Template for MBR Research Debate (RD) Submission

# Overview

An MBR RD article is expected to:

* Identify a research question of practical importance to managers
* Present two or more conflicting perspectives on the question based upon the research literature
* Analyze the underlying assumptions and reasoning leading to the alternative perspectives
* Attempt to reconcile the perspectives and identify situations where each is likely to be valid and invalid
* Identify potential situations where none of the perspectives seem likely to be useful

Such an article would normally be around 5 to 15 pages.

Acceptance of an MBR RD submission will take into consideration:

* The significance of the question being asked
* The degree to which the perspectives being examined are likely to divide practicing managers or create a division between researchers and managers
* The degree to which the analysis seems likely to provide value to managers and researchers.
* Presentation of findings in a manner likely to engage readers.

# Instructions

* Save this document under the name to be used with the RD submission
* Delete the “Instructions” page
* On the first page, replace the generic information with your specific information:
	+ Leave the “Research Debate” heading
	+ Title: Use the **Title** style, centered.
	+ (Author information will be submitted in the review system)
* Styles should be used for all headings
	+ Main headings should use **Heading 1** style
		- Sub headings should use **Heading 2** style
			* **Heading 3**, Etc.
* Graphics should be embedded as .jpg, .gif or .png images. Do not use Office drawings.
* References should be listed at the end, in APA format
* Fill in the information specified in the **Reviewer Appendix** at the end of the template. This information will not be included in the published version of the article, but will be used during the review process.
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# Tagline

In this section, place a 25-50 word paragraph that captures the significance of the research issue being debated and its relevance to practice (if that is not obvious). This will not appear in the article itself, but will be used in the contents.

# Keywords

Put 5-10 keywords that will be used to index the article and make it easier to find when a search is done.

# Executive Summary

A 150-250 word summary that summarizes the importance of the research issue being debated, the differences between the perspectives, and the degree to which understanding these differences will provide value to managers. This will appear at the beginning of the article.
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# Introduction

An RD article will normally begin with a brief description of the context of the business problem that motivates the debate and the nature of the disagreement between researchers or between research and practice. This section should avoid being a repetition of the executive summary.

# Review of Perspectives

A narrative that describes the historical context through which the perspectives being explored evolved. This section should avoid the stilted conventions of an academic literature review, nor is it expected to be comprehensive. Ideally, this section will be divided by subheadings for each perspective, each under a page in length. Upon completing the section, the reader should be able to understand the core premises of each perspective.

# The Debate

This section describes the nature of the disagreement between the perspectives presented in the previous section and the implications for practical business decision-making. Of particular importance here is identifying:

* Differences in premises and assumptions across the perspectives
* Differences in the contexts under which perspective evolved
* Differences in the evidence used to support each perspective
* Differences in the predicted behavior or outcomes according to each perspective

The objective of this section is to help the reader understand the nature of the debate and why it should matter to manager.

# Discussion

In this section, the results of the RD are synthesized by the author(s) and, ideally, reconciled by identifying those contexts in which each is likely to have the greatest applicability. Of particular interest is the identification of situations where each perspective seems particularly appropriate, and situations where each seems likely to fail. As a general rule, the authors should attempt to present a balanced case for each perspective considered and allow the reader to make up his or her own mind with respect to the validity of each.

# Conclusions

The summary of the key takeaways from the RD. Normally, these should be under a page and should be sufficiently self-contained that a reader can jump to them and still understand them.

# References

APA format should be used for all references.

# Reviewer Appendix

The reviewer appendix is not published with the article, but it is a critical component of the review process. It is required to allow the manuscript’s reviewers to assess whether the RD was conducted according to standards of rigor consistent with publishable research. The author(s) should fill out each of sections that follows.

# Perspective Selection

Explain the process through which the competing perspectives were selected. If the topic of the RD was motivated by a business question or a research interest, describe the research conducted by the author(s) prior to formulating the question.

# The RD Protocol

Describe the process through which the literature review for the RD was conducted. Include information on:

* General databases searched (for business-related questions, these will normally be ABI-Inform and Google Scholar). For each database, indicate:
	+ Specific queries tried—authors will do themselves a favor if they keep a record of this as the search progresses
	+ Types of results from each query
* Specific databases searched (IT-related questions, for example, these might include the library’s Gartner database). For each database, indicate:
	+ Why it was selected? (Advice of a reference librarian would be a good example of a reasonable justification if a more obvious justification is not available)
	+ Specific queries tried—authors will do themselves a favor if they keep a record of this as the search progresses
	+ Types of results from each query
* What was the process through which articles for review were chosen?
* What was the process through which a summary on each article was prepared?

In the event a separate MBR *Research Summary for Practice* (RSP) has been submitted, this section may be identified as being copied or excerpted from that submission.

# The Discussion and Conclusions

Describe the process through which the discussion and conclusions were developed.

# Permissions

The author(s) of a manuscript is responsible for acquiring necessary permissions prior to publication. For interviews, these permissions are likely to involve permission to use any external materials (such as graphics or extensive quoted content) that are included in the discussion.

Particular care should be taken when copying images. Even when it is claimed that they are available to copy, it is not always the case that the site displaying them has the right to make that claim. When copying a graphic, if there is any doubt you can recreate the graphic (using your own styling) in PowerPoint or some other tool, then cite the source as “Adapted from {source citations}”.