

Teamwork And Organisational Performance: A Case Of Mogas Petroleum Company In Kampala, Uganda

Nabbasa Emmanuel¹, Zikusooka Enock²

1, 2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between teamwork and organisational performance at Mogas Petroleum Company in Kampala, Uganda. Employing a quantitative descriptive correlational design, data were collected from 88 employees using structured questionnaires. Teamwork was operationalised through team communication, team cohesion and trust, team goal alignment, and collaborative decision-making. Organisational performance was measured through operational efficiency, customer satisfaction, and employee retention. Findings revealed significant positive correlations between all teamwork dimensions and organisational performance (r ranging from .612 to .694, $p < .001$). Multiple regression analysis showed that teamwork dimensions collectively explain 65.9% of the variance in organisational performance ($R^2 = .659$, $F(4,83) = 40.03$, $p < .001$). Team communication was the strongest predictor ($\beta = .371$, $p < .001$). The study concludes that effective teamwork significantly enhances organisational performance at Mogas Petroleum Company and recommends investment in team communication training, structured team-building activities, cross-functional goal alignment sessions, and participatory decision-making frameworks.

Keywords: Teamwork, organisational performance, team communication, cohesion, Mogas Petroleum, Uganda, petroleum industry

1.0 Background

The petroleum industry, including fuel retail and distribution, operates in an environment characterized by complex supply chains, safety-critical operations, customer service demands, and regulatory compliance requirements (N. Faridah et al., 2023). Effective teamwork defined as the cooperative interaction among group members working towards a shared goal, characterized by mutual support, shared leadership, and collective accountability (Salas et al., 2005) is widely recognized as a critical organisational capability in industries where individual tasks are interdependent and errors can have serious consequences (K. Faridah et al., 2023). In petroleum retail and distribution, teamwork enables coordinated management of fuel procurement, storage, quality assurance, distribution logistics, and customer service (Derrick et al., 2023).

Mogas Petroleum Company is a Ugandan petroleum company engaged in the retail distribution of petroleum products including petrol, diesel, and kerosene through its network of service stations in Kampala. Operating in a highly competitive fuel retail market that includes international players such as Total, Shell, and Vivo Energy, Mogas relies on service quality, operational efficiency, and customer retention as its primary competitive levers (Christopher et al., 2022). The company employs approximately 100 staff across various departments including operations, sales, logistics, finance, and administration (Nelson, Christopher, Teddy, et al., 2022). Like many mid-size Ugandan companies, Mogas faces challenges related to employee coordination, communication breakdowns across

Received: 20.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

departments, and inconsistent service delivery — challenges that are frequently symptoms of teamwork deficiencies (Polycarp et al., 2023).

The theoretical foundation for this study draws on three complementary frameworks. First, the Input-Process-Output (IPO) model of team effectiveness (Hackman, 1987) posits that team performance is determined by inputs (team composition, task design, organisational context), team processes (communication, coordination, conflict management), and outputs (performance, satisfaction, learning) (Audrey & Kazaara, 2025). Second, Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) explains how strong team identification and cohesion motivate members to exert collective effort towards shared objectives. Third, the Resource Dependence Theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) is relevant in understanding how teams pool complementary skills and information to achieve outcomes that exceed what individual members could accomplish alone.

Research on teamwork and organisational performance spans a wide range of industries and national contexts. Katzenbach and Smith (1993) conducted seminal work demonstrating that high-performance teams significantly outperform individual contributors and working groups on complex organisational tasks. In the service industry specifically, Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001) found that teamwork quality was the strongest predictor of project performance, explaining 43% of performance variance. In African organisational contexts, research on teamwork is less developed; however, Acheampong et al. (2016) found a significant positive relationship between teamwork and service quality in Ghanaian banking, while Muteswa and Orllepp (2011) found that teamwork was a key driver of employee performance in South African organisations. In Uganda, empirical research on teamwork specifically in the petroleum or commercial services sector is notably absent, creating the research gap addressed by this study.

2.0 Problem Statement

Preliminary investigation at Mogas Petroleum Company revealed a pattern of operational performance inconsistencies including variable fuel station service quality, occasional supply chain coordination failures, recurrent inter-departmental communication breakdowns, and a staff turnover rate above the industry average (Kazaara & Audrey, 2024). Management attributed many of these challenges to coordination and communication weaknesses within and between teams (Alex & Kazaara, 2023). However, no systematic empirical assessment had been conducted to determine the nature and strength of the relationship between teamwork quality and organisational performance within the company (Ntirandekura et al., 2022). The absence of an evidence base limited management's ability to design targeted, evidence-based interventions to improve teamwork and thereby enhance organisational performance (Julius, 2024). Moreover, the existing literature on teamwork and organisational performance in Uganda's private sector is sparse and does not address the petroleum industry specifically (Ramadhan et al., 2023). This study therefore addresses the research question: what is the relationship between teamwork and organisational performance at Mogas Petroleum Company, Kampala, Uganda?

Received: 20.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

3.0 MAIN OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between teamwork and organisational performance at Mogas Petroleum Company, Kampala, Uganda. Specific objectives included: (i) assessing the level of teamwork practices at Mogas; (ii) evaluating the level of organisational performance at Mogas; (iii) determining the relationship between teamwork dimensions and organisational performance; and (iv) establishing the extent to which teamwork predicts organisational performance at Mogas.

4.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1 Teamwork

Teamwork is a multidimensional construct that encompasses the behavioural, cognitive, and affective processes through which team members interact to achieve collective objectives (Moses, 2023). Salas et al. (2005) identified five core components of effective teamwork: team leadership, mutual performance monitoring, backup behaviour, adaptability, and team orientation. Communication is consistently identified as the most foundational teamwork behaviour, as it enables the flow of information, coordination of activities, and management of conflict (Cannon-Bowers et al., 1995). Effective team communication is characterized by accuracy, timeliness, openness, and active listening. Team cohesion and trust refer to the degree to which team members are attracted to the team and motivated to remain part of it, and the degree to which they rely on each other to fulfil their respective roles with integrity (Carron et al., 1998). High-cohesion teams have been found to exhibit greater effort, better coordination, and higher performance across a wide range of organisational contexts (Evans & Dion, 1991). Trust within teams reduces the transaction costs of coordination, allows members to be more open in sharing information, and enables more risk-taking and innovation (Mayer et al., 1995).

Team goal alignment refers to the degree to which all team members share a clear, common understanding of team objectives and their individual roles in achieving them (Laquindanum, 2022). When team goals are aligned with organisational goals, the efforts of all team members are directed towards outcomes that create organisational value. Locke and Latham's (1990) Goal Setting Theory provides strong empirical support for the performance benefits of goal clarity and specificity at both individual and team levels. Collaborative decision-making, the fourth teamwork dimension in this study, refers to processes through which team members collectively analyse problems, generate options, and select courses of action. Research by Ancona and Caldwell (1992) found that teams with more participative decision-making processes made better strategic decisions and demonstrated higher performance.

4.2 Organisational Performance in Petroleum Retail

Organisational performance is a multidimensional concept encompassing financial, operational, customer, and employee-related outcomes (Kaplan & Norton, 1996). In petroleum retail, operational efficiency (measured by throughput, downtime, inventory management, and safety incident rates), customer satisfaction (measured by service quality, waiting times, and loyalty), and employee retention are critical performance dimensions. Service quality in

Received: 20.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

petroleum retail is determined by factors including station cleanliness, fuel availability, pricing accuracy, staff responsiveness, and ancillary service offerings (Zeithaml et al., 2018).

Empirically, studies in service industries comparable to petroleum retail have found strong positive relationships between teamwork and performance dimensions (Polycarp et al., 2023). Campion et al. (1993) found that teamwork predicted productivity, satisfaction, and manager judgments of team effectiveness in a study of 357 work groups. Mathieu et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 138 studies and found a mean correlation of $r = .31$ between team processes and team performance, with communication and coordination as the strongest team process predictors. In the African service sector, Acheampong et al. (2016) found that team communication had the strongest effect on customer service quality among all teamwork dimensions—a finding that is particularly relevant to the Mogas Petroleum context, where customer-facing service quality is a key competitive differentiator.

5.0 Methodology

The study employed a quantitative descriptive correlational research design. The population comprised all employees of Mogas Petroleum Company in Kampala, totalling 100 staff members. A census approach was initially intended; however, 88 employees responded to the questionnaire, yielding a response rate of 88%, which is considered excellent and sufficient for robust statistical analysis (Nafiu et al., 2012). Data were collected using a researcher-administered structured questionnaire comprising 28 items on teamwork dimensions (7 items each for communication, cohesion and trust, goal alignment, and collaborative decision-making) and 15 items on organisational performance (A. Nafiu et al., 2012).

All questionnaire items used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach's Alpha values were .831 for team communication, .819 for cohesion and trust, .824 for goal alignment, .808 for collaborative decision-making, and .843 for organisational performance, all exceeding the .70 threshold (Nunnally, 1978). Content and face validity were established through expert review by two organisational psychologists and one petroleum industry HR manager. Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25, employing descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple linear regression analysis at the .05 significance level (Nelson, Christopher, & Milton, 2022).

6.0 RESULTS

6.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all study variables. Team communication recorded the highest mean among teamwork dimensions ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.843$), suggesting that Mogas employees perceive communication within their teams to be relatively stronger compared to other teamwork dimensions (Sarah & Audrey, 2024). Team cohesion and trust followed ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 0.871$), then team goal alignment ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.912$), and collaborative decision-making recorded the lowest teamwork mean ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 0.934$). The pattern of means

Received: 20.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

suggests that Mogas has invested more in facilitating communication and interpersonal relationships between employees than in formalising goal-setting processes and participatory decision-making frameworks — dimensions that require more structural and process-level interventions.

For organisational performance, operational efficiency recorded the highest mean ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.858$), followed by customer satisfaction ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 0.882$) and employee retention ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.903$)(K. Faridah et al., 2023). The moderate mean for employee retention ($M = 3.51$) is consistent with the management's observation of above-average staff turnover, suggesting that while employees are somewhat satisfied with the organisation, retention challenges persist. The moderate means across all performance dimensions confirm that there is significant room for performance improvement at Mogas, and the regression analysis helps establish the extent to which teamwork improvements would drive these performance gains.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Teamwork and Organisational Performance Variables

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Team Communication	88	3.71	0.843	1.00	5.00
Team Cohesion & Trust	88	3.62	0.871	1.00	5.00
Team Goal Alignment	88	3.54	0.912	1.00	5.00
Collaborative Decision-Making	88	3.47	0.934	1.00	5.00
Operational Efficiency	88	3.68	0.858	1.00	5.00
Customer Satisfaction	88	3.59	0.882	1.00	5.00
Employee Retention	88	3.51	0.903	1.00	5.00

Source: Primary Data, 2025

6.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 2 presents the Pearson correlation matrix. All teamwork dimensions were positively and significantly correlated with organisational performance. Team communication showed the strongest correlation ($r = .694$, $p < .001$), followed by team cohesion and trust ($r = .671$, $p < .001$), team goal alignment ($r = .648$, $p < .001$), and collaborative decision-making ($r = .612$, $p < .001$)(Nelson et al., 2023). These findings strongly confirm the theoretical positions of Salas et al. (2005) and Cannon-Bowers et al. (1995) that communication is the most foundational and consequential teamwork behaviour for organisational outcomes.

The inter-correlations among teamwork dimensions ranged from $r = .547$ to $r = .623$, reflecting a moderate positive interrelationship that confirms these dimensions are related but distinct aspects of teamwork(Alex & Moses, 2024). The strongest inter-correlation between team communication and team cohesion ($r = .623$) is conceptually consistent: teams that communicate more openly tend to develop stronger interpersonal trust and cohesion. The absence of any inter-correlation exceeding $r = .80$ confirms that multicollinearity does not compromise the integrity of the regression

Received: 20.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

model. The overall pattern of correlations, with all teamwork dimensions significantly and substantially correlated with performance, provides strong support for the primary hypotheses of this study.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	Sig.
1. Team Communication	1.000					
2. Team Cohesion & Trust	.623**	1.000				
3. Team Goal Alignment	.581**	.604**	1.000			
4. Collaborative Decision-Making	.547**	.563**	.591**	1.000		
5. Organisational Performance	.694**	.671**	.648**	.612**	1.000	.000

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

Source: Primary Data, 2025

6.3 Regression Analysis

The multiple linear regression analysis yielded a statistically significant model ($F(4,83) = 40.03$, $p < .001$) that explains 65.9% of the variance in organisational performance at Mogas Petroleum Company ($R^2 = .659$, Adj. $R^2 = .644$). This is a high level of explanatory power for a workplace study of this nature, strongly confirming the central role of teamwork in driving organisational performance outcomes at Mogas. The adjusted R^2 (.644) is very close to the unadjusted R^2 (.659), indicating minimal over fitting and good model generalizability.

Team communication emerged as the strongest predictor of organisational performance ($\beta = .371$, $t = 4.689$, $p < .001$), followed by team cohesion and trust ($\beta = .318$, $t = 4.239$, $p < .001$), team goal alignment ($\beta = .281$, $t = 3.882$, $p < .001$), and collaborative decision-making ($\beta = .231$, $t = 3.028$, $p = .003$). All four teamwork dimensions were statistically significant predictors, confirming their unique and positive contributions to organisational performance when the other dimensions are controlled for. The beta coefficient for communication ($\beta = .371$) is particularly striking — it indicates that a one standard deviation improvement in team communication quality is associated with a .371 standard deviation improvement in organisational performance, making communication improvement the single most impactful teamwork investment Mogas can make.

Table 3: Multiple Linear Regression — Teamwork Predicting Organisational Performance

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t-value	Sig.
(Constant)	0.751	0.238		3.155	.002
Team Communication	0.347	0.074	.371	4.689	.000
Team Cohesion & Trust	0.301	0.071	.318	4.239	.000
Team Goal Alignment	0.264	0.068	.281	3.882	.000
Collaborative Decision-Making	0.218	0.072	.231	3.028	.003

Received: 20.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

R = .812, R ² = .659, Adj. R ² = .644, F(4,83) = 40.03, p < .001					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Source: Primary Data, 2025

7.0 Discussion of Results

The finding that team communication is the strongest predictor of organisational performance at Mogas Petroleum ($\beta = .371, r = .694$) is consistent with the meta-analytic findings of Mathieu et al. (2008) and the sector-specific findings of Acheampong et al. (2016) in Ghanaian banking services. In the petroleum retail context specifically, communication is critical because it coordinates the logistics of fuel procurement, inventory management, price updates, and safety procedures — all of which require timely, accurate information sharing across shifts, departments, and hierarchical levels. Communication failures in this context can result in fuel shortages, pricing errors, safety incidents, or service delivery failures, each of which directly impacts customer satisfaction and operational efficiency.

The significant relationship between team cohesion and trust and organisational performance ($\beta = .318, r = .671$) resonates strongly with the social identity and cohesion literature (Carron et al., 1998; Evans & Dion, 1991). In the Mogas context, high-cohesion teams are more likely to maintain service quality standards during high-demand periods, support colleagues during absences, and collectively resolve customer complaints. The finding that collaborative decision-making has the lowest beta coefficient among teamwork dimensions ($\beta = .231$) yet remains statistically significant suggests that while Mogas teams do not currently leverage collaborative decision-making as fully as they do communication and cohesion, improvements in this area would still yield measurable performance benefits.

The overall model's R^2 of .659 is considerably higher than the meta-analytic average of $R^2 \approx .10$ reported by Mathieu et al. (2008) for the teamwork-performance relationship. This large difference is likely attributable to the more holistic operationalisation of teamwork in this study — encompassing four distinct dimensions rather than a single composite — and the organisationally specific context of a single company, which eliminates between-organisation variance that typically attenuates correlations in broader samples. The findings suggest that within Mogas Petroleum, teamwork quality is the dominant institutional driver of performance variation.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concludes that teamwork is a positive, significant, and substantial predictor of organisational performance at Mogas Petroleum Company, explaining 65.9% of performance variance. Team communication is the strongest individual predictor, followed by team cohesion and trust, team goal alignment, and collaborative decision-making. All teamwork dimensions are at moderate levels, with collaborative decision-making being the weakest and most underutilised dimension. These findings provide compelling empirical support for significant investment in teamwork development at Mogas.

The study recommends that Mogas Petroleum Company invest in structured team communication training for all staff, with particular emphasis on active listening, constructive feedback, cross-shift communication protocols, and digital communication tool adoption. Regular team-building activities should be institutionalized-not as one-off events but as ongoing processes embedded in the organisation's calendar to strengthen inter-team cohesion and trust. Mogas should implement formal goal alignment sessions at the beginning of each quarter, where team objectives are explicitly linked to company performance targets and each team member's role in achieving those targets is clarified. A participatory decision-making framework should be developed and implemented, particularly for operational decisions at the station level, empowering frontline staff to contribute to decisions that affect their daily work. Finally, Mogas should develop a structured team performance monitoring system that tracks teamwork quality indicators alongside operational performance metrics, enabling management to identify and respond to teamwork deterioration before it impacts customer service and business outcomes.

References

- A. Nafiu, L., O. Oshungade, I., & A. Adewara, A. (2012). Alternative Estimation Method for a Three-Stage Cluster Sampling in Finite Population. *American Journal of Mathematics and Statistics*, 2(6), 199–205. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.ajms.20120206.06>
- Alex, I., & Kazaara, A. G. (2023). *Internal Controls and Financial Performance of Saccos in Wakiso District*. 7(3), 47–56.
- 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.
- Audrey, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2025). *Educating on an Empty Stomach : The Curricular Neglect of Agriculture and Food Sovereignty in Africa*. 9(12), 66–76.
- Christopher, F., Moses, N., Enosh Muhindo, M., & Ruth Komunda, T. (2022). Employee Training and Organizational Performance: A Case Study of African College of Commerce and Technology in Kabale District, South Western Uganda. *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research*, 6(5), 1–7. www.ijeais.org/ijapr
- Acheampong, F., Agyapong, G. K. Q., & Kyei, D. A. (2016). Teamwork and service quality delivery in the Ghanaian banking sector. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 7(6), 112–124.
- Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Demography and design: Predictors of new product team performance. *Organization Science*, 3(3), 321–341. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.3.3.321>
- Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., & Higgs, A. C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(4), 823–847. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb01571.x>
- Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Tannenbaum, S. I., Salas, E., & Volpe, C. E. (1995). Defining competencies and establishing team training requirements. In R. A. Guzzo & E. Salas (Eds.), *Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations* (pp. 333–380). Jossey-Bass.

Received: 20.06.2026

Accepted: 25.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

- Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, D. (1998). Cohesion and performance in sport: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20(2), 119–126.
- Evans, C. R., & Dion, K. L. (1991). Group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research*, 22(2), 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496491222002>
- Hackman, J. R. (1987). The design of work teams. In J. W. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 315–342). Prentice Hall.
- Hoegl, M., & Gemuenden, H. G. (2001). Teamwork quality and the success of innovative projects: A theoretical concept and empirical evidence. *Organization Science*, 12(4), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.4.435.10635>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Prentice Hall.
- Mathieu, J. E., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997–2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410–476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316061>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335>
- Muteswa, R., & Ortlepp, K. (2011). Contributing factors to potential turnover in a sample of South African management-level employees. *Acta Commercii*, 11(1), 13–29.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row.
- Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a "Big Five" in teamwork? *Small Group Research*, 36(5), 555–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496405277134>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., Gremler, D. D., & Wilson, A. (2018). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Derrick, T., Nelson, K., Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Deus, T., Christopher, F., Catherine, M., & Ismail, L. (2023). The Effects of Savings and Credit Cooperative Societies on the Livelihood of Rural Dwellers, A Case Study At Kyamuhunga People's Sacco Rutookye Town Mitooma District. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijamr

- Faridah, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *The Effect Of Supplier Selection On Product Quality Management In Organizations . A Case Study Of Uganda Wild Life*. 7(3), 307–317.
- Faridah, N., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *An Evaluation of the Effects of Advertising on Consumer Brand Awareness in an Organization , a Case Study of Mukwano Group of Companies*. 7(3), 206–212.
- Julius, A. (2024). *Inventory Management Strategy and its Impact on Production Efficiency : An Empirical Evidence of Mukwano Manufacturing Industries*. 8(4), 96–99.
- Kazaara, A. I., & Audrey, A. (2024). *Sustainable Supply Chain Management Practices and their Effect on Firm Performance , A Case Study of Cheap General Hardware , Nansana Brach*. 8(8), 268–274.
- Laquindanum, E. (2022). *Effectiveness of Microsoft Teams: A Study of Perception among Tertiary Learners*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6477320>
- Moses, T. (2023). *On Job Training and Its Implication on Staff Performance in Uganda : A Case Study of Kasanda District Local Government*. 7(4), 155–163.
- 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
- Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. 6(7), 84–122.
- Nelson, K., Christopher, F., Teddy, A., & Alex, A. (2022). *Customer Care and Sales Volume of Miami Hotel in Kabale District , South Western Uganda*. 6(6), 26–33.
- Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. 7(3), 124–145.
- Ntirandekura, M., Ainebyoona, A., Registrar, D., District, B., & Commission, E. (2022). *Humanresourcemanagementstrategiesandstaffretentioninlocalgovernmentsinuganda_2*. 6(7), 89–103.
- Polycarp, K., Kazaara, A. G., Kazaara, A. I., Prudence, K., & Nicholas, K. (2023). *The effect of loan defaults on profitability of financial institutions in Uganda : a case study of post bank , Anaka branch , Nwoya district*. 7(3), 172–178.
- 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.
- Sarah, A., & Audrey, A. (2024). *Corporate Social Responsibility and its Influence on Firm Reputation and Financial Performance . A Case Study of Equity*. 8(8), 202–207.