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Background

- Spring 2015
  - DBA program launched
  - First publication course: case writing
  - No obvious outlet

- Fall 2015
  - Decision to launch two journals
  - Muma Case Review: discussion cases
  - Muma Business Review: practice-focused research

- 2016
  - Editorial & review system acquired
  - Websites acquired
  - MCR Launched

- 2017
  - MBR launched
  - Three peer review paths initiated
  - Muma sampler published—active solicitation of outside submissions
Missions
Missions

To publish high quality peer reviewed open access research articles so as to be accessible to practice.

To publish high quality peer reviewed open access discussion cases and technical notes.
Positioning

- Channel for research findings presented for the practitioner & practitioner-scholar audience
- Seeks to broaden what we consider “research”
- Encourages authors to break findings into manageable chunks
- Seeks approval from DBA & practice communities; less concerned with validation from research community
- Supports “3 paper” thesis model
- Alternative to expensive HBS cases
- Focus is business and organizational decisions that cross functions
- Encourages “selfie” cases as a form of reflective research
- Promotes discussion case development as a tool for building academic <-> practice relationships
- Online publication only, with possibility of collections published in book form
The Journals
Research Debate: Where Do Entrepreneurs Come From?

By Gilbert Gonzalez, University of South Florida

Can a community instigate the supply and/or quantity supplied of entrepreneurs through prevarigations, training, stimuli, and regulatory change? It is generally agreed that small and medium sized businesses (SMB) play a significant role in the capital market and the region of the community or nation in which they operate. The supply of SMBs stimulates growth, creates jobs, and, maybe more importantly, creates high quality jobs. The positive impact of SMB growth and sustenance is of interest to researchers, government, and industry. The significance of SMBs current role in our nation and communities makes it a mandate to understand the variables that can influence and/or increase the supply of SMBs. Adam Smith recognized that the key catalyst needed to generate all the unique combinations of factors of production needed for a viable enterprise is the fourth factor of production: entrepreneurship. This is why in his work Wealth of Nations, entrepreneurship is segregated and distinguished from labor (Smith, 1776). The act of forming and creating an ongoing business enterprise from nothing is unique from that of growing or maintaining an ongoing enterprise. The supply of new SMBs is driven from one key catalyst—the individual who acts on an idea and acquires capital, employees, and land to cause that idea to become a functioning business. The entrepreneurship factor acts as an ex-ante on the other three factors of production to create economic output. In periods of recession or slow growth, many economists believe that it is the single best solution to lowering unemployment, stimulating growth, and achieving a higher level of prosperity for their community.

The ongoing debate and discussion about the total supply and quantity supplied of entrepreneurship is of interest to researchers looking to understand how to increase the total number of viable SMBs. Understanding whether there is a change in the quantity supplied, or on an overall shift in the entire supply curve occurs crucial to developing the most efficient strategies by the stakeholders charged with inducing growth in startups. To understand this difference, one must understand how nature and nurture impact the entrepreneurial decision to become an entrepreneur. This question drives the well-documented debate: Can a community increase the total supply, or is it just a movement along the same supply curve? Implied in this debate is the question: Do entrepreneurial intentions flow naturally, or can they be created through nurturing?

Keywords: Nature, Nurture, Entrepreneur, Entrepreneurship, Intention, Start-up, Small and Medium Business (SMB), Stimulus, Pattern of Production, Jobs, Employment, Incentive, Small Business Development Center.
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Welcome to the Muma Business Review

The Muma Business Review (MBR) is a journal whose mission is to publish high quality peer reviewed open access business research articles written so as to be accessible to practice.

The operations and publications of the MBR are supported by the Muma College of Business at the University of South Florida.

The journal's peer review system is maintained by the Informing Science Institute. To contact the editorial staff, please see the journal's Contact Us page.

The journal encourages participation from authors and reviewers from around the globe. Additional information on contributing manuscripts as an author can be found on the Authors page. More information on participating as an MBR reviewer can be found on the Reviewers page.

To get started, browse the articles and editorials or use the search and keyword functions to explore specific topics.

---

Case Production Checklist

July 2, 2017, Minneapolis, Minnesota

This checklist should be used in formatting cases for final publication in the Muma Case Review: Case Production Checklist

Cost Estimating – Make or Buy?


Troy Montgomery, a consultant at Humana in April of 2015, was tasked with providing leaders of Humana's corporate real estate group, Workplace Solutions (WPS), with an answer as to how to provide early cost estimates on large construction projects. Should they create a solution internally, outsource, or look for an existing “cost calculator”?

How to Grow Revenues in an Uncertain World?


Should Synteris, a company whose principal business involved routing text messages between telecom carriers, re-think its business? Rob Hammond, product executive for enterprise products, wonders if he focus the company on the products it knew, expanding the existing text messaging business into high growth mobile markets, or should he invest in expanding the new product...
Comparison

### Similarities
- Open access
- Interdisciplinary
- No submission or publication fee
- Both target fast turnaround
- Use review system supplied by the *Informing Science Institute*
- Require templated submissions
- Three review paths
  - Editorial
  - Constructive
  - Strict

### Differences
- Intended audience
  - MBR: Practitioner scholars & practitioners
  - MCR: Faculty & students
- Layout
  - MBR: Typeset by staff
  - MCR: Uses submission template
- Range of submissions
  - MBR: Wide variety of templates
  - MCR: Discussion cases & technical notes
Authoring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBR Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant theory article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical findings article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel idea papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research summaries for practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Template for MBR Research Question Review (RQR) Submission

Overview

An MBR RQR article is expected to:

- Identify a research question of practical importance to managers.
- Present a summary of the results of a systematic search of the research literature related to the question; this will normally be done in tabular form.
- List the key references of the search.
- Identify strengths and weaknesses of the literature in terms of addressing the question being asked.

Such an article would normally be around 5 to 10 pages.

Acceptance of an MBR RQR submission will take into consideration:

- The significance of the question being asked.
- The degree to which the results provide value to managers and researchers. It should be noted that such value might derive from two quite opposite sources. Specifically:
  - Research findings are submitted that could provide novel insights into business and managerial practice.
  - Another research approach offers little of value in addressing the significant question, thereby presenting an opportunity to valuable future manager-researcher collaboration.
- Presentation of findings in a manner likely to engage readers.
- The degree to which it seems likely to contribute to business and managerial knowledge.

Instructions

- Save this document under the name to be used with the RQR submission.
- Define the “Instructions” page.
- On the first page, replace the generic information with your specific information:
  - Leave the “Research Question Review” heading.
  - Title: Use the title style, context.
- Include all figures and tables as per the instruction provided.
Using the MBR Templates

Submissions to the Muma Business Review must be made using one of the MBR templates, accessible on the Authors page. The videos and instructions that follow may assist you if you are not used to using MS-Word templates.

- Formatting using templates

The specific instructions by template are provided in the table that follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant theory article</td>
<td>Article proposing or explaining a theory that would be relevant to managers; similar in structure to traditional academic articles but lighter on the literature review and written for clarity. HBR prints many articles of this type.</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/9jxqF56y702Q">https://youtu.be/9jxqF56y702Q</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical findings article</td>
<td>Article describing interesting empirical findings. Written in a form that is similar to chapters in business books, such as those by Dan Ariely, that emphasize intriguing or counter-intuitive research findings without a heavy emphasis on theory.</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/FR2A5flN7hU">https://youtu.be/FR2A5flN7hU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research case studies</td>
<td>Case studies that emphasize a complete story (as opposed to discussion case studies, which emphasize presenting the context of a decision) and frame in terms of theory. Unlike academic research case studies, much more attention would be given to the story itself rather than to the methodology of data gathering and analysis.</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/RSIPoLHNTU4">https://youtu.be/RSIPoLHNTU4</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MCR Templates

Muma Case Review
A publication of the Muma College of Business | University of South Florida
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AUTHOR NAMES

WRITING A MUMA CASE REVIEW CASE

Writing a discussion case for MCR seems like a lot of work...Will it be worth the effort for me to do so?

Mary Bailey, a fictional faculty member at a non-existent university pondered this question as she looked over the formatting instructions for case studies submitted to the recently launched publication outlet: Muma Case Review (MCR). Everything about this particular outlet seemed to be different from the research journals that she was used to: the intended audience, the review process, the writing style. Even the formatting instructions—these were written in the form of a discussion case!

Bailey’s decision of whether or not to proceed was influenced by a number of issues. First, there was the question of whether or not she really wanted to write a discussion case. Discussion cases, it turned out, were very different from research cases in style and focus. Their audience also tended to be different—although faculty members chose what cases to use, it was ultimately the reaction of students to the case that determined its success of failure. Furthermore, discussion cases were nearly always constructed around the need to make a decision or create an action plan. For this reason—unless these research case counterparts—discussing cases did not typically argue for course- and field relationships or present a theory. Instead, they laid out the decisions to be made and then provided the reader with sufficient information about its content to allow for meaningful analysis.

Even if she decided that she wanted to write a discussion case study, there was the question of whether or not MCR was the most suitable outlet. Given that she was teaching in a business-related field, topic was not a problem. But MCR was a new outlet, and had a review process that varied from the double-blind peer review that she was used to. Would her dean even treat a MCR case study as research?

Balancing these concerns was the knowledge that if she were to write a MCR case study, she could immediately put it to use in her own classroom. That was something she found really hard to live with.

A NOTE ON WRITING A MUMA CASE REVIEW TECHNICAL NOTE

A technical note is a publication that provides supporting information for one or more case studies. Most commonly, it provides background information at a deeper level than might be possible within a Muma Case Review (MCR) discussion case. For this reason, such notes are normally constructed as companions to MCR cases.

Topics where a technical note might be appropriate include industry studies, explanations of specific technologies, descriptions of theories or research that might be relevant to a case, and economic or cultural analysis of a particular region—just to name some possibilities. MCR case studies may refer to companion technical notes, or the notes may be totally independent of the case for which they were developed.

Muma Case Review (MCR) technical notes use the same formatting styles as MCR discussion cases. Because the subject matter of technical notes can vary substantially, however, there is no recommended or prescribed organization, with two exceptions. First, the title of the note should always begin with “A note on...”. Second, the introductory section, following the title, should provide an overview of the contents of the note. Ideally, this should be kept under a page but, unlike MCR cases, this is not a requirement.

This note, which also serves as a template for creating technical notes, will quickly summarize contents under which technical notes might be appropriate. It will then cover the stylistic aspects of MCR notes.

What is a Technical Note?

A technical note is, essentially, a white paper on a particular topic. To be considered for publication in MCR, it should be relevant to a particular MCR discussion case or, possibly, of likely relevance to future MCR cases. Technical notes must be written in a clear, concise, and professional manner.
Writing an MCR Case Study

If you have never written a discussion case study before, you may be a bit concerned about the process. We have compiled a number of resources that may help you get started. Among these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing with the Case Method</td>
<td>An open access book that provides an overview of case writing and facilitation. The book itself and a video series on the early chapters are included.</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Discussion Cases</td>
<td>A video that was developed to help students prepare for a case competition.</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Case Template</td>
<td>An MS-Word template that provides substantial information on the case writing process as well as formatting instructions. Authors are encouraged to read the entire template before using it.</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Case Studies Checklist</td>
<td>A step-by-step guide to the process of designing, writing and publishing a case. Both the checklist and videos are included.</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reviewing
William Starbuck (2003, 2005) looked at consistency of reviews for 500 Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ) submissions

• Correlation coefficient was 0.12
  • Statistically significance but of minimal practical significance

• Similar measures for other journals in the fields of psychology and sociology ranged from 0.16 and 0.50 (Miller, 2006)

• Starbuck’s estimate based on simulations:
  • Between 29% and 77% of the articles published in a top tier journal—with typical acceptance rates of 5-10%—are not in the top 20% in terms of actual underlying value, with a midpoint estimate of 57% (Starbuck, 2005, p. 197).
Peer Review Options

• **Editorial review.**
  - The manuscript will be screened by one or more editors.
  - An “accept” or “reject” decision should be rendered within two weeks of submission, along with feedback in either case.

• **Constructive Peer Review**
  - After passing a screening by the journal’s Editor-in-Chief, the manuscript will undergo an initial round of anonymous peer review.
  - External reviews will be considered.
  - 60 day submission to publication turnaround targeted.

• **Strict Peer Review.**
  - After passing a screening by the journal’s Editor-in-Chief, the manuscript will undergo an initial round of anonymous peer review.
  - Reviewers would be assigned in accordance with prevailing practices at top business academic journal and care would be taken to avoid detectable conflicts of interest, such as prior co-authorship or common institutional affiliations.
  - Turnaround times of up to a year.
Qualities of “Ideal” Reviewer

**Interdisciplinary**
- Focus on practical problem, not on disciplinary perspective
- Open to new perspectives

**Supportive**
- **Goals:** make the manuscript better, whether or not it is published; help new authors learn to communicate ideas
- Offers constructive suggestions

**Decisive**
- Single strongly positive, thoughtful review → accept
- Accept/reject decision by the editor is made after first round of reviews
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 RQR was conducted according to standards of rigor consistent with publishable research. The author(s) should fill out each of sections that follows.

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

The RQR Protocol
Describe the process through which the literature review for the RQR was conducted. Include information on:

- General databases searched (for business-related questions, these will normally be ABIInform 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?

The Discussion and Conclusions
Describe the process through which the discussion and conclusions were developed. If further synthesis of the findings in the results table was not attempted, explain the basis for this decision.
Editors
Help Wanted!

Reviewer

- Workload: 6-12 submissions/year
- Helps authors improve manuscripts
- Recommends acceptance or rejection to editor

Editor

- Workload: <= 6 submissions/year
- Consolidates reviews into development letter
- Mentors reviewers
- Identifies possible editors from reviewers

Senior Editor

- Workload: 6-12 submissions/year
- Makes accept/reject decision after first round
- Sends development letter to authors (editing it if needed)
Questions?