

UGANDA MARTYRS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

PROGRAMM: B.Sc. Finance & Accounting (CPA)

COURSE UNIT: **Research Methodology**

DATE: Sunday 27th August , 2019

TIME ALLOWED: 3 hours: 9.00 pm – 12.30 pm

Instructions to Candidates:

Read the following before answering the questions

1. Answer FOUR Questions.
2. Question ONE of section A is compulsory and carries 40 marks.
3. Answer any other THREE Questions from section B. Each question carries 20 marks.
4. Write clearly and legibly.
5. **Do not** write anything on the question paper.

Question 1 :

READ and INTERNALISE the passage

Letting the Big Fish Swim"Failures to Prosecute High-Level Corruption in Uganda

Source : <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/10/21/letting-big-fish-swim/failures-prosecute-high-level-corruption-uganda> 20/08/2019

"Untouchables. Come rain, come shine, they're never going to court, not while there's somebody close to them in power. That's because of the politics involved."

—Prosecutor in the Anti-Corruption Court, May 21, 2013

"This court is tired of trying tilapias when crocodiles are left swimming."

—Justice John Bosco Katutsi, former head of the Anti-Corruption Court, during a ruling convicting an engineer during the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting scandal, June 29, 2010

"Someone will ask, 'Will it pay?' If it will, one will steal. If it won't pay, one won't steal. It should be too expensive to steal. This is why corruption is happening on a grand scale. They must steal enough to stay out of jail."

—Auditor General John Muwanga, May 31, 2013

The news that US\$12.7 million in donor funds had been embezzled from Uganda's Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) hit the headlines in many donor capitals in late 2012, prompting serious questions about Uganda's commitment to fight corruption. The stolen donor funds were earmarked as crucial support for rebuilding northern Uganda, ravaged by a 20-year war, and Karamoja, Uganda's poorest region. Approximately 30 percent of the national budget came from foreign aid in 2012. As a result of the OPM scandal and claims that the money was funneled into private accounts, the European Union, United Kingdom, Germany, Denmark, Ireland, and Norway suspended aid.

The OPM scandal was not the first time that grand scale theft of public money deprived some of Uganda's poorest citizens of better access to fundamental services such as health and education. Past corruption scandals have had a direct impact on human rights. For example, millions of dollars' worth of funds were diverted from the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation in 2006 and from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria in 2005. Despite investigations, none of the high-ranking government officials who managed the implicated offices have faced criminal sanction. Most often they have remained in office, untouched, while individuals working at the technical level have faced prosecution and, in some cases, jail time. Even when ministers have been forced to resign from office, such resignations have been temporary; they were eventually reappointed to key positions in government, in what one diplomatic representative calls a "game of musical chairs." Years of evidence indicate that Uganda's current political system is built on patronage and that ultimately high-level corruption is rewarded rather than punished.

Corruption in Uganda is severe, well-known, cuts across many sectors, and is frequently debated and discussed in the media. Such corruption undermines human rights in multiple ways: a direct defiance of the rule of law and accountability, it indicates that the law and its institutions cannot be relied on to protect against violations of fundamental human rights or deliver justice. By unlawfully interfering with resources that should be available to realize fundamental rights such as the rights to health, water, food, and education—either through illegally appropriating public funds for personal wealth or rendering access to services subject to bribes, which are illegal—corruption leads to violations of human rights that may have disastrous consequences.

Media attention of Uganda's corruption often focuses on the "big fish who got away" and who were allegedly protected from prosecution by other elites. Solutions—often proposed and supported by international donors—usually rely on technical responses. Those responses overlook what, based on past actions, can be described as the government's deep-rooted lack of political will to address corruption at the highest levels and importantly, to set an example—starting from the top—that graft will not be tolerated.

This report analyzes the government's failure to close legal loopholes and ensure that laws are not written or interpreted to insulate political appointees from accountability. It documents why Uganda has failed to hold the highest members of its government accountable for theft of public funds, despite its stated commitment to eradicating corruption and much good work from investigators and prosecutors at the technical level. It also shows how lack of political will has crippled Uganda's anti-corruption institutions, undermining their efforts through political interference, underfunding, harassment, and threats. The lack of a clear system to protect witnesses and insulate prosecutors from bribery and intimidation means that anti-corruption institutions in Uganda have ended up focusing on low-level corruption involving small sums of money, while the "big fish" have continued to accumulate wealth and power.

Lastly, the report examines how efforts of Uganda's international donors—often quick to respond with well-intentioned attempts to support anti-corruption efforts—have been undermined or weakened by their own vested interests, poor coordination, and fluctuating institutional memory, the latter thrown into stark relief by President Yoweri Museveni's long stay in power and his political shrewdness.

Since President Museveni took office in 1986, despite recurrent corruption scandals, only one minister has ever been convicted of a corruption-related offense, a verdict that was overturned on appeal just after the president publicly offered to pay the defendant's legal costs.

Uganda has a variety of government bodies focused on eradicating corruption, including the Anti-Corruption Court, a specialized tribunal within the Ugandan judiciary; the office of the Inspectorate of Government (IG, led by the Inspector General of Government, the IGG), an office mandated by the Ugandan constitution to fight corruption; the Auditor General; and Parliament's Public Accounts Committee, among others. But while these institutions have ably prosecuted low-level corruption for small amounts of money, thus far they have been largely ineffective in curbing grand scale corruption or pushing prosecutions and convictions in an equitable and apolitical manner that would be more likely to ensure accountability of the highest-ranking members of government.

There are institutional, political, and legislative reasons for Uganda's failure to prosecute grand corruption. Most importantly, President Museveni and parliament, which is heavily dominated by ruling party members, have failed to empower key institutions, either by failing to fill key vacancies or by failing to establish institutions such as the Leadership Tribunal which could challenge inaccurate financial asset declarations. In the most egregious example, the position of Deputy Inspector General of Government—which because of a constitutional court ruling is legally required to be filled in order for the IG's office to prosecute cases independently—was vacant since 1995. It was only filled in mid-2013 when donors pressured President Museveni to fill the post. The fact that this occurred only after donors made it a condition for resuming aid shows that a powerful inspector general's office was far from a priority for President Museveni's governance agenda. This case highlights the broader need for vacancies in the justice section to be filled—the Supreme Court has not yet heard the appeal of this ruling because of a lack of quorum—and for legislative reform to address this issue since routine personnel vacancies should not be used to cripple a crucial anti-corruption institution.

Another important reason is that actors within the anti-corruption institutions are inadequately protected and shielded from political influence. In some Anti-Corruption Court cases involving well-connected individuals, senior officials have directed prosecutors to delay prosecution or prematurely try a case with incomplete or weak evidence. Investigators, prosecutors, and witnesses involved in such cases have been the targets of threats and requests for bribes. The Ugandan government should provide greater protection for those involved in prosecutions, including investigators, prosecutors, and witnesses. More robust systems for witness protection could potentially assist in ensuring that quality evidence against high-ranking members of government could come to light.

Legislative reforms would also bolster anti-corruption efforts. Vaguely defined offenses such as "abuse of office" and "causing financial loss" in the 2009 Anti-Corruption Act should be amended to specify more clearly what conduct is prohibited and that intentionality is required. The lack of definitional precision grants discretion to prosecutors to interpret corruption crimes and opens the door to allow political motives to drive cases. To some extent, the overlapping mandates of the Inspectorate of Government and the Directorate of Public Prosecutions for corruption-related offenses has caused a diffusion of responsibility in ensuring accountability for theft of public assets and makes it difficult to hold these agencies to account for prosecutorial inaction. So far the two offices have coordinated but this is an informal and fragile system. And the lack of security of tenure for prosecutors from the Inspectorate of Government makes them vulnerable to the shifting politics and vulnerable to removal should their investigations touch on certain individuals, particularly during the re-appointments process before parliament.

The government's fresh pledges to fight corruption following the OPM scandal in 2013 are called into serious question by the arrest of at least 28 anti-corruption activists in 2013 alone—a significant increase over previous years. A coalition of civil society groups known as the Black Monday Movement began raising grassroots awareness and protesting corruption by wearing black on Mondays and handing out newsletters with information about graft in various sectors. Police have thwarted attempts to distribute information and arrested Black Monday Movement activists, charging them with a range of crimes, from "spreading of harmful propaganda" to "inciting violence" and "possession of prohibited publications." Rather than harassing activists and obstructing public access to information, the government should support the crucial role of civil society in upholding human rights and anti-corruption efforts. This will mean respect and tolerance for civil society's interaction with, and education of, Uganda's urban and rural citizenry.

Corruption obstructs progress on many of Uganda's most serious human rights problems, including access to justice, as well as economic and social rights, such as health, education, water, and food. For international development assistance to address these sectors, Uganda's donors should massively increase the focus on accountability at the highest levels of government and ensure that any reengagement is based on substantive, not cosmetic, changes to Uganda's anti-corruption structures, and serious, not token, government commitments to eradicate corruption. External donors should also actively and vocally support civil society working to document and raise awareness of corruption, by both financially supporting their work and publicly denouncing their arrests and harassment.

Some of Uganda's international donors are considering expanding support for anti-corruption efforts. This support is critical to any meaningful effort to address high-level corruption given its low priority for government spending. However, international donors should proceed with caution if considering a return to sector or direct budget support and ensure the programs can be carefully monitored with clear benchmarks. Donors seeking to support the government in anti-corruption efforts should ensure that serious instances of corruption by high-level government officials, regardless of the stature of the alleged perpetrator or affiliation with the president's inner circle, are duly investigated and successfully

prosecuted. Focus should remain on the highest-ranking individuals possible not only to ensure that kingpins are held responsible but also to make clear that theft and diversion of public resources will not be tolerated irrespective of the perpetrator.

Human Rights Watch calls on the Ugandan government and its international donor community to fight corruption at the highest levels and its attendant human rights consequences and to bolster the capacity and functionality of key anti-corruption institutions. Given Uganda's political patronage system and the duration of President Museveni's stay in power, it is highly unlikely that anything other than the prosecution of the highest-ranking members of the government will fundamentally alter the deeply-rooted patterns of graft and resultant wealth accumulation of certain elites. Without substantial changes in this regard, the injustices of Uganda's corruption problem will endure.

- **END of PASSAGE** -

Using the passage above

- a. Develop a possible problem statement from the information provided. (8 marks)
- b. Suggest a research topic for this problem statement (5 marks)
- c. Develop a Conceptual Framework for this study. (9 marks)
- d. Suggest research objectives (8 marks)
- e. Suggest the research approach/approaches you would use in this study (5 marks)
- f. Discuss the possible problems you may face in carrying out this study (5 marks)

Question Two

" ... review of literature is a critical component of a research ..."

- a. Give at least 5 reasons for a literature review (5 marks)
- b. Assume you have either finalized your research dissertation and the following circumstances
 - UMU has a printing house called UMU Publishers located in Nkozi, Mpigi
 - The work was accessed through the University Link www.umu.ac.lib.rep.12.ac.234.///ax.c and Google www.google.com.aefsrhtj.awetg.//32r
 - The Journal of reference is a UMU Accounting Journal, 4th Volume, 2020.

How would your book be referenced; (10 marks)

- i. *If your work was referenced through Google on 17 July 2020*
- ii. *If your work was published as Chapter 12 in the UMU Accounting Journal of 2020*
- iii. *If the work was accessed through the UMU library portal*
- iv. *If your work was reference , but the year of publication was not known by the person citing*

v. *If your work published as a book in Uganda Martyrs University.*

c. Elaborate the possible challenges you would have in developing a literature review (5 marks)

Question Three

With reference to a possible research objectives (possibly from your personal work or from Qn 1)

- a. Elaborate on the possible characteristics of good study objectives (10 marks)
- b. Elaborate on the possible research tools a researcher can collect field data (5 marks)
- c. Elaborate on the challenges a researcher would face in collecting data (5 marks)

Question Four

- a. State and discuss at least 5 sections of the Research Methodology (Chapter 3) in the UMU Research dissertation. (5 marks)
- b. Discuss at least five possible research designs one may select in carrying out research (10 marks)

Question Five

Using examples from your professional or academic exposure;

- a. Discuss the possible reasons that make a research problem (9 marks)
- b. Elaborate on the concept " serendipity" in research (5 marks)
- c. How would you ensure quality control of your findings? (6 marks)

Question Six

Kyeyune D (2017) carried out a study, Information Systems and Institutional Performance, A Case Study of Vision Group . One of the specific objectives of the study was: The Effect of Information System (IS) End Users on Institutional Performance . Data was collected and the findings are presented in Table 1 .

- a. Read and internalize the findings presented in Table 1

Table 1 : Respondents Opinion on IS End Users on Institutional Performance

	Responses of the respondents				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
End users have an effect on employees' performance at Vision group	11 (6.5%)	17 (10.1%)	43 (25.4%)	52 (30.8%)	46 (27.2%)
The organization has several end users dubbed technicians to help operate IS operations at Vision Group	15 (8.9%)	15 (8.9%)	30 (17.8%)	49 (29.6%)	60 (35.5%)
The end users of IS at Vision Group are well qualified that they can handle the operations of IS efficiently	12 (7.1%)	30 (17.8%)	31 (18.3%)	33 (19.5%)	63 (37.3%)
The end users here warmly accepted the available information systems at Vision Group	19 (11.2%)	30 (17.8%)	32 (23.9%)	40 (23.7%)	43 (28.4%)
Vision Group regularly offers extra training for the end users of the Information systems	23 (13.6%)	17 (10.1%)	18 (10.7%)	64 (37.9%)	47 (27.8%)
With constant use & training, the end users of the IS at Vision group are have gained experience to handle all the related tasks	13 (7.7%)	18 (10.7%)	20 (11.8%)	60 (35.5%)	58 (34.3%)
Recruitment of the end users of the information systems is based on merit	4 (2.4%)	14 (8.3%)	37 (21.9%)	63 (37.3%)	51 (30.2%)

Source: Primary Date 2017.

Qn. Make an interpretation and analysis of the descriptive data presented in Table 1 (7 marks)

- b. The study further ran a Pearson Correlation to determine the relationship strength between the IS End Users and Institutional Performance. The findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 : Pearson Correlation of IS End Users and Institutional Performance

		IS End Users	Institutional Performance
IS End Users	Pearson Correlation	1	.208
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	169	169
Institutional Performance	Pearson Correlation	.208	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	169	169

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

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

Qn. Make an interpretation and analysis of the findings presented in Table 2. (7 marks)

From findings presented in Table 1 and Table 2 make a possible summary , conclusion and recommendations for the *New Vision Group* (6 marks)