

FACULTY OF NATURAL RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMICS

FACTORS AFFECTING THE ADOPTION OF CLIMATE CHANGE  
MITIGATION STRATEGIES

A CASE OF BRIQUETTE TECHNOLOGY IN MUBENDE DISTRICT



MABIRIIZI JULIUS

REG NO: BU/GS14/MCC/06

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DIRECTORATE OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
AND RESEARCH INNOVATIONS IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF A MASTER OF SCIENCE IN  
CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT OF BUSITEMA  
UNIVERSITY

SEPTEMBER 2018

**DECLARATION**

I, Mabiriizi Julius, declare that the dissertation hereby submitted to Busitema University for the award of a degree of Master of Science in Climate Change and Disaster Management has not been previously submitted to this University or any other Higher Institution of Learning for any Degree award.



**MABIRIIZI JULIUS**

Candidate

Date: 27/09/2018.



**APPROVAL**

This research was conducted under the guidance and supervision of:

Signature: ..........

Date ..........

**ISABIRYE MOSES, PhD**

### **DEDICATION**

I would like to dedicate this work to the Almighty God, and to my beloved family members, Rose Akwaro, my daughter Shammer, Justine Nambwere, John-Mary Male and Immaculate Nantumbwe.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Firstly I would like to thank the almighty God who has enabled me go all this far, in the hard times that seemed fierce characterized by signs of impossibilities for one to accomplish and overcome, you offered me zeal, determination and courage to face them. I glorify you lord.

I also acknowledge the efforts of my supervisors, Dr. Isabirye Moses (Busitema University) and Mr. Kakungulu Moses (Busitema University), for sacrificing and taking off your tightly busy schedule in order to offer to me the much needed technical support, guidance and direction. I appreciate your professionalism and exhibition of true workmanship.

I also thank the Madhivani foundation for the great financial and moral support facilitating me in the struggle to acquire the wealth of knowledge that will finally extract the source and form the bedrock of my profession career and indeed enlighten my future.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION.....	i
APPROVAL.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	x
ABSTRACT.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	3
1.3 Overall objective.....	4
1.4 Specific objectives.....	4
1.5 Research questions.....	5
1.6 Justification of the study.....	5
1.7 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.8 Conceptual framework.....	7
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
2.1 Innovation and Diffusion Theory.....	9
2.1.1 Innovation.....	9
2.1.2 Adoption.....	10
2.1.2.1 Adoption Categorisation.....	10
2.2 Theory of planned behavior.....	12
2.3 History of briquetting.....	13
2.4 Factors influencing adoption of improved charcoal production technologies.....	13
2.4.1 Socio- economic characteristics of households influencing adoption of innovations.....	14
2.4.2 Institutional factors that influence adoption of new technologies.....	16
2.4.3 Environmental factors.....	17

2.4.4	Technological factors .....	18
2.5	Summary of literature review and knowledge gaps.....	18
CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS .....		20
3.1	Introduction.....	20
3.2	Description of the study area .....	20
3.3	Research design .....	22
3.4	Data types and collection methods.....	23
3.4.1	Sampling .....	23
3.4.2	Data collection tools .....	23
3.5	Data analysis.....	24
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS .....		26
4.0	Introduction.....	26
4.1	Social Economic and Demographic Characteristics.....	26
4.1.1	Gender.....	27
4.1.4	Membership to associations.....	28
4.1.6	Marital status .....	29
4.1.7	Household source of Income .....	30
4.1.8	Social Economic Characteristic.....	31
4.2	Households' Perception and Constraints Faced .....	32
4.2.1	Perception .....	32
4.2.2	Criteria for Choosing Technology .....	34
4.2.3	Level of Acceptance .....	35
4.2.3	Challenges to Briquettes Consumers.....	36
4.2.4	Challenges to Briquette Producers.....	37
4.3	Institutional Roles and Effectiveness in Adoption of Briquettes.....	38
4.3.1	Briquettes promotion .....	38
4.3.2	Source of Information about Briquettes .....	38
4.3.4	Nature of support .....	40
4.3.5	Level of awareness about laws, policies and regulation.....	41
4.4	Logit model results .....	42
4.4.1	Gender.....	42

4.4.2 Credit facility.....	43
4.4.3 Income level.....	43
4.4.4 Household size.....	44
4.4.5 Land size.....	44
4.4.6 Age.....	45
4.4.7 Marital status.....	45
4.4.8 Education level.....	45
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	47
5.1 Introduction.....	47
5.2 Summary of the study results.....	47
5.3 Conclusion.....	48
5.4 Recommendations.....	49
REFERENCES.....	51
APPENDICES.....	55
Appendix I: House-Hold Questionnaire.....	55
Appendix II: House-Hold Questionnaire for Producer.....	59
Appendix III: KEY INFORMANTS INTERVIEW CHECKLIST.....	61
Appendix IV: Photos.....	62



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Socio-economic characteristics.....	26
Table 4.2: other social economic characteristic.....	31
Table 4.3: Logistic regression results.....	42

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework.....	8
Figure 2.1: Adoption categorisation .....	10
Figure 2.2: Theory of planned behavior .....	12
Figure 3.1: Map of Mubende district.....	22
Figure 4.1: Marital status of respondents .....	29
Figure 4.2: Source of house-hold Income.....	30
Figure 4.3: Household perception .....	33
Figure 4.4: criteria for choosing the cooking technology.....	34
Figure 4.5: Level of acceptance of briquettes.....	35
Figure 4.6: Limitation of briquettes to consumers.....	37
Figure 4.7: Challenges to briquettes producers .....	37
Figure 4.8: Awareness of briquette promotion .....	38
Figure 4.9: Source of information about briquettes.....	39
Figure 4.10: Perception about level of support.....	40
Figure 4.11: Nature of support given by institutions .....	41
Figure 4.12: Respondents' awareness about energy biomass energy laws, policies and regulation .....	41

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

CBO's	Community Based Organisations
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GIS	Geographic Information system
GOU	Government of Uganda
IEA	International Energy Agency
MEMD	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development
MJ	Mega joules
NEDS	National Energy Demand Strategy
NGO's	Non- Governmental Organizations
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UNHS	United Nations Health Strategy
USA	United States of America

## ABSTRACT

Briquettes and other improved biomass energy technologies were introduced in Uganda and in the cattle corridor as an alternative energy source following a rapidly increasing energy demand and reducing wood fuel. Despite the widespread campaigns, the adoption of briquettes remains very low, therefore, this study aimed at identifying the factors influencing adoption of briquette technology. The study was conducted in Mubende district and employed both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis tools. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse variables between adopters and non-adopters. A logistic regression was employed to determine their effect on adoption of briquettes.

The logistic regression analysis indicated that household income level, household size, age of household head, marital status, and education level, access to credit and membership to association significantly affected the adoption of briquette technology. Household adoption was further influenced by availability, affordability and ease of use of the technology. The low levels of adoption were due to limited supply of briquettes on market, unavailability of briquette stoves and limited lighting of briquettes for consumers and limited output of machines, limited supply of raw materials and limited supply of machinery on local market as well as unavailability of credit facilities for producers.

The study recommended that there is need to sensitise and mobilize masses on briquettes and intensifying training of households with focus on social-cultural practices and engaging women. In addition a public private partnership should be established to enhance the adoption briquettes. Furthermore carbonate char to reduce on smoke production, and improve on the lighting of briquettes. Producers should be encouraged to form cooperatives so as to increase on their supply on market and also bargain for better prices of briquettes and also accelerate their chances accessing financial support. And lastly the Ministry of Energy and Mineral development and the Parliament should improve policy environment in favor of improved biomass energy technologies especially through setting appropriate implementation strategies and coordination of the associated programmes.

**Keywords:** Biomass energy, Adoption, Briquettes, Cattle corridor, Uganda

---

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

Nearly half of the global population relies on solid fuel, such as biomass, coal, or dung, for their cooking needs (Legros *et al.*, 2009; Rehfuess *et al.*, 2006). Unprocessed biomass (like charcoal, wood, crop waste) remains a major household fuel source for most residents of low income countries particularly the poor (Bruce *et al.*, 2000). In sub-Saharan Africa, wood-based fuels account for over 80% of primary energy supply and more than 90% of the population rely on firewood and charcoal (IEA, 2006).

According to the Uganda Demographic Health Survey (2006), most households use solid fuels for cooking such as charcoal, wood and other biomass fuels. During the Uganda National Household Survey for 2009/10, information on the type of fuel that a household most often used for cooking was collected in which majority of the households (95%) still used wood fuels (wood and charcoal) as a main source of energy for cooking. Firewood was most commonly used by the rural household (86%) while charcoal is commonly used by urban households (70%). It is worth noting that the proportions of households that used electricity for cooking was still very low. Studies indicate that even those with access to electricity the capacity to use and to pay for it is limited (MEMD, 2006 & UBOS, 2010). Recent studies in Uganda revealed that biomass energy accounts for 94% of the total energy consumption in the country (MEMD, 2014).

Large volumes of biomass residues are generated annually in developing countries as by-products of the commercial forestry, agricultural and industrial sectors (Njenga *et al.*, 2009). These residues are often considered waste products and are either burned without heat recovery or left to rot in situ, subsequently emitting greenhouse gasses (GHG) and causing other environmental problems. Estimates from Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) indicate that as much as 1000 million tons (Mt) and 140 Mt are generated annually from the forestry and agricultural sectors, respectively (Dasappa, 2011). Most of these residues are usable as fuel, directly or indirectly, and salvaging them for this purpose prevents unnecessary burning, burying or storage. Direct use of biomass for fuel is justifiable when the source of waste is close to the point of energy production or use. As distances between sources and sites of end-use increase,

## REFERENCES

- Abadi-Ghadim, A. & Pannell, D., (1999). A conceptual framework of adoption of an Agricultural innovation. *Agricultural Economics*, 2(21), pp. 145-154.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior, in Kuhl, J and Beckmann, J. *Action - Control: From Cognition to Behavior* (11-39). Heidelberg Springer.
- Akinola, A., 1987. An application of Tobit Analysis to the adoption of tractor hiring services scheme in Nigeria. *Oxford Agrarian Studies*, Issue 16, pp. 70-82.
- Akinola, A. A. and Young, T.(1985). An Application of the Tobit Model in the Analysis of Agricultural Innovation Adoption Process: A study of Use of Cocoa Spraying Chemicals among Nigeria Cocoa Farmers. *Oxford Agrarian Studies* 14: 26-57.
- Alavalapati, J., Luchert, M. & Gill, D., (1995). Adoption of agro forestry Practices. *Agroforestry Systems*, 1(32), pp. 1-14.
- Amemiya, T.(1985). *Advanced Econometrics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Baidu-Forson, 1999. Adoption of soil and water conservation practices in the Sudan-Sahelian zone. Constraints and incentives. *Agricultural Economics*, 3(21), pp. 231-239
- Barnes, D. F., Openshaw, K., Smith, K. R., & van der Plas, R. (1994) What Makes People Cook with Improved Biomass Stoves? A Comparative International Review of Stove Programs. (World Bank Technical Paper) (p. 44). Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Bartz, Peter, K. & Janseen, W., (1999). Influence of Technology Characteristics on the Rate and Speed of Adoption. *Agricultural Economics*, 2(21), pp. 121-130
- Bruce, N, Perez-Padilla, R, Albalak, R., (2000) Indoor air pollution in developing countries: a major environmental and public health challenge. Bull World Health Organization.
- Budlender, D., (2008). The political and social economy of care. Contesting Gender and class inequalities Tanzania Report 2 Geneva. The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. [Online] Available at: <http://www.un.org/women> [Accessed 30 September 2014].
- Burton, M., Rigby, D. & Young, T.,(1999). Analysis of the determinants of adoption of organic horticultural techniques in the UK. *Agricultural Economics*, 1(50), pp. 47-63.
- Calliope, Arturo & Ausilio, 2011. Report on the main factors influencing biomass demand, s.l.: s.n.

Byakola T. and Mukheibir (2009). Energy Systems Vulnerability, Adaptation and Resilience Report for Uganda. Helio International.

Chidumayo EN, Gumbo D (2013). The environmental impacts of charcoal production in tropical ecosystems of the world: A synthesis. 2013; 17: 86–94.

Dasappa S. (2011). Potential of biomass energy for electricity generation in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy Sustain Dev* 2011; 15:203– 33.

Dutta, S., (1997). International Network on Gender and Sustainable energy. *Energia news issues* 4. [Online] Available at: <http://www.google.co.tz>

Energy Regulatory Commission, (2004). Sessional Paper NO. 4 on Energy, Nairobi: Ministry of Energy.

Eriksson S, Prior M. The briquetting of agricultural wastes for fuel. FAO Environment and Energy Paper, 11. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations; 1990

Fontana, M. & Natali, L., (2008). Gender patterns of time use in Tanzania. Public investment in infrastructure can help. Paper prepared for the IFPRI project on Evaluating the long-term impacts of gender focused policy interventions. [Online] Available at: <http://www.ids.ac.uk>

Gardner & G.C, Rauser, (2001). *Handbook of Agricultural Economics*. Elsevier:

GOU (2001). The National Biomass Energy Demand Strategy for Uganda 2001-2010.

Green fields Coal. What is the history of briquette production? [www.greenfieldscoal.com/faq3.php](http://www.greenfieldscoal.com/faq3.php) [Accessed April 19, 2017]

GTZ (2008). Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST) Lessons learned and recommendations for cooking energy interventions. Policy Brief, GTZ.

Gwalema, S., (2002). Levels and sources of poverty in Kibondo District Tanzania: The University of Innsbruck

Hatibu, N. et al., (1999). Soil and water conservation in semi arid areas of Tanzania. *National Policies and Local Practices.. Agricultural Sciences*, 2(2), pp. 151-169

Hiroki & M, Ashok. K., (2001). Net effects of education on technology adoption by US farmer. Ag Center, USA: Louisiana State University

IEA, World Energy Outlook, (2006). IEA/OECD, Paris, France, p. 596.

International Energy Agency, IEA (2013). World Energy Outlook 2013. Chapter 2 Extract: Modern Energy for All. Paris, France: International Energy Agency.

Kaliba, A., Featherstone, A. & Normare, D., (1997). A stall feeding Management for improved cattle in semi arid central Tanzania. *International Association of Agricultural Economics*, 23(17), pp. 133-146.

Kalineza, H., (1999). Factors influencing adoption of soil conservation technologies in Tanzania. A case study in Gairo. *Proceedings of FoA. Sokoine University of Agriculture.*

Kituyi Evans (2000), *Towards Sustainable Charcoal Production and Use: A Systems Approach* African Centre for Technology Studies, PO Box 45917, Nairobi, Kenya

Legros G, Havet, I, Bruce, N, Bonjour S., (2009). *The Energy Access Situation in Developing Countries: A Review Focusing on the Least Developed Countries and Sub-Saharan Africa.* New York: united Nations Development Program and World Health Organization.

Lewis, J. J., & Pattanayak, S. K. (2012). Who adopts improved fuels and cook stoves? A systematic review. *Brogan & Partners*, 120(5), 637–645.

Malgavkar PD, Panandiker PA. *Impediments to rural technology.* Bombay, Calcutta: Oxford and IBH Publishing; 1986.

MEMD (2006, 2014). *Ministry of energy and mineral development annual report; Government of Uganda (GOU), Kampala*

MEMD (2008). *Renewable Energy Investment Plan for Uganda (draft).* Ministry of Energy and Mineral development, Kampala.

Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (2014)

Nhembo (2003). *Assessment of the adoption rate of rain water harvesting technologies for crop production in Dodoma, Tanzania. A Dissertation for the award of MA (Rural Development), Morogoro: Sokoine University of Agriculture*

Njenga M, Karanja N, Prain G, Malii J, Munyao P, Gathuru K, *et al* (2009). *Community-based energy briquette production from urban organic waste at Kahawa Soweto informal settlement, Nairobi. Urban Harvest Working Paper Series, no. 5, Lima, Peru: International Potato Center; 2009.*

Owens, L. K., (2002) *Introduction to Survey Research Design. Seminar Research Series.* Available from: <http://www.srl.uic.edu>.

Pattanayak & Pfaff, (2009). *Behavior, environment, and health in developing countries: evaluation and valuation*



Plant, M., (2005). Unit 8 Study Guide: Researching Education for Sustainability. London: London South Bank University.

Rehfuess, E.A, Mehta, S., Pruss-Ustun, A., (2006). Assessing household solid fuel use: multiple implications for the millennium development goals. *Environment Health Perspective*.

Rogers (1971). *Diffusions of Innovations* 1<sup>st</sup> edition, New York, Free Press

Rogers (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. New York Free Press

Rogers, (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Free Press.

Sagar, A., & Kartha, S. (2007). Bio-energy and sustainable development. *Annual Review of Environment Resources*, 32(1), 131–167.

Saundry, P (2009). *Energy Profile for Uganda*. Energy Information Administration and Library of Congress. [http://www.eoearth.org/article/Energy\\_profile\\_of\\_Uganda](http://www.eoearth.org/article/Energy_profile_of_Uganda)

Sebyiga (2008). *Feasibility response to institutionalized land conservation approaches for improved agricultural productivity in Tanzania*. A thesis for award of Doctor of Philosophy Degree, Tanzania: The Open University of Tanzania

Shiferaw, B. & Holden, S., (1998). Resource Degradation and Adoption of land Conservation Technologies in the Ethiopian Highlands. *Agricultural Economics*, 3(18), pp. 233-247

Simon (2006). *Adoption of Rotational Woodlot Technology in Semi-arid areas of Tanzania Morogoro*. Tanzania: Sokoine University of Agriculture.

Tendler, (1993). *Tales of Dissemination in Small-farm Agriculture: Lessons for Institutional Builders*. *World Development*, Issue 21, pp. 1567-1582

UBOS (2010). *Statistical Abstract 2010*. Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), Kampala.

UBOS. *Uganda National Household Survey 2009/10: Socio-Economic Module*. Kampala: Uganda Bureau of Statistics; 2010. p. 122.

*Uganda Demographic Health Survey (2006)*.

Wawa, A., 1999. *The need for women participation in Environmental Management Programmes*, Dar-es Salaam, Tanzania: University of Dar-es Salaam

World Bank (2003). *Reaching the Rural Poor. A Renewed Strategy for Rural Development*, Washington D.C, USA: The World Bank.