

Budget Monitoring and Evaluation and Efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in Agriculture Sector in Uganda A Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited

Murungi Pamela¹, Rutaro Abas²

1 A Master of Science in Finance Student, Team University (TU), Kampala, Uganda

E-mail: murungipamela@gmail.com

2 Lecturer, School of Graduate Studies and Research, Team University (TU), Kampala, Uganda

E-mail: rutaro1982@gmail.com

Abstract: *The study examined the relationship between budget monitoring evaluation and efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited. Specifically, the study is to examine the relationship between budget monitoring and efficiency and budget evaluation and efficiency of SMEs. The study adopted a descriptive correlational and cross-sectional survey design and used a sample size of 94 respondents to collect data. The findings revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between budget monitoring and efficiency as evidenced by ($R=0.619$, $P=.000$). A significant positive relationship was also revealed between budget evaluation and efficiency as evidenced by Pearson correlation ($R=0.795$, $P=.000$). The study concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between all the two predictor variables (i.e.; budget monitoring, budget evaluation) and efficiency SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda. This study recommended that managers within the organisation must have a clear understanding of their roles in ensuring budget compliance; Senior management should use budgets to communicate corporate objectives downwards and ensure that other employees understand them and co-ordinate their activities to attain them. It is also recommended that managers produce detailed budget plans to enable the implementation of the long term or strategic plans. The annual Budget monitoring and evaluation must be embraced always as found out in this study to encourages managers to plan for future operations, refine existing strategic plans and considers how they can respond to changing circumstances.*

Keywords— *budget monitoring; evaluation; efficiency; Small and Medium Enterprises)*

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

For a long time, there has been a need for organizations, both Governmental and private to improve their efficiency (Magoro, 2010). Sometimes, there is a conflict between efficiency and transparency. SMEs are therefore required to act as a model for the rest organisations in the country. For example, if the SMEs increase their allocative efficiency and also their technical efficiency, it may have a bigger voice on all other private sector to follow suit. That makes adoption of appropriate Budget monitoring and evaluation much quicker. If failure to adhere to Budget monitoring and evaluation is to be prevented, it requires long steps, rules and policies to check and audit the budget processes, which make budget decisions and lead times longer and less efficient.

This study was based on the goal setting theory, developed by Locke and Latham (1990). This theory suggests that an organisation is more efficient where the it has control over its performance. In 1997, Locke, Alavi, and Wagner reviewed all the reviews and controversies regarding participation in decision making and concluded that participation in decision making is more fruitfully conceived as a method of information exchange or information sharing rather than as a

method of gaining goal commitment. Locke and Latham (1990) concluded that all goal effects are mediated by task knowledge. Motivation without cognition is useless. Conversely, cognition without motivation is also useless because the individual will have no desire to act on what is known. budgeting is a way of setting organization at goals for a specific period of time. The prime principle of goals leads to higher performance than when people strive to simply do their best (Locke and Latham 1990). Budgets should therefore be set to a standard that is quite challenging for employees to achieve, obtaining a high standard set goal creates a sense of efficiency and this will bring about yearn to achieve more.

According to Dunk (2009), budget monitoring and evaluation refers to the process of developing a spending plan and periodically comparing actual expenditures against that plan to determine if it or the spending patterns need adjustment to stay on track. This process is necessary to control spending and meet various financial goals. Organizations rely heavily on Budget monitoring and evaluation to manage their spending activities, and this technique is also used by the public and the private sector as well as private individuals, who want to make sure they live within their means.

Scarlett (2008), defines budgeting monitoring and evaluation as the principles, procedures and practices of achieving given objectives through budgets. The Budget monitoring and evaluation helps in fixing the goals for the organization as a

whole and concerted efforts made for its achievements. It enables economies in the enterprise. Magoro (2010) defines the term efficiency to refer to achieving what is intended to be achieved. Therefore, in evaluating efficiency we compare objectives with results. Efficiency is therefore the achievement of the intended objectives or targets. In its Western Cape Expenditure Review 2004 working paper, the Provincial Treasury describes efficiency as “achieving the maximum outputs from a given level of resources used to carry out an activity”. It thus seems as if the relationship between outputs, in terms of goods, services or other results and resources used to produce them, determines the level of efficiency. Abedian and Biggs (1998) define efficiency as the optimal employment of resources over time.

Potter and Smedley (2006) integrated efficiency with quality by defining efficiency “as making the best use of the resources available for the provision of public services”. To further explain the link between efficiency and quality, Potter and Smedley (2006) identified four ways of achieving efficiency. According to them efficiency is improved when; lower inputs in terms of money, people, assets, etc, are used, while outputs remain on a similar level; prices of procurement, labour costs, etc., are reduced, while outputs are maintained constant; output is increased or quality improved, while keeping input constant; the increased output or improved quality results in a proportionally smaller increase in resources than the increase in output. For purposes of this study, the concept of efficiency will be measured following Salerno’s (undated) three types of efficiency, namely technical efficiency, allocative efficiency and economic or overall efficiency.

SMEs in Uganda are diverse in nature, being spread across a wide range of industrial sectors; as many as ten sectors comprise (5%) or more of the overall base of SMEs. The highest proportion of SMEs work in the agricultural sector (14%), followed by the education & health sector (13%), and recreation & personal (10%). SMEs in Uganda are relatively young enterprises; a majority (69%) of them are aged between one and ten years old. The entrepreneurial nature of the Ugandan SME environment is highly visible; nearly (90%) owners started up using their own funds, and nearly (75%) operate as sole proprietorships. SMEs are run and typically managed by owners - under a third (31%) have a manager who is in charge of operations. Owners are also relatively well-educated; over half have secondary education or higher.

Therefore, budget and Budget monitoring and evaluation keep the plans of an organization running smoothly and up to date. As such, control is very important because if one cannot control the internal processes, constraints on cost, time and objectives will follow. With this, adherence to the Budget monitoring and evaluation is the device that an organization makes use for all these purposes. For example, in 2000, in Europe, around 20% of all SMEs were declared inefficient (Cabrita & Perista, 2007). Within the same decade, relatively high degrees of organisational inefficiency in Greece, Italy and Spain were recorded (Employment in Europe, 2003). The

problem of low levels of organizational efficiency, according to available research, does not discriminate developed and none developed countries. However, available data shows no consensus about recent organizational efficiency trends. For example, there are interesting claims and counterclaims about organizational efficiency trends in the past decade. There has been a decline in levels of organizational efficiency in the UK, Germany (Tsitsianis, 2005) and the US (The Conference Board, February, 2005). Despite this, there are scanty studies that have been conducted to examine the extent to which adherence to Budget monitoring and evaluation affects the efficiency of the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda.

Statement of the Problem

In today’s business environment and almost in all countries, the problem of inefficiency among SMEs is becoming bigger and bigger each day that passes. In Uganda, although the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda, are expected to exhibit a high level of efficiency, there are claims indicating the opposite. For example, the key constraints to efficiency which SMEs feel confront them are financial. Financing challenges include seasonality of cash flows, lack of or no financial records, small loan sizes for smallholder farmers, all of which make it less attractive for lending institutions to provide financial products to smallholders lacking in the skills needed to grow their businesses. They centre around both limited access to finance (74.3%), and the cost of finance (73.2%). It is clear from the Uganda national SME survey (2022) that a fundamental challenge is the extent to which commercial banks and other financial institutions have stringent requirements around collateral security which SMEs are not able to meet. Inefficiency of the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda, is likely to result in more economic, financial and morale problems, if left unchecked can lead to a number of operational challenges Preetabh (2010), highlighted Budget monitoring and evaluation results in proper planning and coordination of different functions, proper control over various capital and revenue expenditures and putting resources into best use. It was against this orientation that the researcher decided to examine the extent to which Budget monitoring and evaluation affect efficiency in the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda using a Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited, hence the gap for this study to fill.

Purpose of the Study

The general objective of the study is to examine the relationship between Budget monitoring and evaluation and efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.

Research objectives

- i To examine the relationship between budget planning and of efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.

- ii To assess the relationship between budget monitoring and efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.
- iii To establish the relationship between budget evaluation and efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.

Hypothesis of the Study

- i There is no relationship between budgeting planning and of efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.
- ii There is no relationship between budgetary monitoring and efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.
- iii There is no relationship between budgetary evaluation and efficiency of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study followed a descriptive correlational and cross-sectional survey design, and followed quantitative approach. The study was descriptive in that the researcher intended to describe the level of Budget monitoring and evaluation practiced by the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda, and its impact on the level of efficiency. A correlational survey research design was used to establish the relationship between Budget monitoring and evaluation and efficiency of the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda. Correlation studies aimed at establishing whether or not and to what extent an association existed between two or more variables (Keitany, 2000). The survey design was used since the study involved an investigation into the level of Budget monitoring and evaluation and efficiency in the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda, of a big sample (Fanning, 2005). It was also cross-sectional, since data was collected from directors and employees Jesa Farm Dairy Limited, at once and for a short period of time. It was quantitative in that variables will be measured and analysed using numbers, have pre-determined hypotheses, population, procedure, and instrument and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Study Population

The target population of this study comprised of all the managers and employees of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited. According to the human resource staff list that was accessed by the researcher, there are 130 staff of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited, which is located at Old Port Bell road, Kampala. This study population was relevant because the Budget monitoring

and evaluations involves all the departments of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.

3.3 Sample Size

Given a total population of 130 managers and employees of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited, a sample size of 97 respondents was selected using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for determining sample size for research activities, for any given population. In this table, given the population of 130, the corresponding sample was 97. Of the 97 respondents, 10 were managers and assistant managers while 87 were employees of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited.

3.4 Sampling Procedures/Techniques

In this study, simple random sampling techniques was used in selection of the sample. In this technique, each and every individual from the target population had an equal chance of being selected. The researcher requested for a list of the staff members from the human resource manager of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited and selected the sample from this list. The researcher used the cards consisting of the numbers from I to 130 and 97 cards were picked and the numbers on the cards picked were matched with the corresponding the names from the list and considered in this study.

Data Collection Methods

Questionnaires that were employed contained both open-ended and closed-ended question. These questionnaires were self-administered and were collected after a two weeks time interval. The researcher collected data using closed-ended questionnaires, and directly distributed questionnaires to the respondents, and allow respondents to fill in the questionnaires for a period of two week before collecting them personally for the analysis of the data obtained.

Data Analysis

Data was collected, compiled, sorted, edited, classified, coded and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS). Frequency counts were used to analyse data on profile characteristics of respondents. Means and standard deviations were used to determine the extent of Budget monitoring and evaluation and level of efficiency in the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda. The Pearson’s linear correlation coefficient and linear regression were used to establish the relationship of budget planning, budget monitoring and budget evaluation and efficiency in SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda. The 0.05 alpha level of significance was used to test the study null hypotheses.

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics Showing Budget Monitoring and Efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited

Questionnaire Items	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	Std Dev
---------------------	----	---	---	----	------	---------

	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Budget monitoring is a carried out in this organization	27	28.8	51	54.5	14	15.2	2	1.5	3.11	0.701
Continuous comparison of actual with budgeted performance is done in our organization	28	30.3	55	58.1	8	8.6	3	3.0	3.16	0.699
All departments are involved in budget monitoring in our organization	27	28.3	37	38.9	27	28.3	4	4.5	2.91	0.862
Coordination among various departments during budget monitoring is done	30	31.8	38	40.9	23	24.7	2	2.5	3.02	0.818
During budget monitoring, we always identify high priority activities to be included in the future budgets.	32	34.3	48	51.0	12	12.6	2	2.5	3.18	0.722
We have Budget policies to check on spending	24	25.8	52	55.6	17	17.7	1	1.0	3.06	0.688
The budgets are based on the needs identified by our sections/departments during the monitoring process.	44	46.5	36	37.9	10	10.6	4	4.0	3.28	0.811
The budget performance is always communicated to all stakeholders	28	30.3	43	45.5	18	18.7	5	5.6	3.01	0.846

Source: Primary data 2024

Results from the table 1 indicated that majority of the respondents 54.5% strongly agreed and 28.8% agreed that budget monitoring is a carried out in this organization, 15.2% were disagreed, and 1.5% strongly disagreed. This is evidenced by the mean of 3.11 and standard deviation of 0.701. Values on the table indicate that majority 58.1% agreed and 30.3 agreed that continuous comparison of actual with budgeted performance is done in the organization, as shown by the mean 3.16 and standard deviation 0.699. But the respondents have different understanding about the statement which is shown by the variation they provided to the statement. However, 8.6% disagreed and 3.0% strongly disagreed. This implies that when a budgeting and control system is in use, budgets are established which set out in financial terms, the responsibility of managers in relation to the requirement of the overall policy of the company. Continuous comparison is made between the actual and budgeted results, which are intended to either secure, through action of managers, the objective of policy or to even provide a basis for policy revision (Bartle, 2008).

Results from the table 1 indicate that, 38.9% agreed, 28.3% both strongly agreed and disagreed and only 4.5% strongly disagreed that all departments are involved in budget monitoring in our organization evidenced by the mean value 2.91 and standard deviation 0.862. The respondents have different understanding about the statement which is shown by the variation they provided to the statement. Findings from

table above, the mean of 3.02 and SD of 0.818 indicated majority 40.9% agreed that coordination among various departments during budget monitoring is done, 31.8% of the respondents strongly agreed and 24.7% disagreed and 2.5% strongly disagreed to the same. These findings agree with Warren (2011) who noted that within an organisation, different departments have a bearing on one another, this therefore makes coordination of various executives and subordinates necessary in achieving of budgetary targets. According to the study findings, it was indicated that the majority (51.0%) of the respondents agreed that during budget monitoring, they always identify high priority activities to be included in the future budgets, (34.3%) strongly agreed whereas the other (12.6%) disagreed and the minority (2.0%) strongly disagreed. This had a mean score of 3.18 which is tending towards the maximum of 4 implies that most of the respondents agreed and the standard deviation of 0.722 explains the responses that vary between those who strongly agreed and agreed. It was also revealed that they have Budget policies to check on spending as seen from the majority 55.6% who agreed, 25.8% who strongly agreed, 17.7% disagreed and 1.0% strongly disagreed. This was evidenced by the mean of 3.06 and Standard deviation of 0.688. This implies that control policies have to be clear and properly understood by the concerned members if they are to become effective.

In relation to the study findings, it was presented that the majority 46.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that the budgets are based on the needs identified by their sections/departments during the monitoring process, those

were followed by 38.9% who agreed whereas 10.6% of the respondents disagreed and 4.0% strongly disagreed. This is because the statement had a mean score of 3.28 in addition to the standard deviation of 0.811. It was also revealed from table that both 45.5% of the respondents agreed and 30.3% strongly agree that the budget performance is always communicated to all stakeholders as evidenced by the mean score of 3.01 and standard deviation 0.846 which explains the varying of responses between respondents that strongly

agreed and those that agreed. This is because a budget is a sensitive process which requires management to prioritize the needs of the organisation first, based on the broad picture of its total income and then approve it for implementation (Xaba, 2011).

Table 2: Correlational analysis between budget monitoring and efficiency of SMEs

		Budget Monitoring	Efficiency of SMEs
Budget Monitoring	Pearson Correlation	1	0.619**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000
	N	94	94
Efficiency of SMEs	Pearson Correlation	0.619**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	
	N	94	94

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Primary data 2024

The table 4.2 shows a significant relationship between budget monitoring and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited. This was done with the support of the Pearson correlation product moment technique. The p-value = 0.00, that is less than the alpha level of significance of 0.05 which implies that there is a significant relationship between budget monitoring and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited. The r value of 0.619 reveals that a positive relationship exists between budget

monitoring and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited, therefore reject the hypothesis that, “There is no significant relationship between budget monitoring and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited”.

Table 3: Regression Analysis between Budget Monitoring and Efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.318	0.149		8.831	0.000
Budget Monitoring	0.525	0.048	0.619	11.041	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Efficiency

increase by 0.619 units. This was statistically significant (0.000<0.05) i.e. the variable (Budget Monitoring) is making a significant unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable (efficiency of SMEs).

Source: Research 2024

From the analysis in table 4.10 the co-efficient value for achievement was 0.619. This means that all things being equal, when the other independent variables (budget planning and budget evaluation) are held constant, efficiency would

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics Showing budget evaluation and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited

Questionnaire Items	SA		A		D		SD		Mean	Std Dev
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		

Directors hold budget meetings regularly to review budget performance	25	26.9	38	40.1	28	29.4	3	3.6	2.9	0.837
We prepare interim reports (weekly/ monthly) to compare results with budget	22	23.2	28	30.3	38	40.4	6	6.1	2.8	1.694
I always a written submit an explanation about budget variances in department	19	20.2	31	32.8	38	40.9	6	6.1	2.67	0.866
Directors always take timely corrective actions when adverse variances are reported	16	17.2	42	44.4	30	32.3	6	6.1	2.73	0.816
Budget matters are regularly discussed with supervisors	21	22.7	59	63.1	11	12.1	2	2.0	3.07	0.654
The costs of activities are always reviewed by the executive committee	23	24.2	56	59.6	13	14.1	2	2.0	3.06	0.681
All departments are involved in budget evaluation in our organization	21	22.7	46	49.0	24	25.3	3	3.0	2.91	0.772
The perceived level of budget evaluation in our organization is adequate	18	19.2	49	52.0	23	24.2	4	4.5	2.95	1.565

Source: Primary data (2024)

It was also indicated in table 4 that the majority 40.1% of the respondents agreed and 26.9% strongly agreed that Directors hold budget meetings regularly to review budget performance, whereas 29.4% disagreed and the minority (3.6%) strongly disagreed. This is because it has a mean score of 2.9 and SD of 0.837. Results from table above indicate that 40.4% disagreed and 30.3% agreed that they prepare interim reports (weekly/ monthly) to compare results with budget as contrasted to the 23.2% who strongly agreed and 6.1% who strongly disagreed; this is signified by the mean of 2.8 and SD of 1.694. This implies that managers also make sure that monthly monitoring interim reports which are also prepared by the departments to the relevant authorities (Kenneth & Ambrose, 2013).

According to the study findings, it was indicated that the majority 40.9% of the respondents disagreed and 6.1% strongly disagreed that they always submit a written explanation about budget variances in department, 32.8% agreed whereas the other 20.2% strongly agreed. This had a mean score of 2.67 which is tending towards those that mainly disagreed. The standard deviation of 0.866 explains the responses that vary between those who agreed and disagreed. This implies that budget evaluation involves the process of examining variances by subdividing the total variance into smaller parts in such a way that management can assign responsibility for any off budget performance.

In relation to the study findings, it was presented that the majority 44.4% of the respondents agreed that Directors always take timely corrective actions when adverse variances are reported, these were followed by 32.3% who disagreed whereas 17.2% strongly agreed and 6.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed as evidenced by the mean score of 2.73 and standard deviation 0.816 which explains the varying of responses between respondents that agreed and those that disagreed. This implies that the management moreover takes a corrective action measures whenever there is a discrepancy in execution. By fixing targets for the employees, they are made conscious of their responsibility. Everybody knows what he is expected to do and he continues with his work uninterrupted.

From the findings of the study, it was shown that the 63.1% of the respondents agreed Budget matters are regularly discussed with supervisors, 22.7% strongly agreed. This is because it has a mean score of 3.07 and SD of 0.654 which is tending towards the maximum of 4 implies that most of the respondents agreed. More so, the findings showed that 59.6% of the respondents agreed that the costs of activities are always reviewed by the executive committee, those were followed by 24.2% who strongly agreed, 14.1% disagreed while the minority 2.0% of the respondents strongly disagreed. This is evidenced by the mean mark of 3.06 from the responses and standard deviation of 0.681. From the table, the means of 2.91 and SD of 0.772 revealed that 49.0% of the respondents agreed though 25.3% disagreed, that all departments are involved in budgetary evaluation in the organization, whereas 22.7% of the respondents strongly

agreed and 3.0% strongly disagreed. The study revealed that 52.0% of the respondents agreed that the perceived level of budget evaluation in the organization is adequate, 24.2% disagreed, 19.2% strongly agreed whereas 4.5% strongly disagreed to the statement as seen from the mean of 2.95 and SD of 1.565. This implied that each department prepares a budget prior to the Overall budget, the perceived level of

budget evaluation in SMEs is adequate and also that their views are considered in formulating the final budget

Table 5: Correlational analysis between Budget Evaluation and Efficiency of SMEs

		Budget Evaluation	Efficiency of SMEs
Budget Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	1	.795**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	94	94
Efficiency of SMEs	Pearson Correlation	0.795**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	
	N	94	94

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

Source: Primary data (2024)

Results in the table 5, shows the findings from the Pearson correlation product moment technique. The table comprises of variables; budget evaluation and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited, the Pearson correlation ($r=0.795$, $P=.000$). This revealed a positive significant relationship between budget evaluation and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited. Therefore, rejecting the hypothesis that “There is no significant relationship between budget evaluation and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited”

Table 6: Regression Analysis between Budget Evaluation and Efficiency of SMEs

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.175	0.098		11.944	0.000
Budget Evaluation	0.618	0.034	0.795	18.349	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Efficiency

Source: Researcher (2024)

From the analysis the co-efficient value for achievement was 0.795. This means that all things being equal, when the other independent variables (budget planning and budget monitoring) are held constant, efficiency would increase by 0.795 units. This was statistically significant ($0.000 < 0.05$) i.e. the variable (Budget evaluation) is making a significant unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable (efficiency of SMEs). Budget evaluation involves the extent to which budget variances are traced back to individual departmental heads and used in evaluating their performance as noted by Mui, Wong and Ismail, (2016). The ways in which budgets are used in performance evaluation tend to influence behaviours, attitudes and the performance of employees as well as the efficiency of an organisation.

Table7: showing Responses on efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited

Questionnaire Items	SA		A		D		SD		Mean	Std Dev
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		

Your department has clear goals to meet	57	61.1	32	34.3	4	4.0	1	0.5	3.56	0.599
Your department endeavors to complete its tasks	30	32.2	57	61.1	6	6.1	1	0.5	3.25	0.585
Your department completes its tasks with minimum costs	24	25.3	56	60.1	13	13.6	1	0.5	3.1	0.65
There are controlled expenditures on personnel services, supplies and inputs.	21	22.7	56	59.6	15	6.2	2	1.5	3.04	0.671
Your department completes its tasks within its budget limits	19	20.2	49	52.5	22	23.2	4	3.0	2.89	0.766
There is transparency in use of the farm resources	17	18.2	37	38.9	31	33.3	9	9.6	2.66	0.886
There is economical use of resources in this department	20	21.7	56	59.1	16	16.7	2	2.5	3	0.698
Your department fully delivers and meets the goals and objectives	25	26.9	60	64.5	8	8.1	1	0.5	3.18	0.584
Expected services are received or clients receive the service as expected	21	22.2	57	60.6	15	16.2	1	0.5	3.04	0.652
There are efforts to reduce expenditures and costs in your department	23	25.3	53	56.6	15	15.7	2	2.5	3.05	0.715
Your department leaders make sure that the right things are done	44	46.5	39	41.1	10	11.1	1	0.5	3.33	0.712
There are efforts to increase productivity of workers in your department	27	28.8	57	61.1	8	8.1	2	2.0	3.17	0.651
There are no redundant workers in your department	23	24.7	29	30.8	36	38.4	6	6.1	2.74	0.901
All assets of your department are fully used (no unused assets)	20	21.7	49	52.5	20	21.7	4	4.0	2.92	0.77
There is value for money for all goods/ service produced	25	26.8	55	58.6	10	10.6	4	4.0	3.08	0.729
The services offered here meet country expectations	20	21.7	46	49.0	23	24.2	5	5.1	2.87	0.806
The service provided and officers here are easy to access	19	20.7	50	53.0	21	22.2	4	4.0	2.9	0.765
There is equality in provision of services	19	20.7	32	33.8	38	39.9	2	5.6	2.7	0.86
There is openness in provision of services	15	15.7	34	36.4	40	42.4	5	5.6	2.62	0.814
The workforce here is well motivated	19	19.7	22	23.7	37	39.4	16	16.7	2.46	0.995
There is less corruption and red tape in your department	12	13.1	21	22.2	45	48.0	16	16.7	2.32	0.901
There is common understanding among staff in your department	19	20.7	55	58.1	14	14.6	6	6.6	2.93	0.784
There is a low staff turnover in your department and in the whole farm	17	17.7	27	28.8	38	39.9	13	13.6	2.51	0.938

Source: Primary data, (2024)

It was revealed that majority 61.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that their department has clear goals to meet, and 34.3% agreed as seen from the mean of 3.56 and SD of 0.599. Results from the table indicated that majority of the respondents 61.1% agreed as evidenced by the mean of 3.25 and SD 0.585, that department endeavors to complete its task, 32.2% strongly agreed, 6.1% disagreed and 0.5% strongly disagreed. From the table, 60.1% agreed and 25.3% strongly agreed that their department completes its tasks with minimum costs as compared to 13.6% who disagreed and 1.0% strongly disagreed as evidenced by the mean of 3.1 and standard deviation of 0.65. It was indicated that the majority 59.6% of the respondents agreed and 22.7% strongly agreed that there are controlled expenditures on personnel services, supplies and inputs, 6.2% disagreed whereas the 1.5% strongly disagreed, as evidenced by the mean score of 3.04. However, the responses varied as shown by the standard deviation of 0.671. This implies that efficiency involves productivity and it is achieved through the reduction of the costs of transactions through mechanization or automation. This measurement is generally only applicable to well-structured and routine administrative tasks.

The mean of 2.89 and standard Deviation of 0.766 in the findings from the study revealed that their department completes its tasks within its budget limits because majority of the respondents 52.5% agreed and 20.2% strongly agreed that their department completes its tasks within its budget limits. It was also revealed that 38.9% of the respondents agreed and 33.3% disagreed that there is transparency in use of the farm resources. This was followed by 18.2% of the respondents who strongly agreed and 9.6% who strongly disagreed. This had a mean score of 2.66. The standard deviation of 0.886 explains the responses that varies between those who strongly agreed and disagreed.

Findings on the table indicate that majority 59.1% and 21.7% agreed and strongly agreed respectively that there is economical use of resources in this department. This was evidenced by the mean of 3.0 and SD of 0.698. The mean of 3.18 and SD of 0.584 indicated that majority 64.5% agreed and 26.9% strongly agreed that their department fully delivers and meets the goals and objectives. Results from the table indicate that, 22.2% agreed, 60.6% agreed that expected services are received or clients receive the service as expected as seen by the mean of 3.04 and standard deviation of 0.652. Findings from table above indicate majority 56.6% agreed, 25.3% strongly agreed that there are efforts to reduce expenditures and costs in the department and 15.7% disagreed, as seen from the mean of 3.05 and SD of 0.715. As noted by Kenneth and Ambrose (2013) it is important to know the obligations to pay that will occur over the planned period, not only to monitor expenditures.

Findings from the study indicate that majority of the respondents 46.5% strongly agreed while minority 1.0% strongly disagreed that department leaders make sure that the right things are done as seen from the mean of 3.33 and SD of 0.712. It was also indicated that there are efforts to increase productivity of workers in the department. This was supported by the mean of 3.17 and SD of 0.651. According to the study findings, it was indicated that the majority 38.4% of the respondents disagreed that there are no redundant workers in the department as seen from the mean of 2.74 and standard deviation of 0.901. The findings also revealed that majority of the respondents 52.5% agreed that all assets of the department are fully used (no unused assets) although minority 4.0 strongly disagreed. As revealed from the table above, the mean score of 3.08 and standard deviation 0.729 explains the varying of responses between respondents that strongly agreed and those that agreed that there is value for money for all goods/ service produced as seen from 58.6% who agreed and 26.8% who strongly agreed. This implies that it is important for the organization to be efficient in terms of responsiveness, timeliness, reliability and openness; value for money, where the level of expenditure at which the service is delivered, is acceptable.

In relation to the study findings, it was presented that the majority 49.0% of the respondents agreed that the services offered meet country expectations, those were followed by 24.2% disagreed. This is because the mean value of 2.87 revealed that most of the respondents agreed. However, a standard deviation of 0.806 reveals that there were varied responses from the respondents of which some disagreed that the services offered meet country expectations. From the findings of the study, it was shown that the 53.0% of the respondents agreed and 22.2% disagreed that the service provided and officers are easy to access. The mean score of 2.9 and standard deviation 0.765 explains the varying of responses between respondents that agreed and those that disagreed. It was indicated that the majority 39.9% of the respondents disagreed that there is equality in provision of services, as seen from a mean of 2.7. However, a significant standard deviation of 0.86 is a clear manifestation of varied responses from respondents.

More to the above, the findings showed that 42.4% of the respondents disagreed that there is openness in provision of services which had a mean score of 2.62 and the standard deviation of 0.814 explains the responses that vary between those who agreed and disagreed. According to the study findings, it was indicated that the majority 39.4% of the respondents disagreed that the workforce here is well motivated, 23.7% agreed whereas the other 19.7% strongly agreed, and the minority 17.2% strongly disagreed. This is indicated by a mean of 2.46 and mean of 0.995. In relation to the study findings, it was presented that the majority 48.0% of the respondents disagreed that there is less corruption and red tape in the department evidenced by the mean score of 2.32. However, the responses varied as shown by the standard deviation of 0.901. However, it is important to note that without proper controls, multiple opportunities for corruption exist at all stages of the budgetary implementation process and efficiency will be generally low.

In relation to the study findings, it was presented that the majority 58.1% of the respondents agreed that there is common understanding among staff in the department, those were followed by 20.7% strongly agreed. This is because the mean value of 2.93 revealed that most of the respondents agreed. However, a standard deviation of 0.784 reveals that there were varied responses from the respondents of which some disagreed that there is common understanding among staff in your department. From the findings of the study, it was shown that the 39.9% of the respondents disagreed that there is a low staff turnover in the department and in the whole farm and 28.8% agreed. The mean score of 2.51 and standard deviation 0.938 explains the varying of responses between respondents that agreed and those that disagreed. Organisations which do not have efficient means in their processes, procedures

and plans, experience lower performance and higher customer dissatisfaction and employee turnover (Batenburg & Versendaal, 2006).

Table 8: Correlation analysis between Budget monitoring and evaluation and efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited

Correlations

		Budget monitoring and evaluation	Efficiency of SMEs
Budget monitoring and evaluation	Pearson Correlation	1	0.691**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.001
	N	94	94
Efficiency of SMEs	Pearson Correlation	0.691**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	
	N	94	94

Correlations

		Budget monitoring and evaluation	Efficiency of SMEs
Budget monitoring and evaluation	Pearson Correlation	1	0.691**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.001
	N	94	94
Efficiency of SMEs	Pearson Correlation	0.691**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	
	N	94	94

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Source: Primary data, 2024*

All in all, it was revealed in the table 4.15 above that the Budget monitoring and evaluation has a positive relationship with the efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited, the Pearson correlation ($r=0.691$, $P=.001$). Preetabh (2010), highlighted that Budget monitoring and evaluation aim at maximization of profits or an organization through, proper planning and co-ordination of different functions, proper control over various capital and revenue expenditures and putting resources into best use. Coordination; achieved through working of different departments and sectors. This also enhances the efficiency of the organization.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate

1	0.810 ^a	0.655	0.650	0.273
---	--------------------	-------	-------	-------

a. Predictors: (Constant), Budget Evaluation, Budget Monitoring **Source: Primary data 2024**

The value of R being equal to 0.810 and the coefficient of determination (R squared) is equal to 0.655. Adjusted R² linear value of (0.655) meant that budget monitoring and budget evaluation contribute to the efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda by 0.655(65.5%). This means that budget evaluation, budget monitoring have a positive effect on efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda. In line with the findings, a study by Adongo and Jagongo (2013) revealed that a positive significant relationship exists between budgetary control and efficiency of state corporations in Kenya. A study by Margah (2005) revealed that budgetary controls are important tools for a county's economy because they allow planning for expenditure thus facilitating efficient use of the financial resources.

Table 8: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.433	3	9.144	122.939	.000 ^a
	Residual	14.430	91	.074		
	Total	41.864	94			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Budget Evaluation, Budget Monitoring

b. Dependent Variable: Efficiency

Source: Primary data 2024

The ANOVA findings in table above show that there is significant relationship between the Predictors variables (Budget Evaluation, Budget Monitoring) and dependent variable (efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector) since P value -estimation of 0.00 is under 0.05. The ANOVA comes about to demonstrate that the autonomous factors altogether (F=122.939, p=0.00)

The table 4.18 shows the determination of the coefficients for the regression equation.

Table 9: coefficients for the regression equation Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	0.777	0.146	.221	5.323	0.000
Budget Monitoring	0.525	0.048	0.619	11.041	0.000
Budget Evaluation	0.582	0.047	0.749	12.302	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Efficiency

Source: Primary data 2024

According to the above illustrations, the p values are <0.05 hence there is evidence to accept that the variables of Budget Monitoring, Budget Evaluation significantly contribute to efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda. This is evidenced by the β coefficients as seen in table above. This implies that a unit increases in any of the independent variables other factors constant increase the level of efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector. The established multiple linear regression equation becomes: $Y = 0.777 + 0.619\beta_1 + 0.749\beta_2$. Where; Constant = 0.777, shows that if Budget Monitoring, Budget Evaluation were all rated as zero; efficiency of SMEs rating would be 0.221.

A regression was done to ascertain the effect Budget Monitoring on efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda. $\beta_1 = 0.619$ shows that one unit change in Budget Monitoring, results in 0.619 units increase in efficiency of SMEs. The standardized beta

coefficient indicates that Budget Monitoring has a positive contribution towards efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda. $\beta_2 = 0.749$, shows that one unit change in Budget Evaluation, results in 0.749 units increase in efficiency of SMEs. The standardized beta coefficient indicates that Budget Evaluation has a positive contribution towards efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

From the study it is concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between Budget Monitoring and Efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited thereby rejecting the null hypothesis. From the study it was further concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between Budget Evaluation and Efficiency of SMEs in the Agriculture Sector in Uganda using Case Study of Jesa Farm Dairy Limited thereby rejecting the null hypothesis

Recommendations

- i. Budget monitoring was seen to positively affect the efficiency of the bank, it is therefore recommended from the study that all the departments should be involved in budget monitoring and also that high priority activities should be included in the future budgets during budget monitoring.
- ii. It is also recommended that managers should prepare detailed budget plans to enable the implementation and evaluations of the long term or strategic plans.
- iii. The annual Budget monitoring and evaluation must be embraced always as found out in this study since, it encourages managers to plan for future operations, refine existing strategic plans and considers how they can respond to changing circumstances. This encourages managers to anticipate problems before they arise and ensures informed decision making.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adongo, K.O. & Jagongo, A. (2013). Budget monitoring and evaluation as a Measure of Financial Performance of State Corporations in Kenya. *International Journal of Accounting and Taxation*, Vol. 1 No. 1.
- [2] Amaratunga, D., & Baldry, D. (2002). Moving from Performance Measurement to Performance Management. *Facilities*, 20 (5/6), 217-223.
- [3] Arbin, K. (2006). The Budget Adoption and Usage Model. Working paper. 15th Annual IPSERA Conference, San Diego.
- [4] Artley, W., & Stroh, S. (2001). *The Performance-Based Management Handbook*, Volume II. Retrieved March 24, 2018, from <http://www.orau.gov/pbm/pbmhandbook/Volume%202.pdf>
- [5] Auditor-General of Canada (1990). Efficiency in Government: A Special Study. Report of the
- [6] Auditor-General of Canada, Chapter 8. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on 18 March 2018
- [7] Ministry of Justice, SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda, Mbale branch Act (2011). The Laws of Uganda.
- [8] Bartle, J.R. (2008). *Applying Pragmatism to Public Budgeting and Financial Management*. Texas: State University.
- [9] Batenburg, R., & Versendaal, J. (2006). *Alignment Matters - Improving business functions using the budget alignment framework*. Retrieved March 13, 2018, from Archive library Utrecht University web: 214623/batenburg_06_alignmentmatters
- [10] Bester, A.V. (2007). Efficiency in the Public sector; An analysis of performance measurements employed by the Western Cape Provincial Treasury. Unpublished Master of Public administration University of Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- [11] Birnberg, J.C. Shields, M.D. & Young, S.M. (1990). "The case for multiple methods in empirical management accounting research: With an illustration from budget setting", *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 33-66.
- [12] Fulcher, K.B. (2011). Effect of Budget Methods and Procedures on Drug Usage in Uganda Public Hospitals: A Case Study of Butabika Hospital. Unpublished Bachelor of Commerce Dissertation, Makerere University Kampala
- [13] Brownell, P. & Dunk, A.S. (2001). Task Uncertainty and Its Interaction with Budgetary planning and Budget Emphasis: Some Methodological Issues and Empirical Investigation. *Accounting, Organization & Society*. 16 (8), 693-703.
- [14] Buyers and Holmes (1995) *An assessment of the budget and Budget monitoring and evaluation in enhancing financial performance of An organization The case of Tanesco* (Doctoral dissertation, Mzumbe University).
- [15] Cabrita & Perista, (2007) Determinants of academic job satisfaction in Germany. In *Job satisfaction around the academic world* (pp. 125-143). Springer, Dordrecht.
- [16] CIPS Australia. (2005). *How do we measure up? An Introduction to Performance Measurement of the Budget Profession*. Retrieved March 17, 2018, from Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply web site: http://www.cips.org/documents/Performance_Measurement.pdf
- [17] Coates (2002) The impact of budget on the management of operating resources supply. *The Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Winter, 4-13.

- [18] Das, (2011). *The game of budget control*. Routledge
- [19] D'Avanzo, Lewinski and Wassenhove (2003) *Defense Spending and the budget control act limits* (Vol. 44039). Congressional Research Service.
- [20] Dollery, B. (2005). Relative effectiveness and efficiency of NSW Local Government. Retrieved 27 March 2018 at [http://www.lgi.org.au/docs/0207%20Website %20%20LGI%20Commissioned%20Research%20Papers/Dollery_B_Relatie](http://www.lgi.org.au/docs/0207%20Website%20%20LGI%20Commissioned%20Research%20Papers/Dollery_B_Relative)
- [21] *Efficiency and Effectiveness of NSW Local Government (2005).pdf* Dunk, A.S. (2009). Budget Emphasis, Budgetary planning and Managerial Performance: A Note. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 14(4), 321- 324.
- [22] Etomi, G. & Partners (nd). Nigeria: New Guidelines on Budget and Award of Contracts.
- [23] European Union (2009). EU public budget policy: responding to new challenges. Available at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/smn/_smn57/docs/public_budget_en.pdf, accessed on 2nd March, 2018
- [24] Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007). Budget Procedures Manual for Public Budget in Nigeria. Bureau of Public Budget
- [25] Flynn, B. B, Sakakibara, S, Schroeder, R. G, Bates, K. A, and Flynn, J. E. (1990). Empirical Research Methods in Operations Management. *Journal of Operations Management* vol. 9, 250-284.
- [26] Gacheru (2012), Interview on the use of Preferential Budget in Local Government Pretoria. The City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality
- [27] [Government Finance Officers Association \(GFOA\)](#), (1999)
- [28] Ebel, G.B. (2003). *Labour Management in Agriculture; Cultivating Personnel Productivity*, 2nd Edition, United States of America. The regents of the University of California.
- [29] Gul, F.A. & Chia, Y.M. (1994). The effects of management accounting systems, perceived environmental uncertainty and decentralization on managerial performance: A test of three-way interaction, *Accounting, Organisations and Society*, vol. 19, no. 4-5, pp. 413-426.
- [30] Hanberger, A. (2011). The real functions of evaluation and response systems, *Evaluation*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 327-349.
- [31] Hancock, (2009). Health promotion in Canada: 25 years of unfulfilled promise. *Health promotion international*, 26(suppl_2), pp.ii263-ii267.
- [32] Heuer, L., Penrod, S. & Kattan, A. (2007). The role of societal benefits and fairness concerns among decision makers and decision recipients, *Law Human Behaviour*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 573-630.
- [33] Hindereth, (2002) Determinants of Budget Control In Ethiopian Public Organization (The Case of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State
- [34] Holland (2005) *Budgeting and Budget monitoring and evaluation practices at Multi Credit Savings and Loans Company Limited*
- [35] Jawahar, I.M. (2010). The mediating role of appraisal feedback reactions on the relationship between rater feedback-related behaviour and rate performance, *Group and Organization Management*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 494-526.
- [36] Johanna, M. (2012). Measuring the Effectiveness of Public Budget. Unpublished Bachelor of International Business disertation. HAMK University of Applied Sciences
- [37] Kearney, A. T. (2008). *Assessment of Excellence in Budget*. London: McGraw Hill.
- [38] Keitany, 2000). The survey design was used since the study involved an investigation into the level of Budget monitoring and evaluation and efficiency in the SMEs in Agriculture sector in Uganda, Mbale branch of a big sample (Fanning, 2005
- [39] Kenis, I. (1979). Effects of budgetary goal characteristics on managerial attitudes and performance, *The Accounting Review*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 707-721.
- [40] Knudsen, D. (1999). *Budget Performance Measurement System: Focusing on the Swedish Public Sector*. Retrieved March 17, 2018, from http://www.tlog.lth.se/documents/publications/Lic_Daniel_Knudsen.PDF
- [41] Lardenoije, E. J., Van Raaij, E. M., & Van Weele, A. J. (2005). Performance Management Models and Purchasing: Relevance Still Lost. Researches in Purchasing and Supply Management, the 14th IPSERA Conference, (pp. 687- 97). Archamps.
- [42] Lazaridis, L. (2006). Relationship between working capital management and profitability of listed companies in Athens stock exchange. *Journal of financial management and analysis*, 19, 5-7.
- [43] Magoro, M.J. (2010). The Implementation of the Budget Policy with Reference to the Reconstruction and Development Housing Programme in Limpopo Province (South Africa). Unpublished Master of Philosophy in Public Policy, University of Pretoria.
- [44] Margah, M.P. (2005). *Financial Management and Control in Higher Education*. New York: Routledgefalme.
- [45] McCrudden, C. (2004). Using Budget to achieve to social outcomes. *National Resource Forum*, Vol 28(6):257-267.
- [46] Meyer, N. Dean.(1986). Efficiency vs. Effectiveness. Retrieved 18 March 2018 from [http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/30000/25057/p7meyer.pdf?key1=25057&key2=1652921611&coll=GUIDE&dl=GUIDE &CFID=3852620&CFTOKEN=590](http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/30000/25057/p7meyer.pdf?key1=25057&key2=1652921611&coll=GUIDE&dl=GUIDE&CFID=3852620&CFTOKEN=590) 41182
-

- [47] Milani (1975) Relationship between budgeting and performance of remittance companies in somalia. *educational research international*, 2, 7.
- [48] Mui Yee, C., Wong SekKhin, E. and Ismail, K. (2016).An analysis of budgetary goals impacting organizational performance. *Audit Financiar*, vol. XIV, no. 5(137)/2016, pp. 551-563.
- [49] Mui Yee, Wong SekKhin and Ismail (2016)
- [50] Mui, Wong and Ismail, (2016). Municipal Association of Victoria Model Budget Policy, updated August 2011.
- [51] Nadir, A.G.S.G. (2003). Preferential budget in Local Government: A case study in the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Area. Unpublished MBA dissertation, University of Pretoria, South Africa.
- [52] Naser, K., Kabhari, Y., &Zulkifli, M. (2004). Impact of ISO 9000 registration on company performance: Evidence from Malaysia. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 19(4), 509-516.
- [53] 516.
- [54] Needles, S.C. (2011).*Managerial Accounting*. Nason, USA: South Western Cengage
- [55] Learning.
- [56] Neef, D. (2001). *Budget: From Strategy to Implementation*. Prentice Hall.
- [57] Olympio, A., Biplove, C. and Nicholas J. (2014).An analysis of Government Budgets in
- [58] South Sudan from a human development perspective. Discussion Paper UNDP Uganda August, 2014
- [59] Onduso, E.O. (2013). The Effect of Budgets on Financial Performance of Manufacturing Companies In Nairobi County. *New Business Journal*, 7, 46, 74.
- [60] Pauw, J.C. &Wolvaardt, J.S. (2009). Multi-criteria decision analysis in Public budget-a plan from the south. *Politeia*, Vol. 28(1): 66-88.
- [61] Peacock, S., Chan, C., Mangolini, M. and Johansen, D. July (2001).Techniques for
- [62] Measuring Efficiency in Health Services, Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper. Australia. Retrieved 18 March 2018
- [63] Potter, L. &Smedley, S. (2006). Integrating Quality and Efficiency HM. Commissioning
- [64] Editor: Mark Lupton. Retrieved 18 March 2018 from
- [65] <http://www.cih.org/policy/QualityEfficiency.pdf>
- [66] Preetabh.(2010).*Advantages of Budgetary Control*. Retrieved February 26th, 2018, from <http://expertscolumn.com/content/advantages-budgetary-control>.
- [67] Qi, Y. (2010). The impact of Budget monitoring and evaluation on performance in SMEs in China. Jstor, 117-122.
- [68] Reunis, M. R. B. & van Raaij E. M. (2006). *Scale Development for Budget Adoption Influence Tactics*. Working paper. 15th Annual IPSERA Conference, San Diego.
- [69] Republic of South Africa. (1999). Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999). Pretoria. State Publisher
- [70] Republic of South Africa. (2004). Public Audit Act (Act 25 of 2004). Pretoria. State Publisher.
- [71] Sager, F.K. (1994). The Role of Behavior Intentions in Turnover of Salespeople. *Journal of Business Research*, 29(3): 179-189.
- [72] Salerno (undated). Senior Research Associate, TheCenter for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente.
- [73] Samuel P. and Henrietta L. (2016). Budgeting and its Impact on Financial Performance: The Case of Non-Bank Financial Institutions in Ghana. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection* Vol. 4, No. 5, 2016
- [74] Shields, J.F. & Shields, M.D. (1998). Antecedents of budgetary participation, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 49-76.
- [75] Silva, L.M.D. & Jayamaha, A. (2012).Budgetary Process and organizational performance of Apparel Industry in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, 3(4), 354-360.
- [76] Smith, P.C.; Kendall L.M. & Hulin C.L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- [77] Somanathan, A. Hanson, K, Dorabawila, T. &Perera, B. (2000).Operating Efficiency in Public Sector Health Facilities in Sri Lanka: Measurement and Institutional Determinants of Performance. Small Applied Research Paper No.12. Bethesda, MD: Partnerships for Health Reform Project, Abt Associates Inc. Retrieved 18 March 2018 from <http://www.phrplus.org/Pubs/sar12.pdf>
- [78] Subramaniam, C. & Shaw M. J. (2004).The Effects of Process Characteristics on the Value of B2B Budget. *Information Technology and Management* 5, 161- 180.
-

- [79] Surajkumar, P. (2005). A Study of “Budget monitoring and evaluation System as a Tool of Finance Control” Need and Importance. Retrieved March 08, 2018, from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/13044904/Needand-importance-of-budgetarycontrol-system>
- [80] Syptak, J.M., Marsland, D.W, & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job Satisfaction: Putting Theory Into Practice, *Farm Practice Management*, Oct; 6(9):26-30.
- [81] Tata, J. (2002). The influence of managerial accounts on employees’ reactions to negative feedback, *Group and Organisation Management*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 480-503.
- [82] The British Government Guide to Completing Annual Efficiency Statements for the Department of the Premier (2006)
- [83] Ting, C.Y & Yu, T. K. (2010). Modeling patient perceptions of service recovery: The effects of perceived fairness on health center patronage, *Social Behaviour and Personality*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 395-404.
- [84] Van Weele, A. J. (2006). *Purchasing & Supply Chain Management: Analysis, Strategy, Planning and Practice* (4th ed.). Australia: Thomson.
- [85] Waal, A.A. (2004), Stimulating performance driven behavior to obtain better results, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp.301-306.
- [86] Wijewardena, H., & De Zoysa, A. (2001).the impact of financial planning and control on performance of SMEs in Australia. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 353-365.
- [87] Wofford, J.C. & Goodwin, V.L. (1990). Effects of feedback on cognitive processing and choice of decision style, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 75, no. 6, pp. 603- 612.