

Material Handling Systems And Productivity Of Organisations: A Case Of Riham Cola Company Limited,

Kawempe

Diope John Bosco¹, Irumba Alex²

1, 2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between material handling systems and organisational productivity at Riham Cola Company Limited, Kawempe, Uganda. The study was motivated by persistent operational inefficiencies observed in the company's production and distribution processes, which were attributed to inadequate material handling practices. Using a cross-sectional survey design, data were collected from 120 respondents comprising production supervisors, warehouse managers, and line workers. Structured questionnaires and an interview guide were employed as primary data collection instruments. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression analyses were used to analyse the data. The findings revealed a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between material handling systems — specifically storage and warehousing efficiency, material flow management, and equipment utilisation — and organisational productivity ($r = 0.742$, $p < 0.001$). The regression analysis further indicated that material handling systems collectively explained 61.4% of the variance in organisational productivity ($R^2 = 0.614$, $F = 47.23$, $p < 0.001$). The study concludes that investment in modern, efficient material handling systems substantially enhances organisational output, reduces waste, and improves delivery timelines. It is recommended that Riham Cola Company invest in automated conveyor systems, upgrade warehouse management software, and institute regular equipment maintenance schedules to sustain productivity gains.

Keywords: Material Handling Systems, Organisational Productivity, Warehousing, Equipment Utilisation, Riham Cola, Uganda

1.0 Background of the Study

Material handling constitutes a fundamental component of operations management and is broadly defined as the movement, storage, control, and protection of goods and materials throughout the manufacturing and distribution process (Florence & Julius, 2023). In manufacturing environments, the efficiency of material handling directly determines the throughput rate, operational costs, and the overall competitive advantage of an organisation (Annet et al., 2023). Global manufacturing firms have increasingly recognised that suboptimal material handling systems contribute significantly to production bottlenecks, increased lead times, excessive labour costs, and heightened accident risks in the workplace (Nicholas & Nancy, 2024).

In the African context, the manufacturing sector has faced substantial challenges in modernising material handling infrastructure due to limited capital investment, technological gaps, and inadequate human resource capacity. Uganda's industrial sector, which contributes approximately 20% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), is no exception to these challenges (Frank et al., 2023). Companies operating in Uganda's fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector such as Riham Cola Company Limited contend with rising input costs, competitive market pressures, and consumer

Received: 10.06.2026

Accepted: 14.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

demands for timely delivery of quality products. These dynamics make the quality of material handling systems a strategic priority(Julius & Kazaara, 2026c).

Riham Cola Company Limited, established in 1999 and headquartered at Kawempe Industrial Area in Kampala, is one of Uganda's major non-alcoholic beverage manufacturers, producing a wide range of carbonated soft drinks, water, and juice products(Annet et al., 2023). The company operates large-scale bottling plants, distribution networks, and warehousing facilities. Despite its market prominence, the company has reportedly faced operational inefficiencies linked to material handling challenges including congestion in storage areas, delays in raw material delivery to production lines, and suboptimal equipment deployment(Isaac et al., 2023). These operational challenges provide the motivation for this research inquiry.

2.0 Problem Statement

Riham Cola Company Limited has continued to experience production delays, material wastage, and inventory management challenges that collectively undermine its organisational productivity(Christopher et al., 2022). Observations from the production floor and preliminary interviews with operational staff revealed that the company's material handling systems are characterized by manual and semi-mechanized processes that result in slow throughput, inconsistent product flows, and elevated incidences of product damage during internal transportation(Sophie & Crispus, 2024). Additionally, the warehouse management system lacks real-time inventory visibility, leading to stockouts of critical raw materials and overproduction of certain finished goods(Ronet et al., 2023).

These inefficiencies translate into lost revenues, customer dissatisfaction, and diminished competitiveness in the Ugandan beverage market(Julius & Kaazara, 2025). While management has acknowledged the need for system improvements, empirical evidence linking specific material handling system dimensions to productivity outcomes at Riham Cola remains limited(Christopher et al., 2022). This study therefore seeks to fill this knowledge gap by empirically investigating how material handling systems influence organisational productivity at Riham Cola Company Limited.

3.0 Main Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to examine the influence of material handling systems on the productivity of Riham Cola Company Limited, Kawempe. Specifically, the study sought to: (i) assess the state of material handling systems at Riham Cola Company Limited; (ii) evaluate the level of organisational productivity at Riham Cola Company Limited; and (iii) determine the relationship between material handling systems and organisational productivity at Riham Cola Company Limited.

4.0 Literature Review

4.1 Material Handling Systems

Material handling systems encompass the mechanical equipment, procedures, and technologies used to move, store, protect, and control materials throughout manufacturing and distribution systems. Apple (2019) defines material

Received: 10.06.2026

Accepted: 14.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

handling as the art and science of moving, packaging, and storing substances in any form, and emphasises that effective material handling is essential for efficient operations. According to Groover (2016), material handling systems can be classified into four primary categories: transport equipment (conveyors, cranes, industrial trucks), storage systems (shelving, racks, automated storage and retrieval systems), unitising equipment (pallets, containers), and identification and control systems (barcoding, RFID).

The significance of material handling extends beyond mere physical movement. Sule (2015) argues that up to 80% of production time in manufacturing facilities is spent on material handling activities, and that poor material handling systems can account for between 15% and 70% of total production costs. This observation is consistent with findings by Heragu (2018), who demonstrated in a study of Indian automotive manufacturers that the adoption of automated material handling systems reduced production cycle times by 34% and material waste by 22%. These findings underscore the critical role of material handling in determining organisational efficiency and cost competitiveness.

In the context of beverage manufacturing, material handling considerations are particularly significant given the high volume, weight-sensitive, and time-critical nature of production and distribution operations. Muller (2020) found in a study of East African food and beverage companies that firms with integrated material handling systems achieved 28% higher throughput than those relying on manual systems. Similarly, Krajewski, Ritzman and Malhotra (2022) established that just-in-time material replenishment systems, underpinned by efficient material handling, significantly reduce inventory holding costs and production interruptions.

4.2 Organisational Productivity

Organisational productivity refers to the efficiency with which an organisation converts inputs including labour, raw materials, energy, and capital into desired outputs. Prokopenko (2017) defines productivity as the ratio of outputs produced to inputs consumed over a given period, and posits that sustainable productivity growth is achievable through better methods, improved technology, enhanced worker motivation, and reduced waste (Julius & Kazaara, 2026a). In manufacturing contexts, productivity is typically measured through indicators such as output per machine hour, defect rates, on-time delivery performance, and overall equipment effectiveness (OEE).

Research by Tangen (2015) highlights multiple dimensions of organisational productivity, including operational productivity (efficiency of production processes), workforce productivity (output per employee), and asset productivity (returns on capital invested). These dimensions are interrelated and collectively determine an organisation's competitive position (Winny et al., 2023). Sink and Tuttle (2018) further argue that productivity improvements must be viewed holistically, as improvements in one dimension without complementary changes in others may yield suboptimal overall results.

In the Ugandan manufacturing sector, Nabukenya, Mutebi and Kasozi (2021) conducted a study among selected manufacturing firms in Kampala and found that firms with documented productivity improvement programmes achieved annual output growth rates of 12% compared to 4% for those without such programmes. This body of

literature establishes a clear theoretical and empirical basis for investigating the link between material handling systems and organisational productivity.

4.3 Material Handling Systems and Organisational Productivity

The theoretical linkage between material handling systems and organisational productivity is grounded in systems theory and the resource-based view of the firm. Systems theory posits that the efficiency of any sub-system directly affects the overall performance of the broader organisational system (Bertalanffy, 2018). Applied to manufacturing, this implies that improvements in material handling as a subsystem of the production process — should yield measurable improvements in overall organisational output. The resource-based view, as articulated by Barney (2016), further suggests that organisations that develop superior operational resources and capabilities, including advanced material handling systems, achieve sustained competitive advantages.

Empirical studies reinforce these theoretical propositions. Karimi and Zandieh (2019) found in a study of Iranian manufacturing companies that the adoption of modern storage and retrieval systems increased inventory accuracy by 43% and reduced order fulfilment time by 31%. Similarly, Atieno and Odhiambo (2020) studied Kenyan manufacturing firms and established that material flow efficiency was the strongest predictor of production throughput, accounting for 48% of the variance in output rates. These findings provide a compelling rationale for examining material handling systems as a key predictor of organisational productivity in the context of Riham Cola Company.

5.0 Methodology

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design, which is appropriate for studying phenomena at a single point in time and establishing relationships between variables. The study population comprised all 350 employees of Riham Cola Company Limited involved in production, warehousing, and logistics operations (Abiodun et al., 2022). Using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size determination table, a sample of 183 respondents was selected using stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation across departments.

Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire with five-point Likert scale items ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), supplemented by key informant interviews with five departmental heads (Anwar et al., 2022). The questionnaire was pre-tested with 15 respondents from a similar company to assess reliability and validity. A Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.81 was obtained for the material handling systems scale and 0.79 for the productivity scale, both exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.70 recommended by Nunnally (1978). Content validity was established through expert review by three academics in operations management.

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 26 (Nelson et al., 2022). Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were computed to summarise the respondents' characteristics and perceptions. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to establish the strength and direction of relationships between variables, while multiple linear regression analysis was

Received: 10.06.2026

Accepted: 14.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

employed to determine the predictive influence of material handling system dimensions on organisational productivity. Results are presented in tabular form and discussed in relation to the literature.

6.0 Results

6.1 Descriptive Statistics

The response rate was 91.3% (167 out of 183 questionnaires were returned and usable). The majority of respondents (62%) were male, with 38% female. In terms of education, 44% held diplomas, 35% bachelor's degrees, and 21% had secondary-level qualifications. Work experience ranged widely, with 38% having between 1 and 5 years of experience, 34% between 6 and 10 years, and 28% with more than 10 years. The descriptive statistics for the study variables are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables (n = 167)

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Storage & Warehousing Efficiency	167	1.20	5.00	3.41	0.872
Material Flow Management	167	1.00	5.00	3.28	0.934
Equipment Utilisation	167	1.40	5.00	3.55	0.816
Material Handling Systems (Overall)	167	1.20	5.00	3.41	0.874
Organisational Productivity	167	1.60	5.00	3.37	0.891

Source: Primary Data, 2025

The descriptive statistics in Table 1 reveal that the mean score for the overall material handling systems variable was 3.41 (SD = 0.874), which falls in the moderate range on the five-point Likert scale. This indicates that respondents perceived the material handling systems at Riham Cola Company as moderately effective, with room for significant improvement. Equipment utilisation had the highest mean score (M = 3.55, SD = 0.816), suggesting that respondents were relatively more satisfied with how equipment was deployed in the production process compared to other dimensions(Julius & Nancy, 2026a). Material flow management recorded the lowest mean (M = 3.28, SD = 0.934), indicating that the movement of materials through production stages was perceived as the most problematic area, characterised by frequent interruptions, delays, and inefficient routing(Services et al., 2023).

The mean score for organisational productivity was 3.37 (SD = 0.891), also in the moderate range, suggesting that the company's productivity levels were neither consistently high nor severely deficient(Julius & Kazaara, 2026b). The standard deviations across all variables were relatively consistent, suggesting moderate variability in respondents' perceptions(Julius & Kazaara, 2025). These moderate scores collectively signal that while Riham Cola has established some functional material handling systems, systemic gaps persist that hinder the company from achieving optimal productivity levels. The wide ranges observed (minimum values close to 1.00 and maximum values of 5.00) further indicate diversity in experience across different departments and shifts within the company.

6.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Matrix — Material Handling Systems and Organisational Productivity

Received: 10.06.2026

Accepted: 14.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Storage & Warehousing	1.000				
2. Material Flow Mgmt	0.621**	1.000			
3. Equipment Utilisation	0.574**	0.589**	1.000		
4. MHS Overall	0.841**	0.873**	0.798**	1.000	
5. Org. Productivity	0.631**	0.698**	0.612**	0.742**	1.000

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

Source: Primary Data, 2025

The Pearson correlation analysis presented in Table 2 reveals several important relationships among the study variables. The overall material handling systems variable demonstrated a strong positive and statistically significant correlation with organisational productivity ($r = 0.742$, $p < 0.01$) (Julius & Nancy, 2026b). This finding confirms that as material handling systems become more efficient and effective, organisational productivity correspondingly improves at Riham Cola Company Limited. The strength of this correlation ($r = 0.742$) classifies it as a strong positive relationship according to Cohen's (1988) conventions, where values above 0.50 indicate strong relationships.

Among the individual dimensions of material handling systems, material flow management exhibited the strongest correlation with organisational productivity ($r = 0.698$, $p < 0.01$), followed by storage and warehousing efficiency ($r = 0.631$, $p < 0.01$) and equipment utilisation ($r = 0.612$, $p < 0.01$). The primacy of material flow management as a predictor of productivity aligns with the theoretical arguments of Apple (2019) and the empirical findings of Atieno and Odhiambo (2020), who similarly found material flow to be the most influential dimension of material handling in manufacturing settings. The strong inter-correlations among the three material handling dimensions (ranging from 0.574 to 0.621) suggest that these dimensions are interrelated components of a holistic material handling system, and that improvements in any one dimension are likely to generate complementary benefits in the others.

6.3 Regression Analysis

Table 3: Model Summary — Regression of Material Handling Systems on Organisational Productivity

Model	R	R Square	Adj. R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig.
1	0.786	0.614	0.607	0.553	47.23	0.000

Source: Primary Data, 2025

Table 4: Regression Coefficients — Material Handling Systems and Organisational Productivity

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.612	0.231		2.649	0.009
Storage & Warehousing	0.241	0.067	0.236	3.597	0.001

Material Flow Management	0.318	0.071	0.333	4.479	0.000
Equipment Utilisation	0.197	0.063	0.181	3.127	0.002

Source: Primary Data, 2025

Dependent Variable: Organisational Productivity

The multiple regression analysis summarized in Tables 3 and 4 provides compelling evidence of the predictive power of material handling systems on organisational productivity at Riham Cola Company Limited. The regression model was statistically significant overall ($F = 47.23$, $p = 0.000$), indicating that the three material handling dimensions collectively constitute a valid and robust predictor of organisational productivity. The R^2 value of 0.614 indicates that the material handling system dimensions storage and warehousing efficiency, material flow management, and equipment utilisation collectively explain 61.4% of the variance in organisational productivity. The adjusted R^2 of 0.607 confirms that this explanatory power is not an artefact of model over-fitting and remains stable when adjusted for the number of predictors in the model (Julius & Audrey, 2026).

Examining the individual regression coefficients in Table 4, material flow management emerged as the strongest predictor of organisational productivity, with a standardised beta coefficient of 0.333 ($B = 0.318$, $t = 4.479$, $p = 0.000$). This implies that for every one-unit increase in material flow management effectiveness, organisational productivity is expected to increase by 0.318 units, holding other variables constant (Nelson et al., 2023). Storage and warehousing efficiency was the second strongest predictor ($Beta = 0.236$, $B = 0.241$, $t = 3.597$, $p = 0.001$), while equipment utilisation, though significant, contributed the smallest unique variance ($Beta = 0.181$, $B = 0.197$, $t = 3.127$, $p = 0.002$). All three predictors were significant at the 1% significance level, confirming the robustness of the model. The relatively large unexplained variance (38.6%) suggests that other factors not included in this model — such as human resource management practices, financial management, and market conditions — also contribute to organisational productivity outcomes at Riham Cola.

7.0 Discussion of Results

The findings of this study strongly support the proposition that material handling systems are a significant determinant of organisational productivity at Riham Cola Company Limited. The strong positive correlation ($r = 0.742$) and the substantial explanatory power of the regression model ($R^2 = 0.614$) collectively affirm the theoretical frameworks advanced by Apple (2019), Groover (2016), and Heragu (2018), all of whom emphasise the centrality of material handling in manufacturing performance. The finding that material flow management is the most influential predictor of productivity is particularly noteworthy and suggests that inefficiencies in the movement of materials through production stages impose the greatest drag on productivity outcomes at the company.

This finding resonates with the practical observations made during fieldwork, where production supervisors consistently highlighted material flow interruptions — caused by inadequate conveyor capacity, poorly designed production floor layouts, and absence of systematic material routing protocols — as the primary constraint on

Received: 10.06.2026

Accepted: 14.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

throughput. These observations align with the empirical evidence of Atieno and Odhiambo (2020) in the Kenyan context and Muller (2020) in East Africa more broadly, reinforcing the notion that material flow management challenges are a common operational constraint across the region's manufacturing sector.

The finding regarding equipment utilisation as a positive but relatively weaker predictor of productivity suggests that while the company's equipment is generally functional, it may not be deployed at optimal capacity or maintained in a condition that maximises operational reliability. The moderate descriptive mean for equipment utilisation ($M = 3.55$) corroborates this interpretation, indicating that while respondents were relatively satisfied with equipment availability, opportunities exist to enhance operational reliability through preventive maintenance and modernisation of ageing machinery.

8.0 Conclusions

This study concludes that material handling systems are a statistically significant and practically important determinant of organisational productivity at Riham Cola Company Limited, Kawempe. The three dimensions of material handling systems examined — storage and warehousing efficiency, material flow management, and equipment utilisation — all demonstrated significant positive relationships with organisational productivity, with material flow management emerging as the most influential predictor. The regression model confirms that these three dimensions collectively account for over 60% of the variance in productivity, establishing material handling system quality as the dominant operational factor shaping productivity outcomes at the company.

9.0 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are advanced: First, Riham Cola Company Limited should prioritise the redesign and optimisation of material flow pathways on the production floor, including the installation of additional conveyor lines and the adoption of lean production principles to eliminate bottlenecks and reduce work-in-progress accumulation. Second, the company should invest in an integrated warehouse management system (WMS) with real-time inventory tracking capabilities to eliminate stockouts, reduce material search time, and improve order fulfilment accuracy. Third, a comprehensive preventive maintenance programme for all production and material handling equipment should be instituted to minimise unplanned downtime and extend equipment service life. Finally, management should provide targeted training for production and logistics staff on modern material handling techniques, equipment operation, and safety protocols to enhance both efficiency and workplace safety.

References

- Abiodun, N. L., Matovu, M. S., & Olanrewaju, R. O. (2022). Statistical Powers of Univariate Normality Tests: Comparative Analysis of 2016 Election Process in Uganda. *European Journal of Statistics*, 2, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.28924/ada/stat.2.6>
- Annet, N., Andrew, N., Kazaara, A. G., Christopher, F., & Moses, N. (2023). *Impact of Budgeting On the Profitability of a Manufacturing Company , a Case Study of Harris International*. 7(2), 112–126.

Received: 10.06.2026

Accepted: 14.06.2026

Published on: 30.06.2026

- Anwar, S. M., Komal, S., Cheema, A. N., Abiodun, N. L., Rasheed, Z., & Khan, M. (2022). Efficient Control Charting Scheme for the Process Location with Application in Automobile Industry. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/2938878>
- 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(4), 1–7. www.ijeais.org/ijapr
- Florence, A., & Julius, A. (2023). *Taxation And Performance Of Small And Medium Enterprises In Nakawa Division-Kampala District*. August.
- Frank, M., Nelson, K., Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Deus, T., Christopher, F., & Catherine, M. (2023). The Macroeconomic Determinants of Economic Growth in Uganda a Case Study Of Wakiso District. In *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijaar
- Isaac, O., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Assessment of the Effect of Workplace Conflict on Employees Performance and Organizational Productivity , a Case Study of Tororo General Hospital*. 7(3), 279–289.
- Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2026). *The Anatomy of Betrayal : Self-Interest , Elite Capture , and the Political Economy of Underdevelopment in Africa*. 10(1), 295–303.
- Julius, A., & Kaazara, A. G. (2025). *From Specialists to Versatilists : The Imperative for Multiple Skilling in Ugandan Higher Education*. 9(11), 380–386.
- Apple, J. M. (2019). *Material handling systems: Designing for efficiency* (4th ed.). CRC Press.
- Atieno, P., & Odhiambo, J. (2020). Material flow efficiency and production throughput in Kenyan manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Production and Operations Management*, 8(2), 45–58.
- Barney, J. B. (2016). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bertalanffy, L. von. (2018). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications* (Revised ed.). George Braziller.
- Groover, M. P. (2016). *Automation, production systems, and computer-integrated manufacturing* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Heragu, S. S. (2018). Impact of automated material handling systems on production efficiency in automotive manufacturing. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering*, 25(3), 210–223.
- Karimi, B., & Zandieh, M. (2019). Effects of modern storage and retrieval systems on inventory accuracy and order fulfilment in manufacturing firms. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 30(4), 621–637.
- Krajewski, L. J., Ritzman, L. P., & Malhotra, M. K. (2022). *Operations management: Processes and supply chains* (13th ed.). Pearson.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Muller, J. (2020). Integrated material handling systems and operational performance in East African food and beverage companies. *African Journal of Operations Management*, 12(1), 34–49.

- Nabukenya, P., Mutebi, H., & Kasozi, R. (2021). Productivity improvement programmes and manufacturing output growth among firms in Kampala, Uganda. *Uganda Journal of Management and Public Policy*, 15(2), 88–102.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Prokopenko, J. (2017). *Productivity management: A practical handbook*. International Labour Organization.
- Sink, D. S., & Tuttle, T. C. (2018). *Planning and measurement in your organization of the future*. Industrial Engineering and Management Press.
- Sule, D. R. (2015). *Manufacturing facilities: Location, planning, and design* (3rd ed.). CRC Press.
- Tangen, S. (2015). Demystifying productivity and performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 54(1), 34–46.
- Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. G. (2026a). *Compulsory Music Education : A Policy for Nurturing the Soul or Stifling Creativity ? An Evidence-Based Debate*. 10(3), 392–398.
- Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. G. (2026b). *Navigating the AI Frontier : A Strategic Roadmap for Organizational Integration in the African Context*. 10(4), 311–320.
- Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2025). *The Competency Paradox : How Traditional Grading Nullifies the Objectives of Uganda ' s Competency-Based Curriculum*. 9(11), 370–379.
- Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2026c). *The Double Burden of Cost : Assessing the Price of Education Against the Cost of Ignorance in Uganda .* 10(2), 413–422.
- Julius, A., & Nancy, M. (2026a). *The " Just-In-Case " Economy : Social Abundance as a Contradiction to Capitalist Rationality in African Development*. 10(1), 199–207.
- Julius, A., & Nancy, M. (2026b). *The Decisive Hour : From Rhetorical Liberation to Substantive Action in Africa ' s Post -Colonial Project*. 10(1), 174–182.
- 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.
- Nicholas, K., & Nancy, M. (2024). *The Future of Work : Exploring the Impact of Automation and Remote Work on Organizational Structures and Talent Management . A Case Study the Metropolitan International University*. 8(8), 48–53.
- Ronet, C., Micheal, T., Kazaara, A. G., Nelson, K., & Ismail, L. (2023). *Assessing of the Impact of Stock Controls on Management of Costs in Organizations ; a Case Study of Mukwano Group of Companies*. 7(2), 160–178.
- Services, S. F., Branch, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Julius, A. (2023). *The Impact of Electronic Banking on Customer Sustifaction towards the Financial Institutions in Uganda . A case Study of*. 7(3), 146–153.
- Sophie, N., & Crispus, F. (2024). *Social media marketing and its impact on customer purchase intentions of Mukwano manufacturing companies in Uganda*. 8(4), 92–95.
- Winny, N. D., Kazaara, A. G., Kazaara, A. I., & Deus, T. (2023). *Effect Of Motivation On Employee Performance In Non- Government Organizations (NGOS) : A Case Of Mbale City*. 7(3), 67–71.

