



**EVALUATION OF ANIMAL WELFARE AND PRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE OF  
OXEN USED FOR DRAUGHT POWER IN NAGONGERA TOWN COUNCIL AND  
NAGONGERA SUB COUNTY, TORORO DISTRICT.**

**AWINO DOREEN**

**BU/UP/2020/2749**

**RESEARCH DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL  
PRODUCTION IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ANIMAL PRODUCTION AND  
MANAGEMENT OF BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY**

**FEBRUARY 2024**

## **DECLARATION.**

Awino Doreen, declare that this dissertation is my original compilation and that none of its section(s) is/are plagiarised. I further declare that this proposal has never been submitted to any university for the award of any degree.

**APPROVAL**

**APPROVAL**  
Student name: AWIHO DOREEM  
Signed: [Signature]  
Date 06<sup>th</sup> / 03 / 2024

This dissertation is submitted with the approval of the academic supervisor;

Etiang Patrick  
Lecturer  
Department of Animal Production and Management  
Faculty of Agriculture and Animal sciences  
Busitema University  
P.O. Box 230, Tororo, Uganda

Signature: [Signature] Date: 6/3/2024

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate my research report to my husband, my siblings and all my friends for their willing support towards the progress of my research.

Special thanks go to my supervisor, the examiners and the entire fraternity of Busitema University.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to take this great opportunity to thank the Almighty God for life, good health, guidance and the provision that he granted unto me throughout my research process.

I also take this opportunity to appreciate my academic supervisor for the guidance and constructive support that he rendered to me during my research.

My sincere appreciation goes to my siblings, my husband and all my friends for the spiritual, social, and economical support rendered to me in the due course of the research study may God bless you all.

## **ABSTRACT**

Draught animal power technology, also known as animal traction, is the use of domesticated animals, primarily horses, donkeys, and oxen, to provide power for various agricultural and transportation tasks. This study was purposed to identify the main welfare issues by assessing the animal welfare and productive performance of the draught power animals. Nagongera Town Council and Sub-county are among the lower local governments within Tororo district found in the Eastern region of the country. They lie along the Tororo – Busolwe highway which goes through to Butaleja district. A cross sectional study was conducted in October 2023 on randomly selected respondents (animal’s owners) from Nagongera town council and Nagongera sub county to evaluate technology, productivity and welfare issues associated with draught animal power use in Nagongera Town Council and Nagongera Sub County, Tororo District. The farmers are not aware of existence of hunger and thirst for their animals as evidenced by existence of mild supplementary feeds. In general there is mild exertion of pain, injury and diseases to the animals, and the farmers did not provide a comfortable environment to their animals. The study reveals the practices that violate animal welfare as; limited water points for animals, limited feeding points, no provision of supplementary feeds, not providing good palatable pastures, no ready access to fresh water, and kneeling at feeding points as evidence to overcrowding of animals. The average acreage of fallow land opened by each of the farmers was only 0.46 acres per animal per season. The average number of hours worked by each animal in each session is three hours. Farmers do not earn any extra income from their animals providing other services such as water fetching, carrying of heavy loads etc. to the community around

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Contents  |          |
| DECLARATION.....  | i        |
| APPROVAL .....  | ii       |
| DEDICATION.....   | iii      |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....  | iv       |
| ABSTRACT.....   | v        |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....   | vi       |
| List of tables.....   | ix       |
| <b>1.0 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....</b>  | <b>1</b> |
| <b>1.1. Background .....</b>  | <b>1</b> |
| <b>1.2 Problem statement .....</b>  | <b>2</b> |
| <b>1.3.0 Objectives of the Study .....</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <b>1.3.1 General objective.....</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <b>1.3.2 Specific Objectives .....</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <b>1.4. Research questions.....</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <b>1.5 Justification .....</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <b>1.6 Significance.....</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <b>1.7 Scope of the study.....</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <b>1.8. Conceptual Framework.....</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <b>CHAPTER TWO; LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>   | <b>6</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction.....   | 6        |
| 2.2 Freedom from pain, injury, and disease. ....  | 7        |
| 2.3 Freedom from discomfort. ....   | 8        |
| 2.4 Freedom to express normal behavior.....   | 9        |
| 2.5 Freedom from fear and distress.....   | 9        |
| 2.6 Uses and importance of draught power animal technology in agriculture in Uganda and its contribution to household food security in Uganda. .... | 9        |
| 2.7 Challenges faced by rural farmers who use draught power technology in Uganda and their copying strategies.....                                  | 9        |
| 2.9 Future of draught power technology in rural agriculture in Uganda and proposed interventions .....  | 11       |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 2.10 Definition of operational terms and concepts .....  | 11        |
| <b>CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY .....</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| 3.1 Description of Study Area .....  | 12        |
| 3.2 Study Design.....  | 12        |
| 3.3.0 Selection of Target Population.....  | 13        |
| 3.3.1 Selection of animals.....  | 13        |
| 3.3.2 Selection of individual farmers .....  | 13        |
| 3.3.3 Sample Size .....  | 13        |
| 3.3.4 Sampling Method.....   | 14        |
| 3.4 Determination of Animal Welfare .....  | 14        |
| 3.5 Data Collection .....  | 14        |
| 3.5.1 Surveys and Questionnaires .....   | 15        |
| 3.5.2 Key Informant Interviews .....   | 15        |
| 3.5.3 Observation .....  | 15        |
| 3.6 Data Analysis.....   | 16        |
| 3.6.1 Quantitative Data Analysis .....   | 16        |
| 3.6.2. Coding.....   | 16        |
| 3.6.3. Tabulation.....   | 17        |
| 3.7 Quality Assurance, Validity and Reliability .....  | 17        |
| 3.8 Ethical Consideration .....  | 17        |
| <b>CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS .....</b>   | <b>18</b> |
| 4.1 General characteristics of the respondents.....  | 18        |
| 4.2 Respondents' Occupation.....   | 18        |
| 4.3.0 Welfare status and productive performance of oxen used for draught power in Nagongera town council and Nagongera sub-county..... | 18        |
| <b>Specific Objective 1B; Freedom from discomfort.....</b>   | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Objective 1C; Freedom to express normal behaviour.....</b>  | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Specific Objective 1D. Freedom from fear and distress.....</b>  | <b>22</b> |
| 4.4 Objective Two: Practices that violate the welfare of draught animals.....  | 23        |
| 4.5 Objective Three: Contribution of draught power to acreage opened.....  | 24        |
| Sub-Objective Three A-a; Land opened for household production by individual farmers.....   | 25        |
| Sub-Objective Three A-b; Fresh grass Land opened for production by individual farmers.....   | 26        |
| Sub-Objective Three B; Income earned by hiring out oxen per season.....  | 27        |



|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>Sub-Objective Three C</b> .....   | 30 |
| <b>CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS</b> .....                                     | 32 |
| <b>CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....                            | 34 |
| <b>6.1. Conclusion on Objective one</b> .....  | 34 |
| <b>6.2. Conclusion on objective two</b> .....  | 34 |
| <b>6.3. Conclusion on objective three</b> .....                                      | 34 |
| <b>6.4 Recommendations of the study</b> .....  | 34 |
| <b>REFERENCES</b> .....  | 35 |
| <b>APPENDICES</b> .....  | 37 |
| <b>Appendix 1: Showing Work Plan</b> .....   | 37 |
| <b>Appendix 2: Showing project budget</b> .....                                      | 38 |
| <b>Appendix 3: Showing Questionnaire</b> .....                                       | 39 |
| <b>APPENDIX 4</b> .....  | 46 |
| Researcher testing the tool with the research assistants before data collection..... | 46 |
| Researcher sensitizing farmers.....  | 46 |
| Researcher interviewing the respondents.....   | 47 |
| Researcher observing the welfare of animals.....                                     | 47 |
| Researcher interviewing the farmer about the use of draught animals.....             | 48 |

## List of tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Table 11: Summary of income earned from the hire of oxen.</b> .....        | 27 |
| <b>Table 12: Summary of income earned from the hire of oxen.</b> .....        | 28 |
| <b>Table 13: Summary of income earned from the hire of oxen.</b> .....        | 29 |
| <b>Table 14: Summary of sessions worked by each animal in each day.</b> ..... | 30 |

## 1.0 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background

Draught animal power technology, also known as animal traction, is the use of domesticated animals, primarily horses, donkeys, and oxen, to provide power for various agricultural and transportation tasks (*Capdeville & Veissier, 2001*). This technology has been used for centuries and continues to be an important part of many rural economies around the world (*Mutiarahmi et al. 2021*). *Okello et al. (2015)* points out that draught animal were in common use in Mesopotamia before 3000 BC for farm work and for pulling wheeled carts. Despite the enormous technological upheavals of the 20th century, both in agriculture and in many other sectors of the global economy, animal draught power has remained important in many countries, even though is very old (*Lewejohann et al., 2020*). The recorded history of animal power in Africa started about 6-5000 BC in Egypt with the first drawings of oxen pulling plows occurring in the III Dynasty (*Chanie et al., 2012*). The earlier Egyptian plows were clearly illustrated in wall paintings and on papyrus, further evidence comes from intact plows that have been found in some tombs, and also from some detailed models of plowing teams as discussed by (*Candia & Saasa, 2004*)

According to Sciences, (2004), the use of draught power animals started as early as 1909 in the then Bukedi (Tororo) district east of the country and also colonial farmers and British authorities introduced ox plows for cotton production in the Teso district east of the country at the beginning of the twentieth century (*Of et al., (2011)*). The uptake was rapid, with a favorable combination of training centers, available animals and implements and a cash crop. Eventually, the British Ransome plow was considered to be the most suitable. The current situation of ox plough in Uganda according to a study by *Okello et al. (2015)* shows that the enterprise is labor saving, highly profitable with a yearly gross margin of 245 US dollars contributing about 8-9%.

Draught power animals depend mainly on grazing on communal lands which are extensive in nature where the lands can hardly provide the minimum nutrient requirements because they are degraded and overstocked. Draught animal power is regarded as a feasible means to improve the income and nutrition of rural communities as discussed by (*Candia & Saasa, 2004*). The draught animals have become very popular in recent years as a pathway out of poverty for people from communities in Tororo District, Uganda.

## REFERENCES

- Botreau, R., Veissier, I., & Butterworth, A. (2007). *Definition of criteria for overall assessment of animal welfare*. 225–228.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). Snowball Sampling Completion Irina-Maria Dragan, Alexandru Isaic-Maniu. *Journal of Studies in Social Science*, 5(2), 160–177.
- Breed, M. D., & Moore, J. (2021). Animal Behavior. *Animal Behavior*, August, 1–588.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-819558-1.00019-1>
- Candia, A., & Saasa, A. (2004). Constraints to utilization of draft animal power technology at farm level in Uganda. *Uganda Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 9, 564–568.
- Capdeville, J., & Veissier, I. (2001). A method of assessing welfare in loose housed dairy cows at farm level, Focusing on animal observations. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica A: Animal Sciences*, 51, 62–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/090647001316923081>
- Chanie, M., Fentahun, T., Mitiku, T., & Berhan, M. (2012). *Strategies for Improvement of Draft Animal Power Supply for Cultivation in Ethiopia : A Review Department of Basic Veterinary Sciences*, . 4(3), 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.ejbs.2012.4.3.6648>
- Erasmus, M. (2020). *Animal welfare and animal rights : Ethics , science and explanations*. 1–5.
- Knott, E., Rao, A. H., Summers, K., & Teeger, C. (2022). Interviews in the social sciences. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-022-00150-6>
- Lawrence, A. B., Vigors, B., & Sandøe, P. (2019). What is so positive about positive animal welfare?—A critical review of the literature. *Animals*, 9(10), 1–19.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9100783>
- Lewejohann, L., Schwabe, K., Häger, C., & Jirkof, P. (2020). Impulse for animal welfare outside the experiment. *Laboratory Animals*, 54(2), 150–158.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0023677219891754>
- Lija, S. (2023). *Significance of draught animals in India*. 12, 1095–1098.
- Makki, E. K. (2017). *Factors Affecting Draught Animal Technology Adoption in Rural Kordofan*. 5(5).
- Makki, E. K., Eltayeb, F. E., & Badri, O. A. (2017). Factors Affecting Draught Animal Technology Adoption in Rural Kordofan. *International Journal of Agriculture Innovations Research*, 5(5), 681.
- Manteca, X. (2012). *WHAT IS ANIMAL WELFARE ? JUNE*.

- Millar, K., & Morton, D. (2017). Animal Integrity in Modern Farming. *Ethics, Law and Society: Volume IV*, 4(January 2009), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315094328-3>
- Mota-rojas, D., Braghieri, A., Adolfo, Á., Serrapica, F., Cruz-monterrosa, R., Masucci, F., Moramedina, P., & Napolitano, F. (2021). *The Use of Draught Animals in Rural Labour*. 1–17.
- Mutiarahmi, C. N., Hartady, T., & Lesmana, R. (2021). Use of Mice As Experimental Animals in Laboratories That Refer To the Principles of Animal Welfare: a Literature Review. *Indonesia Medicus Veterinus*, 10(1), 134–145. <https://doi.org/10.19087/imv.2020.10.1.134>
- National Planning Authority. (2013). *TRANSFORMING SMALLHOLDER FARMING TO MODERN AGRICULTURE IN UGANDA; Policy Paper* . 24.
- Of, I., Nutrition, A., & Welfare, O. N. A. (2011). *Impact of animal nutrition on animal welfare – Experts Consultation 26–30 September 2011 – FAO* (Issue September).
- Office International des Epizooties [OIE]. (2021). Introduction To the Recommendations for Animal Welfare. *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*, 4.
- Okello, W. O., Muhanguzi, D., Macleod, E. T., Welburn, S. C., Waiswa, C., & Shaw, A. P. (2015). Contribution of draft cattle to rural livelihoods in a district of southeastern Uganda endemic for bovine parasitic diseases : an economic evaluation. *Parasites & Vectors*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-015-1191-9>
- Protection, W. A., Protection, W. A., & Nations, U. (2012). *Welfare of Working Animals Lecture Notes*. 1–23.
- Rai, N., & Thapa, B. (2019). A study on purposive sampling method in research. *Kathmandu:Kathmandu School of Law*, 1–12.
- UBOS-Statistical Abstract. (2020). UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS, 2020 Statistical Abstract. *Uganda Bureau of Statistics*, 1, 303.
- UBOS. (2014). Uganda national population and housing census report: Population growth rates - non-household population and sex composition of the population. *UBos*, 73.
- Welfare, A. (n.d.). *What is Animal*. 1–14.
- Welfare, P. A. (2023). *Behavioral Diversity as a Potential Indicator of Positive Animal Welfare*. 1, 1–17.