

MEMO

To: **SEMINAR SERIES III STUDENTS, MSc MARKETING**
Date: October 3rd 2026
Course: Seminar Series III (MKT 8108)
Academic Year: 2026/2027, Semester One
Subject: **UPDATED COURSE WORK ONE RESULTS.**
From: Assoc. Prof. Aaron ECEL, Ph.D | Internal Examiner

A. RESULTS

NAME	Content & essence alignment	Literature review quality	Referencing accuracy (APA 7)	Structural compliance	TOTAL	
	(X/8)	(X/6)	(X/4)	(X/2)	(X/20)	100%
1 BANURA Isaac	6	4	2	1.25	13.25	66
2 KABAHWEZA FAVOUR RUHWEZ	5	4	2.5	1	12.5	63
3 KAKAYI Cecilia	5	4.5	2.5	1.5	13.5	67.5
4 KAMBWE Sulah	7	5.5	3	1.75	17.25	86
5 NAYEBARE Vanessa	4.5	3	2	0.5	10	50

B. FEEDBACK

1. NAYEBARE Vanessa

- No quantified problem, and no data period.
- Your problem statement has no evidence. It lists factors that ‘*may*’ matter but gives no export values, trends, destinations or documented market access incidents.
- Classification inconsistency. Section 1.0 asserts 04059020 for Uganda, while 2.2 says the national line must still be confirmed. HS 040590 also covers butteroil and anhydrous milk fat, so values at six digits are not ghee alone.
- Objective 3 (quality, packaging, labelling, certification) cannot be answered by Trade Map, ePing or Social Blade.
- Your literature review lacks a ‘*current debate*’, is thin and dated literature base (about eight sources, few journal articles). No global ghee literature, though India dominates world ghee trade and offers comparative evidence.
- Social Blade selection criteria are undefined. Many small Ugandan ghee firms will have little or no tracked presence.
- Nkuingoua Nana et al. (2023), WCO (2022) and UNBS (2023) are listed but not cited in text.
- Trade Map, ePing and Social Blade are discussed in text without citations.

2. KAKAYI Cecilia

- The topic is current and has clear marketing relevance as service innovation adoption.

- b. Determinants are inconsistent across sections. The scope lists seven (affordability, service quality, safety, convenience, environmental concern, awareness, perceived usefulness); the problem statement adds digital payment ease and habit; 2.4 lists price, service quality, payment convenience, environmental concern and habit.
- c. Time scope of 2014 to 2026 "to provide sufficient observations" is wrong for a passenger study of a service launched in May 2026.
- d. Contextual facts are outdated. The paper says fares are fixed regardless of distance. Since then, fares on Kampala routes have become journey based.
- e. Habit as defined in UTAUT2 refers to the target technology, which commuters have not yet formed for a new service. The real issue is inertia toward taxis and boda bodas.
- f. Background facts lack in text citations, and Wikipedia is used as a source.
- g. Problem statement has no figures (ridership, occupancy, congestion costs, investment value).
- h. Problem statement has no figures (ridership, occupancy, congestion costs, investment value).
- i. Literature is largely pre 2015 and from high income settings. Add recent empirical studies on bus rapid transit and e bus acceptance in African and other emerging cities (for example Dar es Salaam, Lagos, Nairobi).
- j. **References are inserted in the middle of Chapter One (This is reckless)**
- k. Current debate is absent

END