Editorial Statement and Reviewing Policies

Management and Organization Review (MOR) aims to be the premier journal for advancing indigenous management and organization research in China and all other transforming economies.

MOR is a multidisciplinary journal rooted in the behavioral, social, and economic sciences underlying management research, broadly defined. MOR seeks to publish research from diverse social science disciplines, including international business, organizational behavior, organization theory, social psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology, political science, economics, strategic management, economic geography, development studies, innovation theories, public administration, urban planning, cross-cultural studies, and cognitive science.

The editors recognize that new insights emerge at the intersection of established theories and research methods. They also realize that many of the established theories were developed in western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic societies. Therefore, MOR aspires to attract manuscripts that complement such established theories with indigenous data and indigenous theories. Such papers must justify and discuss the contextual, cultural, and institutional applicability of testing established theories in the context of China or other transforming economies. MOR welcomes comparative studies in which comparison to non-transforming economies highlights unique indigenous aspects of transforming economies. MOR also seeks papers that observe actual indigenous phenomena and involve abductive reasoning and new insights to arrive at a novel understanding of phenomena that are new to the literature and contextually relevant to China or to other transforming economies.

Papers published in MOR can focus on all types of organizations, such as firms, academic, educational, and cultural institutions, not-for-profits, governmental and nongovernmental organizations, and state-owned enterprises.

MOR is open to diverse and rigorously executed research methodologies, including qualitative research, surveys, archival and historical analyses, content analysis, laboratory and field
experiments, simulations, and computational methods, as well as papers that synthesize or translate theories and empirical research that make research accessible to scholars outside disciplinary subfields.

When considering papers submitted to MOR, the Editors consider the following questions:

1. Is the paper intended for MOR? (e.g., literature review is embedded in discourse related to MOR and shows understanding of up-to-date research published in MOR)
2. Does it fall within the domain of MOR? (e.g., contextually specific to China or other transforming economies)
3. Is it forward looking? Does it offer fresh insights? Does it break new ground? Does it elucidate indigenous management theories outside disciplinary subfields?
4. Does the empirical analysis and methods satisfy rigorous requirements for scientific research, for example falsifiability, data transparency and replication criteria? One of the strengths of MOR is the methodological diversity of the journal, but different methods have different quality mechanisms. For example, for historical methods replication is not relevant - traceability of evidence is.

**Perspective Papers**

To enrich scholarly discourse and promote theoretical innovation, MOR will occasionally publish perspective papers that direct attention to new important phenomena or that redirect or shut down a line of research. The Editor-in-Chief oversees the review of perspective papers. Accepted perspective papers may be followed by one or more invited commentaries.

**Dialogue, Debate, and Discussion (D³) Submissions**

The goal of the D³ editorial area is to attract discourse that breaks ground at the crossroad of disciplinary exchanges on related topics, revisit past debates, and highlight important current issues in management and globalization. It features essays and interviews designed to stimulate and engage vibrant Dialogue, Debate, and Discussion between management scholars and practitioners.

**Management and Organization Review Reviewing Policies**

The MOR editorial team is committed to seeking the jewel in each submitted manuscript. They will engage the author(s) in a developmental process to feature the paper’s ideas and findings. MOR invites authors to nominate the Senior Editor that best matches the domain of the paper
submitted for consideration by MOR [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/management-and-organization-review/information/editorial-subject-areas]. In addition, MOR encourages authors to nominate up to four ad-hoc reviewers who are knowledgeable in the domain of their paper and do not have a conflict interest with the author(s) (e.g., family member, on same faculty, co-author, faculty supervisor, etc.)

The purpose of the reviewing policies is to ensure that research published in MOR satisfies falsifiability, data transparency, and replication criteria. For a comprehensive discussion of these goals, see Lewin et al. (2016) [doi: 10.1017/mor.2016.43]. MOR is a signatory to the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines, which were adopted by over 850 scientific journals (Nosek et al. 2015).

The guidelines that follow delineate the underlying principles of the MOR peer-review process:

1. Hypothesis testing is not a prerequisite. MOR welcomes papers that avoid framing research in the guise of hypothesis testing. MOR encourages, and will consider, exploratory research meant to identify and describe the phenomena of interest. However, hypothesis testing is appropriate when research involves confirmatory research or replications meant to test hypotheses generated from theory or reported in prior research.

2. The context of every paper published in MOR must be that of transforming economies (e.g., China, India, Latin America, Africa, and Eastern Europe, Russia and former Soviet Republics). Whenever appropriate, contextual studies in transforming economies should consider comparative implication for Chinese Management research.

3. Empirical studies must motivate every research question by framing it within the extant literature. The objective is to convey the puzzle in the literature, a puzzle that the manuscript aims to solve (or at least elucidate). The literature review underlying the theory development should serve as a mini review and must demonstrate that the author is interpreting implications of cited papers. The discussion of empirical papers must convey summary conclusions about the empirical findings – including discussion of effect size in prior findings. If the cited paper does not report effect size, the literature
review should draw appropriate implications. The empirical plan for investigating the focal research question and the discussion of the data for the study follows the theory development section.

4. MOR requires that statistical analyses present and discuss all findings including null findings. Report coefficient estimates alongside exact p-values. Arbitrary cutoff points (asterisks *) of significance should not be reported or referred to.

5. Authors are required to provide readers with a reasonable sense of how strongly an independent variable affects the dependent variable by including an explicit discussion of the effect size (extent of explained variance) and discuss alternative theoretical explanations. Comprehensive discussion of findings including competing or alternative theoretical explanations is foundational for advancing understanding and knowledge creation.

6. We encourage post-hoc analysis but expect authors to clearly distinguish between such analysis and hypothesis testing. Hypothesizing after results are known (HARKing) is a questionable practice that undermines the scientific effort. When justified appropriately, post-hoc analysis can be important in exploring and testing hypotheses and new research questions that were not originally considered but that emerge from new insights during the analysis (e.g., because of unexpected null results, negative findings, or analysis of outlier data points).

7. Data, Research Materials, and Analytic Code
   i. During the review process authors may be asked to provide the Senior Editor and reviewers with access to data and research materials (e.g., survey instruments, field notes), or analytic code (e.g., variable definitions, transformations, statistical procedures). These will be kept confidential, just like a submitted manuscript. Authors who foresee difficulty in complying with this policy must disclose it at the time of submission.¹

¹ Authors can easily meet this requirement by sharing a private project page with editors and reviewers, using a view-only link. The Open Science Framework (OSF) offers free and secure tools to manage scientific projects. To start, see http://help.osf.io/m/projects
ii. Once a manuscript is accepted, authors are encouraged to make the data and/or the instruments publicly available and receive the corresponding badges (see below). Authors are not required to share, but every published article must state whether data, materials, or code are available, and, if so, where to access them. This information will be requested at the initial submission, and authors may update it up to the time of publication.

iii. Citation of data and materials: MOR recognizes data, research materials, or analytic code, as original intellectual contributions, which deserve recognition. All data, materials, or analytic code must be appropriately cited. Specifically, references for data sets and program code should include a persistent identifier, such as a Digital Object Identifier (DOI). Persistent identifiers, which ensure future access to published digital objects, are assigned to data sets by digital archives. For instance, authors who deposit their data or research materials with the Open Science Framework receive a DOI.

http://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR07218.v3

8. Qualitative studies. MOR encourages the submission of qualitative studies. Such studies must be clear about the research question of interest, methods, such as examination of archival documents, interviews, informants, triangulation, and alternative or competing explanations for observed phenomena. Senior Editors knowledgeable with the requirements and nuances of qualitative studies will guide the review process of such papers.

9. Replication. Publishing replication studies or null findings is foundational for building cumulative knowledge about any phenomenon. MOR encourages the submission of replication studies using the same data or new data. Replication studies must be identified at the time of submission prior to the assignment of a Senior Editor who will guide the review of the paper. A replication paper must provide enough detail of the purpose of the replication and the importance and relevance of the findings, compared with those of the original study. Replication studies will undergo double-blind review, just like non-replication studies.
10. Authors are encouraged to review the standards available for many research applications from http://www.equator-network.org/ and use those that are relevant for the reported research applications.

11. Recognition of authors who share materials, data, and/or preregister their studies. “If I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants,” wrote Isaac Newton. MOR recognizes that science is a collective effort (Lewin et al., 2016). Scholars build on the efforts of their predecessors and contemporaries: refining theories, testing predictions, and honing instruments. Benefiting from others’ work requires access to it. That is why the scientific currency is a peer-reviewed publication – making one’s work publicly available. Yet any journal article has length limitations, so it necessarily omits some information that may be useful for those who wish to build on its author’s research. Because of the current replication crisis in the social sciences, in which the validity of much published research is questionable, fuller disclosure can bolster the public confidence in validity of empirical social science and renew trust in scientific findings.

Badges to Recognize Exemplary Scientific Practices
MOR recognizes authors who share more than a manuscript by featuring badges that recognize exemplary scientific practices: openly sharing data, research materials, or preregistering the study. The badges will be featured prominently in the published article. Authors should request a unique Digital Object Identifier (DOI) for their data or research materials, so that they can be cited independently of the article.

Such badges, based on the principles of the Open Science Framework, have been introduced in similarly leading journals in other disciplines, such as the Strategic Management Journal, Psychological Science and the American Journal of Political Science.

When submitting an eligible manuscript, authors will indicate the desired badges. Upon acceptance, a journal editor will verify eligibility.
Open Materials

We grant an Open Materials badge to authors who deposit their research materials in an open-access repository. A prominent repository is the Open Science Framework (OSF), which will also assign a DOI to the materials, so that they can be cited. Many other repositories are listed in the Registry of Research Data Repositories. The deposited materials should be as complete as possible, to allow an independent researcher to reproduce the reported methodology. Depending on the methodology, materials may include statistical code, questionnaires, interview questions, experimental procedures, and participant instructions (but not data). The criteria for Open Materials are here: https://osf.io/gc2g8/

Open Data

Separately, we grant an Open Data badge to authors who deposit their data (and statistical code, if necessary) in such an open-access repository. Authors can satisfy this requirement by depositing their entire dataset or by depositing a slice of it, as long as it allows an independent researcher to reproduce the reported results. If confidentiality is sought, authors may deposit a transformed dataset, as long as it allows reproduction of the reported results (Reiter, 2002). Depending on the methodology, deposited data may include quantitative and qualitative materials, but may not compromise the anonymity of participants or undermine promises of confidentiality. Often, it is easy to remove such identifying information from the dataset while preserving the ability of an independent researcher to reproduce the results. But if access to such identifying information is necessary to reproduce the reported results, then authors are not eligible for an open data badge.

If the data are statistical, authors are expected to deposit the code necessary to generate the results. Once the data and the code are available, authors may, but are not required to, assist others in using the deposited materials.

A prominent repository is the Open Science Framework (OSF), which will also assign a DOI to the data, so that they can be cited. The criteria for Open Data are here: https://osf.io/g6u5k/
Preapproved and Preregistered Study

We offer preapproval for studies, drawing on the model of registered reports in the natural and social sciences. Such practices advance science, so we wish to encourage them: Authors whose studies were preapproved and preregistered will receive in-principle acceptance. The published article will bear the corresponding badge.

Preregistration and Preapproval

MOR encourages authors to submit proposals for preregistered and preapproved studies. After peer review, such proposals can receive a conditional acceptance in MOR – all before data are collected and results are realized. The editors of MOR believe that this innovative initiative is probably the most effective strategy for developing papers that are ultimately accepted for publication in Management and Organization Review.

The Editors of MOR would like to engage with authors at the earliest stage of developing their research study. This will allow the Editors to nurture the study of research questions that highlight important questions or phenomena, open new directions, offer alternative or competing explanations for existing findings, or otherwise question extant management research when situated in transforming economies or anchored in indigenous history, culture, values, and national aspirations.

The MOR preapproval and preregistration process offers an important benefit for the authors and the scientific community: it determines the merit of a proposal – and the likelihood of its publication – before the findings are known. The underlying theory and research questions are peer reviewed and deemed important and interesting; hypotheses and data collection procedures are established before data collection and hypothesis testing commence. By doing this, we combat the temptation to HARK, the all-too-common practice of squeezing empirical findings into a theory that may not fit well. Rather, we want to understand reality as it is, whether ‘as predicted’ or not.

The Editors of MOR are committed to assisting authors with preapproval and preregistration to enhance the importance of the research, satisfy falsifiability requirements, and enhance data transparency, rigor, and replicability (Lewin et al., 2016). This is an ambitious goal that
differentiates MOR articles, by alleviating the publication bias inherent in research toward ‘counterintuitive’ findings and supported hypotheses (Starbuck, 2016). A recent study estimates that 24%–40% of results in strategic management research cannot be replicated (Goldfarb & King, 2016). Another suggests that the real number may be even higher (Bergh, Sharp, Aguinis, & Li, 2017), even if this journal is comparatively more reliable (Li, Sharp, & Bergh, 2017).

Preapproval and preregistration can help authors clarify their goals and plans before embarking on the time-consuming (and sometimes irreversible) effort of data collection. In preregistration, authors register the proposal in a public, open-access repository (but they may keep the registration non-public during the review process). Then, authors submit for peer review a proposal, akin in content to a dissertation or grant proposal. The proposal should describe the research questions that the study proposes to address and the key hypotheses and data collection and analysis plan. Essentially, authors submit what typically constitutes half a ready manuscript, up to and including the data and description of the empirical approach. However, the proposal should not include data analyses, results, or conclusions. Instead, authors should provide an estimate of the time needed to complete the study.

The MOR preapproval process applies to quantitative and qualitative work as well as inductive and deductive work. The Editors of MOR recognize that inductive qualitative research is indeed a discovery process, and authors should carefully think through and discuss which discoveries the study aims to make and why such discoveries are important. To gain preapproval, authors should articulate which theoretical debates the research will address and how the outcome of the research will advance theory or society, regardless of whether the hypotheses are confirmed. Theoretical significance, knowledge impact, and thoroughness and rigor of the research plan are the major criteria for preapproval. Preapproval proposals are evaluated by MOR’s most senior editors: the Editor-in-Chief or one of the Deputy Editors. If the proposal is deemed of interest to the journal, it is assigned to a Senior Editor who will guide the developmental peer-review process. After peer review, the Senior Editor, in consultation with the Editor-in-Chief or the Deputy Editor, may reject the proposal, request revisions, or approve it. If it is approved, the authors commit to collecting data and completing the study as proposed, and the journal grants conditional acceptance—regardless of the findings. In other words, because of the importance of the subject matter, MOR will publish the final manuscript regardless of whether the results are as hypothesized, whether positive or null. After this
conditional acceptance, authors embark on data collection, analysis, and writing to turn the proposal into a manuscript. However, preapproval and preregistration should not restrict flexibility in the knowledge generation process. Adjustment to the proposal may be granted under exceptional circumstances, such as unavailability of data. Following preapproval, authors should update the editor on progress and seek advice, as needed. Detailed instructions are in MOR’s Instructions to Contributors.

The manuscript will be published in MOR in two parts: The first part will report the results of the study according to the preapproved and preregistered plan. The second will present and discuss exploratory (post hoc) analyses, which may emerge in the course of analyzing and reporting the originally approved study. Both parts will feature a preapproval and preregistration badge.

The Editors of MOR accept that preapproval and preregistration entail more effort on our part and a stronger commitment to knowledge co-creation. We understand that it requires us to shepherd the knowledge co-creation process, rather than act as gatekeepers. The Editors of MOR are confident that the preapproval process will result in higher-quality accepted manuscripts. It can also combat the crisis of confidence in the social sciences, revitalizing the research and publication culture in management and organization science.
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**AUTHOR SUBMISSION GUIDELINES**

**Online Submission**

Please submit manuscripts online through the MOR ScholarOne Manuscripts site at
The manuscript is checked to ensure that it is appropriate for the journal, that it is formatted according to the MOR Style Guide, and that it is formatted for blind review. Every submission is also checked with state of the art online plagiarism software.

**Manuscript Format**

1. The journal publishes articles in English only. Translation of abstracts in Chinese, Hindi, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish are available online.
2. The journal accepts original manuscripts that are not under review or consideration for publication in other journals or books.
3. All papers will be blind reviewed by two qualified reviewers. MOR aims to provide timely feedback and will aim to make first editorial decision within 60 days after manuscript has been assigned to Senior Editor.
4. Manuscripts must be double-spaced throughout (this includes notes and references) with all margins at least one inch and no more than 40 pages. The first page of the manuscript should include a title, an informative abstract of no more than 200 words, and three to five keywords or phrases. References must be listed alphabetically. All tables and figures should be at the end of the manuscript, after the references.

**Beware of Scams**

Increasingly, cyber criminals are attempting to scam researchers by sending emails purporting to be from well-known journals, asking for payment to publish. You can learn more about this problem and how to avoid getting caught at [https://thinkchecksubmit.org/](https://thinkchecksubmit.org/).

Neither Cambridge University Press, the IACMR nor MOR charges for peer reviewing a submitted article. We only charge authors for:

- Accepted papers that are published under the gold open access model, and this payment (an article processing charge or APC) will be collected once an article is accepted and once you have agreed with the journal that it will be published open access.
- Requirements related to accepted articles, e.g. providing colour figures in the print version of an article.
- Optional pre-submission services, like language editing, at our author services website: [www.cambridge.org/academic/author-services/](http://www.cambridge.org/academic/author-services/). If you have any concerns or doubt about an email you have received asking for payment to publish, please contact the journal directly using the contact details on Core, and we can advise as to its legitimacy.

**Editorial Review Process**

*Management and Organization Review* has a decentralized editorial structure composed of Senior Editors and an Editorial Review Board committed to working with authors to develop interesting ideas into publishable papers. Each Senior Editor has the autonomy to accept or reject a paper for publication or to request that the author revise and resubmit the paper. The decisions of Senior Editors are binding on the journal.

MOR is committed to providing in-depth, constructive, and insightful reviews. Therefore, authors are invited to nominate two Senior Editors who are best suited to oversee the review.
of the paper. Prior to nominating two Senior Editors please review the list of Senior Editors and their research interests. Feel free to review their personal web sites. The Editor in Chief or Deputy Editors will make the assignment of the Senior Editor. In addition, authors are invited to nominate up to four reviewers (with suitable expertise and no conflict of interest with the author(s) (e.g., co-authors, mentors, past students, same faculty, family, etc.) as potential reviewers for the paper being reviewed). Management and Organization Review will make every effort to select one author-nominated reviewer. Manuscripts are reviewed in a double-blind process by at least two reviewers. The Senior Editor integrates his or her independent evaluation with those of the reviewers to provide guidelines for revising the paper when it is considered suitable for potential publication in MOR or reasons for why the paper is not suitable for publication in Management and Organization Review.

To maximize the match between the research reported in the paper, it is important that authors give careful thought to the nomination of the two Senior Editors and ad-hoc reviewers.

Questions: Please forward any questions regarding the submission or review process to Tina Minchella (MORMangingEditor@cambridge.org), the Managing Editor for Management and Organization Review.

Open Access
Please visit http://journals.cambridge.org/openaccess for information on our open access policies, compliance with major funding bodies, and guidelines on depositing your manuscript in an institutional repository.

STYLE GUIDELINES

Please note that failure to follow the style guidelines may result in the return of your manuscript for reformatting before it is considered as a submission.

Authors, particularly those whose first language is not English, may wish to have their English-language manuscripts checked by a native speaker before submission. This is optional, but may help to ensure that the academic content of the paper is fully understood by the editor and any reviewers. We list a number of third-party services specialising in language editing and/or translation here, and suggest that authors contact as appropriate.

Please note that the use of any of these services is voluntary, and at the author's own expense. Use of these services does not guarantee that the manuscript will be accepted for publication, nor does it restrict the author to submitting to a Cambridge published journal.

Manuscript Format
1. Manuscripts must be double-spaced throughout (this includes notes and references) on one side of A4 or US standard letter size paper with all margins at least one inch.
2. Though we do not impose a page limit, we encourage conciseness in writing. Typical manuscripts are expected to be between 25 to 40 pages, including references, tables, and figures. The best ideas are expressed in simple, direct language. Excessive references are not helpful. Cite only the most representative and authoritative sources to support your points.
3. The separate title page has the title of the paper, the names of all the authors and their affiliations, along with the detailed address of the corresponding author, including full
postal address, email address, phone number, and fax number.

4. The first page of the manuscript should have the title of the paper and an informative abstract of no more than 200 words, double-spaced. Provide three to five keywords or phrases to help in identifying appropriate reviewers and to facilitate abstracting and search functions. The title should be short, informative, and contain a major keyword. A short running title (fewer than 40 characters) should also be provided.

5. The body of the paper begins on page two with the main heading INTRODUCTION, left justified. It is not necessary to include the title on this page.

6. Primary headings should be capitalized and bold. Secondary headings should be in upper and lower case, bold, and with the first letters of each word capitalized. Tertiary headings should be italicized with the first letter of the first word capitalized. All headings should be left justified.

7. Organize the manuscript into the following main sections: INTRODUCTION, THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES (if hypotheses are used), METHOD, RESULTS, DISCUSSION, and CONCLUSION. Use secondary headings within each main section to clearly organize the presentation.

8. Put sentences in the active voice (“I did it”; “They did it”) instead of the passive voice (“It was done”) to make it easy for readers to see who did what. Use the first person (‘I’ or ‘we’) to describe what you yourself did. However, be sure to avoid any phrasing that may reveal your identity and compromise the blind peer review process. For example, when self-referencing, write ‘In Smith (2000), results showed . . .’ DO NOT write ‘In my previous research (Smith, 2000), results showed . . .’ or ‘The author’s previous research (Smith, 2000) revealed . . .’

9. If required, use notes and not endnotes or footnotes. See section on ‘Notes’ in this document for more information on the preparation of notes.

10. A separate acknowledgements document should identify the source of financial grants and other funding as well as the contribution of colleagues or institutions. Please note that this information should not be included in the main manuscript document to ensure the blind review process is not compromised. Once a paper has been accepted or conditionally accepted and is past the blind review process, acknowledgements will be included as the first entry in the NOTES section. The numbered notes (e.g., [1]) begin after the acknowledgements.

11. Put all tables, figures, and appendices at the end of the manuscript, following the REFERENCES.

12. All pages should be numbered consecutively in the top right-hand corner.

13. Prepare the entire manuscript (including tables and figures) in Microsoft Word® using Times New Roman font. Use 12 point size for the body of the paper.

Tables and Figures

1. Each table or figure should bear an Arabic number (1, 2, etc.) and a title and should be reasonably interpretable without reference to the text.

2. Each table should be bracketed with a solid horizontal line with minimum use of horizontal lines inside the table. Do not use vertical lines in the tables or figures. Check published papers in MOR for table and figure format.

3. Each table or figure should be presented on a separate page at the end of the
manuscript, after the REFERENCES. Figures and tables reproduced from already published work must be accompanied by the permission of the original publisher (or copyright holder, if not the publisher). Please indicate the position of figures and tables in the text as follows:

________________________________________________________________________

INSERT TABLE I ABOUT HERE

________________________________________________________________________

4. Should your paper be accepted for publication, please ensure that all figures are of a suitable quality and resolution to be printed. Do not embed graphics in the Word document – they must be supplied in separate files, one file per figure. Full information on how to prepare and supply your figures can be found here.

5. Charges apply for all colour figures that appear in the print version of the journal. At the time of submission, contributors should clearly state whether their figures should appear in colour in the online version only, or whether they should appear in colour online and in the print version. There is no charge for including colour figures in the online version of the Journal but it must be clear that colour is needed to enhance the meaning of the figure, rather than simply being for aesthetic purposes. If you request colour figures in the printed version, you will be contacted by CCC-Rightslink who are acting on our behalf to collect Author Charges. Please follow their instructions in order to avoid any delay in the publication of your article.

6. Avoid “stacking” – write all words horizontally, not vertically.

7. Use tabs, not spaces, to separate data points in tables.

8. Use the same variable names you use in the text. Spell out the words or names of all the variables in the tables or figures. Do not abbreviate. Look at figures in published MOR articles for format ideas.

9. Data entries in tables should be restricted to two decimal places.

10. In tables, footnote symbols †, ‡, § and ¶ should be used (in that order) and *, **, *** should be reserved for P-values.

Citations

Citations must be used to identify and credit the appropriate source(s) when you refer to or borrow ideas, paraphrase text, or quote verbatim in your manuscript. Verbatim quotations are text taken directly, word-for-word from another written work. They are generally a few words or more but also include original one or two word phrases coined by an author that have not yet integrated into common speech. Again, whether you are directly quoting, summarizing, or simply referring to another author’s ideas, it is imperative that you cite.

1. In the text, where the author’s name appears, the date should follow in parentheses, e.g., Mintzberg (1985). If the author’s name is not present in the text, insert it with the date in parentheses, e.g., (Mintzberg, 1985).

2. Multiple references should be listed alphabetically in parentheses, separated by semicolons, e.g., (Jackson, 1996; Watson, 1986).

3. Page numbers to indicate a passage of special relevance or to give the source of a quotation or paraphrase should appear in parentheses, e.g., (Willmott, 1992: 12).
4. If there is more than one reference to the same author in the same year, postscript the date of each reference with a, b, c, etc., e.g., (Sparrow, 1998a, 1998b).

5. For references with two authors, give both names every time you cite it, e.g., (Meyer & Lu, 2004).

6. References with three to six authors should be listed in full in the first appearance of the citation in the text, e.g., (Weber, Ames, & Blais, 2005). Use the last name of the first author and “et al.” in all its subsequent appearances in the text, e.g., (Weber et al., 2005).

7. For seven or more authors, use “et al.” even for the first citation. (Note: the matching reference should give all the authors.)

Notes
In general, MOR discourages the use of notes as essential information should be included in the body of the paper. If Notes are required, however, they should be provided on a separate page immediately following the text and before the REFERENCES under the heading NOTES. Notes should be numbered in the list and referred to in the text with consecutive, superscript Arabic numerals. Please see articles in past issues of MOR for examples of notes. When using notes, please type the notes as a continuation of the main body text and avoid using Word’s endnote or footnote reference tools.

References
Cite the names of all authors. Do not use ibid or op cit. References should be listed alphabetically by author and be placed at the end of the manuscript, before the tables, figures, and appendices. Reference to unpublished data and personal communications should not appear in the list but should be cited in the text only (e.g., Smith, 2000, unpublished data). All citations mentioned in the text, tables or figures must be listed in the reference list. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of the references.

We recommend the use of a tool such as EndNote or Reference Manager for reference management and formatting. EndNote reference styles can be searched for here: http://www.endnote.com/support/enstyles.asp Reference Manager reference styles can be searched for here: http://www.refman.com/support/rmstyles.asp

1. Journal references should be listed as follows:


Please always include an issue number in parentheses after the volume number to help facilitate other researchers seeking to find your references.

2. Book references should be listed as follows:


3. Chapter references should appear as follows:

4. Unpublished papers or conference presentations should appear as follows:


5. If an article has no author, the periodical or producing body is referenced:


6. Articles used from online sources should appear as follows:


**Appendices**

Present long but essential methodological details, such as explanations of the calculation of measures or items of new measures not already in the text, in an appendix or appendices. Presentation should be concise, but avoid table formats and reproductions of surveys. Multiple appendices are labeled numerically as follows: Appendix I, Appendix II, etc. and referred to in the text.

**Technical Note**

Many authors use the tracking facility of the reviewing tool in working on successive versions of their manuscripts. Word can detect corrections to previous versions of the manuscript by clicking on a “Showing Markup” option when the Reviewing tool bar is activated. To prevent this and to ensure blind reviews, before submitting your manuscript you should (i) click on “Final”, (ii) select the entire document, and then (iii) save that version as a new file under a new name. That will be a “clean” version, free of the history of previous versions and corrections. This is the version that you should submit to MOR.

The Properties Summary of a document often automatically populates with an author’s name and company. Please go to File > Properties > Summary to delete this information, then save prior to submitting.

*Last updated 8th October 2018*