MAKERERE UNIVERSITY BUSINESS SCHOOL
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES & RESEARCH
FINAL EXAMINATION FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY, ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/26

COURSE NAME:	**SEMINAR SERIES IV FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS**		
COURSE CODE :	**MIB 8201**		
YEAR :	**TWO (2)**	DATE:	**May 31st 2026**
SEMESTER :	**TWO (2)**		
DATE OF ISSUE:	**MAY 21ST 2026**	SUBMISSION DATE:	**MAY 31st 2026**

MATERIALS PROVIDED WITH THIS PAPER

1. This question paper.
2. SPSS Dataset: **Export_Performance_Final_2026.sav** (provided separately via MUBSEP).
3. Research Questionnaire (Appendix A).

INSTRUCTIONS

A. Examination Format and Submission Requirements

1. **Take-home format.** This is a take-home, open-book examination. Your answer scripts are due for submission on **31st May 2026 at 12:00 PM (noon).** The examination question paper will be availed to students 10 days prior via the University Learning Management System (**MUBSep**) at **https://mubsep.mubs.ac.ug**. You are expected to work independently from the date the paper is released on MUBSep.

2. **Attempt ALL FIVE (5) questions.** All questions carry equal weight (20 marks each). Total marks: 100.
3. **Submission channel.** Email your completed PDF to Quality Assurance Directorate at **exams@mubs.ac.ug.** Copy in the facilitators at **eaaron@mubs.ac.ug** and **rnakigudde@mubs.ac.ug** All three addresses must appear in the email. Submissions must be sent from your **official MUBS student email address** before the deadline.
4. **Document title.** Prepare your answers in a single PDF document. The document must be titled: **'MIB8101 Final — [Your Full Name]'**.
5. **Cover page requirements.** The first page of your answer script must clearly indicate: Programme name, year of study, semester, course code, course name, student registration number, student number, and the name of your registered firm.
6. **Page identification.** Indicate your **student number and signature** on every page of your answer script.
7. **Late submissions.** Submissions received after the deadline will **not be accepted** and will attract an automatic score of zero for the written component.

B. Answering the Questions and Academic Conduct

1. **Software choice.** You may use SPSS, Stata, R, Python, Excel, or any other appropriate statistical software. **Clearly identify the software used** at the beginning of each question in which you produce statistical output.

2. **Embedding outputs.** All statistical outputs (tables, charts, results) must be embedded directly in your submission at the point they are referenced. Outputs presented without accompanying written interpretation will receive zero credit for the interpretation component.
3. **Narrative components.** Every question contains at least one narrative sub-question. These require original analysis and personal academic judgement. There are no single correct answers, marks are awarded for the quality of reasoning, use of evidence, and application of theory.
4. **Independent work.** Students may discuss concepts with colleagues, but all written submissions must be entirely the student's own independent work. Similarity detection will be applied to all submissions. Collusion and plagiarism will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee.
5. **Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools** to generate analytical outputs, statistical interpretations, or narrative responses constitutes academic misconduct and will be penalised accordingly. Assessors are trained to detect AI-generated writing.

DATASET OVERVIEW AND VARIABLE REFERENCE GUIDE

The dataset **Export_Performance_Final_2026.sav** contains responses from **180 managers** employed in Ugandan export firms. Data were collected using the questionnaire in Appendix A. Sections B–E contain Likert-scale items rated from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Composite mean scores have been pre-computed and saved as **EP_Mean, FLC_Mean, IE_Mean,** and **MO_Mean.**

Section	Construct / Variable	Variable Codes	Scale Type	Role in Study
B	Export Performance	EP1 – EP5	Likert 1–5	Dependent Variable (DV)
C	Firm-Level Capabilities	FLC1 – FLC6	Likert 1–5	Independent Variable (IV1)
D	Institutional Environment	IE1 – IE6	Likert 1–5	Independent Variable (IV2)
E	Market Orientation	MO1 – MO6	Likert 1–5	Independent Variable (IV3)
A	Gender	Gender	Nominal (1=F, 2=M)	Grouping variable
A	Designation	Designation	Ordinal (1–3)	Grouping variable
A	Education Level	Education	Ordinal (1–3)	Grouping variable
A	Firm Size (employees)	FirmSize	Ordinal (1–4)	Grouping variable
A	Years of Export Experience	ExportYears	Ordinal (1–4)	Grouping variable

QUESTION ONE

a) Generate a frequency distribution for each of the five background variables: Gender, Designation, Education Level, Firm Size, and Years of Export Experience. For each variable,

report frequencies and valid percentages. Present your results in clearly labelled tables.

(05 marks)

b) Compute descriptive statistics for the four composite mean variables. Your output must include, at minimum: N, Mean, Median, Mode, Standard Deviation, Variance, Skewness, Kurtosis, Minimum, and Maximum for each construct. **(06 marks)**

c) Using the skewness and kurtosis values from 1(b), assess the normality of the distribution for each construct. Where skewness or kurtosis values fall outside the range of ±1.0, describe the nature and direction of the departure from normality. Supplement your assessment with at least one visual output (e.g., histogram or Q-Q plot) for any construct that appears non-normal. **(04 marks)**

d) Based on the descriptive statistics generated in 1(a) and 1(b), write a data-driven profile of the study sample in 200–250 words. Your narrative must: (i) characterize the respondents in terms of their background attributes; (ii) identify which construct recorded the highest and lowest mean scores and offer a substantive explanation, drawing on what you know about Ugandan export firms; and (iii) comment on whether the spread of responses (standard deviation) suggests consensus or divergence of views among respondents. **(05 marks)**

QUESTION TWO

a) Run a reliability analysis for each of the four constructs (EP, FLC, IE, MO) separately. For each construct, report: (i) the overall Cronbach's Alpha coefficient; (ii) the Corrected Item-Total Correlation for each item; and (iii) the Alpha if Item Deleted value for each item. Present each construct's results in a properly labelled table. **(08 marks)**

b) Using a threshold of $\alpha \geq 0.70$ as the minimum acceptable standard of internal consistency, evaluate each construct. For any construct that falls below this threshold, or any individual item whose deletion would improve alpha by more than 0.05, identify the item and state the decision you would make regarding its retention or removal. Justify your decision statistically.

(04 marks)

c) A fellow student submits a dissertation chapter in which she reports Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.81, 0.76, 0.79, and 0.83 for her four constructs and concludes: 'The scales are valid and the data are ready for regression analysis.' In 200–250 words, critically evaluate this conclusion. Your response should: (i) explain what Cronbach's Alpha does and does not measure; (ii) distinguish between reliability and validity; (iii) identify at least two additional validity checks she should have conducted before proceeding to regression; and (iv) state whether, in your view, her conclusion is academically defensible. **(08 marks)**

QUESTION THREE

a) State THREE testable research hypotheses for a multiple regression model in which Export Performance is the dependent variable and Firm-Level Capabilities, Institutional Environment , and Market Orientation are the independent variables. Present each hypothesis in both null (H_0) and alternative (H_1) form. Briefly anchor each hypothesis in one relevant theoretical framework (e.g., Resource-Based View, Institutional Theory, Uppsala Model). **(04 marks)**

b) Generate a Pearson correlation matrix for EP_Mean, FLC_Mean, IE_Mean, and MO_Mean. Report all correlation coefficients and significance values. For each pair involving EP_Mean, state the direction, strength, and significance of the relationship (at both $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$ levels). Use an established framework for interpreting r values to categorise each relationship. **(04 marks)**

c) Run a multiple linear regression with EP_Mean as the dependent variable and FLC_Mean, IE_Mean, and MO_Mean as predictors. Report and interpret: (i) the Model Summary — R, R^2, and Adjusted R^2; (ii) the ANOVA table — F-statistic, degrees of freedom, and significance; (iii) the Coefficients table — unstandardised (B) and standardised (β) coefficients, t-values, and significance for each predictor; and (iv) Tolerance and VIF values for each predictor. For each hypothesis stated in 3(a), state whether it is supported or rejected at $\alpha = 0.05$. **(08 marks)**

d) Based on your regression results, write a theoretically grounded interpretation of 220–280 words. Your narrative must: (i) identify which predictor exerts the strongest effect on export performance and explain why the standardised coefficient (β) is the appropriate basis for this comparison; (ii) discuss what the R^2 and Adjusted R^2 values tell you about the explanatory power of the model and what the gap between the two implies; (iii) reflect on which of the

three theoretical frameworks (RBV, Institutional Theory, or Market Orientation theory) receives the strongest empirical support from your findings; and (iv) identify one limitation of the regression model as applied to this dataset. **(04 marks)**

QUESTION FOUR

a) Conduct an Independent Samples t-Test to determine whether perceived Export Performance (EP_Mean) differs significantly between male and female respondents. Report: (i) the Levene's Test result and explain which row of the t-test output you will read and why; (ii) the t-statistic, degrees of freedom, and two-tailed significance; and (iii) the mean EP_Mean score for each gender group. At $\alpha = 0.05$, state your conclusion regarding gender differences. **(05 marks)**

b) Conduct a One-Way ANOVA to test whether Export Performance (EP_Mean) differs significantly across the three levels of education (Certificate/Diploma, Bachelor's Degree, Postgraduate). Report the F-statistic, degrees of freedom, and significance. If the result is significant at $p < 0.05$, run an appropriate post-hoc test to identify which specific groups differ. Report the group means and post-hoc results in a clearly labelled table. Also report Levene's test for homogeneity of variance and comment on whether the ANOVA assumption is met. **(06 marks)**

c) Extend the ANOVA framework by testing whether Firm-Level Capabilities (FLC_Mean) differ significantly across firms of different sizes (FirmSize, four categories). Run the One-Way ANOVA and, if significant, the appropriate post-hoc test. Report the η^2 (eta-squared) effect size for this ANOVA and interpret its magnitude using standard benchmarks (small = 0.01, medium = 0.06, large = 0.14). **(04 marks)**

d) Drawing on ALL group difference analyses in Questions 4(a), 4(b), and 4(c), write a policy-oriented narrative of 220–270 words addressed to the Uganda Export Promotions Board (UEPB). Your narrative must: (i) summarise the most significant group-level findings in plain, non-technical language accessible to a policy audience; (ii) identify which group of exporters appears most disadvantaged in terms of capabilities or performance; (iii) propose two specific, evidence-based interventions the UEPB could implement; and (iv) acknowledge one important caveat about the causal claims that can legitimately be drawn from these cross-sectional findings. **(05 marks)**

QUESTION FIVE

a) Generate a cross-tabulation of Designation (rows) by Education (columns). Display row percentages, column percentages, and total percentages. Accompany the table with a clustered bar chart. Describe in three to four sentences the pattern you observe: does the distribution of educational qualifications vary systematically across designation levels? **(04 marks)**

b) From the Chi-Square output for the Designation × Education cross-tabulation, report: (i) the Pearson Chi-Square value (χ^2), degrees of freedom, and asymptotic significance; (ii) the percentage of cells with expected frequency below 5 (from the footnote) and comment on whether the Chi-Square assumption is satisfied; and (iii) the Cramer's V coefficient and interpret its magnitude as an effect size. State your conclusion regarding the association between designation and education at $\alpha = 0.05$. **(05 marks)**

c) Conduct ONE additional chi-square test of your own choosing using any two categorical variables from the dataset (other than the Designation × Education pair already analysed). State why you selected this particular combination, report the full chi-square output, and interpret the result. Reflect on what the finding adds to your understanding of the sample. **(04 marks)**

d) Write an integrated research narrative of 300–350 words that synthesises the findings from ALL five questions into a coherent academic conclusion. Your narrative must address the following, in this order: (i) a one-paragraph summary of the sample profile and data quality (drawing on Questions 1 and 2); (ii) the central finding of the study, which determinant most strongly predicts export performance and what this implies theoretically (drawing on Question 3); (iii) the key group-level insight and its practical implication (drawing on Question 4); (iv) what the associational patterns among categorical variables add to the picture (Question 5); and (v) a closing reflection of three to four sentences on what you personally found most surprising or challenging in this dataset, and why. The reflection in (v) must be specific to your own experience of the data, generic statements will not attract marks. **(07 marks)**

END OF EXAMINATION