



MARKETING
& SOCIAL RESEARCH
ASSOCIATION



Before the convention:

POINTS TO NOTE:

Please ensure not to miss any submission deadline

- Please submit your synopsis by **November 24th 2010**
- Selection will be made by judges by **30th November** and selected winners informed
- For the people that are selected, final written papers to be submitted by **18th February 2011.**
- Final presentations should reach MSRA at the latest by **11th March 2011**, to enable MSRA to prepare CD's with all the materials for the delegates.
- Participants are also required to book an appointment with MSRA for a **dry-run** of their presentations on the **18th of March 2011**
- Phone **+254-20-4452524 / +254-20-4445082/3** to make other arrangements (please use international and city code numbers for all communication)
- Email: anne@msra.or.ke
- Please send your av equipment requirements by the same deadline.
- Standard requirements will be: laptop, projector, podium
- Any other requirements to be sent through before the **11th of March 2011.**

YOUR WRITTEN SYNOPSIS SUBMISSION:

As a service to speakers and delegates, and as future reference work for students and practitioners in marketing and marketing research, MSRA's policy is to publish the papers for each convention. In an effort to save trees we will be publishing CD's of papers and presentations.

Therefore, it is important that you adhere to the following guidelines.

Contents synopsis:

The idea of a synopsis is that it is short and to the point, a summary of the issue(s) which you plan to tackle in your paper including an upfront hypothesis that you are

trying to prove. Highlight how this subject is inline with the conference theme. Don't forget the name of the author(s) and his/her (their) contact details.

Note that synopsis should NOT consist primarily of charts, figures or tables. It should be a narrative summary.

YOUR WRITTEN PAPER SUBMISSION:

Contents:

The manuscript should start with an abstract followed by a short introduction on the guiding questions and hypothesis of your contribution. This should be followed by the main body of your contribution, ending with a summary or concluding remarks.

Note that manuscripts should NOT consist primarily of charts, figures or tables.

Length of the Manuscript:

The length of the text should not exceed 30 pages, page format A4, including tables and figures. One text page should contain no more than 550 words or 2750 characters.

Layout of the final text:

Type all text in upper and lower case letters and preferably, in size 12 Times Roman Typeface. Do not write headlines in capital letters.

First page should contain:

- Title of the paper
- Name of author(s)
- Brief abstract (no more than 100 words): should give reader a 'taste' of the article and be as informative as possible

Following pages:

- Headings: Use bold letters (not capitals) for headings and have no more than two levels of headings throughout

- Give reference to any tables or figures
- Ensure that you include any source references within the text. E.g. (Johnson and Smith, 2001)

Referencing for the written papers

Referencing for the written papers and presentation, must use the following formats:

In a sentence with a reference: One of the origins of correspondence analysis lies in a French technique termed *reciprocal averaging*, allied to which is optimal scaling (Greenacre, 1984).

In a sentence where a reference is an integral part of the sentence: As Diener and Lucas (2000) put it: "The rain in Spain falls mainly on the plain."

In a sentence where a reference has several authors: (Diener et al., 1997),

In the references at the end:

If it is a book, the book title is underlined: Kahneman, D., Diener, E. and Schwarz, N. (Eds) (2000), Hedonic Psychology, Russell Sage, New York, 2000

If it is an article/paper in a journal:

Diener, E., Suh, E. and Oishi, S. (1997), Recent Findings on Subjective Well-Being, Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1997

Summary / Conclusions:

- Ensure that you include these please.

Appendices:

- Technical appendices if needed.
- References in alphabetical order please.

Submitted paper Judging Criteria:

The Content (60% of the mark)

- Is the paper inline with the **conference theme** and have the laid out guidelines

for writing conference papers been followed?

- Does the paper exhibit **fresh thinking** and high levels of creativity (i.e. is it innovative)?
- Does it show a real **understanding of the issues** by proving its actual or potential impact on the decision making process in business and/or society?
- Does it offer **insight** into how the theories (or findings) identified may be best practiced?
- Does it show real and deep **respondent knowledge**?
- Does it demonstrate **scientific, statistical and analytical** methods and techniques to gain insight or support decision making?

The way findings are explained (40% of the mark)

IS IT EASY TO UNDERSTAND, IS IT WELL WRITTEN

- **Look:** Does the paper look attractive?
- **Layout:** Is the content logical and well structured?
- **Writing style:** Is the content easy to follow and understand?
- **Accuracy:** Is the grammar and spelling correct?

YOUR PRESENTATION:

Your paper deserves the maximum attention and interest from your audience. Here are some suggestions to help you achieve this:

Timing and delivery:

In fairness to the chairman and other speakers in your session, and the audience, it is essential that you rehearse your presentation to make sure it fits within the time allotted to you (*20 minutes + 10 minutes questions at the end each session for local speakers and 45 minutes + 15 minutes for international speakers*). You will be cut at the end of 20/45 minutes, so please ensure that you complete your presentation in time.

Your personal delivery should be a summary of the written paper, drawing out and expanding on the main points, and never consist of reading the paper that appears in the CD. Your presentation will always be more interesting if it concentrates on case histories rather than the theoretical aspects of the subject. Punctuation, diction and expression should never be overlooked.

Audience:

Please keep in mind that your audience might not be familiar with the research facilities and jargon applicable to your own field. Therefore abbreviations and types of service, facility or technique must all be explained fully. It is also important to control your speed and delivery and try to speak as clearly as possible. Your audience will in all likelihood be seated cinema style.

Visual aids:

The value of a presentation and the impression left of both the paper and the speaker are at least partly determined by the use of effective, legible, high quality visual aids.

Video and audio equipment is available. Should you have any special audio-visual requirements, please notify us as soon as possible.

Slides / PowerPoint presentations:

- Make sure that your slides will be clearly legible from the back of a large hall.
- Restrict the amount of data on any slide using as few words as possible. It is advisable to place a maximum of 10 lines of text, including a heading.
- Please number your slides.
- Tip – test your colours on an audience.

Important note: A small logo of your company is permitted on the title slide but preferably not on the bottom of every slide as we see this as being about the industry, the speaker and their content - not the companies they represent.

References to companies are to be limited to content that would not make sense without it. For example, you may say that based on XY Co data we found....

Papers that effectively sell proprietary methodologies will be considered **ineligible** for awards.

Presentation Judging Criteria:

THE CONTENT (60% of the mark)

- Is the presentation in-line with the **conference theme** and does the title reflect content?
- Does the presentation exhibits **fresh thinking** and high levels of creativity (innovation)?
- Does it show real **understanding of the issues** by proving its actual or potential impact on the decision making process in business and/society?
- Does it offer **insight** into how the theories (or findings) identified may be best practiced?
- Does it show real and deep **respondent knowledge**?
- Does it demonstrate **scientific, statistical and analytical methods** and techniques to gain insight or support decision making?

THE WAY FINDINGS ARE EXPLAINED (40% of the mark)

- **Look:** Do the visual aides look attractive?
- **Structure:** Is the structure of the content logical and well articulated?
- **Presenter:** Is the presenter confident and their narrative easy to follow and understand?
- **Accuracy:** Is the narrative accurate and does the presenter demonstrates familiarity with the material?

THANK YOU AND GOOD LUCK