

---

**Modern Methods Of Farming And It's Impact On Agricultural Productivity; A Case Study Of Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council, Kasozi Village.**

**Bafirawala Mathias<sup>1</sup>, Kavuma Julius<sup>2</sup>**

**1,2 Metropolitan International University**

**Abstract**

This research aims to examine the utilization of modern farming techniques by smallholder farmers in Kasozi Village, Rugombe Town Council located in the Rwenzori Region of Kyenjojo District and how the adoption of these progressive agricultural practices has influenced crop productivity levels within the community. As agricultural production continues to be the primary source of livelihoods for the majority of households in this predominantly rural setting, it is imperative to investigate approaches that can potentially enhance yields and income to improve household welfare. A mixed methods research strategy was employed to collect both quantitative and qualitative data from primary and secondary sources. Structured questionnaires were administered to 100 randomly sampled farms to quantify information regarding techniques applied, yields attained, and financial benefits accrued from modern practice adoption. Moreover, focus group discussions and key informant interviews with farmers and agricultural experts elicited qualitative insights into the perceived advantages, obstacles faced, and role in output increases. Additionally, longitudinal archival information from government databases was referenced to contextualize findings within historical productivity trends over time. Preliminary results show that integrated use of hybrid seeds, inorganic fertilizers, irrigation pumps, post-harvest technologies and other recommendations from extension workers has led to considerable bumper harvests above traditional means. Furthermore, qualitative findings indicate these improved agricultural approaches have empowered smallholders economically while strengthening household food security standards across the village. Basing on study findings, 38(54.3%) of the respondents involved in the study have been in farming for 2 years and below, 9(12.9%) of the respondents have been in farming for at least 2-3years while in agriculture and of them were even practicing it for 6years and above, 8(11.4%) of them have been in farming for a period of 4-5 years while 6(8.6%) of the respondents have been in farming for a period of 3-4years. Nonetheless, challenges subsist in the form of high initial investment costs and unreliable access to knowledge, inputs and water resources that still restrict complete uptake.

**Keywords: Modern Methods, Farming And Agricultural Productivity**

**Background of the study**

This study is based on two variables, which are modern farming methods and agricultural productivity (Winny et al., 2023). The independent variable is the modern way of farming and the dependent variable is agricultural productivity. Modern agriculture means the use of modern

technologies, techniques and science to increase agricultural production (Francis, Richard, Kazaara, et al., 2023). Agriculture is the cultivation of domestic animals, fish, birds, plants and crops for the purpose of food, substances and other products necessary for sustaining life. Agriculture plays an important role in

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

---

the development of human civilization (Journal et al., 2023). Before the Industrial Revolution, most of these people engaged in agriculture for their daily basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter. They had no idea about the world market and had very low production due to the use of traditional farming methods. But now things have changed (Francis, Richard, Nicholas, et al., 2023).

The different types of modern farming methods currently in use are agribusiness, intensive farming, organic farming and sustainable farming (Allan et al., 2023). Farmers are now able to buy and sell their produce on world markets. With the increased use of pesticides with synthetic nitrogen, mechanization and mined rock phosphate, crop production has increased significantly. He directed a green revolution in the production of cereals such as rice, wheat and maize. In the past, farmers plowed to dig the soil (Collins et al., 2023). On the other hand, farmers nowadays use modern equipment like multi-function tractor to dig the soil. In the past, farmers were dependent on natural weather conditions and fertilizers and tended to have very low productivity. Now things have changed, with the use of synthetic fertilizers, highly productive breeds, the productivity of agriculture has increased a lot (F. Christopher et al., 2022). As we all know, the world population is growing rapidly. We

#### **Statement of the problem**

Farmers from Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council claim that modern agricultural methods increase production in almost all sectors (Kazaara & Christopher, 2023). Using modern agriculture and farming is a must because modern farming methods can increase production and can feed the world. The economy of some countries is mostly dependent on agriculture and agriculture-related business (Faridah et al., 2023). A large part of the population is directly or indirectly involved in agriculture and agribusiness. People's sources of income are

need more products like food, cloth etc. which are totally dependent on agricultural production. As a result, we need more production in agriculture, which is quite difficult in traditional agriculture. Thus, modern agriculture is a necessity to obtain more production according to rapid population growth (Ramadhan, Alex, Kazaara et al., 2023). Agricultural production is the use of cultivated plants or animals to produce products to sustain or improve human life. Humans use a wide variety of agricultural products every day, from the clothes we wear to the paper we write on. We decorate with flowers, often produced by agriculture, and we run our cars partly on ethanol produced by agriculture (Ronald & Kazaara, 2023). Agricultural crops turned into products fall into one of four groups: foods, fuels, fibers, or raw materials. Roughly 11% of the planet's land is dedicated to crop production, and close to 26% is being used for animal pastures. According to the UNs Food and Agriculture Organization, Uganda's fertile agricultural land has the potential to feed 200 million people. Eighty percent of Uganda's land is arable but only 35% is being cultivated. In fiscal year 2020/2021, agriculture accounted for about 23.7% of GDP, and 31% of export earnings (T. Christopher et al., 2022). The UBOS estimates that about 70% of Uganda's working population is employed in agriculture.

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

---

limited. That is, the breeding of poultry, ducks, dairy products, fish, sheep and goats. It can be a great source of extra income. It will also ensure the availability of food for the next generation and the ever-growing population (T. Christopher et al., 2022). Modern agriculture has changed the overall agricultural process. A modern agricultural revolution is therefore a must. To be successful in agriculture and farm business, we need correct, correct and experimental information based on modern technology. Thanks to this, our dream will quickly become a reality. Most of the farmers around Rugombe Town Council are engaged in agriculture or farming based on the knowledge and experience they have acquired from their relatives or the previous generation (Ramadhan, Alex, Ariyo et al., 2023). Despite the above benefits, modern farming methods damage the soil, increasing salinity problems, consolidation problems, wind and water erosion, loss of organic matter, loss of microbial activity, soil covering and heavy nutrient runoff (Ntirandekura & Christopher, 2022).

The researcher therefore wishes to determine the impact of modern farming methods on agricultural productivity.

**Specific objectives**

1. To evaluate how irrigation affects agricultural productivity in Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council.
2. To find out benefits of applying inorganic fertilizers in agriculture production in Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council.
3. To investigate how chemical pest control affects agricultural productivity in Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council.

**Research hypothesis.**

1. A relationship exists between irrigation and agricultural productivity in Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council.
2. Agricultural productivity depends on the application of inorganic fertilizers in Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council.
3. There is a relationship between modern methods of farming and agricultural productivity in Rwenzori Region, Kyenjojo District, Rugombe Town Council.

**Methodology**

This study employed a mixed methods research approach to comprehensively examine how the adoption of modern farming methods impacted agricultural productivity in Kasozi village, Rugombe town council in Kyenjojo district. The population for the study included all farming households in Kasozi village (Nafiu et al., 2013). Primary quantitative data was collected using a structured questionnaire that was administered to 100 randomly sampled households through face-to-face interviews. The questionnaire gathered data on types of modern farming methods utilized, crop yields, income levels, among other variables. In addition, direct observations were made on farms to validate self-reported methods and yields (Aslam et al., 2022). Qualitative data was obtained through conducting 10

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

key informant interviews with agricultural extension workers and 4 focus group discussions with different categories of farmers. Interview guides and discussion topics focused on perceived benefits and challenges of modern practices, and their role in productivity improvements (Olanrewaju et al., 2021). All interviews and discussions were recorded then transcribed verbatim. Additionally, secondary data on long-term weather patterns, soil analyses reports, and historical agricultural production statistics for the locality were obtained from Kyenjojo district production office and Uganda Bureau of Statistics and both qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (Rasheed et al., 2022). Emerging themes from interactions were identified and representative quotes extracted. Quantitative data was summarized using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Triangulation of different data sources and types ensured comprehensive and accurate findings. The data gathered from different methods was examined and combined to build a coherent justification and possible answers to the research questions (Nafiu, 2012). Therefore, data was analyzed using SPSS (Nelson et al., 2022). Correlations and tabulations were also used. The data generated was presented and interpreted basing on themes derived from the sub themes of the study objectives in the introductory chapter. The qualitative data was obtained from quotations and farmers experiences (Allan et al., 2023). Content analysis was used to determine the relationship between the two variables modern methods of farming and agricultural productivity (Ntirandekura & Christopher, 2022).

## **RESULTS**

### **Modern methods of Farming**

**Table 1 showing the marital status of the respondent**

|       |                                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Irrigation                           | 7         | 10.0    | 10.0          | 10.0               |
|       | Fertilization                        | 8         | 11.4    | 11.4          | 21.4               |
|       | Application of inorganic fertilizers | 42        | 60.0    | 60.0          | 81.4               |
|       | Total                                | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

The study findings in table 1, reveals that 42(60.0%) of the respondents involved in the study use inorganic fertilizers 8(11.4%) of them use chemical fertilizers and 7(10.0%) practice irrigation farming.

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

**Period spent in farming**

The study involved a number of people who were engaged in farming but with specific period of time spent in there. The table below explains it clearly.

**Table 2 showing whether the respondent is a farmer and for how long**

|       |               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Below 2 Years | 38        | 54.3    | 54.3          | 54.3               |
|       | 2-3 years     | 9         | 12.9    | 12.9          | 67.1               |
|       | 3-4 years     | 6         | 8.6     | 8.6           | 75.7               |
|       | 4- 5 years    | 8         | 11.4    | 11.4          | 87.1               |
|       | Above 6 years | 9         | 12.9    | 12.9          | 100.0              |
|       | Total         | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

Basing on study findings, 38(54.3%) of the respondents involved in the study have been in farming for 2 years and below, 9(12.9%) of the respondents have been in farming for at least 2-3years while in agriculture and of them were even practicing it for 6years and above, 8(11.4%) of them have been in farming for a period of 4-5 years while 6(8.6%) of the respondents have been in farming for a period of 3-4years (Nelson et al., 2023).

**Respondents using modern methods of farming**

The study involved respondents some of whom use modern methods of farming and others don't use as seen in the table bel

| Table 3 showing whether the respondent use modern methods of farming |       |           |         |               |                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
|                                                                      |       | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid                                                                | Yes   | 53        | 76.8    | 76.8          | 76.8               |
|                                                                      | No    | 16        | 23.2    | 23.2          | 100.0              |
|                                                                      | Total | 69        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

According to the research findings in table 3 above, shows that 53(76.8%) of the respondents use modern methods of farming while 16(23.2%) of them don't use modern methods of farming

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

**How informed about modern methods of farming**

The researcher used respondents who were differently informed about modern methods of farming

**Table 4 showing the average amount of money the respondent earned per month**

|       |                              | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Not all informed only little | 12        | 17.1    | 17.1          | 17.1               |
|       | Well informed                | 29        | 41.4    | 41.4          | 58.6               |
|       | Moderately                   | 15        | 21.4    | 21.4          | 80.0               |
|       | Very well informed           | 14        | 20.0    | 20.0          | 100.0              |
|       | Total                        | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

Basing on the findings in table 4 above, 29(41.4%) were well informed about the use of modern methods of farming, 15(21.4%) of the respondents were moderately informed while 14(20.0) were very well informed and 12(17.1%) of them were not all informed but only little about the modern methods of farming (Paul & Kazaara, 2023)

**How often modern methods of farming are discussed?****Table 5 showing duration discussed by farmers about modern methods of farming**

|       |            | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Very often | 15        | 21.4    | 21.4          | 21.4               |

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

---

|           |    |       |       |       |
|-----------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| Often     | 12 | 17.1  | 17.1  | 38.6  |
| Sometimes | 14 | 20.0  | 20.0  | 58.6  |
| Seldom    | 11 | 15.7  | 15.7  | 74.3  |
| Never     | 11 | 15.7  | 15.7  | 100.0 |
| Total     | 70 | 100.0 | 100.0 |       |

Source: Field Data 2022

According to the findings in table 5 above, modern methods of farming are very often discussed at 15(21.4%), Breeds of seeds planted contributes 14(20.0%), often discussed at 12(17.1%), seldom discussed at 11(15.7%), and never discussed at 11(15.7%). How important are modern methods of farming (Kazaara & Kazaara, 2023).

The study covered those respondents who had benefited and those who had not benefited from the modern methods of farming

**Table 6 showing how modern methods of farming are important to the respondents**

|                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Very important | 24        | 34.3    | 34.3          | 34.3               |
| Important            | 24        | 34.3    | 34.3          | 68.6               |
| Unimportant          | 22        | 31.4    | 31.4          | 100.0              |
| Total                | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Source: Field Data 2022

Basing on the findings of the study in table 6, it showed that 24(34.3%) of the respondents modern methods of farming were very important to them and the other 24 of them carrying the same valid % modern methods of farming were important to them while 22(31.4%) modern methods of farming were unimportant to them (Faridah et al., 2023).

#### Knowledge on irrigation, chemical pest control and inorganic fertilizers

Received: 11.04.2024

Accepted: 19.04.2024

Published on: 29.04.2024

The study covered respondents some of whom had knowledge on irrigation, chemical pest control and inorganic fertilizers and others didn't have.

**Table 7 showing whether the respondent had information on irrigation, chemical pest control and inorganic fertilizers**

|       |       | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | No    | 11        | 15.3    | 15.7          | 15.7               |
|       | Yes   | 59        | 81.9    | 84.3          | 100.0              |
|       | Total | 70        | 97.2    | 100.0         |                    |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

In response to whether respondents had knowledge on irrigation, chemical pest control and inorganic fertilizers, the findings in table 4.10 above, revealed that 59(84.3%) of them had information on irrigation, chemical pest control and inorganic fertilizers while only 11(15.7%) of the respondents had no information on irrigation, chemical pest control and inorganic fertilizers (Nafiu et al., 2016).

#### **Type of inorganic fertilizer used**

The study covered different types of inorganic fertilizers used by respondents to improve on their agricultural productivity. The table below explains

**Table 8 showing type of inorganic fertilizer the respondent uses**

|       |            | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Phosphorus | 21        | 30.7    | 30.7          | 30.7               |
|       | Calcium    | 25        | 35.7    | 35.7          | 65.7               |
|       | Sulphur    | 24        | 33.5    | 33.5          | 90.0               |
|       | Total      | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

Table 8 showing type of inorganic fertilizer the respondent uses

|       |            | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Phosphorus | 21        | 30.7    | 30.7          | 30.7               |
|       | Calcium    | 25        | 35.7    | 35.7          | 65.7               |
|       | Sulphur    | 24        | 33.5    | 33.5          | 90.0               |
|       |            |           |         |               | 100.0              |
|       | Total      | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Source: Field Data 2022

Basing on the findings in table 8 above, it shows that 25(35.7%) of the respondents use calcium, 21(30.0%) of them use phosphorus, while 24(33.5%) of them use Sulphur.

**In case Fertilization is used, which type**

The study also covered the type of fertilizer used by the respondents.

Table 9 showing the type of fertilizer used by the respondents to improve on agricultural productivity.

|       |           | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Chemical  | 59        | 81.9    | 84.3          | 84.3               |
|       | Inorganic | 11        | 15.3    | 15.7          | 100.0              |
|       |           |           |         |               | 100.0              |
|       | Total     | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Source: Field Data 2022

Findings in table 9 above, shows that 59(81.9%) of the respondents use chemical fertilizers and 11(15.3%) of them use inorganic fertilizers

Received: 11.04.2024

Accepted: 19.04.2024

Published on: 29.04.2024

**Methods of pest control**

The study also covered different methods that respondents used to control pests

**Table 10 showing when crops are attacked with pests, which method you use to control it.**

|                               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Pest management methods | 26        | 37.1    | 37.1          | 37.1               |
| Biologically                  | 13        | 18.6    | 18.6          | 55.7               |
| Chemical pesticides           | 26        | 37.1    | 37.1          | 100.0              |
| Total                         | 65        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

The study findings in table 10, shows that 26(37.1%) of the respondents use pest management methods to control pests, another 26 respondents with a similar % use chemical pesticides, 13(18.6%) of them control pests biologically.

**Has the respondent ever attended agriculture training?**

The researcher used both respondents who had ever attended agriculture trainings and those who had never attended any.

**Table 11 showing whether the respondent has ever attended agriculture enrichment training/teachings/seminar**

|           | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 20        | 28.6    | 28.6          | 28.6               |
| No        | 50        | 71.4    | 71.4          | 100.0              |
| Total     | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

**Table 11 showing whether the respondent has ever attended agriculture enrichment training/ teachings/seminar**

|           | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Yes | 20        | 28.6    | 28.6          | 28.6               |
| No        | 50        | 71.4    | 71.4          | 100.0              |
| Total     | 70        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

According to the findings in table 11 above, shows that 50(71.4%) of the respondents had never attended any agriculture training and or seminar and only 20(28.6%) of them had ever attended agriculture enrichment trainings.

#### **Impacts of the training.**

The study also involved respondents whom the agriculture trainings had impacted but differently as put in the table below.

**Table 12 showing the impact of agriculture enrichment training/ teachings/seminar in your out put**

|                                                                 | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Client's capacity to add value on the out put is improved | 16        | 23.2    | 23.2          | 23.2               |
| Client's capacity to respond to changes                         | 38        | 55.1    | 55.1          | 78.3               |
| Clients' capacity to respond to low out put is improved         | 15        | 21.7    | 21.7          | 100.0              |
| Total                                                           | 69        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Source: Field Data 2022**

Table 12 above, shows that 38(55.1%) of the respondents had been influenced by the agriculture trainings and could now be able to respond to changes, 16(23.2%) of them had now gotten the capacity to add value on the output while 15(21.7%) of the respondents could now manage to respond on the low output.

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

### **Discussion of the study findings**

Findings from the field, showed that the highest number (gender) of respondents involved in the study were females. This is an implication that most of the females are the people involved in farming. Further findings revealed that most people who were mostly involved in the study were in between the age of 31-40 years an age that lair in the youth stage implying that most of the youth as energetic people are involved in agriculture this is in line with (Francis, Richard, Nicholas, et al., 2023)explaining that there are many factors contributing to the level of agricultural output such as nature of Soil, fertility of soil, level of maintenance and seasonal changes.

According to the study findings from the field, most of the respondents had at list obtained different levels of education meaning, they had reasons for their responses according to their knowledge on the impact of modern methods of farming on agricultural productivity, this follows (Victoria et al., 2023) who noted that in some cases more education means more money, since some educated people earn more compared to those who are not educated. A group of farmers with better income would meet their needs comfortably. Farmers income contributes to increased agricultural productivity in that, the lower the farmers income, and the greater the challenges of increasing agricultural output.

More study findings from the field, revealed that most of the respondents involved in the study use inorganic fertilizers, and only a few of them use irrigation. This implies that most of the farmers use inorganic fertilizers due to low agricultural productivity that has become the order of the day leaving farmers poor due to low earnings.

However further findings from the field of study showed that the highest number of farmers had spent a period of 2 years and below in farming.

Further findings from the field showed that most of the respondents use modern methods of farming and that is irrigation, chemical pest control and application of inorganic fertilizers. This indicates a high agricultural output this improving farmers standards of living.

According to the findings from the field of study, most of the respondents were well informed about modern methods of farming however others very well informed and others moderately informed and others Not informed but little. This means that farmers use modern methods of farming to improve on their agricultural productivity since they are well informed about them. However more research showed that the highest number of farmers very often discuss about modern methods of farming and therefore they are well equipped with the benefits of modern methods of farming and skills of applying them thus improving on agricultural productivity. This is more highlighted by Glory Outreach Assembly (2004) who has been carrying out an agricultural program which has been used to repair farmers before they engage in agriculture. however, the number of those who go through the preparation are very chronological compared to those who engage in agriculture without going through the preparation. More findings from the study field also showed that many of the farmers control pests through use of pest management methods and chemical pesticides. This helps to improve on quality and quantity of agricultural products.

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

---

### **Conclusions**

In conclusion therefore, majority of the respondents were using modern methods of farming which included irrigation, chemical pest control and application of inorganic fertilizers to increase on agricultural productivity however some use traditional methods of farming due to cost implications (Isaac et al., 2023).

It can therefore be concluded that most of the respondents were benefiting from the use of modern methods of farming.

### **Recommendations**

It is very important for the researcher to recommend that use of modern methods of farming should be paramount to every farmer since some respondents who underwent through the trainings of agriculture noticed changes in their agricultural output. Stake holders from different corners across the world including the government and non-governmental organizations should intervene to help farmers improve on their agricultural productivity through providing better breeds of seeds to Farmers. More sensitization of the masses about the value of modern methods of farming in increasing agricultural output among farmers and before agriculture as a subject should be implemented in lower levels of education like primary level and be emphasized most.

### **References**

- Allan, K., Charles, N., Moses, N., Kazaara, A. G., & Nelson, K. (2023). *The Effect of Operation Wealth Creation on Youth Farmers Development : A Case Study of Labongo Layamo Sub County , Kitgum District*. 7(2), 50–63.
- Aslam, M., Anwar, S. M., Khan, M., Abiodun, N. L., & Rasheed, Z. (2022). *Efficient Auxiliary Information – Based Control Charting Schemes for the Process Dispersion with Application of Glass Manufacturing Industry*. 2022.
- Christopher, F., Moses, N., Muhindo, M. E., & Komunda, T. R. (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.
- Christopher, T., Nelson, K., & Prudence, K. (2022). The Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on Economic Growth in Uganda-A Case Study of Kampala District. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 6). [www.ijeais.org/ijamr](http://www.ijeais.org/ijamr)
- Collins, A., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Agricultural Loans and Farmer ' s Livelihood in Uganda a Case Study of Nyakayojo Sub County in Mbarara District*. 7(3), 40–46.
- 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.
- Francis, A., Richard, K., Kazaara, A. G., Moses, N., & Nelson, K. (2023). *Study On the Contribution of Bee Farming On the Socio- Economic Transformation of Communities in Rural Areas in Arua District a Case Study of Pajulu Sub-County*. 7(2), 1–12.
- Francis, A., Richard, K., Nicholas, K., Paschal, T., & Ismail, L. (2023). *Study on the Contribution of Bee Farming*

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

---

- 
- On the Socio- Economic Transformation of Communities in Rural Areas in Arua District Pajulu Sub-County.* 7(2), 44–54.
- 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.
- Journal, I., Phiona, A., & Muhammed, M. (2023). *The Effect Of Weather Changing Pattern On Farming Activities In Uganda , A Case Study Of Bulamagi Sub County , Iganga DISTRICT.* 7(3), 10–16.
- Kazaara, A. G., & Christopher, F. (2023). *Impact of Micro Credit Financing on Agricultural Production A case Study of Bundibugyo District In The Western Region Of.* 7(3), 56–62.
- Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Assess The Impacts Of Inflation To The Development Of Societies . A Case Study of Kagadi District.* 7(3), 281–290.
- Nafiu, L. A. (2012). *On an Alternative Estimator in One-Stage Cluster Sampling Using Finite Population.* 2(7), 102–107.
- Nafiu, L. A., Aser, A., & Adiukwu, R. N. (2016). *Determinants of Maternal Mortality in Somalia .* 17(2), 318–328.
- Nafiu, L. A., Oshungade, I. O., & Adewara, A. A. (2013). *GENERALIZATION OF MULTISTAGE CLUSTER SAMPLING USING FINITE POPULATION.* 3(1), 17–20.
- 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., & Christopher, F. (2022). *Employee Welfare and Productivity of Bankers in Kabale Municipality , Kabale District : a Case Study of Equity Bank.* 6(7), 134–144.
- 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>
- Paul, W., & Kazaara, A. G. (2023). *Assessing How Employee Job Rotation Affects Workers Productivity In Organizations . A Case Study of Action against Hunger , Kiryandongo District .* 7(3), 168–173.
- Ramadhan, B., Alex, I., Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Nelson, K., Deus, T., & Pascal, T. (2023). *Taxation and the Development of Small Businesses in Uganda, a Case Study of Iganga District.* In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7). [www.ijeais.org/ijamr](http://www.ijeais.org/ijamr)
- 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.
- Rasheed, Z., Khan, M., Abiodun, N. L., Anwar, S. M., Khalaf, G., & Abbasi, S. A. (2022). *Improved Nonparametric Control Chart Based on Ranked Set Sampling with Application of Chemical Data Modelling.* 2022.
- Ronald, K., & Kazaara, A. G. (2023). *Influence of Population Growth on Land Use in Uganda . A Case Study of Biguli Subcounty Kamwenge District.* 7(3), 291–299.
- Victoria, N., Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *The Impact Of Staff Development On The Pupils ' Academic Performance In Primary Schools In Kimaanya Sub-County , Masaka District A Case Study Of*

**Received: 11.04.2024**

**Accepted: 19.04.2024**

**Published on: 29.04.2024**

*Kimaanya Sub-County , Masaka District. 7(3), 179–186.*

Winny, N. D., Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Kazaara, A. I., & Deus, T. (2023). Effect Of Motivation On Employee Performance In Non-Government Organizations (NGOS): A Case Of Mbale City. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7). [www.ijeais.org/ijamr](http://www.ijeais.org/ijamr)