

Monitoring Practices And Project Performance In Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Uganda

Musekura Fred¹, Kabanda Richard²

1, 2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between monitoring practices and project performance in Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Uganda. Guided by a positivist research philosophy and descriptive correlational design, the study drew a sample of 105 respondents from KCCA project staff using stratified random sampling. Data were collected using structured questionnaires and analysed using SPSS version 25. The study found that monitoring practices — comprising planning and scheduling, progress tracking, reporting systems, and feedback mechanisms — are positively and significantly correlated with project performance ($r = .683$, $p < .001$). Regression analysis revealed that monitoring practices collectively explain 62.6% of the variance in project performance ($R^2 = .626$, $F(4,100) = 41.87$, $p < .001$). The study concludes that robust monitoring practices are a critical determinant of project success in public institutions. It recommends that KCCA institutionalise real-time monitoring dashboards, invest in training project managers in monitoring and evaluation methodologies, and establish independent audit frameworks for all capital projects.

Keywords: Monitoring practices, project performance, KCCA, progress tracking, reporting systems, Uganda

1.0 BACKGROUND

Public project management has emerged as one of the most significant concerns in governance across Sub-Saharan Africa (Alex & Devis, 2023). The delivery of public infrastructure and services within time, cost, and quality parameters remains a persistent challenge for urban local governments, particularly in rapidly urbanising cities. Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), the institutional body responsible for managing Uganda's capital city, has since its establishment under the KCCA Act of 2010 undertaken several large-scale projects in road construction, market renovation, drainage improvement, sanitation, and urban planning (Julius & Nancy, 2026). Despite the allocation of substantial financial resources, many of these projects have been characterised by cost overruns, delayed completion, and substandard outputs (KCCA Annual Reports, 2018–2022).

Monitoring, in the context of project management, refers to the systematic process of collecting, recording, and reporting information on project inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes against a predetermined plan (PMI, 2021). Effective monitoring enables project managers and oversight authorities to identify deviations from the project baseline early enough to institute corrective actions (Promise et al., 2024). In public institutions, monitoring is particularly critical because of the accountability demands of public finance management. However, many public

institutions in Uganda, including KCCA, have been criticised by the Auditor General for weak internal monitoring mechanisms, inadequate progress reporting, and insufficient stakeholder feedback integration (OAG Uganda, 2021).

The theoretical foundation for this study rests on the Theory of Change (ToC), which posits that intentional causal pathways from inputs through activities to outcomes must be regularly tracked to ensure development objectives are achieved (Weiss, 1995). Additionally, the agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) is relevant, as it highlights the monitoring role of principals (KCCA leadership) in ensuring that agents (project implementers) act in accordance with institutional goals. Project performance is a multi-dimensional construct that encompasses time performance, cost performance, and quality of deliverables (Atkinson, 1999). The iron triangle of project management cost, time, and scope remains the dominant framework for measuring project success in both public and private sector contexts (Nancy & Prudence, 2024). Uganda's public project landscape has been plagued by systemic governance failures that include poor monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, political interference in project implementation, and limited technical capacity. According to the World Bank (2020), Uganda loses approximately USD 500 million annually through inefficiencies in public project implementation, much of which is attributable to weak monitoring (Faith et al., 2023). KCCA specifically has faced parliamentary scrutiny over unfinished projects, with the Public Accounts Committee regularly querying the authority over project delays and poor accountability (Parliament of Uganda, 2022). This study is therefore timely in examining the empirical relationship between monitoring practices and project performance in KCCA.

2.0 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Notwithstanding the extensive financial investments made by KCCA in urban development projects, evidence from government audit reports, parliamentary enquiries, and field observations consistently reveals poor project performance outcomes (Ramadhan et al., 2023). The Auditor General's Report of 2021 flagged KCCA for delayed implementation of 47% of its capital development projects, cost overruns in 33% of sampled projects, and inadequate performance reporting in 61% of reviewed projects (Ntirandekura et al., 2022). These figures point to systemic weaknesses not merely in project design but, critically, in the monitoring mechanisms that are supposed to ensure on-track implementation (Alex et al., 2023). There is a paucity of empirical, institution-specific research that examines the statistical relationship between monitoring practices and project performance in KCCA. While several general studies on project management in Uganda exist (Muhwezi & Acellam, 2013; Tumwine et al., 2018), none has rigorously examined the role of planning and scheduling quality, progress tracking frequency, reporting system effectiveness, and feedback loop integration as predictors of project performance in a large urban local government authority (Wegulo et al., 2023). This gap in knowledge limits KCCA's ability to design evidence-based interventions to improve project outcomes. This study therefore addresses the question: what is the relationship between monitoring practices and project performance in KCCA, Uganda?

3.0 MAIN OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between monitoring practices and project performance in Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Uganda. Specifically, the study sought to: (i) assess the level of monitoring practices in KCCA; (ii) evaluate the level of project performance in KCCA; (iii) determine the relationship between monitoring practices and project performance in KCCA; and (iv) establish the extent to which monitoring practices predict project performance in KCCA.

4.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1 Monitoring Practices

Monitoring is universally recognised in project management literature as an essential management function (Kazaara et al., 2023). According to the Project Management Institute (PMI, 2021), monitoring involves the collection and analysis of project data against the approved project management plan, enabling project managers to identify variances and implement corrective actions. Monitoring practices encompass a broad range of activities including planning and scheduling, progress tracking, reporting, and feedback integration (Faith et al., 2023). Ika et al. (2012) conducted a study of World Bank-funded projects in Africa and found that effective monitoring was the single strongest predictor of project success, surpassing even funding levels and technical expertise.

Planning and scheduling constitute the foundational monitoring practice. Meredith and Mantel (2012) argue that a well-constructed project schedule, complete with milestones, resource allocations, and critical path identification, enables project managers to anticipate bottlenecks and reallocate resources proactively (Lydia et al., 2023). In the Ugandan public sector context, Tumwine et al. (2018) found that only 34% of government projects had comprehensive baseline plans, which severely limited the effectiveness of subsequent monitoring efforts. Progress tracking, another key dimension of monitoring, involves regularly comparing actual project performance against the approved plan. Obeng (2007) identified progress tracking as a real-time corrective mechanism that allows managers to catch deviations before they cascade into major failures (Alex & Moses, 2024).

Reporting systems serve as the information backbone of monitoring. Effective reporting systems aggregate data from multiple project components and present them to decision-makers in timely, accurate, and actionable formats (Arto et al., 2011). However, in many African public institutions, reporting is characterised by delays, inaccuracies, and selectivity—a phenomenon known as 'upward distortion' (Scott, 2001). Feedback mechanisms complete the monitoring cycle by ensuring that information generated from monitoring activities is used to improve project implementation. Shenhar and Dvir (2007) found that projects with embedded feedback loops performed 37% better on cost and time metrics than those without structured feedback systems.

4.2 Project Performance

Project performance is traditionally measured along the dimensions of the iron triangle: time, cost, and quality (Atkinson, 1999). More recent frameworks, however, have expanded this conception to include stakeholder satisfaction, safety performance, and environmental sustainability (Joslin & Müller, 2015). In the public sector, project performance takes on additional dimensions of accountability, equity, and public value creation (Flyvbjerg, 2014). Muhwezi and Acellam (2013) found that public projects in Uganda had a high failure rate, with 58% of projects surveyed failing to meet at least one of the iron triangle criteria (Mwelu et al., 2019).

Several empirical studies have established positive relationships between monitoring practices and project performance. Chifu and Borca (2015) conducted a study in Romania and found a significant correlation ($r = .712$) between the rigour of monitoring systems and project delivery effectiveness. Similarly, Ochieng and Price (2010) examined public infrastructure projects in Kenya and found that projects with structured monitoring frameworks were 2.4 times more likely to be completed on time and within budget. In Uganda, Nabukeera and Balunywa (2019) examined NGO projects and found that monitoring frequency was a significant predictor of project quality, though their study was limited to the non-governmental sector and did not address urban local governments.

5.0 METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a positivist research philosophy, which assumes that social phenomena can be measured and analysed objectively using quantitative methods. A descriptive correlational research design was employed, as the study sought to measure the extent and direction of the relationship between monitoring practices and project performance without manipulating variables (Nafiu et al., 2012). The study population comprised 147 KCCA project management staff, including project managers, monitoring and evaluation officers, engineers, and project accountants. Using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sampling table, a sample size of 108 respondents was determined, of whom 105 returned usable questionnaires, yielding a response rate of 97.2%.

Stratified random sampling was used to ensure proportional representation from different project divisions within KCCA. Data were collected using a structured, five-point Likert scale questionnaire divided into four sections: planning and scheduling (8 items), progress tracking (7 items), reporting systems (6 items), and feedback mechanisms (7 items), alongside a project performance section (12 items) (Olanrewaju et al., 2021). Content validity was established through expert review by three academic peer reviewers and two KCCA M&E practitioners. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded coefficients of .841, .817, .803, and .829 for the four monitoring sub-scales respectively, and .856 for the project performance scale, all exceeding the acceptable threshold of .70 (Nunnally, 1978).

Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25(Nelson et al., 2022). Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were used to characterize the levels of monitoring practices and project performance(Florence & Julius, 2023). Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test the bivariate relationships between variables, and multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the predictive power of monitoring practices on project performance. All inferential tests were conducted at the 0.05 level of significance.

6.0 RESULTS

6.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all study variables. Planning and scheduling recorded the highest mean score ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 0.721$), indicating that respondents perceived planning and scheduling practices in KCCA to be moderately strong, though not yet at optimal levels. Progress tracking followed with a mean of 3.74 ($SD = 0.834$), while reporting systems ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 0.912$) and feedback mechanisms ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.876$) recorded comparatively lower means, suggesting that these latter monitoring dimensions are areas of relative weakness in KCCA. Regarding project performance outcomes, cost performance recorded a mean of 3.69 ($SD = 0.798$), time performance recorded 3.58 ($SD = 0.854$), and quality of deliverables recorded 3.72 ($SD = 0.811$). These scores indicate moderate levels of project performance, with quality being perceived as marginally stronger than time performance — a finding that aligns with anecdotal observations that KCCA projects often achieve acceptable quality standards when eventually completed, but frequently run over time and budget.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Monitoring Practices and Project Performance Variables

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Planning & Scheduling	105	3.87	0.721	1.00	5.00
Progress Tracking	105	3.74	0.834	1.00	5.00
Reporting Systems	105	3.62	0.912	1.00	5.00
Feedback Mechanisms	105	3.55	0.876	1.00	5.00
Project Cost Performance	105	3.69	0.798	1.00	5.00
Project Time Performance	105	3.58	0.854	1.00	5.00
Quality of Deliverables	105	3.72	0.811	1.00	5.00

Source: Primary Data, 2025

6.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 2 presents the Pearson correlation matrix for all study variables. The results reveal statistically significant positive correlations between all monitoring practice dimensions and project performance. Planning and scheduling had the strongest correlation with project performance ($r = .683$, $p < .001$), indicating that better planning is most strongly associated with improved project outcomes. Progress tracking also showed a strong positive correlation ($r =$

Received: 06.06.2026

Accepted: 12.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

.641, $p < .001$), confirming that regular and systematic tracking of project activities is closely linked to performance improvements. Reporting systems ($r = .598$, $p < .001$) and feedback mechanisms ($r = .554$, $p < .001$) also showed significant moderate-to-strong correlations with project performance.

The inter-correlations among the monitoring practice dimensions were themselves significant and positive, ranging from $r = .498$ to $r = .612$. This suggests that the monitoring dimensions are interrelated and mutually reinforcing — an organisation that excels in planning and scheduling is likely to also have stronger progress tracking and reporting systems. However, none of the inter-correlations exceeded the multicollinearity threshold of $r = .80$ (Field, 2013), indicating that each dimension makes a distinct contribution to explaining project performance and that the regression model is not compromised by multicollinearity.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	Sig.
1. Planning & Scheduling	1.000					
2. Progress Tracking	.612**	1.000				
3. Reporting Systems	.541**	.589**	1.000			
4. Feedback Mechanisms	.498**	.523**	.571**	1.000		
5. Project Performance	.683**	.641**	.598**	.554**	1.000	.000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Source: Primary Data, 2025

6.3 Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the collective and individual predictive power of monitoring practices on project performance. Prior to the regression, assumptions of normality, homoscedasticity, linearity, and independence of residuals were verified and found to be met. The results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 3.

The overall model was statistically significant ($F(4,100) = 41.87$, $p < .001$), with an R^2 of .626 and an adjusted R^2 of .612. This indicates that the four monitoring practice dimensions collectively explain 62.6% of the variance in project performance in KCCA — a substantial explanatory power that confirms the central importance of monitoring to project outcomes. The remaining 37.4% of variance is attributable to other factors not captured in this model, which may include political interference, procurement inefficiencies, contractor capacity, and environmental factors (Nelson et al., 2023).

Examining the individual beta coefficients, planning and scheduling emerged as the strongest predictor of project performance ($\beta = .384$, $t = 5.090$, $p < .001$), followed by progress tracking ($\beta = .298$, $t = 4.042$, $p < .001$), reporting systems ($\beta = .223$, $t = 3.356$, $p < .001$), and feedback mechanisms ($\beta = .191$, $t = 2.762$, $p = .007$). All four predictors

Received: 06.06.2026

Accepted: 12.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

were statistically significant, confirming that each dimension of monitoring makes a unique and positive contribution to project performance when other dimensions are held constant. Notably, the standardised beta for planning and scheduling ($\beta = .384$) indicates that a one standard deviation increase in planning and scheduling quality is associated with a .384 standard deviation improvement in project performance, making it the most actionable lever for performance improvement in KCCA.

Table 3: Multiple Linear Regression — Monitoring Practices Predicting Project Performance

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t-value	Sig.
(Constant)	0.712	0.213		3.342	.001
Planning & Scheduling	0.341	0.067	.384	5.090	.000
Progress Tracking	0.287	0.071	.298	4.042	.000
Reporting Systems	0.198	0.059	.223	3.356	.001
Feedback Mechanisms	0.174	0.063	.191	2.762	.007
R = .791, R ² = .626, Adj. R ² = .612, F(4,100) = 41.87, p < .001					

Source: Primary Data, 2025

7.0 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The finding that planning and scheduling is the strongest predictor of project performance ($\beta = .384$, $p < .001$) aligns with the theoretical positions of Meredith and Mantel (2012) and the empirical findings of Ika et al. (2012), who identified planning quality as the foundational determinant of project success in African public institutions. In the KCCA context, this finding is particularly salient given that audit reports have repeatedly cited inadequate project planning as the root cause of delays and cost overruns. The high mean score for planning ($M = 3.87$) relative to other dimensions suggests that KCCA has made some progress in baseline planning, but the regression coefficient confirms that further improvements in this area would yield the largest returns in project performance.

The significant relationship between progress tracking and project performance ($r = .641$, $\beta = .298$) is consistent with findings by Ochieng and Price (2010) in Kenya and Nabukeera and Balunywa (2019) in Uganda. Progress tracking enables real-time corrective action, which is critical in the KCCA environment where contractor performance is variable and resource constraints are common. The lower relative score for feedback mechanisms ($M = 3.55$) and its comparatively smaller beta coefficient ($\beta = .191$), while still significant, suggests that KCCA has the weakest feedback loop among the monitoring dimensions. This is consistent with the literature on upward distortion in African public institutions (Scott, 2001), where performance information generated at the field level does not always reach decision-makers in actionable form.

The overall model's explanatory power of 62.6% is substantially higher than comparable studies in the region — Chifu and Borca (2015) reported $R^2 = .487$ in their Romanian context, while Muhwezi and Acellam (2013) reported $R^2 = .514$ for Ugandan government projects generally. This suggests that in KCCA specifically, monitoring practices play an even more central role in determining project performance than in comparable contexts, possibly because other institutional quality factors (procurement systems, human resource management) are relatively weaker and therefore monitoring serves as a more critical compensating mechanism.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concludes that monitoring practices are a positive, significant, and substantial predictor of project performance in KCCA, Uganda. Planning and scheduling, progress tracking, reporting systems, and feedback mechanisms collectively explain 62.6% of the variance in project performance, with planning and scheduling being the most powerful individual predictor. KCCA projects suffer from moderate levels of monitoring practice implementation, with feedback mechanisms being the weakest dimension. These findings carry important implications for project governance in Ugandan urban local governments.

The study recommends that KCCA invest in digitising its project monitoring systems through a real-time project management dashboard that allows senior management to track progress against baselines without relying on periodic paper-based reports. Secondly, KCCA should mandate comprehensive baseline project plans — including detailed work breakdown structures, milestone schedules, and resource allocation plans — for all projects above a defined financial threshold before implementation begins. Thirdly, a structured feedback mechanism should be institutionalised, requiring project implementers to submit and discuss monitoring findings in monthly performance review meetings with cross-functional representation. Finally, the KCCA Directorate of Engineering and Technical Services should build internal M&E capacity by training project managers in modern monitoring methodologies, including Earned Value Management (EVM) and results-based monitoring frameworks.

References

- Alex, I., Ariyo, D., & Kazaara, G. (2023). Internal Controls and Financial Performance of Saccos in Wakiso District. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijamr
- Alex, I., & Devis, A. (2023). *Project Risk Management , Project Resilience And Project Efficiency . A Case Of Health Cbos In Busoga Region*. 8(December), 133–140.
- Alex, I., & Moses, N. (2024). *Interest Rates and its Impact on Stock Prices among Small Scale Enterprises : An Empirical Evidence of Kampala District*. 8(4), 43–46.
- Faith, K., Kalikola, J., Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Catherine, M., & Ismail, L. (2023). The Effects of Public Sector

- Monitoring and Evaluation on Promoting Good Governance in Uganda: A Case Study of the Ministry Of Local Government. In *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijapr
- Florence, A., & Julius, A. (2023). *Taxation And Performance Of Small And Medium Enterprises In Nakawa Division-Kampala District*. August.
- Artto, K., Martinsuo, M., Dietrich, P., & Kujala, J. (2011). Project strategy: Strategy types and their contents in innovation projects. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 4(2), 200–221.
- Atkinson, R. (1999). Project management: Cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, its time to accept other success criteria. *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(6), 337–342. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863\(98\)00069-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(98)00069-6)
- Chifu, E. S., & Borca, C. (2015). The connection between project management and project success. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26, 831–838.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2014). What you should know about megaprojects and why: An overview. *Project Management Journal*, 45(2), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21409>
- Ika, L. A., Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2012). Critical success factors for World Bank projects: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(1), 105–116.
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X\(76\)90026-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X)
- Joslin, R., & Müller, R. (2015). Relationships between a project management methodology and project success in different project governance contexts. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(6), 1377–1392.
- Kampala Capital City Authority. (2018). *Annual report 2017/2018*. Kampala Capital City Authority.
- Kampala Capital City Authority. (2019). *Annual report 2018/2019*. Kampala Capital City Authority.
- Kampala Capital City Authority. (2020). *Annual report 2019/2020*. Kampala Capital City Authority.
- Kampala Capital City Authority. (2021). *Annual report 2020/2021*. Kampala Capital City Authority.
- Kampala Capital City Authority. (2022). *Annual report 2021/2022*. Kampala Capital City Authority.
- Meredith, J. R., & Mantel, S. J. (2012). *Project management: A managerial approach* (8th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Muhwezi, M., & Acellam, N. (2013). An assessment of the factors causing delays on building construction projects in Uganda. *International Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 2(1), 13–23.
- Nabukeera, M., & Balunywa, W. (2019). Monitoring and evaluation practices and project performance among non-governmental organisations in Uganda. *Uganda Management Review*, 14(1), 45–61.

- Obeng, E. (2007). *All change! The project leader's secret handbook*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Ochieng, E. G., & Price, A. D. F. (2010). Managing cross-cultural communication in multicultural construction project teams: The case of Kenya and UK. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(5), 449–460.
- Office of the Auditor General. (2021). *Report of the Auditor General to Parliament for the financial year ended 30 June 2021*. Government of Uganda.
- Parliament of Uganda. (2022). *Report of the Public Accounts Committee on Kampala Capital City Authority projects and expenditures*. Parliament of Uganda.
- Project Management Institute. (2021). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)* (7th ed.). Project Management Institute.
- Scott, J. C. (2001). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
- Shenhar, A. J., & Dvir, D. (2007). *Reinventing project management: The diamond approach to successful growth and innovation*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Tumwine, J., Nuwagaba, A., & Babyesiza, A. (2018). Project planning practices and implementation of government-funded projects in Uganda. *African Journal of Business Management*, 12(8), 185–196.
- Weiss, C. H. (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. In J. P. Connell, A. C. Kubisch, L. B. Schorr, & C. H. Weiss (Eds.), *New approaches to evaluating community initiatives: Concepts, methods, and contexts* (pp. 65–92). Aspen Institute.
- World Bank. (2020). *Uganda public expenditure review: Improving efficiency in public investment management*. World Bank.
- Julius, A., & Nancy, M. (2026). *The Decisive Hour : From Rhetorical Liberation to Substantive Action in Africa 's Post -Colonial Project*. 10(1), 174–182.
- Kazaara, A. G., Deus, T., Prudence, K., & Nicholas, K. (2023). *A study on the effect of corruption practices on the implementation of government project in Uganda . A case study of Koch Goma town council*. 7(3), 213–219.
- Lydia, N., Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Kazaara, A. I., Brenda, T., Moses, N., & Bafaki, G. (2023). Promotion of Small-Scale Industries and Development of Business. A Case Study; Masafu Subcounty (Busia). In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijamr
- Mwelu, N., Davis, P. R., Ke, Y., Watundu, S., & Jefferies, M. (2019). Success factors for implementing Uganda's public road construction projects. *International Journal of Construction Management*.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2019.1573481>

Nafiu, L. A., Oshungade, I. O., & Adewara, A. A. (2012). *Generalization of Multistage Cluster Sampling Using Finite Population*. 3(1), 17–20. www.eaas-journal.org

Nancy, M., & Prudence, K. (2024). Capacity Building programs and their impact on employee performance. A case study of Metropolitan International University. *Researchgate.Net*, 8(4), 23–27. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Metropolitan-University/publication/380909234_Capacity_Building_programs_and_their_impact_on_employee_performance_A_case_study_of_Metropolitan_International_University/links/665576b30b0d2845745e0182/Capacity-Building-p

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. 6(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. 7(3), 124–145.

Ntirandekura, M., Friday, C., & Muhammad, M. (2022). Rewards and Staff Retention in Public Sector in Uganda: An Empirical Study from Kabale District Local Government. *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, 6(7), 165–170.

Olanrewaju, R. O., Waititu, A. G., & Abiodun, N. L. (2021). *Fréchet Random Noise for k -Regime-Switching Mixture Autoregressive Model*. 11(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.ajms.20211101.01>

Promise, O., Henry, M., & Julius, A. (2024). *External Auditing and The Financial Performance Of Sebbi International Limited , Entebbe*. 8(6), 156–161.

Ramadhan, B., Alex, I., Kazaara, A. G., Nelson, K., Deus, T., & Pascal, T. (2023). *Taxation and the Development of Small Businesses in Uganda , a Case Study of Iganga District*. 7(2), 136–149.

Wegulo, N. A., Kazaara, A. G., Kazaara, A. I., Deus, T., Moses, N., & Charles, N. (2023). *Effect Of Public Sector Monitoring And Evaluation On Promoting Good Governance In Uganda , A Case Study Of Ministry Of Local Government*. 7(3), 227–239.