1. **Template Artikel**

PLEASE MAKE SURE MINIMUM MANUSCRIPT REQUIREMENT ARE MET

Title : Approximately 20 words
Abstract : No more than 160 words
Keyword : Maximum 5 keywords
Main : 4000-7000 words including: **Introduction, Literature Review, Method, Result, Discussion, Conclusion, Limitation**

Type the Title of Your Manuscript

[The title no more than 20 words]

Yonata Laia[a], Edy Fachrial[a], Jepri Banjarnahor[a]
[a]Universitas Prima Idonesia

Abstract

The abstract should stand alone, which means that no citation in the abstract. The abstract should concisely inform the reader of the manuscript's purpose, its methods, its findings, and its value. The abstract should be relatively nontechnical, yet clear enough for an informed reader to understand the manuscript's contribution. The manuscript's title, but neither the author's name nor other identification designations, should appear on the abstract page. An abstract between 100-200 words.

Keywords: We would like to encourage you to list your keywords in this section (6-8 words).

Introduction

What is the purpose of the study? Why are you conducting the study? The main section of an article should start with an introductory section, which provides more details about the paper's purposes, motivation, research methods, and findings. The introduction should be relatively nontechnical, yet clear enough for an informed reader to understand the manuscript's contribution.

Literature review

The literature review represents the theoretical core of an article. In this section, we will discuss the purpose of a literature review. We will also consider how one should go about to find appropriate literature on which to base a literature review and how this information should be managed. Finally, we will answer four questions that first-time researchers often battle with when compiling a literature review.

These questions are: which aspects should I include in a literature review?; how should I go about synthesizing information in a literature review?; how should I structure a literature review? what writing style should I use when compiling a literature review?

The purpose of a literature review is to "look again" (re + view) at what other researchers have done regarding a specific topic (Leedy & Ormrod 2005:70). A literature review is a means to an end, namely to provide background to and serve as motivation for the objectives and hypotheses that guide your own research (Perry et al. 2003:660)

A good literature review does not merely summarise relevant previous research. In the literature review, the researcher critically evaluates, re-organizes and synthesizes the work of others (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005:84). In a sense, compiling a literature review is like making a smoothie or fruit shake: The end product is a condensed mix that differs totally in appearance from the individual

ingredients used as inputs. The key to a successful literature review lies in your ability to "digest" information from different sources, critically evaluate it and resent your conclusions in a concise, logical and reader-friendly" manner.

First-time researchers often naively believe everything they read or are scared to criticize the work of others. However, academic research is all about critical inquiry! It is, therefore, extremely important that you critically evaluate the material that you read. Do you agree with the arguments and conclusions of other researchers? If you disagree, why? Can you identify contradictory arguments or findings? How could one explain these contradictions? Do the findings of previous studies apply in all contexts or are the findings context-specific? What are the criticisms against the conceptual models or measurement approaches discussed in the literature? Which limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of previous research?

You have to carefully read the most recent available literature to identify specific gaps, inconsistencies and/or controversies that may form the basis of your own research. Always show that you have considered an issue from several angles and that you are aware of the arguments for and against a specific point of view. Many researchers in services marketing, for example, use the SERVQUAL measurement scale without considering existing criticisms against it.

To compile a proper literature review, one has to overcome three specific challenges, namely: finding appropriate literature on a specific topic, managing the information, and presenting a logical, synthesized, and reader-friendly review of the current knowledge relating to a specific topic. Consider the following search strategies: Blackwell Synergy; Proquest Data Basis; EBSCOhost (Business Source Premier and Business Source Premier); Emerald; Taylor and

Francis; Infotrac; Wiley Interscience; and others open access journal using Google Scholar. To view information about the "literature review" more fully, please visit the link

METHODS

The methods section describes the steps followed in the execution of the study and also provides a brief justification for the research methods used (Perry et al., 2003:661). It should contain enough detail to enable the reader to evaluate the appropriateness of your methods and the reliability and validity of your findings. Furthermore, the information should enable experienced researchers to replicate your study (American Psychological Association, 2001:17).

The methodology section typically has the following sub-sections:

- Sampling (description of the target population, research context, and units of analysis; sampling; and respondent profile)
- Data collection
- Measures (Alternatively: Measurement)

RESULTS

The results section summarizes the data collected for the study in the form of descriptive statistics and also reports the results of relevant inferential statistically analysis (e.g., hypothesis tests) conducted on the data. You need to report the results in sufficient detail so that the reader can see which statistical analyses were conducted and why, and to justify your conclusions.

Mention all relevant results, including those that are at odds with the stated hypotheses (American Psychology Association 2001: 20).

There is no fixed recipe for presenting the findings of a study. We will, therefore, first consider general guidelines and then turn our attention to options for reporting descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis test.

Reporting Research Results

You should present your findings as concisely as possible and still provide enough detail to adequately justify your conclusions, as well as enable the reader to understand exactly what you did in terms of data analysis and why.

You may assume that the reader has a working knowledge of basic statistics (i.e., typically the contents covered in a 1st statistics course). It is, therefore, not necessary to discuss basic statistical procedures in detail. You may, however, have to explain advanced multivariate statistical methods (e.g., repeated measures ANOVA, two- or –way ANOVA, multiple regression analysis, and factor analysis) in nen-technical terms. Figures and Tables (detached from main of the manuscript) often allow one to present findings in a clear and concise manner.

Example:

Insert Table 1 Here

Insert Figure 1 Here

DISCUSSION

In many ways, it is the most important section in an article (Feldman, 2004:4). Because it is the last thing a reader sees, it can have a major impact on the reader's perceptions of the article and the research conducted (Summers 2001:411).

Different authors take different approaches when writing the discussion section. According to Feldman (2004:5), Perry et al. 2003: 658), and Summers 2001: 411412), the discussion section should:

- Restate the study's main purpose
- Reaffirm the importance of the study be restating its main contributions
- Summarize the results in relation to each stated research objective or hypothesis without introducing new material
- Relate the findings to the literature and the results reported by other researches
- Provide possible explanations for unexpected or non-significant findings
- Discuss the managerial implications of the study
- Highlight the main limitations of the study that could influence its internal and external validity
- Discuss insightful (i.e., non-obvious) directions or opportunities for future research on the topic

The discussion section should not merely restate the findings reported in the result section or report additional findings that have not been discussed earlier in the article. The focus should

instead be on highlighting the broader implications of the study's findings and relating these back to previous research. Make sure that the conclusions you reach follow logically from and are substantiated by the evidence presented in y

our study (Varadarajan 1996: 5).

CONCLUSION

In this section, the author presents brief conclusions from the results of research with suggestions for advanced researchers or general readers. A conclusion may review the main points of the paper, do not replicate the abstract as the conclusion.

Not only does the author write down the major flaws and limitations of the study, which can reduce the validity of the writing, thus raising questions from the readers (whether, or in what way), the limits in his studies may have affected the results and conclusions. Limitations require critical judgment and interpretation of their impact. The author should provide the answer to the question: is this a problem with error, method, validity, and or otherwise?

Writing an academic article is a challenging but very fulfilling endeavor. Hopefully, the guidelines presented here will enable you to write your first academic article with relative ease. Students, however, often underestimate the time required to produce a “polished” first effort. You cannot write a proper research article in a weekend or even a week. It is, therefore, extremely

important to allow yourself enough time –at least three to four weeks—to work on the successive draft.

LIMITATION

It is for sure that your research will have some limitations and it is normal. However, it is critically important for you to be striving to minimize the range of scope of limitations throughout the research process. Also, you need to provide the acknowledgement of your research limitations in conclusions chapter honestly.

It is always better to identify and acknowledge shortcomings of your work, rather than to leave them pointed out to your by your dissertation assessor. While discussing your research limitations, don't just provide the list and description of shortcomings of your work. It is also important for you to explain how these limitations have impacted your research findings.

Your research may have multiple limitations, but you need to discuss only those limitations that directly relate to your research problems. For example, if conducting a meta-analysis of the secondary data has not been stated as your research objective, no need to mention it as your research limitation.

REFERENCES

Example:

Perry , C., D. Carson, and A. Gilmore. 2003. Joining conversation: Writing for EJM's editors, reviewers and readers requires planning, care, and persistence. *European Journal of Marketing* 37 (5/6): 653-557.

Leedy, P. D., and J. E. Omron. 2005. *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merril Prentice Hall.

Summers, J. O., 2001. Guideline for conducting research and publishing in marketing: From conceptualization through the review process. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 29 (4): 405-415.

Feldman, D. C., 2004. The devil is in the details: Converting good research into publishable articles. *Journal of Management* 30 (1): 1-6.