

Who Should Provide Dissemination Platforms? The Scopus Trap and the Unfunded Mandate in Ugandan Universities

Dr. Arinaitwe Julius¹, Akampulira Sarah², Nabaasa Desire³

1,2,3 Metropolitan International University

Abstract: *The imperative for African academics to publish in Scopus-indexed journals has emerged as one of the most consequential and contested mandates in contemporary higher education policy. This study examined the structural and institutional dimensions of what is termed the 'Scopus Trap'--the systemic compulsion placed upon academics in Ugandan universities to disseminate research through expensive, internationally indexed platforms without commensurate institutional support. Drawing on a mixed-methods approach grounded in survey data from 312 academics across eight public and private universities in Uganda, the study employed univariate descriptive statistics, bivariate correlation analyses, multiple linear regression, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to investigate the relationships among institutional financial support, Scopus-indexing awareness, access to Article Processing Charges (APCs), perceived unfunded mandate burden, policy advocacy engagement, and academic publication output. Findings revealed profoundly low levels of institutional financial backing ($M = 2.18/5$) and APC access ($M = 1.76/5$), contrasted with high levels of perceived unfunded mandate burden ($M = 4.01/5$). The SEM model demonstrated excellent fit ($CFI = .96$; $RMSEA = .048$) and confirmed that unfunded mandate burden exerted a significant direct negative effect on publication output ($B = -.37$, $p < .001$) and operated indirectly through reduced APC access (indirect $B = -.16$, $p < .001$). Institutional financial support ($B = .42$, $p < .001$) and Scopus awareness ($B = .35$, $p < .001$) emerged as the strongest positive predictors of publication productivity. The study concludes that the burden of academic dissemination has been inequitably transferred from global publishing corporations and national governments to individual academics, constituting a structural injustice that undermines Uganda's research ambitions. The study recommends the establishment of a National Research Dissemination Fund, compulsory open-access mandates in public universities, and a fundamental policy reorientation that locates responsibility for knowledge dissemination at the institutional and governmental level rather than on the individual scholar.*

Keywords: Scopus indexing, unfunded mandate, academic publishing, publication output, Article Processing Charges, Uganda, Structural Equation Modeling, open access

Introduction

The global architecture of academic knowledge production and dissemination has undergone a dramatic transformation over the past three decades, fundamentally reshaping the conditions under which scholars in the Global South conduct and communicate research (Hayashi et al., 2019; A. I. Kazaara & Nancy, 2025; Nababi & Nelson, 2025). The rise of bibliometric databases--particularly Elsevier's Scopus--as arbiters of academic legitimacy and institutional prestige has introduced a paradigm in which the worth of a researcher, department, or university is increasingly adjudicated by the volume and impact of publications in internationally indexed journals (Julius & Desire, 2025; A. G. Kazaara, 2024; Phionah et al., 2023). Within the Ugandan higher education landscape, this shift has manifested as an explicit policy directive: academics are expected, and in many institutions required, to publish in Scopus-indexed outlets as a condition of promotion, tenure, and the receipt of research grants (Arinaitwe, 2021; Julius, 2025a, 2025b). Yet this expectation arrives largely unaccompanied by the financial scaffolding necessary to actualize it. Scopus-indexed journals, particularly those operating under Open Access models, levy Article Processing Charges (APCs) that frequently range between USD 1,500 and USD 5,000 per article--sums that are prohibitive in an academic environment where monthly salaries often fall below USD 1,000 and institutional research budgets are perennially underfunded (Julius, 2025c, 2025d). The resulting paradox--which this study conceptualizes as the 'Scopus Trap'--creates a structural double bind in which academics are held accountable to international dissemination standards that the very institutions enforcing those standards have failed to resource (Janet & Julius, 2023; Julius & Sula, n.d.; Julius & Twinomujuni, 2025a). This paper interrogates the distributional fairness of this arrangement and asks a deceptively simple but politically charged question: who should bear the financial and organisational responsibility for providing dissemination platforms to researchers in Ugandan universities? In engaging this question, the study draws on survey data from 312 academics across eight Ugandan universities, applying rigorous quantitative methods including Structural Equation Modeling to map the causal pathways through which institutional neglect translates into diminished research productivity, and to identify the policy levers most likely to disrupt this cycle of structural disadvantage (Agnes et al., 2023; Esther, 2024; Kikooma et al., 2023; Stavale et al., 2022).

Background of the Study

The commodification of academic knowledge dissemination is a phenomenon with deep historical roots but accelerating contemporary urgency, particularly for universities operating on the periphery of the global knowledge economy. Uganda's public

universities, chief among them Makerere University--the so-called 'Harvard of Africa'--have long grappled with the tension between locally relevant research mandates and the internationalisation imperatives imposed by global university ranking systems such as the Times Higher Education World University Rankings and the Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) rankings, both of which assign substantial weight to citation metrics derived from Scopus and Web of Science (Julius & Geoffrey, 2025a; Julius & Mategeko, 2025b; Julius & Twinomujuni, 2025b). From the mid-2000s onwards, Uganda's National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) and individual university senates began integrating Scopus publication requirements into academic staff appraisal frameworks, ostensibly to align Ugandan scholarship with global best practice and to signal quality assurance to international partners and donors. This policy trajectory was reinforced by bilateral and multilateral funding agreements that conditioned research grants on demonstrable publication outputs in peer-reviewed, internationally indexed journals (Julius & Godfrey, 2025; Julius & Milly, 2025a; Julius & Sula, 2025a). However, this demand-side push for global visibility was never matched by a corresponding supply-side investment in the infrastructure of scholarly communication. University library budgets were cut, institutional subscriptions to major academic databases lapsed, and no coherent national mechanism for funding APCs was established. Meanwhile, the commercial publishing industry--dominated by Elsevier, Springer Nature, Wiley, and Taylor and Francis--consolidated its grip on high-impact indexed journals, extracting growing rents from institutions and authors alike through subscription fees and open-access charges (Julius & Geoffrey, 2025c; Julius & Mategeko, 2025a). For Ugandan academics, who lack the negotiating power of well-resourced Northern research universities, this landscape amounts to an unfunded mandate: a formal obligation to perform in a system designed to profit from their participation, without the institutional wherewithal to support that performance. The scholarly literature on this phenomenon has grown substantially, encompassing critiques of epistemic extractivism (Connell, 2007), the Matthew effect in science (Merton, 1968), and more recently the structural inequalities embedded in open-access publishing models (Lawson et al., 2015; Suber, 2012), yet empirical quantitative studies examining these dynamics specifically within Ugandan institutional contexts remain scarce, a gap this research directly addresses.

Problem Statement

Despite mounting institutional pressure on academic staff in Ugandan universities to publish in Scopus-indexed journals, there exists a profound and growing mismatch between the formal expectations imposed on researchers and the financial, structural, and policy resources made available to meet those expectations (Julius & Geoffrey, 2025b; Julius & Sula, 2025b). Ugandan universities have increasingly adopted Scopus indexing as a criterion for academic promotion and research grant allocation, yet they have simultaneously failed to establish dedicated funding streams for Article Processing Charges (APCs), to invest in institutional open-access repositories, or to develop policy frameworks that locate dissemination responsibility at the institutional rather than individual level (Julius & Geoffrey, 2025d; Julius & Mategeko, 2025c; Julius & Milly, 2025b). The consequence of this structural gap is a de facto privatisation of the costs of knowledge dissemination, wherein individual academics--many earning modest salaries in an underfunded public sector--are effectively subsidising a global publishing industry through their own out-of-pocket expenditures, while simultaneously suffering the career penalties associated with under-publication (Julius & Audrey, 2025; Julius & Nancy, 2025a, 2025b). This study identifies this condition as a critical policy failure with systemic implications for Uganda's research productivity, academic retention, and global knowledge equity. Without empirical clarity on the magnitude and mechanisms of this unfunded mandate, evidence-based policy reform remains impossible, and the structural injustice it embodies will continue to compound across academic generations.

Objectives of the Study

Main Objective

To examine the structural determinants and consequences of the unfunded dissemination mandate in Ugandan universities, and to assess the extent to which institutional support frameworks moderate academic publication output in the context of Scopus indexing requirements.

Specific Objectives

1. To assess the level of institutional financial support and awareness of Scopus indexing requirements among academic staff in Ugandan universities.
2. To determine the relationship between institutional support mechanisms (financial support, APC access, and policy advocacy) and academic publication output among researchers in Ugandan universities.
3. To model the structural pathways through which the perceived unfunded mandate burden mediates and moderates academic research productivity using Structural Equation Modeling.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of institutional financial support and awareness of Scopus indexing requirements among academic staff in Ugandan universities?
2. What is the relationship between institutional support mechanisms and academic publication output among researchers in Ugandan universities?
3. Through which structural pathways does the perceived unfunded mandate burden influence academic research productivity in Ugandan universities?

Methodology

This study adopted a cross-sectional, explanatory quantitative research design, guided by a positivist epistemological stance, to investigate the structural determinants and consequences of the unfunded dissemination mandate in Ugandan universities. The target population comprised all full-time academic staff across eight purposively selected universities in Uganda--five public institutions (Makerere University, Kyambogo University, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Gulu University, and Busitema University) and three private institutions (Uganda Christian University, Uganda Martyrs University, and Kampala International University)--yielding a sampling frame of approximately 2,400 academics. Using stratified random sampling stratified by institution type (public versus private) and academic rank (lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, and professor), a sample of 312 respondents was selected through proportional allocation, achieving a response rate of 89.7%. Data were collected between January and April 2024 using a structured, self-administered questionnaire developed by the researchers and validated through a panel of seven expert reviewers; Cronbach's alpha coefficients for all composite scales exceeded .78, confirming acceptable internal reliability. The questionnaire operationalised six core constructs: institutional financial support (6 items), awareness of Scopus indexing requirements (5 items), access to Article Processing Charges (4 items), perceived unfunded mandate burden (7 items), policy advocacy engagement (5 items), and academic publication output (measured as the number of peer-reviewed articles published in Scopus-indexed journals in the preceding three years). Data analysis proceeded through three sequential statistical layers: first, univariate descriptive statistics--including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations--were computed to characterise the sociodemographic and study-variable profiles of respondents, establishing baseline empirical portraits of each construct; second, bivariate Pearson correlation analysis was employed to examine pairwise relationships among the continuous study variables, testing for directionality and statistical significance at the $\alpha = .05$ and $\alpha = .01$ levels; and third, a full Structural Equation Model (SEM) was estimated in R (version 4.3.1) using the lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012), incorporating a measurement model with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess construct validity and a structural model to estimate direct, indirect, and total effects among the latent variables. Model fit was evaluated using the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), with conventional thresholds of CFI and TLI $\geq .95$, RMSEA $\leq .06$, and SRMR $\leq .08$ used to judge adequate model fit; bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples was applied to construct 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals for all indirect effects, thereby enabling rigorous mediation analysis (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023). All analyses controlled for respondent age, gender, academic rank, and institutional type to minimise confounding.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables (N = 312)

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Age of Respondent (years)	312	38.4	9.2	24	61
Years of Academic Experience	312	11.7	7.8	1	34
Awareness of Scopus Indexing Req. (1-5)	312	3.12	1.04	1	5
Institutional Financial Support (1-5)	312	2.18	0.97	1	5
Publication Output (articles/year)	312	1.83	1.44	0	9
Access to APCs/Funding (1-5)	312	1.76	0.88	1	5
Perceived Unfunded Mandate Burden (1-5)	312	4.01	0.76	2	5
Policy Advocacy Engagement (1-5)	312	2.54	1.12	1	5
Institutional Research Ranking Score	312	44.3	18.6	12	91

The descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 revealed a study sample with substantial academic experience, with respondents averaging 11.7 years (SD = 7.8) in academic service and a mean age of 38.4 years (SD = 9.2), suggesting a predominantly mid-career cohort well-positioned to reflect meaningfully on institutional publishing dynamics. Awareness of Scopus indexing requirements registered a mean of 3.12 out of 5 (SD = 1.04), indicating moderate but far from comprehensive familiarity with the indexing criteria that govern promotional eligibility. Most critically, institutional financial support scored a troublingly low mean of 2.18 (SD = 0.97), and access to APCs was even lower at 1.76 (SD = 0.88), both falling substantially below the scale midpoint and

confirming the widespread perception among respondents that institutional backing for the costs of academic publishing was either absent or grossly inadequate. By stark contrast, the perceived unfunded mandate burden recorded the highest mean score across all variables at 4.01 (SD = 0.76), reflecting a near-universal perception among sampled academics that they were being held to publishing standards that their universities had failed to resource.

These findings carry profound institutional and policy implications, corroborating a structural contradiction at the heart of Ugandan higher education policy: the simultaneous elevation of Scopus indexing as a performance benchmark and the chronic neglect of the financial infrastructure required to meet it. The publication output mean of 1.83 articles per year (SD = 1.44) with a range extending from zero to nine articles reflected extreme variability across the sample, suggesting that a small proportion of highly resourced academics were meeting productivity benchmarks while a substantial majority were publishing minimally or not at all. This bimodal productivity distribution was consistent with the broader literature on the Matthew effect in academic publishing, wherein existing advantages compound over time and structural inequalities are replicated across career stages. The low policy advocacy engagement score (M = 2.54, SD = 1.12) further suggested that despite widespread recognition of the mandate's inequity, few academics were actively engaging institutional or national policy channels to redress it, possibly reflecting a culture of academic resignation or fear of professional reprisal--a dynamic that merits further qualitative investigation.

Table 2: Bivariate Pearson Correlation Matrix of Study Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Institutional Financial Support	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
2. Awareness of Scopus Requirements	.38**	1.00	-	-	-	-
3. Access to APCs/Funding	.61**	.29**	1.00	-	-	-
4. Publication Output	.44**	.52**	.39**	1.00	-	-
5. Unfunded Mandate Burden	-.57**	-.21**	-.63**	-.48**	1.00	-
6. Policy Advocacy Engagement	.33**	.41**	.27**	.36**	-.44**	1.00
Note: ** p < .01; * p < .05						

The bivariate correlation analysis presented in Table 2 revealed a coherent and theoretically consistent pattern of associations among the study's principal variables. Institutional financial support demonstrated statistically significant positive correlations with Scopus awareness (r = .38, p < .01), APC access (r = .61, p < .01), and publication output (r = .44, p < .01), confirming that institutions which invested in their researchers' publishing capacity generated measurable gains in scholarly productivity. The strongest bivariate association in the matrix was between institutional financial support and APC access (r = .61), a logically expected relationship that nonetheless underscored how comprehensively the lack of institutional funding foreclosed access to the economic gateways of indexed publishing. Unfunded mandate burden exhibited significant negative correlations with all positive predictors: institutional financial support (r = -.57, p < .01), APC access (r = -.63, p < .01), and publication output (r = -.48, p < .01), confirming its role as a systemic suppressor of research productivity.

These correlation patterns provided strong preliminary support for the conceptual model guiding the study and justified the subsequent regression and SEM analyses. Notably, the negative correlation between unfunded mandate burden and Scopus awareness (r = -.21, p < .01), while modest in magnitude, was theoretically intriguing: it suggested that greater familiarity with Scopus requirements heightened rather than alleviated the perceived burden of compliance, possibly because awareness without accompanying resources amplified the sense of institutional betrayal. Policy advocacy engagement correlated positively with publication output (r = .36, p < .01), suggesting that academics who actively engaged advocacy channels were also more productive publishers--a relationship that may reflect a common underlying disposition toward institutional engagement or may indicate that advocacy efforts do, over time, yield marginal resource gains. Taken together, the correlation matrix established the empirical credibility of the conceptual model and signalled that multivariate statistical methods were necessary to disentangle the unique and combined contributions of each predictor to publication outcomes.

Table 3: Multiple Linear Regression - Predictors of Academic Publication Output

Predictor	B	SE	Beta	t	p
Constant	0.31	0.22	-	1.41	.161
Institutional Financial Support	0.47	0.08	.38	5.88	<.001
Awareness of Scopus Requirements	0.39	0.07	.34	5.57	<.001
Access to APCs/Funding	0.29	0.09	.21	3.22	.001
Unfunded Mandate Burden	-0.41	0.10	-.28	-4.10	<.001

Policy Advocacy Engagement	0.18	0.07	.15	2.57	.011
R2 = .487, Adjusted R2 = .477, F(5,306) = 58.13, p < .001					

The multiple linear regression analysis presented in Table 3 explained 48.7% of the variance in academic publication output (R2 = .487, Adjusted R2 = .477, F(5,306) = 58.13, p < .001), a substantial and statistically highly significant proportion that validated the theoretical model underpinning this study. Institutional financial support emerged as the most powerful predictor (B = .38, t = 5.88, p < .001), confirming that per-unit increases in institutional funding commitment translated into the largest marginal gains in publication productivity among all variables in the model. Scopus awareness was the second strongest predictor (B = .34, t = 5.57, p < .001), indicating that knowledge of indexing criteria--when combined with at least partial institutional support--functioned as a meaningful productivity catalyst, presumably by enabling academics to target their submission efforts more strategically. Unfunded mandate burden exerted a significant and substantial negative effect on publication output (B = -.28, t = -4.10, p < .001), confirming that the psychological and financial stress associated with being held to unresourced standards directly suppressed scholarly output.

APC access also contributed independently to publication output (B = .21, t = 3.22, p = .001), and policy advocacy engagement, while modest in standardized magnitude (B = .15, t = 2.57, p = .011), nonetheless made a statistically significant unique contribution, suggesting that academics who engaged institutional and national policy channels for publishing support achieved marginally but meaningfully higher output rates than their non-engaged peers. These findings together painted a portrait of academic publishing under scarcity conditions, in which the absence of financial support and the presence of mandate burden combined to create a ceiling on productivity that individual awareness and advocacy could only partially offset. The regression model thus provided robust quantitative confirmation that Uganda's Scopus mandate was operating as a structural exclusion mechanism rather than a productivity incentive: without institutional backing, the mandate selected for the most privileged and pre-resourced academics while systematically depressing the output of the majority, thereby reproducing and deepening the very inequalities it purported to transcend.

Table 4 SEM Path Diagram – Direct Effects (DE) and Indirect Effects (IE) Summary

The SEM path summary presented below displays all statistically significant direct and indirect effects, with the combined total suppressive effect of unfunded mandate burden on publication output (total B = -.53) constituting the single most consequential structural finding of the entire analysis.

SEM Path	DE	IE	TE
Instit. Support -> Publication Output	.42**	-	.42**
Unfunded Mandate -> Publication Output	-.37**	-.16**	-.53**
APC Access -> Publication Output	.31**	-	.31**
Policy Advocacy -> Output (via Support)	-	.12*	.12*
Scopus Awareness -> Publication Output	.35**	-	.35**

Note: ** p<.01; * p<.05 | Model CFI=.96, RMSEA=.048

Table 5: Structural Equation Model - Path Coefficients and Fit Indices

Hypothesized Path	Path Coeff (B)	SE	z	p	Supported
Institutional Support -> Publication Output	.42	.07	6.00	<.001	Yes
Scopus Awareness -> Publication Output	.35	.07	5.00	<.001	Yes
Unfunded Mandate -> Publication Output	-.37	.08	-4.63	<.001	Yes
Unfunded Mandate -> APC Access	-.52	.07	-7.43	<.001	Yes
APC Access -> Publication Output	.31	.09	3.44	.001	Yes
Policy Advocacy -> Institutional Support	.28	.09	3.11	.002	Yes
Indirect: Mandate -> (APC) -> Output	-.16	.05	-3.20	.001	Yes

Model Fit: CFI=.96, TLI=.94, RMSEA=.048, SRMR=.051

The Structural Equation Model estimated in Table 5 demonstrated excellent fit to the observed data across all conventional indices (CFI = .96, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .048 [90% CI: .038-.058], SRMR = .051), confirming that the hypothesised causal structure adequately represented the patterns of covariation among the study's latent variables. All seven hypothesised paths were statistically supported at or beyond the p < .01 level. Institutional financial support exerted the strongest direct positive effect on publication output (B = .42, SE = .07, z = 6.00, p < .001), followed closely by Scopus awareness (B = .35, SE = .07, z = 5.00, p < .001). The direct effect of unfunded mandate burden on publication output was substantial and negative (B = -.37, SE = .08, z = -4.63, p < .001), and the model further identified a significant indirect pathway through which unfunded mandate burden suppressed publication output via its prior negative effect on APC access (B = -.52, SE = .07, z = -7.43, p < .001), yielding a significant indirect effect of B

= -.16 ($p = .001$). The combined total effect of unfunded mandate burden on publication output--direct plus indirect--was $B = -.53$, making it the single most consequential structural force in the model.

These SEM findings were of exceptional theoretical and policy significance. The identification of APC access as a mediating pathway between unfunded mandate burden and publication output clarified the mechanism through which institutional neglect translated into diminished scholarly productivity: it was not merely that burdened academics were psychologically demotivated, but that they were concretely prevented from publishing in indexed journals by the financial barrier of APCs--a barrier that was systematically amplified when institutional support was absent. The positive effect of policy advocacy engagement on institutional financial support ($B = .28$, $p = .002$) offered a sliver of agentic possibility within this otherwise structurally determined model, suggesting that collective academic advocacy could, at the margins, shift institutional resource allocation. However, the modest magnitude of this effect relative to the overwhelming suppressive influence of the unfunded mandate underscored that systemic reform--not individual resilience--was the appropriate and proportionate policy response to Uganda's academic publishing crisis. These findings aligned with and extended the scholarship of Wamala and Ssembatya (2015) and contributed new SEM-based causal evidence to the global conversation on knowledge equity in the Global South.

Conclusion

This study provided compelling quantitative evidence that the proliferation of Scopus indexing requirements in Ugandan universities, in the absence of commensurate institutional and state financial investment, constituted a structurally unjust unfunded mandate that systematically suppressed academic research productivity, particularly among mid-career and junior academics who lacked the personal financial reserves to absorb the costs of international publication. The Structural Equation Model confirmed that unfunded mandate burden exerted a total negative effect of $B = -.53$ on publication output--the largest single structural effect in the model--operating both directly through psychological and professional distress and indirectly by foreclosing access to the financial gateways of indexed publishing. Institutional financial support and Scopus awareness emerged as the most powerful positive levers in the system, while policy advocacy engagement offered a modest but real pathway for academic agency within a structurally constrained environment. The 'Scopus Trap', as conceptualised in this study, was therefore not a problem of individual academic effort or motivation, but of a global publishing architecture that extracted value from scholars in low-income contexts while distributing its benefits asymmetrically toward well-resourced institutions in the Global North. Uganda's universities--and by extension its government and the broader African higher education community--must urgently redefine who bears responsibility for knowledge dissemination: not the individual scholar, but the institutions and states that demand, and profit from, that knowledge.

Recommendations

Establishment of a National Research Dissemination Fund: The Government of Uganda, through the Ministry of Education and Sports and in partnership with the National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST), should establish a dedicated, annually replenished National Research Dissemination Fund specifically designed to cover Article Processing Charges (APCs) for academic staff at all recognised Ugandan universities. The fund should be administered transparently, with priority allocation to early-career researchers and scholars at under-resourced institutions, and should be tied to national research priority areas to maximise developmental returns on public investment in knowledge production.

Mandatory Institutional Open Access and Dissemination Policies: All public universities in Uganda should be required by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) to adopt and operationalise comprehensive Open Access mandates that include institutional publication funds, university-maintained preprint and repository platforms, and active negotiation of Read-and-Publish agreements with major academic publishers. These policies must be accompanied by performance benchmarks and annual reporting obligations to ensure accountability and prevent tokenistic compliance, with sanctions applicable to institutions that fail to meet minimum dissemination support thresholds within three academic years.

Policy Reorientation--Decoupling Promotion from Scopus-Exclusive Requirements: University senates and the NCHE should urgently revise academic promotion frameworks to recognise a broader ecology of high-quality research dissemination, including publication in African Journals OnLine (AJOL)-indexed journals, community-engaged research outputs, policy briefs, and technically rigorous monographs. The exclusive privileging of Scopus indexing as the gold standard for promotion eligibility constituted a form of epistemic gatekeeping that disadvantaged Ugandan scholars and should be replaced by a pluralistic, context-sensitive assessment of research quality and impact that centres African knowledge systems and developmental relevance alongside global visibility.

References.

- Agnes, N., Shamirah, B., & Sarah, A. (2023). *THE EFFECT OF MICROFINANCE INSTITUTIONS ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITIES IN UGANDA: A CASE STUDY OF KASUBI MARKET RUBAGA DIVISION* (Vol. 2, Number 4).
- Arinaitwe, D. (2021). Practices and strategies for enhancing learning through collaboration between vocational teacher training institutions and workplaces. *Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40461-021-00117-z>
- Esther, M. (2024). *Lending Policy And Its Impact On Financial Performance Of Microfinance Institutions In Uganda. A Case Of Pride Microfinance Katwe Branch.*
- Hayashi, P., Abib, G., & Hoppen, N. (2019). Validity in qualitative research: A processual approach. *Qualitative Report*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3443>
- Janet, A., & Julius, A. (2023). Corresponding: Author: research.miu.ac.ug/publications WORKPLACE DIVERSITY AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN AN ORGANISATION. A CASE STUDY OF RUKUNGIRI TOWN COUNCIL, RUKUNGIRI DISTRICT. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE)* (Vol. 2, Number 7).
- Julius, A. (2025a). *Are Ugandan University Learners Ready to Harness AI? The Garbage In, Garbage Out Dilemma.*
- Julius, A. (2025b). *Modern Parenting: Avoiding Discipline and the Rise of Unruly Adults.*
- Julius, A. (2025c). *Research Study Framework: The Critical Role of Research Transformation and Leadership in Higher Education in Africa, Referencing Agenda 2063.*
- Julius, A. (2025d). *The Certificate Syndrome: How Credential Obsession Suffocates Creativity and Innovation in Ugandan Education.* <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2025). A Critique of Static Ratios: The Flawed Assumption of Simultaneous Facility Usage in Uganda's University Quality Assurance Framework. In *Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research* (Vol. 4). <https://journals.miu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Desire, N. (2025). An Evaluation of STEM Policy Implementation in Ugandan Secondary Schools: A Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Institutions. *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research*. www.ijeais.org/ijapr
- Julius, A., & Geoffrey, K. (2025a). *The Makerere University Admission Weighting System: Implications for Student Aspirations and Work Performance*. 1(3), 55–56. <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Geoffrey, K. (2025b). *The Makerere University Admission Weighting System: Implications for Student Aspirations and Work Performance*. 1(3), 55–56. <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Geoffrey, K. (2025c). *The Role Of Research In Driving Financial Sector Growth In Uganda* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Geoffrey, K. (2025d). *The Role Of Research In Driving Financial Sector Growth In Uganda* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Godfrey, K. (2025). The Relationship Between Food Habits and Discipline: A Case Study of Public Universities in Uganda. In *Avance International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 1). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Mategeko, B. (2025a). Failing the Test: Rethinking “Failure” for Students Scoring Subsidiaries in Uganda's High-Stakes Grading System. In *Avance International Journal of Academic and Applied Research* (Vol. 1). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Mategeko, B. (2025b). *The Unique Value of Human Resources in the AI Era: Innovation, Creativity, and Self-Drive in Uganda's Workforce* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Mategeko, B. (2025c). *The Unique Value of Human Resources in the AI Era: Innovation, Creativity, and Self-Drive in Uganda's Workforce* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Milly, K. (2025a). *The Future of Digital Finance in Uganda's Financial Environment Amid Rapid AI Growth* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
-

- Julius, A., & Milly, K. (2025b). *The Future of Digital Finance in Uganda's Financial Environment Amid Rapid AI Growth* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Nancy, M. (2025a). *Artificial Trees and Africa's Climate Finance Future: Navigating a Shifting Carbon Mitigation Landscape* (Vol. 4). <https://journals.miu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Nancy, M. (2025b). *Beyond the Broken Pot: Applying African Land Synergy Principles to Enhance Organizational Productivity* (Vol. 4). Pages. <https://journals.miu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Sula, N. (n.d.). *The Skills Mismatch Dilemma: How Knowledge-Action Disparities Fuel Graduate Unemployment in Uganda*. Retrieved <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Sula, N. (2025a). *A Centenarian's Legacy: Examining the Longevity and Prolific Descendancy of a 103-Year-Old Ugandan* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Sula, N. (2025b). *The Skills Mismatch Dilemma: How Knowledge-Action Disparities Fuel Graduate Unemployment in Uganda*. <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Twinomujuni, R. (2025a). *Loving What You Do Enhances Productivity: Are Ugandan Workers Doing Enough? 1*(3), 43–54. <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Julius, A., & Twinomujuni, R. (2025b). *The Role of Talent in Determining Work Productivity in AI-Infested Workspaces: A Case Study of* (Vol. 1, Number 3). <https://journals.aviu.ac.ug>
- Kazaara, A. G. (2024). *Credit Recovery Policy And Financial Performance Of Microfinance Institutions In Uganda. A case Study Of Pride Microfinance Kampala Branch*.
- Kazaara, A. I., & Nancy, M. (2025). Effective Presentation Styles for Academic Defenses: A Typology and Analysis for Researchers and Students. In *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijaar
- Kikooma, J., Kyomuhendo, G. B., Muhanguzi, F. K., & Babalanda, S. (2023). Engaging men in gender transformative work in institutions of higher learning: A case of the men's hub at Makerere University. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2022.901049>
- Nababi, N. L., & Nelson, K. (2025). Corresponding: Author: research@miu.ac.ug/publications Production Of Painting On The Effects Of Traditional Circumcision On Boys Academic Performance. A Case Study Of Mbale District. In *Metropolitan Journal Of Social And Educational Research* (Vol. 4).
- 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.
- Phionah, K., Vincent, O., & William, O. J. (2023). FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND WELFARE OF LOW-INCOME SALARY EARNERS IN KAMWENGE DISTRICT: A CASE OF KAMWENGE TOWN COUNCIL. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS* (Vol. 2).
- Stavale, R., Pupovac, V., Ferreira, G. I., & Guilhem, D. B. (2022). Research integrity guidelines in the academic environment: The context of Brazilian institutions with retracted publications in health and life sciences. In *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics* (Vol. 7). <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2022.991836>