, 0.560 between income and healthcare and 0.581 between expenditure and health care, all statistically significant at 1% level.

Accepting violence from domestic partner: We adopted from the DHS a set of variables on domestic violence, which measures the degree to which a woman accepts various justifications of domestic violence (1=not justified under any conditions, 0=justified under various conditions). There are seven situations provided in the questionnaire⁴ and we tested them individually. In the robustness analysis

we also used their unweighted average as well as a factor analysis. Table 1 shows the correlation among these seven situations, highlighting the peculiarity of each. While the correlations are statistically significant and positive, they are not as high as one might have expected.

<Insert Table 1 Here>

Decision making over one's capabilities and functionings: This variable refers to the willingness to attend school (yes equals 1), if never attended (*Attendance*). In the robustness analysis we replace it with the willingness to continue to the next level, independent of the current level of schooling.⁵ Highlighting the multidimensional structure of women's responses to empowerment, we find that these two variables are highly correlated with each other (0.761). However, they are inversely correlated with the proxies in the first group. Particularly, the correlation between income decisions, willingness to attend (Q#14) or study the next level (Q#15) is -0.1 and -0.21, respectively.

Political and civic participation and agency: This set of questions examine the level of willingness to have political and civic participation and well as exercise agency over expression. These questions were adapted from the Activism Orientation Scale (Corning and Meyers, 2002). It also intends to capture the extent to which WGO membership is associated with women's willingness to challenge the status quo. We ask the respondents "when you think about your involvement in grassroots women's or peace organizations, how likely are you to do the following in the future?" (Q#59) (the answer scale ranges from 1 (extremely unlikely) to 5 (extremely likely)):

- Invite a friend to attend a meeting of a grassroots organization or event
- Volunteer to serve as a leader in a grassroots organization.
- Attend an informational meeting on government policy about women's development.
- Attend an informational meeting on government policy about peacebuilding efforts in the region.
- Attend an informational meeting of a political group.

- Organize a political event (e.g., talk, support group, march).
- Give a lecture or talk about a social or political issue.
- Speak about your own experiences with conflict at a public event.
- Go out of your way to collect information on a social or political issue.
- Correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about women in Northern Uganda?
- Correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about those formerly abducted during the war.
- Engage in a political activity in which you suspect there would be a confrontation with the police or possible arrest.
- Encourage a friend to join a political organization.
- Try to change a friend's or acquaintance's mind about a social or political issue.
- Try to change a relative's mind about a social or political issue.
- Wear a t-shirt or button with a political message.
- Keep track of the views of government officials regarding an issue important to you.
- Participate in discussion groups on issues or solutions of a particular social or political group.
- Engage in any political activity in which you fear for your personal safety.

Within this cluster, we also adapted questions from the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (Morgan, 1996). The selected questions asked the respondents whether they agree or disagree with six statements on women's leadership positions (Q#95). The answers range from 'strongly disagree (1)' to 'strongly agree (7)':

- A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.

- Men should respect women more than they currently do.
- Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for government office.
- Women should be involved in deciding how many children a family has.
- Girl child education should be as important as boy child education.
- Women should have more ways to be involved in community decision making.

Table 2 provides the summary statistics for the WGO membership and demographic characteristics of the respondents. We find that the average number of WGO membership is 1.6 organizations while 42 respondents are not a member of any. The average satisfaction level is 6.9 (on a scale of 1-10) with a high level of variation with a standard deviation of 3.1. The average importance level of WGO membership is 4.5 and displays very low variation overall with over 98% of respondents answering on a scale of 3-5. As for the involvement level, 39% of the respondents said they were involved in the WGO activities as much as they wanted while over 60% said they would like more involvement. 18% of respondents have not attended any school while 47% attended some primary schooling and only 15% finished it. In terms of asset holdings, 76% said they owned a house and 71% owned land. The average age is 37 and the average number of children is five. Lastly, 56% of respondents are not married. In Table 2 we also present the summary statistics for income, expenditure, and health care decisions as well as differing attitudes towards domestic violence. Table 3 provides the summary statistics for other dependent variables.

<Insert Tables 2 & 3 Here>

3.2. Empirical Methodology

In our empirical approach, we examine the relationship between WGO membership and participation, and various proxies of empowerment for women in a post-conflict society. While we include various other determinants of empowerment, our focus is on the role of WGOs in Equation (1).

$$Empowerment_{is} = \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 V_i + Q_s + \varepsilon_{is} \quad (1)$$

Empowerment for individual i in survey s is a vector of empowerment measures, which capture the degree of women's empowerment and agency and are discussed in the data section. V is a set of control variables that are individual specific. Q is survey (s) fixed effects and ε is the error term. The standard errors are clustered at the survey level.

The main control variable, X , is a vector, capturing various dimensions of women's participation and involvement in WGOs. It includes:

Membership in a WGO is captured by the number of WGO membership in the past five years (Q#47). *Satisfaction* with WGOs (Q#67) is captured using a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means 'very dissatisfied' and 10 means 'very satisfied'. *Importance* (Q#68) of being a member of a WGO is ranked from 1, extremely important, to 5, not at all important. *Involvement* (Q#69) with the grassroots women's or peace organizations is either 0, I am as involved as I want to be, or 1, I wish I could be more involved in the activities of the group.

As for other control variables, we include *Resources*, which, like Sen's capabilities approach, include:

Educational achievement and human capital, which increases from 1 (never attended school) to 8 (university) (Q#13).⁶

Income and wealth. Given the difficulty in measuring average monthly or annual income, we rely on two proxies, which are sole or joint ownership of a house (Q#34) and land (Q#37) (agricultural or non-agricultural). They are equal to 1 if owned, and 0 otherwise.

We also include additional controls, V , that may condition agency:

Age (Q#2). As is common in societies across the globe, older age usually signals more agency and empowerment in Acholi society. And yet, the degree of conservatism can also increase with age as the degree of openness to changing attitudes and gender roles decrease. Therefore, we may see a

decreasing effect of WGOs membership and involvement on emancipation variables among older women, who may be more inclined to preserve more traditional gender roles.

Number of children (in natural log) (Q#5) and marital status, which is equal to 1 if married, and 0 otherwise (Q#11-12).

We estimate Eq (1) using logit and ordered logit methods and report the odds ratios for beta estimates. The odds ratio from the logit model is defined as the ratio of the success probability over the failure probability. It is equal to one when both have equal probability and ranges between zero (failure) and positive infinity (success).

4. Empirical results

We show the odds ratios from Eq. (1) for the effects of WGO membership on women's income decisions in Table 4. Overall, we do not find any evidence that WGO membership, satisfaction, importance, or involvement increase the women's empowerment. On the contrary, we find some evidence that having any WGO membership (at 5% significance level, column 2) and WGO membership satisfaction (at 10% significance level, column 3) decreases the probability of women's ability to make financial decisions over their own incomes. In Table 5 we examine the determinants of decision making over household purchases. We again fail to find any significant effect of WGO membership, importance, or involvement on women's ability to make decisions over major household purchases. When significant, as in column (3), the effect is in the opposite direction, suggesting that WGO membership satisfaction lowers the likelihood of decision making over household expenditures. In Table 6 we look at the relationship between WGO membership and ability to make decisions over one's own important healthcare choices. The results are again consistent with Tables 4 and 5, showing that WGO membership either does not increase the probability of having control over one's own healthcare choices (columns 1, 4, 5) or decreases it (columns 2 and 3).

<Insert Tables 4, 5 & 6 here>

As for other determinants of women's empowerment over one's own financial, expenditure and healthcare decisions, we find that women who own a house or land and are married are much less likely to exercise agency over these decisions. While the result on marital status can be explained through effects of intra-household patriarchy, the results on asset ownership needs further examination in future research. Particularly, this result contradicts the commonly held notion that wealth and women's emancipation go hand in hand, as suggested by the neoclassical economic theory. What we find suggests that the relationship between ownership of assets and women's empowerment can be more nuanced. We also find that respondent's age has the single biggest positive effect on women's empowerment in all three regression sets, suggesting that older women exercise a significant level of control over their financial and health care decisions. We also find that education and the number of children both have a positive influence, even though at statistically insignificant levels.

Table 7 looks at attitudes towards domestic violence. We present only the results for the WGO membership variables and those that were found to be statistically significant (full results are reported in Appendix Tables A1-A7). We find that women's attitudes towards domestic violence vary significantly. First, we find no strong evidence that WGO membership, participation or satisfaction decreases the likelihood of justifying domestic violence (except for one case, *Violence-2*). Second, in two of the seven justifications of violence, increasing age appears to increase the likelihood of justifying violence, likely reflecting learned and reproduced patriarchal social norms. Third, consistent with previous studies, increasing education level significantly reduces the probability of endorsing violence in three of the seven cases (*Violence-3, -4, -7*). Lastly, married women are less likely to find violence justified but only in two of the seven cases (*Violence-2, -4*).

<Insert Table 7 here>

In Table 8 we test the effect of WGO membership on willingness to attend school if the respondent never attended school before. We again find no significant effect of WGO involvement

on willingness to attend school. The only variable that appears to have a robust and significant effect is the *Age* variable, suggesting that willingness to attend school decreases significantly by age. In the robustness analysis we also examined the effect on the willingness to continue to the next level independent of the current level of schooling. The results were almost identical and are reported in Appendix Table A8.

<Insert Table 8 here>

Next, we examine the effects of WGO membership on political and civic participation and report the results in Table 9a and 9b (full results are reported in Appendix Tables A9-A27 for all other WGO participation variables). Table 9a-9b reports the results for: *invite a friend to attend a meeting of a grassroots organization or event* (Column 1), *volunteer to serve as a leader in a grassroots organization* (Column 2), *attend an informational meeting on government policy about women's development* (Column 3), *attend an informational meeting on government policy about peacebuilding efforts in the region* (Column 4), *attend an informational meeting of a political group* (Column 5), *organize a political event* (Column 6), *give a lecture or talk about a social or political issue?* (Column 7), *speak about your own experiences with conflict at a public event?* (Column 8), *go out of your way to collect information on a social or political issue* (Column 9), *correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about women in Northern Uganda* (Column 10), *correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about those formerly abducted during the war* (Column 11), *engage in a political activity in which you suspect there would be a confrontation with the police or possible arrest* (Column 12), *encourage a friend to join a political organization* (Column 13), *try to change a friend's or acquaintance's mind about a social or political issue* (Column 14), *try to change a relative's mind about a social or political issue* (Column 15), *wear a t-shirt or button with a political message* (Column 16), *keep track of the views of government officials regarding an issue important to you* (Column 17), *participate in discussion groups on issues or solutions of a particular social or political group* (Column 18), *engage in any political activity in which you fear for your personal safety* (Column 19). Regarding the effect of WGO membership, we find that it increases only the probability of volunteering to serve as a leader in a

WGO (Column 2) and correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about women in northern Uganda (Column 10), but not any other, at least not at a significant level.

<Insert Table 9a & 9b here>

As for other determinants of political and civic participation, we find that education is significant and positive in columns (2) and (10), increasing the probability of leadership volunteering and correcting incorrect statements about women in Northern Uganda, like the WGO membership effect. However, education is also negatively related to participating discussion groups on issues or solutions of a particular social or political group (column 18).

House ownership appears to be a significant predictor of a lack of political and civic participation and is the most significant determinant among all other variables. Particularly, women who own a house are significantly less likely to: attend an informational meeting of a political group (Column 5), organize a political event (Column 6), give a lecture or talk about a social or political issue (Column 7), go out of their way to collect information on a social or political issue (Column 9), correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about those formerly abducted during the war (Column 11), encourage a friend to join a political organization (Column 13), try to change a friend's or acquaintance's mind about a social or political issue (Column 14), wear a t-shirt or button with a political message (Column 16), keep track of the views of government officials regarding an issue important to you (Column 17), and engage in any political activity in which their fear for their personal safety (Column 19). This is 10 out of 19 civic participation questions.

Furthermore, land ownership is a positive and significant determinant in two cases, in columns (2) and (4). Age is significant and positive only in columns (10 and (11), as older women appear to be more likely to correct incorrect statements about women or those abducted during the war in northern Uganda. Number of children is not a significant determinant in any of the 19 cases. Being married, however, is significant and positive in columns (1), (2), (5) and (14), suggesting that married women

are more likely to: invite a friend to attend a meeting of a grassroots organization or event (Column 1), volunteer to serve as a leader in a grassroots organization (Column 2), attend an informational meeting on government policy about women's development (Column 3), and try to change a friend's or acquaintance's mind about a social or political issue (Column 14).

Finally, in Table 10 we examine respondents' attitudes towards empowerment in leadership and decision making, asking them if they agree in a scale of one to seven (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree) that: *a woman should have the same job opportunities as a man* (Column 1), *men should respect women more than they currently do* (Column 2), *women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for government office* (Column 3), *women should be involved in deciding how many children a family has* (Column 4), *girls' education should be as important as boys' education* (column 5), *women should have more ways to be involved in community decision making* (Column 6). *WGO membership is found to be positive and significant only in column (2)*, suggesting that it increases the probability of respondents agreeing that men should respect women more than they currently do.

<Insert Table 10 here>

As for other variables, education level is found to increase the probability of respondents agreeing that a woman should have the same job opportunities as a man (Column 1) but not in any others at a statistically significant level. House ownership is significant in columns (4) and (6), suggesting that it increases the probability that respondents agree that women should be involved in deciding how many children a family has (Column 4) and that women should have more ways to be involved in community decision making (Column 6). Land ownership has a similar effect in column (5), as it increases the probability of agreeing that girls' education should be as important as boys' education (column 5). Age, overall, appears to be negatively correlated with the empowerment variables, though statistically significant only in columns (2) and (3), suggesting that older women are more likely to disagree that men should respect women more than they currently do (Column 2), and

that women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for government office (Column 3). The number of children and the marital status do not appear significant in any of these questions.

5. Conclusion

Our empirical analysis suggests that WGO membership itself does not improve any *observed* measures of women's empowerment. Other factors such as access to resources through home and land ownership or traditional social embeddedness such as marriage reveal lower indications of empowerment. These findings are important and are in accord with previous studies, suggesting that women's grassroots organizations are not miracle makers. While WGOs are often found to enhance women's access to resources, or increase women's capacity and control over their lives, membership in these organizations cannot be expected to overcome difficult circumstances where social and governmental systems are largely failing women as they so often do in post-conflict contexts.

This raises a set of questions for further research. First, the motivations to create and join WGOs must be studied further. Many WGOs across the developing world and especially in post-conflict contexts, are created or facilitated by NGOs or governments. Reasons why this is the case and how NGOs interact with grassroots groups need reexamination. Are these organizations created to empower women and create positive community change? Or do NGOs and governments initiate these organizations as instruments for other interventions? More importantly, why do women join these groups? There is a longstanding concern that research on WGOs and empowerment fails to comprehensively capture the complexity of these organizations as social agents (Kabeer, 1999; Richardson, 2018). Too often research on WGOs fails to assess not only quantifiable indicators, but also the motivations and mechanisms that connect organizational decisions and outcomes to resource access, agential responses of women, and group motivations to the larger gendered sociopolitical context and available organizational networks. If women are not joining these organizations for reasons associated with empowerment, should we expect them to increase measures of

empowerment? In post-conflict contexts, women may be joining these organizations for survival. Rather than leading to individual and community transformation, women may simply be looking for material, social, and emotional subsistence.

This leads to a second set of questions. If we hope or expect that membership in WGOs *should* lead to individual or collective empowerment, what circumstances and social or organizational mechanisms might lead to those outcomes? WGO research tends to examine one of the following: the impact of WGO membership on individuals using economic, political, and social indicators, like this study does; the impact of organizational structure, leadership, and administrative evolution of WGOs on organization outcomes; or the results of coalitional practices of WGOs on public policy. It is generally acknowledged that individual and organizational precarity and coalitional potential are all interrelated and thus there are important theoretical discussions that link these three approaches. For instance, Ibrahim (2017) posits that collective capabilities in grassroots organizations are predicated on linking all three. In future research we hope to explore the social and economic mechanisms that ultimately impact the individual or societal consequences of the work of WGOs.

Finally, we should note that the measurement of empowerment needs further work, and as highlighted by Klein and Ballon (2015), standard metrics, like those used in this paper, may not be sufficient in capturing the full spectrum of empowerment in post-conflict or other environments. For example, the ability to reclaim one's time is an act of agency and when women do it, they are resisting patriarchal authority, an authority that derives its power from taking women's time. The women in post-conflict environments that we worked with have been dispossessed of their time, *they are women out of time*. Therefore, involvement with WGOs in and on itself can be interpreted as empowerment.

References

Adeogun, T.J. and Muthuki, J.M. (2018). Feminist perspectives on peacebuilding: The case of women's organisations in South Sudan. *Agenda* 32(2): 83-92.

Adhikari, K.P. and Goldey, P. (2010). Social Capital and its "Downside": The Impact on Sustainability of Induced Community-Based Organizations in Nepal. *World Development* 38(2): 184-194,

Annan, J., Donald, A., Goldstein, M., Martinez, P.G., and Koolwal, G. (2021). Taking power: Women's empowerment and household Well-being in Sub-Saharan Africa. *World Development* 140: 105292

Appadurai, A. (2001). Deep democracy: urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Environment and Urbanization* 13(2): 23-43.

Bargain, O., Boutin, D., and Champeaux, H. (2019). Women's political participation and intrahousehold empowerment: Evidence from the Egyptian Arab Spring. *Journal of Development Economics* 141: 102379.

Beaman, L., Chattopadhyay, R., Duflo, E., Pande, R., and Topalova, P. (2009). Powerful Women: Does Exposure Reduce Bias? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(4): 1497–1540.

Beaman, L., Duflo, E., Pande, R., Topalova, P. (2012). Female Leadership Raises Aspirations and Educational Attainment for Girls: A Policy Experiment in India. *Science* 335(6068): 582-586.

Bernasek, A. (2003). Banking on Social Change: Grameen Bank Lending to Women. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 16: 369–385.

Bloom, S. S., Wypij, D., and Gupta, M. D. (2001). Dimensions of women's autonomy and the influence on maternal health care utilization in a north Indian city. *Demography* 38(1): 67–78.

Corning, A. F. and Myers, D. J. (2002). Individual orientation toward engagement in social action. *Political Psychology* 23: 703-729.

Chhibber, P. (2002). Why are some women politically active? The household, public space, and political participation in India. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 43(3–5): 409–429.

Deiana, M.A. (2016). To settle for a gendered peace? Spaces for feminist grassroots mobilization in Northern Ireland and Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Citizenship Studies* 20(1): 99-114.

Dickin, S. Bisung, E., Nansi, J., and Charles, K. (2021). Empowerment in water, sanitation and hygiene index. *World Development* 137: 105158.

Dutt, A. (2018). Feminist Organizing in Rural Nicaragua: Assessing a Psychosocial Process to Promote Empowered Solidarity. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 61: 500-511.

Flynn, J. and Sumberg, J. (2018) Are savings groups a livelihoods game changer for young people in Africa? *Development in Practice* 28(1): 51-64.

Ghani, E., Kerr, W. R., and O'Connell, S.D. (2014). Political reservations and women's entrepreneurship in India. *Journal of Development Economics* 108: 138-153.

Gizelis, T.-I. (2011). A Country of their Own: Women and Peacebuilding. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 28(5): 522–542.

Gizelis, T.-I., and Joseph, J. (2016). Decoupling local ownership? The lost opportunities for grassroots women's involvement in Liberian peacebuilding. *Cooperation and Conflict* 51(4): 539–556.

Goetz, A.M. and Jenkins, R. (2016). Agency and Accountability: Promoting Women's Participation in Peacebuilding. *Feminist Economics* 22(1): 211-236.

Goldman, M., and Little, J. (2015). Innovative grassroots NGOS and the complex processes of women's empowerment: An empirical investigation from Northern Tanzania. *World Development* 66: 762–777.

Hatlebakk, M., and Gurung, Y. B. (2016). Female empowerment and the education of children in Nepal. *The Journal of Developing Areas* 50(2): 1–19.

Ibrahim, S., and Alkire, S. (2007). Agency and empowerment: A proposal for internationally comparable indicators. *Oxford Development Studies* 35(4): 379–403.

Isgren, E. (2018). 'If the change is going to happen it's not by us': Exploring the role of NGOs in the politicization of Ugandan agriculture. *Journal of Rural Studies* 63: 180-189.

Iyer, L., Mani, A., Mishra, P., and Topalova, P. (2012). The Power of Political Voice: Women's Political Representation and Crime in India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 4(4): 165-93.

Jenkins, K. (2011). Depoliticisation and the Changing Trajectories of Grassroots Women's Leadership in Peru: From Empowerment to Service Delivery? *Journal of Latin American Studies* 43(2): 299-326.

Jensen, R., and Oster, E. (2009). The Power of TV: Cable Television and Women's Status in India. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(3): 1057–1094,

Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and Change* 30: 435–464.

Klein, E., and Ballon, P. (2018). Rethinking measures of psychological agency: A study on the urban fringe of Bamako. *The Journal of Development Studies* 54(8): 1284-1302.

Koenig, M.A., Ahmed, S., Hossain, M.B., Alam, A.B.M.K. (2003). Women's status and domestic violence in rural Bangladesh: Individual- and community-level effects. *Demography* 40: 269–288.

La Ferrara, E., Chong, A., and Duryea, S. (2012). Soap Operas and Fertility: Evidence from Brazil. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 4(4): 1-31.

Laszlo, S., Grantham, K., Oskay, E., and Zhang, T. (2020). Grappling with the challenges of measuring women's economic empowerment in intrahousehold settings. *World Development* 132: 104959.

Lowicki-Zucca, M., Walugembe, P., Ogaba, I., and Langol, S. (2014). Savings groups as a socioeconomic strategy to improve protection of moderately and critically vulnerable children in Uganda. *Children and Youth Services Review* 47(2): 176-181,

Malhotra, A., Schuler, S., & Boender, C. (2002). Measuring Women's Empowerment as a Variable in International Development. The World Bank. Washington, DC.

Mayoux, L. (2001). Tackling the Down Side: Social Capital, Women's Empowerment and Micro-Finance in Cameroon. *Development and Change* 32(3): 434-461.

Miedema, S. S., Haardörfer, R., Girard, A. W., and Yount, K. M. (2018). Women's empowerment in East Africa: Development of a cross-country comparable measure. *World Development* 110: 453–464.

Morgan, B.L. (1996). Putting the feminism into feminism scales: Introduction of a Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS). *Sex roles* 34(5): 359.

Musinguzi, L.K. (2016). The role of social networks in savings groups: insights from village savings and loan associations in Luwero, Uganda. *Community Development Journal* 51(4): 499–516.

Mutebi, A., Kananura, R. M., Ekirapa-Kiracho, E., Bua, J., Kiwanuka, S.N., Nammazi, G., Paina, L., Tetui, M. (2017). Characteristics of community savings groups in rural Eastern Uganda: opportunities for improving access to maternal health services. *Global Health Action*, 10: sup4.

Ochen, E. A. (2017). Women and Liberal Peacebuilding in Post- Conflict Northern Uganda: community social work agenda revisited? *African Sociological Review* 2(2): 15-35.

O'Hara, C., and Clement, F. (2018). Power as agency: A critical reflection on the measurement of women's empowerment in the development sector. *World Development* 106: 111–123.

Porter, E. (2016). Feminists building peace and reconciliation: beyond post-conflict. *Peacebuilding*. 4(2): 210-225.

Pospieszna, P. (2015). Democracy assistance and women's political empowerment in post-conflict countries. *Democratization* 22(7): 1250-1272.

Pradhan, R., Meinzen-Dick, R., and Theis, S. (2019). Property rights, intersectionality, and women's empowerment in Nepal. *Journal of Rural Studies* 70: 26-35.

Pratley, P. (2016). Associations between quantitative measures of women's empowerment and access to care and health status for mothers and their children: A systematic review of evidence from the developing world. *Social Science & Medicine* 169: 119–131.

Prillaman, S. A. (2021). Strength in Numbers: How Women's Networks Close India's Political Gender Gap. *American Journal of Political Science*, in press.

Richardson, R.A. (2018). Measuring Women's Empowerment: A Critical Review of Current Practices and Recommendations for Researchers. *Social Indicators Research* 137: 539–557.

Rowlands, J. (1995). Empowerment examined. *Development in Practice* 5(2): 101–107.

Rowlands, J. (1998). A Word of the Times, but What Does it Mean? Empowerment in the Discourse and Practice of Development. In Afshar H. (eds) *Women and Empowerment* (pp. 11–34). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tagoe, M. and Abakah, E. (2015). Issues of Women's Political Participation and Decision-Making in Local Governance: Perspectives from the Central Region of Ghana. *International Journal of Public Administration* 38(5): 371-380.

Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (UDHS) (2018). Uganda Bureau of Statistics.

UNECA (2011). *African Gender and Development Index*. Ethiopia: Addis Ababa.

United Nations. (2010). *Human Development Report 2010*. UN: New York.

Endnotes

¹ See, for example, the Gender Empowerment Measure of United Nations (United Nations, 2010) or the African Gender and Development Index (UNECA, 2011).

² We covered travel expenses to relax the budget constraint in survey participation.

³ Who usually decides how the money you earn will be used (Q#22)? Who usually makes decisions about making major household purchases (Q#25)? You, your (husband/partner), you and your (husband/partner) jointly, someone other than your husband, or you and someone other than your husband/partner jointly.

⁴ Q#94: In your opinion, is a husband justified in hitting or beating his wife in the following situations: If she goes out without telling him; If she neglects the children; If she argues with him; If she refuses to have sex with him; If she refuses to have sex with him unless he uses a condom; If she refuses to have sex with him without another form of birth control or sexually transmitted infection prevention; If she burns the food.

⁵ If never attended school, would you like to attend (Q#14). Regardless of the level of schooling, would you like to continue to the next level (Q#15).

⁶ Never attended school (1); Some primary school (2); Primary school (3); Some secondary school (4); Completed "O" Level (5); Completed "A" Level (6); Tertiary (7); University (8).

Table 1: Correlation among violence measures

<i>Violence_1</i>	1						
<i>Violence_2</i>	0.273***	1					
<i>Violence_3</i>	0.363***	0.222***	1				
<i>Violence_4</i>	0.301***	0.228***	0.441***	1			
<i>Violence_5</i>	0.184***	0.163***	0.239***	0.441***	1		
<i>Violence_6</i>	0.243***	0.150***	0.348***	0.475***	0.495***	1	
<i>Violence_7</i>	0.234***	0.282***	0.395***	0.420***	0.274***	0.407***	1

Notes: The table refers to the following question, In your opinion, is a husband justified in hitting or beating his wife in the following situations: If she goes out without telling him (Violence-1); If she neglects the children (Violence-2); If she argues with him (Violence-3); If she refuses to have sex with him (Violence-4); If she refuses to have sex with him unless he uses a condom (Violence-5)?; If she refuses to have sex with him without another form of birth control or sexually transmitted infection prevention (Violence-6); If she burns the food (Violence-7).

Table 2: Summary Statistics

	N	Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max
<i>WGO-1</i>	246	1.667	1	1.332	0	6
<i>WGO-2</i>	246	0.829	1	0.377	0	1
<i>Satisfaction</i>	234	6.902	7	3.171	1	10
<i>Importance</i>	243	4.596	5	0.676	1	5
<i>Involvement</i>	238	1.601	2	0.491	1	2
<i>Educ</i>	242	2.496	2	1.367	1	8
<i>House</i>	237	0.768	1	0.423	0	1
<i>Land</i>	242	0.715	1	0.452	0	1
<i>Age</i>	244	37.389	35	13.359	16	80
<i>Children</i>	246	4.882	5	3.193	0	18
<i>Married</i>	243	0.432	0	0.496	0	1
<i>Income</i>	241	0.390	0	0.489	0	1
<i>Expenditure</i>	243	0.399	0	0.491	0	1
<i>Healthcare</i>	241	0.373	0	0.485	0	1
<i>Violence1</i>	237	0.574	1	0.496	0	1
<i>Violence2</i>	235	0.511	1	0.501	0	1
<i>Violence3</i>	223	0.767	1	0.424	0	1
<i>Violence4</i>	221	0.760	1	0.428	0	1
<i>Violence5</i>	216	0.847	1	0.361	0	1
<i>Violence6</i>	225	0.840	1	0.367	0	1
<i>Violence7</i>	233	0.824	1	0.382	0	1

Notes: *WGO-1* is the number of WGO membership, *WGO-2* is equal to 1 if WGO number is positive, *Satisfaction* is the degree of satisfaction with the WGO (1-very dissatisfied, 10 very satisfied), *Importance* is the degree of importance of being a member of a WGO, ranked from 1, extremely important, to 5, not at all important. *Involvement* is the degree of involvement with the WGO and is 0 for being involved as much as wanted and 1 if wish to be more involved. *Education* is the level of schooling, *House* and *Land* are house and land ownership, *Age* is respondent's age, *Children* is the respondent's number of children, and *Married* is the marriage status. *Income* is the decision-making over financial matters and is equal to 1 when the respondent makes the decisions herself over how to spend the money she earns. *Expenditure* is the decision making over major household purchases and is equal to 1 when the

respondent makes the decisions herself. *Healthcare* the decision-making over important healthcare decisions of the respondent and is equal to 1 when the respondent makes the decisions herself. *Violence* is responses to accepting violence from a domestic partner and is equal to 1 if violence is not justified, and 0 if justified. Is a husband justified in hitting or beating his wife in the following situations: If she goes out without telling him (*Violence-1*); If she neglects the children (*Violence-2*); If she argues with him (*Violence-3*); If she refuses to have sex with him (*Violence-4*); If she refuses to have sex with him unless he uses a condom (*Violence-5*); If she refuses to have sex with him without another form of birth control or sexually transmitted infection prevention (*Violence-6*); If she burns the food (*Violence-7*).

Table 3: Summary Statistics-Dependent Variables

	N	mean	p50	sd	min	max
<i>Attendance</i>	121	0.793	1	0.407	0	1
<i>Invite</i>	238	4.576	5	1.087	1	5
<i>Leader</i>	231	4.394	5	1.007	1	5
<i>Attend-1</i>	237	4.397	5	1.055	1	5
<i>Attend-2</i>	229	4.437	5	0.992	1	5
<i>Attend-3</i>	235	3.991	5	1.352	1	5
<i>Organize</i>	229	3.550	4	1.658	1	5
<i>Lecture</i>	231	3.571	4	1.613	1	5
<i>Speak</i>	231	4.420	5	1.084	1	5
<i>Info</i>	231	3.338	4	1.633	1	5
<i>Correct-1</i>	234	4.363	5	1.229	1	5
<i>Correct-2</i>	226	4.535	5	1.025	1	5
<i>Engage</i>	230	2.339	1	1.697	1	5
<i>Encourage</i>	227	3.454	4	1.745	1	5
<i>Change-1</i>	228	3.610	4	1.604	1	5
<i>Change-2</i>	226	3.827	5	1.561	1	5
<i>Wear</i>	225	3.467	5	1.755	1	5
<i>Track</i>	232	3.655	4	1.593	1	5
<i>Participate</i>	231	3.892	5	1.495	1	5
<i>Activism</i>	230	2.443	1	1.709	1	5
<i>Opportunity</i>	240	6.133	7	1.610	1	7
<i>Respect</i>	240	6.129	7	1.524	1	7
<i>Candidate</i>	242	6.306	7	1.393	1	7
<i>Child</i>	243	6.280	7	1.539	1	7
<i>Girl-Educ</i>	243	6.778	7	0.755	1	7
<i>Community</i>	242	6.360	7	1.338	1	7

Notes: *Attendance* is the willingness to attend school. In a scale of 1 (extremely unlikely) to 5 (extremely likely), how likely are you to do the following in the future with respect to WGO: Invite a friend to attend a meeting of a grassroots organization or event (*Invite*); volunteer to serve as a leader in a grassroots organization (*Leader*); attend an informational meeting on government policy about women's development (*Attend-1*); attend an informational meeting on government policy about peacebuilding efforts in the region (*Attend-2*); Attend an informational meeting of a political group

(*Attend-3*); organize a political event (e.g., talk, support group, march) (*Organize*); give a lecture or talk about a social or political issue (*Lecture*); speak about your own experiences with conflict at a public event (*Speak*); go out of your way to collect information on a social or political issue (*Info*); correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about women in Northern Uganda (*Correct-1*); correct another person if they make an incorrect statement about those formerly abducted during the war (*Correct-2*); engage in a political activity in which you suspect there would be a confrontation with the police or possible arrest (*Engage*); Encourage a friend to join a political organization (*Encourage*); try to change a friend's or acquaintance's mind about a social or political issue (*Change-1*); try to change a relative's mind about a social or political issue (*Change-2*); wear a t-shirt or button with a political message (*Wear*); keep track of the views of government officials regarding an issue important to you (*Track*); participate in discussion groups on issues or solutions of a particular social or political group (*Participate*); engage in any political activity in which you fear for your personal safety (*Activism*). Do you strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7): a woman should have the same job opportunities as a man (*Opportunity*); Men should respect women more than they currently do; women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for government office (*Candidate*); women should be involved in deciding how many children a family has (*Child*); girls' education should be as important as boys' education (*GirlEduc*); women should have more ways to be involved in community decision making (*Community*).

Table 4: Effect of WGO Membership on Income Decisions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	WGO-1	WGO-2	Satisfaction	Importance	Involvement
<i>WGO</i>	0.827 (0.112)	0.394** (0.176)	0.923* (0.045)	1.050 (0.227)	0.903 (0.282)
<i>Education</i>	1.251** (0.134)	1.200* (0.133)	1.263** (0.141)	1.255** (0.137)	1.241** (0.132)
<i>House</i>	0.509* (0.180)	0.496** (0.177)	0.458** (0.172)	0.461** (0.166)	0.429** (0.155)
<i>Land</i>	0.654 (0.220)	0.629 (0.211)	0.651 (0.226)	0.659 (0.222)	0.674 (0.229)
<i>lnAge</i>	11.178*** (6.570)	11.247*** (6.401)	8.866*** (4.849)	8.325*** (4.628)	9.001*** (5.010)
<i>lnChildren</i>	0.997 (0.280)	1.014 (0.287)	0.999 (0.275)	1.009 (0.285)	1.045 (0.294)
<i>Married</i>	0.277*** (0.104)	0.276*** (0.103)	0.266*** (0.099)	0.291*** (0.107)	0.293*** (0.110)
<i>Constant</i>	0.000*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.001)	0.001*** (0.001)	0.000*** (0.001)	0.000*** (0.001)
Survey FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	227	227	217	224	221

Notes: The dependent variable is the decision over financial matters and is equal to 1 when the respondent makes the decisions herself over how to spend the money she earns. *WGO* refers to the following: (1) the number of WGO membership, (2) equals 1 if WGO number is positive, (3) *Satisfaction* is the degree of satisfaction with the WGO, (4) *Importance* is the degree of importance of being a member of a WGO, ranked from 1, extremely important, to 5, not at all important; (5) *Involvement* is the degree of involvement with the WGO and is 0 for being involved as much as wanted and 1 if wish to be more involved. *Education* is the level of schooling, *House* and *Land* are house and land ownership, *Age* is respondent's age, *Children* is the respondent's number of children, and *Married* is the marriage status. *Obs* is number of observations, *Survey FE* is survey fixed effects. Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels.

Table 5: Effect of WGO Membership on Expenditure Decisions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	WGO-1	WGO-2	Satisfaction	Importance	Involvement
<i>WGO</i>	1.014 (0.140)	0.561 (0.227)	0.914* (0.045)	0.752 (0.184)	1.225 (0.391)
<i>Education</i>	1.135 (0.126)	1.106 (0.125)	1.167 (0.124)	1.150 (0.128)	1.150 (0.128)
<i>House</i>	0.335*** (0.114)	0.336*** (0.114)	0.315*** (0.110)	0.370*** (0.130)	0.370*** (0.130)
<i>Land</i>	0.534* (0.188)	0.523* (0.184)	0.519* (0.185)	0.497* (0.177)	0.497* (0.177)
<i>lnAge</i>	8.088*** (5.156)	9.794*** (6.263)	6.581*** (4.071)	9.121*** (5.624)	9.121*** (5.624)
<i>lnChildren</i>	1.509 (0.419)	1.544 (0.434)	1.535 (0.417)	1.452 (0.401)	1.452 (0.401)
<i>Married</i>	0.271*** (0.109)	0.262*** (0.107)	0.281*** (0.113)	0.276*** (0.110)	0.276*** (0.110)
<i>Constant</i>	0.000*** (0.001)	0.000*** (0.001)	0.001*** (0.002)	0.001*** (0.002)	0.000*** (0.000)
Survey FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	227	227	217	224	221

Notes: The dependent variable is the decision over major household purchases and is equal to 1 when the respondent makes the decisions herself. Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels. For variable definitions refer to Tables 3 and 4.

Table 6: Effect of WGO Membership on Healthcare Decisions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	WGO-1	WGO-2	Satisfaction	Importance	Involvement
<i>WGO</i>	0.870 (0.112)	0.380** (0.171)	0.905** (0.044)	1.100 (0.235)	1.386 (0.429)
<i>Education</i>	1.146 (0.128)	1.098 (0.130)	1.139 (0.129)	1.123 (0.124)	1.123 (0.124)
<i>House</i>	0.636 (0.226)	0.621 (0.221)	0.625 (0.222)	0.635 (0.228)	0.635 (0.228)
<i>Land</i>	0.255*** (0.089)	0.238*** (0.083)	0.254*** (0.088)	0.240*** (0.085)	0.240*** (0.085)
<i>lnAge</i>	5.275*** (3.250)	5.773*** (3.542)	4.385** (2.602)	4.433** (2.661)	4.433** (2.661)
<i>lnChildren</i>	1.161 (0.362)	1.205 (0.375)	1.154 (0.349)	1.118 (0.347)	1.118 (0.347)
<i>Married</i>	0.516* (0.189)	0.508* (0.189)	0.531* (0.195)	0.551 (0.203)	0.551 (0.203)
<i>Constant</i>	0.004*** (0.008)	0.006*** (0.012)	0.007*** (0.013)	0.004*** (0.009)	0.008** (0.016)
Survey FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	229	229	218	226	223

Notes: Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels. For variable definitions refer to Tables 3 and

4.

Table 7: Effect of WGO Membership on Attitudes towards Violence

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	WGO-1	WGO-2	Satisfaction	Importance	Involvement
<i>Violence 1</i>					
<i>WGO</i>	1.095 (0.139)	0.775 (0.328)	1.015 (0.050)	0.746 (0.171)	0.931 (0.283)
<i>Violence 2</i>					
<i>WGO</i>	1.254* (0.153)	2.829** (1.322)	0.995 (0.045)	0.850 (0.099)	0.747 (0.221)
<i>Married</i>	2.446** (0.873)	2.395** (0.846)	2.096** (0.741)	2.438** (0.874)	2.385** (0.851)
<i>Violence 3</i>					
<i>WGO</i>	0.866 (0.120)	0.333 (0.258)	0.955 (0.060)	0.632 (0.199)	0.287*** (0.126)
<i>Education</i>	1.578*** (0.277)	1.514** (0.273)	1.475** (0.249)	1.577** (0.280)	1.528** (0.261)
<i>InAge</i>	0.139*** (0.096)	0.137*** (0.090)	0.080*** (0.054)	0.137*** (0.089)	0.105*** (0.077)
<i>Violence 4</i>					
<i>WGO</i>	1.008 (0.154)	0.548 (0.340)	0.930 (0.058)	0.994 (0.281)	1.174 (0.449)
<i>Education</i>	2.226*** (0.567)	2.182*** (0.556)	1.988*** (0.458)	2.218*** (0.562)	2.217*** (0.556)
<i>InAge</i>	0.088*** (0.067)	0.097*** (0.069)	0.077*** (0.056)	0.093*** (0.068)	0.090*** (0.063)
<i>Married</i>	2.219* (0.997)	2.133* (0.938)	2.565** (1.209)	2.264* (1.000)	2.123* (0.943)
<i>Violence 5</i>					
<i>WGO</i>	0.904 (0.166)	0.596 (0.391)	0.935 (0.061)	0.408* (1.195)	1.066 (0.431)
<i>Violence 6</i>					
<i>WGO</i>	1.008 (0.179)	0.682 (0.428)	0.927 (0.064)	0.790 (0.238)	0.491* (0.211)
<i>Violence 7</i>					
<i>WGO</i>	1.146 (0.225)	0.887 (0.545)	0.879* (0.060)	0.857 (0.299)	0.603 (0.264)
<i>Education</i>	2.194*** (0.516)	2.176*** (0.505)	2.048*** (0.426)	2.183*** (0.501)	2.293*** (0.572)

Notes: “In your opinion, is a husband justified in hitting or beating his wife in the following situations:

“If she goes out without telling him (Violence 1); If she neglects the children (Violence 2); If she argues with him (Violence 3); If she refuses to have sex with him (Violence 4); If she refuses to have sex with him unless he uses a condom? (Violence 5); If she refuses to have sex with him without

another form of birth control or sexually transmitted infection prevention (Violence 6); If she burns the food (Violence 7). If justified, 0, not justified, 1. Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels. For variable definitions refer to Tables 3 and 4.

Table 8: Effect of WGO Membership on Capabilities and Functionings: Attending school

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	WGO-1	WGO-2	Satisfaction	Importance	Involvement
<i>WGO</i>	1.300 (0.404)	1.092 (0.968)	1.048 (0.089)	1.580 (0.806)	0.410 (0.259)
<i>Education</i>	1.223 (0.251)	1.183 (0.240)	1.239 (0.270)	1.169 (0.232)	1.216 (0.276)
<i>House</i>	0.870 (0.787)	0.927 (0.866)	0.891 (0.843)	0.961 (0.896)	0.726 (0.686)
<i>Land</i>	0.831 (0.877)	0.914 (0.953)	0.863 (0.911)	0.994 (1.075)	0.679 (0.775)
<i>lnAge</i>	0.026** (0.039)	0.041*** (0.048)	0.044*** (0.045)	0.032*** (0.038)	0.042*** (0.051)
<i>lnChildren</i>	1.334 (0.490)	1.320 (0.486)	1.299 (0.493)	1.282 (0.475)	1.324 (0.489)
<i>Married</i>	1.161 (0.802)	0.977 (0.625)	1.018 (0.652)	1.020 (0.637)	1.112 (0.727)
Survey FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	113	113	107	112	110

Notes: Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels. For variable definitions refer to Tables 3 and 4.

Table 9a: WGO Membership and Political and Civic Participation

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Invite	Leader	Attend-1	Attend-2	Attend-3	Organize	Lecture	Speak	Info
<i>WGO</i>	1.158 (0.185)	1.309* (0.191)	0.945 (0.124)	1.196 (0.184)	1.036 (0.136)	0.884 (0.115)	1.133 (0.145)	0.837 (0.115)	1.188 (0.139)
<i>Education</i>	0.819 (0.113)	1.233* (0.155)	0.961 (0.086)	1.057 (0.108)	0.956 (0.093)	0.861 (0.081)	0.930 (0.084)	0.909 (0.117)	1.154 (0.101)
<i>House</i>	0.472 (0.222)	0.659 (0.246)	0.675 (0.242)	0.769 (0.273)	0.338*** (0.126)	0.515* (0.183)	0.454** (0.155)	0.709 (0.260)	0.341*** (0.125)
<i>Land</i>	1.095 (0.411)	2.070** (0.717)	0.964 (0.295)	2.377*** (0.781)	1.031 (0.343)	1.102 (0.318)	0.837 (0.244)	1.570 (0.531)	1.336 (0.417)
<i>lnAge</i>	0.806 (0.647)	1.017 (0.584)	1.320 (0.735)	0.900 (0.537)	1.016 (0.575)	0.675 (0.413)	1.115 (0.582)	1.678 (0.878)	1.617 (0.835)
<i>lnChildren</i>	0.630 (0.285)	0.730 (0.196)	0.637 (0.183)	0.913 (0.281)	1.130 (0.315)	1.029 (0.344)	1.048 (0.284)	0.799 (0.215)	1.112 (0.286)
<i>Married</i>	2.994** (1.381)	2.338** (0.907)	1.169 (0.398)	0.691 (0.239)	2.020** (0.685)	1.309 (0.418)	1.371 (0.436)	1.010 (0.363)	1.213 (0.406)
Obs	224	217	222	215	221	216	218	216	217
Survey FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Ordered logit results. Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels. For variable definitions refer to Tables 3 and 4.

Table 9b: WGO Membership and Political and Civic Participation (continued)

	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
	Correct-1	Correct-2	Engage	Encourage	Change-1	Change-2	Wear	Track	Participate	Activism
<i>WGO</i>	2.067*** (0.379)	1.272 (0.216)	1.059 (0.142)	0.951 (0.117)	0.926 (0.123)	1.035 (0.139)	0.937 (0.133)	1.108 (0.128)	1.055 (0.129)	1.206 (0.151)
<i>Education</i>	1.218* (0.144)	1.113 (0.160)	1.085 (0.131)	0.944 (0.087)	0.994 (0.096)	0.980 (0.103)	0.936 (0.112)	0.954 (0.067)	0.850** (0.063)	1.018 (0.088)
<i>House</i>	1.003 (0.369)	0.308*** (0.122)	1.066 (0.359)	0.452** (0.155)	0.533* (0.189)	1.022 (0.339)	0.508* (0.191)	0.419*** (0.137)	0.750 (0.263)	0.306*** (0.112)
<i>Land</i>	1.313 (0.474)	1.870 (0.715)	0.611 (0.190)	0.895 (0.274)	0.685 (0.186)	0.980 (0.280)	0.920 (0.291)	1.086 (0.332)	1.026 (0.291)	1.143 (0.375)
<i>lnAge</i>	3.793* (2.696)	5.359* (4.897)	1.423 (0.799)	0.871 (0.443)	1.252 (0.705)	2.099 (1.141)	0.899 (0.529)	1.127 (0.541)	1.416 (0.783)	0.936 (0.458)
<i>lnChildren</i>	0.876 (0.297)	0.953 (0.323)	1.049 (0.315)	1.003 (0.217)	1.254 (0.352)	0.834 (0.208)	0.904 (0.263)	0.774 (0.180)	0.731 (0.178)	1.135 (0.324)
<i>Married</i>	0.571 (0.244)	0.638 (0.316)	1.441 (0.505)	1.748 (0.610)	2.049** (0.739)	1.645 (0.541)	1.317 (0.474)	1.488 (0.472)	1.122 (0.385)	1.486 (0.510)
Survey FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	219	215	216	213	215	213	212	219	218	217

Notes: Ordered logit results. Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels. For variable definitions refer to Table 3.

Table 10: WGO Membership and Leadership

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Opportunity	Respect	Candidate	Children	Girl- Education	Community
<i>WGO</i>	1.166 (0.134)	1.248* (0.155)	1.036 (0.127)	0.818 (0.111)	1.061 (0.202)	0.935 (0.135)
<i>Education</i>	1.291** (0.159)	1.035 (0.105)	1.158 (0.149)	1.188 (0.144)	1.162 (0.206)	1.200 (0.187)
<i>House</i>	0.931 (0.356)	1.461 (0.493)	0.866 (0.324)	2.974*** (1.151)	0.578 (0.314)	2.555** (1.024)
<i>Land</i>	1.039 (0.370)	1.149 (0.382)	1.455 (0.511)	1.264 (0.506)	2.758** (1.426)	0.657 (0.280)
<i>lnAge</i>	0.391 (0.239)	0.308* (0.199)	0.320* (0.187)	0.651 (0.431)	0.815 (0.649)	0.778 (0.479)
<i>lnChildren</i>	0.804 (0.211)	1.031 (0.362)	1.019 (0.280)	0.975 (0.296)	1.132 (0.398)	0.876 (0.260)
<i>Married</i>	1.761 (0.713)	1.091 (0.417)	1.192 (0.415)	0.613 (0.256)	0.927 (0.520)	1.109 (0.391)
Survey FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs	227	226	229	229	229	228

Notes: Ordered logit results. Robust standard errors are in parenthesis and are clustered by the survey number. *, **, and *** refer to significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels. For variable definitions refer to Table 3.