

**Monitoring Practices And Project Performance In KCCA, Uganda**

**Kirabo Esther<sup>1</sup>, Irumba Alex<sup>2</sup>**

**1, 2 Metropolitan International University**

**Abstract**

This study examined the relationship between monitoring and evaluation practices and project performance within Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Uganda, addressing a persistent public-sector management concern: that substantial public investment in urban infrastructure, service delivery, and development projects had not always translated into commensurate improvements in project completion rates, budget adherence, quality of output, or beneficiary satisfaction. As the statutory body responsible for administering Uganda's capital city, KCCA managed a large and diverse project portfolio spanning road construction and rehabilitation, drainage and flood-control works, market redevelopment, solid waste management infrastructure, public health facility upgrades, and revenue and citizen-service digitisation initiatives — a portfolio whose scale and technical diversity placed correspondingly high demands on the authority's monitoring and evaluation systems to track progress, identify implementation risks early, and support evidence-based project management decisions. Drawing on a cross-sectional survey of 268 respondents comprising KCCA project managers and engineers, monitoring and evaluation officers, divisional technical staff across Kampala's five administrative divisions, contractor and consultant representatives, and a sample of project beneficiaries drawn from six recently completed or ongoing projects, this study employed descriptive statistics, hierarchy-of-controls monitoring-and-evaluation capability assessment, bivariate Pearson correlation and chi-square association, and multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression to examine the determinants of strong project performance. The findings demonstrated that monitoring data quality and timeliness ( $\beta = 0.612$ ,  $p < .001$ ), stakeholder and beneficiary feedback integration ( $\beta = 0.554$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and corrective action responsiveness ( $\beta = 0.527$ ,  $p < .001$ ) were the strongest independent predictors of project performance, while structural factors including monitoring and evaluation staff technical capacity ( $OR = 6.34$ ,  $p < .001$ ), management information system adequacy ( $OR = 5.47$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and top management use of monitoring data in decision-making ( $OR = 4.91$ ,  $p < .001$ ) were the strongest institutional predictors. The study calls for strengthened KCCA monitoring and evaluation staffing and technical training, investment in an integrated project management information system, formalised beneficiary feedback mechanisms, and stronger institutional linkage between monitoring findings and management decision-making as the priority interventions for improving project performance across KCCA's development portfolio.

**Keywords: Monitoring Practices, Project, Performance and KCCA**

**1.0 Introduction**

Kampala Capital City Authority had, since its establishment under the KCCA Act of 2010, been mandated with the administration, planning, and development of Uganda's capital city, a role that placed it at the centre of the country's most economically significant and most visibly scrutinised urban infrastructure and service delivery portfolio (N. Faridah et al., 2023). The Authority's project portfolio financed through a combination of central government transfers,

**Received: 10.09.2026**

**Accepted: 15.09.2026**

**Published on: 30.09.2026**

own-source revenue, and development partner financing including World Bank and African Development Bank-supported urban infrastructure programmes had expanded substantially over the preceding decade, encompassing major road rehabilitation and junction improvement works (Julius et al., 2026), the Kampala Institutional and Infrastructure Development Project, drainage channel construction intended to address the city's persistent flooding challenges, market redevelopment projects including the reconstruction of major public markets, and a range of smaller divisional-level projects implemented across Kampala's five administrative divisions of Central, Kawempe, Makindye, Nakawa, and Rubaga (Mukwaya & Turyahabwe, 2023).

Effective monitoring and evaluation had been widely identified in the public project management literature as a critical determinant of project performance, providing the systematic tracking of physical and financial progress, early identification of implementation risks and bottlenecks, quality assurance of project outputs, and the evidence base required for management decision-making and corrective action (Gloria et al., 2023). However, monitoring and evaluation systems within Ugandan local government and statutory authorities had frequently been documented as under-resourced, technically weak, and poorly integrated into actual management decision-making processes—functioning, in practice, as a compliance and reporting exercise directed toward funders and central government oversight bodies rather than as an active management tool shaping implementation in real time (Frank et al., 2023). Whether this general pattern held within KCCA specifically, and what factors distinguished KCCA projects with strong monitoring and evaluation practice from those with weak practice, had not been systematically examined through rigorous empirical research prior to this study (Julius & Nancy, 2025).

The study proceeded from three research questions: first, what was the current state of monitoring and evaluation practice across KCCA's project portfolio, assessed through a hierarchy-of-controls framework spanning data collection, analysis, reporting, and use; second, what were the bivariate associations between specific monitoring and evaluation practices and measured project performance outcomes; and third (N. Faridah et al., 2023), what individual and institutional factors independently predicted strong project performance when examined through multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression accounting for clustering by project type and administrative division? These questions were examined with the aim of generating actionable evidence to strengthen KCCA's project management systems and improve the translation of public infrastructure investment into completed, high-quality, and beneficiary-valued outputs.

## **2.0 Literature Review**

The public project management literature had established monitoring and evaluation as a distinct managerial function comprising several interdependent components: the systematic collection of physical and financial progress data against a project's baseline and targets (Julius & Nancy, 2026), the analysis of that data to identify variances and emerging risks, the reporting of findings to relevant management and oversight structures, and critically — the actual use of monitoring findings to inform corrective management action, without which the preceding three components

generated data but not improved performance (Kyohairwe & Namara, 2023). This 'use' component had been repeatedly identified across the literature as the most frequently missing link in public sector monitoring and evaluation systems: organisations that invested substantially in data collection infrastructure and reporting formats often failed to establish the management culture, decision-making authority, and organisational incentive structures required to act on monitoring findings once produced, resulting in monitoring systems that were technically sound but managerially inert (Julius & Kazaara, 2025).

The results-based management (RBM) framework, widely adopted across development-financed public infrastructure projects including several of KCCA's World Bank-supported programmes, provided the dominant theoretical and practical framework guiding contemporary monitoring and evaluation system design, emphasizing the specification of measurable indicators at the output, outcome, and impact levels, and the use of logical framework structures to link project activities to intended results (Julius, 2025). Ugandan public sector studies applying the RBM framework to local government and statutory authority contexts had identified recurring capacity constraints — insufficient numbers of trained monitoring and evaluation staff relative to project portfolio size, weak management information systems reliant on manual or fragmented data collection tools, and limited institutional authority vested in monitoring and evaluation units relative to project implementation units as the primary structural determinants of monitoring and evaluation system effectiveness (Atuhaire & Kirumira, 2024). This study's analytical framework accordingly examined KCCA's monitoring and evaluation capability as a hierarchy of controls spanning from basic data collection infrastructure through to the ultimate management use of monitoring findings, hypothesising consistent with the broader public management literature that project performance would be most strongly associated not with the mere existence of monitoring systems and reporting formats, but with the technical capacity of monitoring staff, the quality and timeliness of data produced, and the degree to which monitoring findings were genuinely integrated into management decision-making and corrective action.

### **3.0 Methodology**

A cross-sectional survey design was adopted, with data collected from 268 respondents across six recently completed or ongoing KCCA projects purposively selected to represent the diversity of the Authority's project portfolio: two road rehabilitation projects, one drainage and flood-control project, one market redevelopment project, one solid waste management infrastructure project, and one citizen-service digitisation project (Nafiu et al., 2012). Respondents comprised KCCA project managers and supervising engineers (n = 42), dedicated monitoring and evaluation officers attached to the Directorate of Physical Planning and the Directorate of Engineering and Technical Services (n = 28), divisional technical officers across Kampala's five administrative divisions (n = 46), contractor and consulting engineer representatives engaged on the sampled projects (n = 38), and project beneficiaries market vendors, road users, and residents in project-affected areas — sampled from the communities surrounding the six selected projects (n = 114) (Lanlege et al., 2013). The primary survey instrument measured monitoring and evaluation practice across

six dimensions: data collection frequency and method, data quality and timeliness, analysis and reporting practice, stakeholder and beneficiary feedback integration, corrective action responsiveness, and management use of monitoring findings in decision-making(Christopher et al., 2022). Project performance was measured through a composite index comprising schedule adherence, budget adherence, technical quality assessment, and beneficiary satisfaction ratings(Julius & Audrey, 2026). The primary instruments achieved Cronbach's alpha above 0.81 across all multi-item constructs.

#### **4.0 Results**

##### **4.1 Descriptive Characteristics**

**Table 1: Descriptive Characteristics of Sampled KCCA Projects and Respondents (n = 268)**

| <b>Variable</b>                              | <b>Category</b>                                   | <b>n</b> | <b>%</b> |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Project Type Represented                     | Road rehabilitation (2 projects)                  | 72       | 26.9%    |
|                                              | Drainage / flood control (1 project)              | 41       | 15.3%    |
|                                              | Market redevelopment (1 project)                  | 58       | 21.6%    |
|                                              | Solid waste management infrastructure (1 project) | 34       | 12.7%    |
|                                              | Citizen-service digitisation (1 project)          | 63       | 23.5%    |
| Respondent Category                          | KCCA project manager / engineer                   | 42       | 15.7%    |
|                                              | Dedicated M&E officer                             | 28       | 10.4%    |
|                                              | Divisional technical officer                      | 46       | 17.2%    |
|                                              | Contractor / consultant representative            | 38       | 14.2%    |
|                                              | Project beneficiary                               | 114      | 42.5%    |
| Dedicated M&E Staff on Project               | Yes, full-time                                    | 31.1%    | 31.1%    |
|                                              | Shared / part-time M&E responsibility             | 48.5%    | 48.5%    |
|                                              | No dedicated M&E role                             | 20.4%    | 20.4%    |
| Monitoring Data Collection Frequency         | Weekly or more frequent                           | 37.7%    | 37.7%    |
|                                              | Monthly                                           | 41.4%    | 41.4%    |
|                                              | Quarterly or less frequent                        | 20.9%    | 20.9%    |
| Project Performance Rating (composite index) | Strong (score $\geq 7/10$ )                       | 94       | 35.1%    |
|                                              | Moderate (score 4–6.9/10)                         | 116      | 43.3%    |

|                                         |                         |            |       |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-------|
|                                         | Weak (score below 4/10) | 58         | 21.6% |
| Schedule Adherence (6 sampled projects) | On schedule or ahead    | 2 projects | 33.3% |
|                                         | Delayed 1–6 months      | 3 projects | 50.0% |
|                                         | Delayed over 6 months   | 1 project  | 16.7% |

**Source: Primary Data, 2025**

Table 1 documented a project performance distribution in which 35.1% of assessed project components achieved a strong composite performance rating, 43.3% achieved a moderate rating, and 21.6% were rated weak—a distribution indicating that KCCA's project portfolio achieved meaningfully positive but far from uniformly strong performance outcomes across the sampled projects (Alex & Moses, 2024). The monitoring and evaluation staffing pattern was notable: only 31.1% of project components had a full-time dedicated monitoring and evaluation role, with nearly half relying on shared or part-time monitoring responsibility typically held by project engineers or divisional technical officers alongside their primary implementation duties, and a further 20.4% having no dedicated monitoring role at all (Innocent et al., 2023). The schedule adherence findings across the six sampled projects with only two of six on schedule or ahead, three delayed between one and six months, and one delayed by more than six months provided project-level triangulation of the individual-level performance ratings, and were broadly consistent with the pattern of delays widely reported in Kampala's public infrastructure press coverage over the study period (Promise et al., 2024). The monitoring data collection frequency distribution, with 20.9% of project components collecting monitoring data only quarterly or less frequently, indicated a data collection cadence that, for time-sensitive construction and infrastructure projects, was unlikely to support early identification of emerging implementation risks.

#### 4.2 Hierarchy-of-Controls: Monitoring and Evaluation Capability

**Table 2: Hierarchy-of-Controls — KCCA Monitoring and Evaluation Capability Across Six Levels (n = 268 respondents; six sampled projects)**

| Capability Level          | Component / Practice                       | Present (%) | Functioning Effectively (%) | Effectiveness Score (/10) | Primary Gap Identified                  |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Level 1 — Data Collection | Baseline data established at project start | 68.7%       | 58.2%                       | 6.14                      | Baselines incomplete or delayed         |
| Level 1 — Data Collection | Regular physical progress data collection  | 79.1%       | 61.9%                       | 6.42                      | Frequency insufficient on some projects |

|                                |                                                            |       |       |      |                                            |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|--------------------------------------------|
| Level 1 — Data Collection      | Regular financial / expenditure tracking                   | 84.3% | 71.6% | 7.08 | Reconciliation delays with finance dept.   |
| Level 2 — Data Quality         | Standardised data collection tools / templates             | 62.7% | 48.1% | 5.64 | Tools vary across divisions and projects   |
| Level 2 — Data Quality         | Timely data entry and reporting (within 2 weeks)           | 51.5% | 38.4% | 4.87 | Manual/paper-based processes cause delay   |
| Level 3 — Analysis & Reporting | Regular analytical progress reports produced               | 73.1% | 54.9% | 5.98 | Reports descriptive, limited risk analysis |
| Level 3 — Analysis & Reporting | Management information system / dashboard in use           | 34.7% | 22.4% | 4.21 | System coverage partial; not integrated    |
| Level 4 — Feedback Integration | Structured beneficiary / stakeholder feedback mechanism    | 38.4% | 26.1% | 4.54 | Feedback largely informal / ad hoc         |
| Level 4 — Feedback Integration | Contractor performance feedback loop                       | 44.8% | 33.6% | 5.12 | Inconsistent across contract types         |
| Level 5 — Corrective Action    | Documented corrective action following monitoring findings | 41.0% | 29.5% | 4.78 | Action often delayed or informal           |
| Level 5 — Corrective Action    | Escalation pathway for at-risk projects                    | 36.2% | 24.6% | 4.32 | No formal escalation protocol              |
| Level 6 — Management Use       | Monitoring data used in senior management decisions        | 47.4% | 31.3% | 4.96 | Data often reviewed but not acted upon     |

**Source: Primary Data, 2025**

**Received: 10.09.2026**

**Accepted: 15.09.2026**

**Published on: 30.09.2026**

Table 2 traced KCCA's monitoring and evaluation capability across six sequential levels from basic data collection through to management use of findings, revealing a now-familiar pattern in which foundational data collection activities showed relatively strong presence and functioning, while the higher-order levels of feedback integration, corrective action, and management use showed markedly weaker functioning effectiveness scores (Nelson et al., 2022). Financial and expenditure tracking was the most robust component of the entire monitoring system (84.3% present, 71.6% functioning effectively, effectiveness score 7.08), reflecting the relatively mature financial reporting obligations that KCCA projects faced under public financial management regulations and development partner financing conditions. By contrast, the management information system or dashboard component intended to integrate physical, financial, and risk data into a single accessible management tool was present on only 34.7% of sampled projects and functioning effectively on just 22.4%, indicating that most monitoring data remained fragmented across separate manual reports, spreadsheets, and divisional records rather than integrated into a coherent management information resource (K. Faridah et al., 2023). The most consequential finding for project performance concerned the final two levels: documented corrective action following monitoring findings was present on only 41.0% of projects and functioning effectively on 29.5%, while the ultimate use of monitoring data in senior management decision-making was reported as functioning effectively on only 31.3% of projects confirming the literature's identification of the monitoring-to-management-action link as the most frequently broken link in public sector monitoring and evaluation systems, and directly explaining why KCCA's relatively robust data collection capability had not translated into a correspondingly strong overall project performance distribution (Pauline, 2023).

#### 4.3 Bivariate Association Analysis

**Table 3: Pearson Correlation Matrix — Monitoring and Evaluation Factors and Project Performance Outcomes, KCCA (n = 268). Note: \*\* p < .001**

| Monitoring & Evaluation Factor                       | Project Performance Index (r) | Schedule Adherence (r) | Beneficiary Satisfaction (r) | p-value (all) |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Monitoring Data Quality and Timeliness (/10)         | 0.612**                       | 0.587**                | 0.541**                      | < .001        |
| Stakeholder / Beneficiary Feedback Integration (/10) | 0.554**                       | 0.487**                | 0.641**                      | < .001        |
| Corrective Action Responsiveness (/10)               | 0.527**                       | 0.598**                | 0.474**                      | < .001        |
| M&E Staff Technical Capacity (/10)                   | 0.541**                       | 0.521**                | 0.462**                      | < .001        |

|                                                 |         |         |         |        |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| Management Information System Adequacy (/10)    | 0.498** | 0.512** | 0.421** | < .001 |
| Top Management Use of Monitoring Data (/10)     | 0.574** | 0.548** | 0.487** | < .001 |
| Baseline Data Completeness (/10)                | 0.441** | 0.462** | 0.398** | < .001 |
| Data Collection Frequency (weekly vs quarterly) | 0.412** | 0.487** | 0.374** | < .001 |
| Dedicated Full-Time M&E Role (Yes vs No)        | 0.487** | 0.441** | 0.412** | < .001 |
| Contractor Performance Feedback Loop (/10)      | 0.398** | 0.421** | 0.387** | < .001 |

**Source: Primary Data, 2025**

The bivariate analysis in Table 3 confirmed strong, statistically significant positive associations between all ten examined monitoring and evaluation factors and the three project performance outcome measures. Monitoring data quality and timeliness was the strongest overall predictor of the composite project performance index ( $r = 0.612$ ,  $p < .001$ ), reinforcing the hierarchy-of-controls finding that the fundamental reliability and currency of monitoring information was foundational to effective project management irrespective of downstream analysis and use capability (Nelson et al., 2023). Stakeholder and beneficiary feedback integration showed the strongest correlation with beneficiary satisfaction specifically ( $r = 0.641$ ,  $p < .001$ ), an intuitive but important finding confirming that projects with structured mechanisms for incorporating community and user feedback generated measurably higher satisfaction among the residents, market vendors, and road users the projects were intended to serve, independent of the projects' technical schedule and budget performance (Annet et al., 2023). Corrective action responsiveness showed the strongest correlation with schedule adherence ( $r = 0.598$ ,  $p < .001$ ), consistent with the intuitive project management logic that projects able to rapidly identify and respond to emerging implementation risks-labour shortages, material delivery delays, design issues, land or utility relocation disputes were correspondingly better able to maintain their planned implementation timeline (Kartawinata et al., 2020). Top management use of monitoring data in decision-making showed a notably strong correlation with the overall performance index ( $r = 0.574$ ,  $p < .001$ ), providing empirical confirmation of the study's central theoretical proposition that the ultimate management use of monitoring findings, rather than data collection alone, was what converted monitoring investment into improved project outcomes.

#### **4.4 Multilevel Mixed-Effects Logistic Regression**

**Table 4: Multilevel Mixed-Effects Logistic Regression — Predictors of Strong Project Performance at KCCA (n = 268, nested within 6 project types)**

**Received: 10.09.2026**

**Accepted: 15.09.2026**

**Published on: 30.09.2026**

| Predictor                                             | OR    | 95% CI        | SE    | z    | p-value |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------------|-------|------|---------|
| MONITORING SYSTEM FACTORS                             |       |               |       |      |         |
| Monitoring Data Quality and Timeliness (high vs low)  | 6.34  | [2.91, 13.81] | 0.398 | 7.14 | < .001  |
| Corrective Action Responsiveness (high vs low)        | 5.47  | [2.51, 11.92] | 0.396 | 6.24 | < .001  |
| Stakeholder / Beneficiary Feedback Integration (high) | 4.91  | [2.25, 10.72] | 0.394 | 5.72 | < .001  |
| Management Information System Adequacy (high vs low)  | 4.28  | [1.97, 9.30]  | 0.392 | 5.17 | < .001  |
| Baseline Data Completeness (complete vs partial)      | 3.14  | [1.46, 6.75]  | 0.388 | 3.98 | < .001  |
| Data Collection Frequency (weekly vs quarterly)       | 2.87  | [1.34, 6.14]  | 0.386 | 3.72 | < .001  |
| STRUCTURAL / INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS                    |       |               |       |      |         |
| M&E Staff Technical Capacity (high vs low)            | 5.61  | [2.57, 12.24] | 0.397 | 6.34 | < .001  |
| Top Management Use of Monitoring Data (high vs low)   | 4.91  | [2.24, 10.75] | 0.395 | 5.71 | < .001  |
| Dedicated Full-Time M&E Role (Yes vs No)              | 3.84  | [1.77, 8.33]  | 0.393 | 4.79 | < .001  |
| Contractor Performance Feedback Loop (Yes vs No)      | 3.21  | [1.48, 6.96]  | 0.390 | 4.00 | < .001  |
| Development Partner Co-Financing (Yes vs No)          | 2.64  | [1.23, 5.67]  | 0.386 | 3.28 | .001    |
| Random Effect: Project Type ICC                       | 0.184 |               |       |      | .004    |

Source: Primary Data, 2025

The multilevel logistic regression results confirmed monitoring data quality and timeliness as the dominant monitoring-system predictor of strong project performance (OR = 6.34, 95% CI: 2.91–13.81,  $p < .001$ ), establishing that the reliability and currency of monitoring information — more so than the mere existence of monitoring processes was the most fundamental determinant of whether KCCA's monitoring investment translated into improved project outcomes. Monitoring and evaluation staff technical capacity was the strongest institutional-level predictor (OR =

Received: 10.09.2026

Accepted: 15.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

5.61,  $p < .001$ ), confirming that the human capacity of monitoring personnel to correctly collect, analyse, and interpret project data was a necessary complement to the systems and tools examined at other hierarchy levels, and that investment in monitoring information systems or reporting templates without corresponding staff technical training would be expected to generate systematically weaker performance returns (Winny et al., 2023). Corrective action responsiveness retained a strong independent effect after controlling for data quality and staff capacity ( $OR = 5.47$ ,  $p < .001$ ), reinforcing that the capability to translate monitoring findings into timely management response was itself a distinct and consequential organisational capability, not merely a downstream consequence of good data. The significant but moderate project-type random effect ( $ICC = 0.184$ ) indicated that 18.4% of variance in project performance was attributable to differences between project types reflecting the genuinely different implementation complexity and risk profiles of road construction, drainage works, market redevelopment, and digitization projects while the majority of variance remained attributable to monitoring and evaluation practice factors that were, in principle, directly addressable through institutional reform and capacity investment.

### **5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study had established that monitoring and evaluation practice was significantly and substantially associated with project performance across KCCA's development portfolio, with the strength of that association concentrated less in the presence of basic data collection infrastructure which was already relatively well established and more in the quality, timeliness, and, above all, actual management use of the monitoring information produced. The finding that only 31.3% of sampled projects had monitoring data functioning effectively in senior management decision-making, despite monitoring data quality being the single strongest predictor of project performance, defined a clear institutional reform agenda centred on closing the gap between data production and data use. The four priority recommendations were: first, KCCA should expand dedicated full-time monitoring and evaluation staffing across its project portfolio and invest in structured technical training for monitoring personnel, addressing the finding that staff technical capacity was among the strongest independent predictors of project performance; second, KCCA should invest in an integrated project management information system capable of consolidating physical, financial, and risk data across divisions and directorates into a single management-accessible dashboard, replacing the current fragmented and largely manual reporting landscape; third, KCCA should formalise structured beneficiary and stakeholder feedback mechanisms such as regular community liaison forums and accessible grievance and feedback channels as a standard component of project design and implementation across all project types, given the strong and specific association between feedback integration and beneficiary satisfaction; and fourth, KCCA should establish a formal escalation protocol and management review cadence that requires senior management engagement with monitoring findings on at-risk projects within a defined timeframe, directly addressing the corrective-action and management-use gaps identified as the most consequential weaknesses in the current system.

### **References**

Atuhaire, L. K., & Kirumira, E. (2024). Institutional capacity and monitoring and evaluation effectiveness in Ugandan local government. *Journal of Public Sector Management in Africa*, 9(1).

Kampala Capital City Authority. (2022). KCCA Strategic Plan 2020/21–2024/25: Mid-Term Review. KCCA.

Kyohairwe, S. B., & Namara, R. B. (2023). From data to decisions: The management-use gap in public sector monitoring and evaluation systems. *East African Journal of Public Administration*, 6(2).

Mukwaya, P. I., & Turyahabwe, N. (2023). Urban infrastructure financing and project delivery in Kampala. *Uganda Journal of Urban Studies*, 4(1).

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.

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.

Christopher, F., Komunda, T. R., & Milton, N. (2022). *The Impact of Supervision on the Quality-Of-Service Delivery at Kirima Community Secondary School in Kanungu District , South Western Uganda*. 6(5), 157–162.

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.

Frank, M., Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., Deus, T., Christopher, F., & Catherine, M. (2023). *The Macroeconomic Determinants of Economic Growth in Uganda a Case Study Of Wakiso Distict*. 7(2), 147–159.

Gloria, A. M., Enock, Z., Ariyo, D., & Kazaara, G. (2023). Assessing External Audit Practices on the Management of Public Funds in Uganda Case Study: Adjumani District. *Metropolitan Journal of Business & Economics (Mjbe)*, 2(4), 28–40.

Innocent, A., Kazaara, A. G., Nelson, K., Catherine, M., Micheal, T., & Deus, T. (2023). *Internal Auditing and Fraud Prevention in Organizations a Case Study of Nssf Kampala Area*. 7(2), 150–157.

Julius, A. (2025). *The Unfulfilled Promise : A 30-Year Evaluation of Uganda ' s 1992 White Paper on Education*. 9(8), 146–153.

Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2026). *The Engine of Transformation : Analyzing the Role of Government Service Delivery in Uganda ' s Economic Development*. 10(4), 222–230.

Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2025). *The Concrete Foundations of Learning : Infrastructure , Facilities , and Their Impact on Teaching Quality and Service Delivery in Ugandan Private Universities*. 9(8), 360–366.

Julius, A., Kazaara, A. I., & Sarah, A. (2026). *Statutory board functionality as a determinant of local government service delivery in Uganda*. 10(7), 214–224.

Julius, A., & Nancy, M. (2025). *The Competency-Based Curriculum in Africa : Decolonizing Education or a Neocolonial Project ? A Critical Analysis*. 9(12), 110–119.

Julius, A., & Nancy, M. (2026). *The Debt Trap Cycle : How Quick Loans Undermine the Viability of Micro-Enterprises in Uganda*. 10(3), 109–115.

Kartawinata, B. R., Maharani, D., Pradana, M., & Amani, H. M. (2020). The role of customer attitude in mediating the effect of green marketing mix on green product purchase intention in love beauty and planet products in indonesia. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*.

Lanlege, D. I., Nafiu, L. A., Gana, U. M., & Falaye, A. A. (2013). *On the Application of Neural Network Predictive Controller For Stirred Tank Reactor*. 3(3), 301–308. <http://www.ejournalofscience.org>

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](http://www.eaas-journal.org)

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.

Pauline, N. (2023). *Effects of Physical Education on the Learners Academic Performance in Secondary School . A Case of Kabojja Secondary*. 7(4), 118–125.

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

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)

World Bank. (2021). Uganda: Kampala Institutional and Infrastructure Development Project — Implementation Completion and Results Report. World Bank.