

Bond University  
Research Repository



## Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples

Faff, Robert; Kastle, Tim; Axelsen, Micheal; Brosnan, Mark; Michalak, Rebecca; Walsh, Kathy

*Published in:*  
Accounting and Finance

*DOI:*  
[10.1111/acfi.12704](https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704)

*Licence:*  
Other

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

*Recommended citation(APA):*

Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2021). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*, 61(2), 3329-3383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

# Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact – A Simple Tool and Illustrative Examples

Robert Faff\*  
Tim Kastle  
Micheal Axelsen  
Mark Brosnan  
Rebecca Michalak  
Kathy Walsh

\* Corresponding author: UQ Business School  
The University of Queensland  
Queensland 4072 Australia  
Telephone: (61) 7 3346 8055  
E-mail address: r.faff@business.uq.edu.au

## Abstract

Using Faff's (2015, 2019) pitching research template as a base (first-phase scholarly pitch), Faff and Kastle (2016) develop a research pitch tool targeting non-academic external stakeholders/end users. The "pitching research for engagement and impact" (*PR4EI*) second-phase pitch augments the original tool, retaining its underlying philosophy. The current paper formally presents the *PR4EI* framework and illustrates the approach with four paired examples from diverse settings, namely: international finance; business model evolution; auditing; and organisational behaviour.

**Key words:** Research Engagement; Research Impact; Pitching Research; External Stakeholders; End Users; Value Proposition

## 1. Introduction

The primary aim of our paper is to expand on a second generation of Faff's (2015, 2019) scholarly pitching research framework, initiated by Faff and Kastle (2016) – namely, a companion research pitch tool targeting non-academic external stakeholders/end users. More specifically, our paper provides clear practical guidance, built around several examples that are “pitching research for engagement and impact”. By delivering on these aims, the core contribution we make is one of enhancing research capacity building, sensitive to the changing expectations of research relevance, in universities of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

The broad motivation for our study, leverages off several contemporary themes derived from the usefulness and relevance of scholarly research. Across the early decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, there is a growing chorus in Australia (e.g. ARC national Engagement and Impact exercise), in the UK (e.g. the UK Research Excellence Framework) and, indeed, globally for producing relevant research – especially, in those cases where the research effort is (significantly) publicly funded. Many would argue that, while there is (and will always remain) an important role for pure and somewhat abstract research, there has become too heavy a focus on such esoteric areas – especially around what one might label “Kevin Bacon” research activity.<sup>1</sup> One way to portray the current state is that academic research has somehow become too much *supply* driven – researchers, as the suppliers of research, have become too disconnected from/ignorant of/apathetic to more broadly “valued” research topics with direct outcomes.

So, to achieve a better balance between the *supply* of and the *demand* for research, more researchers need to be encouraged toward the goal of more directly solving real world

---

<sup>1</sup> There exists a well-known “6 degrees of separation” metaphor involving Kevin Bacon – that is, the *Bacon number* is the number of acquaintance links someone is from the famous actor, Kevin Bacon. As researchers aiming for a strong *PR4EI* story, we want a research “*Bacon number*” = 1, that is, to deliver a research project that is directly linked to a real world problem and context. Often in finance or accounting, our questions are multiple steps removed from real world problems. For example, consider a study addressing the speed of adjustment (SoA) of firm leverage. One could portray this as having a research *Bacon number* = 3: (1) SoA => Tradeoff Theory of capital structure; (2) Tradeoff Theory => corporate financial policies; (3) financial policies => firm value created by policy choices.

problems.<sup>2</sup> But, such a noble sounding goal is easier said than done. It is difficult to try and change the research culture and move from the evolved state of (internally-driven) research, as we know it today. One way to envisage a pathway for change is to pose some simple, but largely rhetorical, question(s).<sup>3</sup>

**Question:** From where do the real-world problems come?

**Answer:** Real world problems come from actual settings and real contexts in which there are key *stakeholders* party to and/or affected by the identified “live” problems.

**Question:** Are all stakeholders equally important?

**Answer:** No. Those stakeholders most affected by the real-world problems, could very likely be pivotal *end users* of research evidence. Such end users can be conveniently thought of as the primary source of *demand* for research – as they might most strongly benefit from the research outcomes. AND, if we are very lucky, we can see our success(es) reflected in particular *impacts* aligned with or even derived from our research evidence and solutions.

**Question:** But how do we truly know whether and to what extent a real-world problem exists and what might be the best approach towards finding a research solution?

**Answer:** What better way to confirm the extent of real-world problems than to communicate directly with those who will know firsthand – that is, *engage* with the key stakeholders – and most importantly, *engage* with those stakeholders likely to be important *end users*. Quite simply, such *engagement* will be critical.

**Question:** Can all real-world problems be posed as valid research questions and are all answers to real-world problems research?

**Answer:** No and No. Some real-world problems will be inherently non-researchable or not readily lead to (valid and highly effective) research solutions or require answers in an unfeasibly short timeframe. In such cases, they will require solutions that come purely from government policy, value judgements, judicial/legal decisions or processes, pragmatic compromise and the like. For example, consulting relationships (typically devoid of any research rigor) are legitimate activities that often arise due to intense engagement.

**Question:** What are the tell-tale signs of such non-research *engagement and impact*?

**Answer:** Some tell-tale signs of pure consulting include: significant payment for service, zero intellectual property (IP) to the agent, short-cuts, unduly rapid analysis, non-reproducibility, secrecy, non-publication, customised pragmatism that avoids or undermines the role of academic theory.<sup>4</sup>

So, a strong theme emerging from the above is, that intertwined in this 21<sup>st</sup> century “enlightenment” of research relevance/utility is, the search for *research engagement* and

---

<sup>2</sup> The reader should carefully note that this call for greater relevance, relates to research of all shapes and flavours. It is a critique – not just of accounting and finance research, not just research at the heart of business schools – but of all research.

<sup>3</sup> Each question is followed by an “indicative” answer that is not meant to be unique or definitive. Rather, each answer is designed to provide some useful non-controversial context upon which we build our story.

<sup>4</sup> Indeed, we would argue that one crucial reason why academics are well-placed to help solve real world problems is their understanding of decision useful theories. Applying these theories to the real world can have a real, measurable impact rather than merely applying the theories to ideas for an internal to academia audience only.

*research impact*.<sup>5</sup> Striving to play a part in this call to action, the current paper: (a) presents a simple enabling tool – the *pitching research for engagement and impact (PR4EI)* framework (Faff and Kastle, 2016) – and (b) illustrates the *PR4EI* approach with four paired examples across a diverse set of areas.

The *PR4EI* framework has two key components. First, is the foundation piece – Faff’s (2015, 2019) pitching research template which delivers the first-phase scholarly pitch.<sup>6</sup> Second, Faff and Kastle (2016) develop a research pitch tool targeting non-academic external stakeholders/end users. The second-phase *PR4EI* pitch augments the original tool, retaining its underlying philosophy. Deriving from the two-phase pitching setup, each example comprises a pigeon pair of pitches. Specifically, we present four illustrations of the *PR4EI*: #1: international finance; #2: business model evolution; #3: auditing; and #4: organisational behaviour.

The current paper is further motivated by a growing effort to create a stronger regime of “Responsible Science”. Of particular note, in their position paper on responsible research in business and management, cRRBM (2017)<sup>7</sup> argue that we are generally witnessing a credibility crisis in science. According to cRRBM, there are two dimensions to the crisis: (a) a *crisis of integrity* – “the credibility of the knowledge published in journals is in doubt” [p. 9] and (b) a *crisis of relevance* – the “... widening gap between research and practice, with business research in many domains increasingly divorced from the real-world practices” [p. 3]. It is the

---

<sup>5</sup> Should we ALL have an E&I strategy? Probably, BUT beware ... this is yet another case in which the “law” of “ONE size does NOT fit ALL”, holds! Think of it as the challenge of choosing where in the strategy “spectrum” that you want to be. What then, are the deciding factors – the factors that each researcher should “listen to”, for rationally deciding where in the spectrum they should sit? It seems likely that these deciding factors might include: (a) personal career goals; (b) perception of the spectrum: at one extreme of being a “pure” academic focused on “basic” research right through to being more a “pracademic”, focused on very applied research; (c) perceived tradeoff between academic vs. non-academic outputs; (d) your discipline area; (e) nature of the chosen research topic; (f) stage in the life cycle of academic career; (g) “local” research incentives. Of course, how one deals with the tensions between these factors and implicitly assigns an “exchange rate” that will allow some type of “rational” decision to be made on this, is challenging and highly personal.

<sup>6</sup> The interested reader is referred to Faff (2019) for a deep discussion of the original template tool, which is regularly up-dated (now in its 17<sup>th</sup> version).

<sup>7</sup> There are 28 founding members of the Community for Responsible Research in Business and Management (cRRBM), spanning all of the major Business School disciplines. Notable amongst this group are five leading accounting and finance scholars: Rashad Abdel-Khalik; Franklin Allen; Ulrich Hommel; Maureen O’Hara and Ira Solomon.

latter of these crises that provides a core motivation for our study.<sup>8</sup> We argue that, by enabling researchers to better plan the engagement and impact dimension of their research, the *PR4EI* framework which is the central focus of our study, can play a role in gradually moving future research toward more useful and relevant outcomes.

Interestingly, there is growing evidence that contemporary published papers are becoming more in tune with diverse relevant recent real-world problems.<sup>9</sup> For example, Asbi et al. (2020, forthcoming) examine recovery from the Black Saturday bushfires. Further, Xue et al. (2020, forthcoming), consider financial well-being amongst elderly Australians, while Michalak and Ashkansay (2020) investigate workplace psychopaths and other toxic employees. In terms of grand challenges, Quayle, Grosvold and Chapple (2019) take on on the grand challenge of refugee crises; while Groen (2019), the grand challenge of zero growth economies.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 outlines the Faff and Kastle (2016) *PR4EI* tool.<sup>10</sup> Section 3 presents several worked examples. Section 4 provides a discussion of how the use of the *PR4EI* tool aided the pitching strategies underlying the examples showcased in the previous section. Section 5 concludes.

---

<sup>8</sup> Motivated by the perceived crisis of integrity, a recent example of this move toward responsible science is the virtual special issue of *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* which celebrated the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the iconic event study, Ball and Brown (1968). The lead article of the special issue, Aman et al (2019a), gives a very helpful coverage of the objectives and outcomes of this research initiative. Other studies included in the vSI are: Aman et al. (2019b); Berkman, Jona, and Soderstrom (2019); Bohmann et al. (2019); Han et al. (2019); Howieson (2019); and Hillier and Loncan (2019). Several more papers focus on the Ball and Brown legacy are included in the special issue (Ball and Brown 2019; Clinch, Lyon, and Pinnuck 2019; and Fargher and Wee 2019).

<sup>9</sup> Indeed, a range of leading domestic/regional focused journals, in the same broad space as *Accounting & Finance*, have instigated a range of recent special issue initiatives that, in various ways, speak to the research relevance question. First, *Australian Journal of Management* Volume 44, Issue 4, 2019; present a special issue on “Grand Challenges in the Asia-Pacific Region: Implications for Organizational Strategy and Management”. Second, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, provide a virtual special issue on responsible science using a registration-based framework. Third, *Abacus* Volume 55, Issue 3, 2019; have a special issue on “Accounting for the Public Sector at a Time of Crisis”. Fourth, *Accounting Research Journal* Volume 29 Issue 2, 2016; offer a special issue on “Advancing Sustainability Management Accounting in the Asia Pacific Region”. And, finally, *Pacific Accounting Review* Volume 29 Issue 4, 2017; provide a special issue on “Government and Municipality Accountability”.

<sup>10</sup> The SSRN paper, Faff and Kastle (2016), is written by the first two authors from the current paper. As such, the current paper is, in effect, a revised and enhanced version of the SSRN paper. Most notably, Section 2 herein, borrows heavily from the unpublished Faff and Kastle (2016).

## 2. Faff and Kastle (2016) *PR4EI* Tool

### 2.1 Some Background

To begin, let us anchor the discussion in terms of a simple, useful and non-controversial view of (scholarly) research, as espoused by the Australian Research Council (ARC) – research is:

“ ... the *creation* of *new knowledge* and/or the use of existing *knowledge* in a *new* and *creative* way so as to generate *new* concepts, methodologies, inventions and understandings. ...include[s] synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is *new* and *creative*.” [*emphasis added*, see ERA Submission guidelines, 2018]

Three notable features stand out from this description of research. First, research is about discovering something *new* – the word “new” features 4 times in this short quote. Second, research is about being *creative* and the creation of something new. Third, central to research is *knowledge* – it is about striving to create new knowledge, relevant to a chosen field.

While research engagement and research impact are strongly related and linked to each other, they are very distinct concepts. Research engagement is a multi-faceted part of shaping and disseminating research. While we acknowledge that there is no one unique definition of research engagement, the ARC propose that research engagement:

“...is the interaction between researchers and research end-users (including industry, government, non-governmental organisations, communities and community organisations), for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge, technologies and methods, and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” [EI 2018 Submission Guidelines]

Building on this view, we argue that research engagement captures the extent to which non-academic stakeholders are aware of, have input into and a meaningful influence over the academic research *process*, i.e. the focus of research engagement is on the inputs into and process of research. While we would naturally aim to create sustainable engagement relationships, the engagement focus is in itself more about the *short-term* communication channels that help inform and make more visible, our research efforts in an outward facing manner. The nature of such engagement will in part be dependent on the discipline area to which the academic belongs.

On the other hand, we argue that, research impact is a natural *long-term* counterpart to research engagement. A very relevant and workable definition, again comes from the ARC:<sup>11</sup>

“Research impact is the *contribution* that research makes to the economy, society, environment or culture, *beyond the contribution to academic research.*”  
[*emphasis added*]

Moreover, for our purposes research impact captures the extent to which non-academic stakeholders/end users: (a) identify a value proposition from; (b) are directly affected by; and/or (c) explicitly use or exploit the results/findings of; a given piece of academic research. That is, the focus of research impact is on the findings of academic research, such that in the case of highly impactful research the key *outputs* are re-cast or translated into a form more directly relevant to the core activity of the given stakeholder/end user – usually helping to solve a problem relevant to them, ideally with enduring flow-on implications for other similar stakeholders/end users over the longer term.

Generally speaking, the greater is the value proposition, and/or the greater is the problem solved, and/or the greater is the widespread application of such solutions for non-academic stakeholders/end users: the greater is the research impact. Impact should be long-standing. Any definition of impact should not trade off research impact against scholarly excellence nor exacerbate the pressure that competition already places on research excellence. A (meaningful) minimum threshold of scholarly excellence should be a condition necessary for research impact. Otherwise, in the absence of a solid scholarly foundation (that is, among other things, lacking deep rigour and/or not informed by relevant academic theory), the endeavour that takes place – while worthwhile and valuable – while “engaging” and “impactful” – is more likely to be deemed consulting than it is true research.

Before we move on, one further thought is worthwhile regarding the relation between research engagement and research impact. While these concepts are very closely related and might naturally occur together, research engagement and impact might also exist largely

---

<sup>11</sup> See the ARC website, “Research Impact Principles and Framework”: <https://bit.ly/382k2SG>

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>.



independent of each other. Yes, it is helpful to think of research engagement as a natural pathway toward research impact, or that one round of successful research impact might well induce a following round of (new and possibly extended) research engagement, and so on. But neither engagement nor impact is a necessary or a sufficient condition for the other to exist. That said, we proceed on the assumption that the two will be fostered as reinforcing parts of the same over-arching strategy that seeks to give research more relevance.

## 2.2 *PR4EI* Pitching Template<sup>12</sup>

For completeness, Faff's (2015, 2019) original scholarly pitching research framework tool is reproduced in Figure 1. Faff and Kastle's (2016) *PR4EI* counterpart template is shown in Figure 2 ("vanilla" version) and Figure 3 ("cued" version). The basic structure of the *PR4EI* template is as follows: (A) Working Title; (B) Basic Impact Goal; (C) Key Industry/External Triggers; (D) Motivation/Problem; (E) Stakeholders?; (F) Value Proposition?; (G) Resources?; (H) Communication Strategy?; (I) Metrics?; (J) Impact?; (K) Other Considerations.<sup>13, 14</sup>

The basic impact goal (B) asks for just one sentence or one key message, that describes the way in which your research will "change the world" – clearly identifying the relevant part of the world most affected. An additional element relating to the engagement angle would be helpful also. For Item (C), you need to identify up to three key industry or "external" triggers" which most critically underpin the topic. For example, highly relevant credible/influential industry reports; government inquiries/publications/reports; controversial/attention grabbing

<sup>12</sup> Mirroring advice given for the original scholarly template of Faff (2015, 2019), we recommend aiming to complete the written exercise using a concise form of expression – ideally 1,000 words in total across the full template. As we shall see in the examples shown in Section 3, complying with this word limit can be very challenging – and so, some leniency is sensible.

<sup>13</sup> The *PR4EI* tool is clearly somewhat contrived in its format, given the similarity to Faff's (2015, 2019) scholarly pitch design. It is argued that the drawbacks coming from being contrived are outweighed by psychological and other benefits this familiarity affords.

<sup>14</sup> Readers should note that we are taking the view that a researcher planning for an achievement beyond the traditional scholarly goals (e.g. refereed publication), is thinking of a combined strategy of relationship building, via research engagement, as a "pathway" to hopefully achieving some measure of longer term research impact. As such, the flavour of the *PR4EI* should ideally be a synergistic balance between how engagement and impact considerations are viewed and planned.

events. Then to round out the preliminary four E&I template items, Item (D) asks for a statement of motivation/problem in one short paragraph, describing the bigger picture “real world” problem that you are trying to help address. Note that it is likely that this motivation/problem picks up on one of the triggers listed in Item (C) above – and elaborates on it a bit more.

The next three items, (E), (F) and (G) are grouped together as *three core engagement and impact dimensions*. Item (E) requires that you identify up to three key stakeholders that have an interest in the problem that you are trying to address. Then, solely for your NUMBER ONE stakeholder, answer (as many as possible) relevant questions, following the cues shown in Figure 3 e.g. What is their interest in the problem? ... Are they willing to invest money into solving this problem? What are the parameters for this? ... How do all of the stakeholders relate/interact with each other? Cooperatively or competitively? ...

Item (F) of the *PR4EI* template is the “value proposition”: identify how the stakeholder/end user will benefit from your research. Frame this in terms of their needs, and the problems that they are actively trying to solve. Such value may derive from business outcomes, business capability, operational capability, or technical capability. Then we have Item (G), Resources: What resources do you need access to in order to realise this impact?

The next pair of template items are labelled the *two key engagement and impact “signals”*. Regarding Item (H), Communication Strategy, we ask how will the stakeholders/end users find out about your work? As a guide, refer to the channels cued in Figure 3 e.g. Industry publications? Social media? ... Face to face meeting (formal and informal), and so on. Note that engagement and impact effort are closely related to each other, and the choices here also determine the depth and nature of the relationships that you will have with stakeholders.

Next, we have Item (I), Metrics. How will you know if (or demonstrate that) the engagement and impact efforts are working? Possible metrics are suggested in Figure 3.<sup>15</sup> Item (J) is the “one bottom line”, i.e. a clear succinct statement that captures your IMPACT message. What is the primary essence of the potential Impact? Is the research aimed at affecting, e.g., policy, managerial and professional practices, social behaviour or public discourse?

Finally, just like the original scholarly template of Faff (2015, 2019), the *PR4EI* template finishes with “Other Considerations”, as a “catchall”. As a supplement, consider creating a matrix or list of likely risks. For example, stakeholder risk might be considered in terms of strategic risk (reputation, partner/alliance); environmental risk (competition, market); and operational risk (compliance, process) (e.g. Hillson, 2016).

## 2.3 Some General Advice to *PR4EI* Users

### 2.3.1 *Think about Internal vs. External Use*

It is strongly recommended that the document be presented as an ‘internally-facing’ document that addresses all points. This internal document then provides a basis for the development of ‘externally-facing’ versions that are provided to prospective partners, collaborators or stakeholders. In an internally-facing document, it would be useful for users to be made aware of commercial-in-confidence issues and the role of non-disclosure agreements in research. Users should also be aware of possible problems with needing to have the research “tell the story” that a vested interest wishes to be told. That is, the researcher ought to consider issues relating to research independence and prospective or perceived conflicts of interest. This may be particularly relevant to research considering sensitive and/or contentious issues. In these cases, users need to clearly understand the potential implications of decisions to offer, for example, caveats or embargoes on theses/publications and the legal or other implications of these conditions.

---

<sup>15</sup> The ARC is a good source of an extensive list of possible indicators of or metrics for both engagement and impact success. See our Appendix for a list of potential indicators suggested in the ARC report “Engagement and Impact Assessment Pilot 2017 REPORT”.

### 2.3.2 *Need for a Process*

Both template tools are primarily designed to be simple, concise starting points for developing research strategies. Downstream, after the *PR4EI* framework has served its main purpose, and assuming the plans look promising – and worth pursuing – researchers will need create a process to surround the artefact. This process would take the tool to more of an ‘action research’ or ‘design science’ perspective.

### 2.3.3 *Apply an Iterative Process*

The template needs to be paired with an iteration process to get the most value from it (e.g. first draft, discuss with project team, revise, test with stakeholders, revise ...). Pairing this process with other tools to produce the template would be very valuable without increasing the complexity of the template itself.

### 2.3.4 *Means to an End – “What’s Next?”*

The process needs to answer the question “What’s next?” That is, what purpose does this template serve? For example, having drafted the template, does the researcher use it to engage in initial or ongoing discussions with industry partner(s), for key discussions with senior researchers within the research group (especially those familiar with ARC Linkage and Discovery grant processes), for promotion purposes where industry linkages/applied research form part of the criteria, or for external/post PhD *non-academic* (e.g., consulting) purposes. It is likely that more than one of these possible “what’s next” applications should be considered.

### 2.3.5 *Practical Challenges for those with Limited Real World Experience*

Identifying the key industry triggers and the motivation/problem were fairly straightforward for users who come from practice. It is not unlikely that early stage “pure stream” academics or PhDs coming straight through the Honours to PhD programs would struggle to articulate what are triggers/motivations/problems. For example, engaging with political agendas, contributing at an expert level on industry-based issues, or addressing issues affecting ‘big

business' or national economy and productivity aspects is not usually a developed part of the repertoire of a student lacking in industry experience. Training would likely be recommended.

### 2.3.6 Staged Approach to Modelling Stakeholders/End Users

Downstream, think of more mature tool(s) to identify stakeholders and rank them or select the key stakeholder(s) as per the identified purpose of the template. For example, a stakeholder analysis matrix (influence and importance) would identify stakeholders more completely. Such a tool would likely complicate the use of the template. Nevertheless, such a complementary tool ensures that all stakeholders are identified, and the user then selects only one for “fleshing out”. Some training might be needed to guide the prioritisation of stakeholders – and which might see (some) stakeholders turn into critical end users of any research outcomes.

### 2.3.7 Complementary Analysis to Assist Identifying the “Value Proposition”

Regarding the value proposition, e.g., for an industry partner, the cues can be enhanced, for example, by identifying likely sources of value and perhaps ranking them by stakeholder. A clear WIIFM (‘what’s in it for me’ as e.g. an employee, a practitioner, a business person) and or WIIFB (what’s in it for business) could be helpful. There might be value in looking at other variations as well, such as WIIFP (for politics), WIIFA (for Australia / another nation), and so on. The “what does a win look like for them?” question essentially provides the value proposition.<sup>16</sup> Capacity to identify and communicate value beyond academic purposes, again, is likely to be a skills/knowledge gap among users – suggesting the need for training.

## 2.4 PR4EI Template Example: Economic–Research Commercialisation

The worked example, displayed in Figure 4, taken from Faff and Kastle (2016), is one that only shows the PR4EI template – in this case a “reverse-engineered” pitch for “Economic–Research Commercialisation”. This example is based on an actual experience of the second

---

<sup>16</sup> WIIFM / WIIFB could replace the Value Proposition. Value may be broadly considered in terms of efficiency and effectiveness benefits (i.e. does the prospective business partner achieve the same things faster or do new things), cost savings (i.e. achieve the same things more cheaply), or reducing stakeholder risk (e.g. compliance risk, organisational risk, operational risk, risk of obsolescence).

author of the current paper. Notably, this example accords with the recommended 1,000 word limit. A sequential discussion of each element contained in this worked example now follows.

As reflected by the *working title*, the focus is on “using the Lean LaunchPad for researchers to maximise research impact” (Item (A)), somewhat ironic given the very nature of the current paper. As shown in Item (B), the *basic impact goal* states that while we “research to try to change the world, a lack of engagement can make it impossible to realise the impact we are aiming for – our approach can help you maximise the impact of your research.” Regarding the *industry/external triggers* (Item (C)), attention is first drawn to numerous national reviews of innovation in Australia, implying a degree of frustration with the lack of meaningful action/success coming from them. The core trigger is then linked to the, US-based, National Science Foundation’s specific program: Lean LaunchPad (LLP), aimed at increasing the impact of research. The brief statement of *motivation/problem* (Item (D)) essentially argues that too often our (academic) research is too self-serving – that our research doesn’t align well with the problems of those we are ostensibly trying to serve. The clear message conveyed in the worked example is that, from an “impact” and/or “engagement” point of view, the quality of our research must be measured by the value that we create for our stakeholders. AND, that is what the LLP for Researchers program is designed to address.

So who then are the key *stakeholders* (Item (E))? In this case, all levels of government, as well as a diverse set of research organisations (e.g. Universities, CSIRO, Industry groups) and researchers. The *PR4EI* pitch argues that these stakeholders should all be working together to solve this problem, but they often do not. A further complication is that the funder/fundee relationship creates competition among the research organisations, so best practice often doesn’t spread, unless it’s promoted by the funding bodies. Item (F) asks for the key *value proposition*. As stated in the worked template, LLP is the best way to promote researchers desired economic outcomes from innovation. Moreover, the example asserts that LLP is now the international standard for creating research impact, and one of the only programs that has

an explicit focus on generating innovation **outcomes**, not just inputs. And what about *resources*, Item (G)? As indicated against this item in Figure 4, the second author has already realised this dimension of impact through collaboration with the CSIRO (Kastelle, King, Verreyne, and Kambouris, 2018). This has enabled the creation of a small team of people that can facilitate LLP for researchers programs, which subsequently expanded to become a national program available to all research organisations in Australia.<sup>17</sup> Other resource-related issues highlighted in the template example are: sourcing/training more facilitators; funding sustainability; administration; and program effectiveness assessment.

We now reach that part of the template, labelled “Two key engagement and impact signals”. Item (H) is the first one, *communication strategy*. The worked template identifies a diverse strategy including through/via: partnerships (e.g. CSIRO); social media (e.g. blogs); public talks. The second form of “signalling” is captured by item (I), *metrics*. Here we need to be careful as different metrics are likely to apply to the engagement versus the impact goals. For example, the short-term impact metrics identified in this example include: (a) number of research organisations adopting this approach; (b) executive education or consulting revenue; (c) research publications. The bottom line for this *PR4EI* example – item (J), *impact* is simply/succinctly stated: the primary impact is Australian research commercialisation performance – an ambitious goal!

The final item (K), is *other considerations*. For this example, the core “other” issue identified is IP. The core tools originate in the US under Creative Commons Licenses. Our local knowledge is embedded in know-how – how to implement this program, particularly with researchers, as adapted for the Australia context. So there is not much of a defensible legal IP position. However, there are significant network effects, so getting to national scale fast is important.

---

<sup>17</sup> See <https://oninnovation.com.au/> for details.

### 3. Worked Paired Examples of the *PR4EI* Pitching Template<sup>18</sup>

#### 3.1 *PR4EI* Example 1: International Finance (Walsh)

This paired example considers an international finance application and Figure 5 shows the scholarly pitch, while Figure 6 displays the *PR4EI* pitch.<sup>19</sup> The specific focus of this research project is the internationalisation of the Renminbi (RMB) and the implications and opportunities for Australian Financial Markets.<sup>20</sup>

As stated early in the scholarly pitch, the rapid pace of reform in China associated with the objective of internationalising the RMB has seen major financial centres around the world vying to be involved. While trading in RMB has been possible in Australia for a number of years, the establishment of an official RMB settlement facility in Sydney piqued interest in Australia becoming a more fully developed RMB business centre. However, Australia (i.e. Sydney) needs a clearer understanding of where the main opportunities lie and how it could best interact with existing offshore centres and hubs in the region and beyond.

While China is the world's biggest trading nation its financial links with the rest of the world are still limited, due primarily to capital controls. China is looking to the development of offshore RMB markets to progress the internationalisation of the RMB. This has led to financial centres around the world jostling for status as an RMB offshore hub. Do the centres compete with each other for the same business or do they specialise? What is the nature of the financial links between these centres? How can Australia best take advantage of and fit into this existing network? And what role will offshore centres play once Chinese capital controls are fully removed?

---

<sup>18</sup> The text discussion in this section does not work through any of the pitches in detail – such information can be gleaned directly from the relevant pitch exhibits. Rather our goal here is to give some relevant context to each example, which allows readers to decide whether they wish to look more closely at the full details in the pitches.

<sup>19</sup> A recorded video version of the oral PowerPoint presentation of this pitch example, is available on YouTube at: <https://youtu.be/fLHWHj1pdeI> (scholarly pitch) and <https://youtu.be/tg2vnmLBJPI> (*PR4EI* Pitch).

<sup>20</sup> For full disclosure, the paired pitches were created as a reverse engineering exercise based on a commissioned research project – in which Kathy Walsh was a team member – for the NSW State government (Walsh and Weir, 2015). As such, it is not surprising that this example comes across very much as an “industry-led” endeavour, to which a scholarly base is created.



As described in the pitch exhibit, the key idea of the project is to execute a qualitative study. That is, to conduct in-depth interviews with officials and practitioners in RMB centres around the world including Singapore, Hong Kong, Seoul, Shanghai, Frankfurt, Luxembourg, London and Paris. Then these data are benchmarked against interviews with domestic participants and determine scope for RMB business in Australia.

The NSW Government is the central stakeholder/end user. It is committed to establishing Sydney's position as a regional financial hub and (at the time of this activity) was looking to grow Sydney as an RMB hub. While state governments can establish official level relationships with China, the establishment of a hub needs to be market driven and independent research outlining the business case for RMB transactions and the scope for growth is required. The government will need clear policy recommendations and targets to ensure the framework is in place to allow growth in RMB business. However, as noted in the *PR4EI* pitch, the Federal Government is also a critical player. It is the Federal Government who is responsible for ensuring that Australia's tax and regulatory frameworks do not unnecessarily discourage cross-border financial relations and that ongoing negotiations with China on market access issues are productive. The pitch claims that his research will provide financial market policy recommendations to enable Australia to benefit from the opening up of China's capital markets and the internationalisation of the RMB.

### **3.2 *PR4EI* Example 2: Business Model Evolution (Brosnan)**

This paired example considers a business model evaluation application and Figure 7 shows the scholarly pitch, while Figure 8 displays the *PR4EI* pitch. The specific focus of this research project is the creation of shareholder value through business model evolution, with a specific focus on retail shopping centres.<sup>21</sup> As the scholarly pitch states, the basic question asks: "Is the

---

<sup>21</sup> For full disclosure, the paired pitches were created by Mark Brosnan, as part of an assessment task in the PhD course in 2016, run by the lead author: "Research Process in Business", at the University of Queensland.

business model evolution, towards entertainment destinations, creating shareholder value for retail shopping centre owners?”

Globalisation of capital markets makes competition for capital increasingly fierce. Economic theory suggests capital will flow to those organisations that utilise it most efficiently, to create shareholder value. Internal and external forces act on businesses, products and industries causing them to move through life cycles. In response to these life cycle forces, organisations need to adapt and evolve their business models and processes in order to continue to create shareholder value. This pitch uses the retail shopping industry to examine if those businesses adapting and evolving their business models, in response to technological pressures (the rise in popularity of online shopping), are creating more shareholder value than those business models stagnating.

The scholarly pitch briefly outlines the plan, suggesting the data comes from the owner of multiple retail shopping centres (10 shopping complexes for approximately 8-10 years). This data includes shopping centre tenancy turnovers, leased area and floor plans (present and historical) with a mix of monthly and annual observations. The shopping centres are located in Australia and the US. The proprietary data are commercially sensitive, hence the need for non-disclosure and other usage agreements.

### **3.3 *PR4EI* Example 3: Intelligent Decision Aids in Auditing (Axelsen)**

This paired example considers an Auditing application and Figure 9 shows the scholarly pitch, while Figure 10 displays the *PR4EI* pitch. The specific focus of this research project is the effects of continued use of intelligent decision aids (IDAs) on auditor knowledge.<sup>22</sup> IDAs are expert systems that help the user to make better decisions. More specifically, the pitch poses

---

<sup>22</sup> For full disclosure, the paired pitches were created by Micheal Axelsen, as part of a semi-formal session held by the Business Information Systems discipline group at The University of Queensland: ‘PhD round table’ for doctoral student networking during the PhD.

the question: does the continued use of IDAs reduce the auditor's professional skills in terms of their ability to form their own professional judgment?

The issue is that many contemporary audits are undertaken according to strict methodologies delivered according to rules set out in an IDA, and the auditor may be restricted to using the methodology contained in the IDA. However, there are concerns however that these methodologies, and the advice and options 'baked into' the IDA dictated by these methodologies, reduce the auditor's skill levels. Previous research indicates the potential loss of 'declarative' knowledge, such as knowing which auditing standard to apply – i.e. 'know-what'. However, no studies have considered loss of 'procedural' knowledge or how to run an audit – i.e. 'know-how'. The puzzle here is, does the long-term use of an IDA de-skill the auditor user in the ways that matter – for example, their ability to run audits effectively, with or without an IDA?

### **3.4 *PR4EI* Example 4: Workplace Management (Michalak)**

This paired example considers a Workplace Management application and Figure 11 shows the scholarly pitch, while Figure 12 displays the *PR4EI* pitch. The specific focus of this research project is the research question: what causes workplace mistreatment, and how and why does it lead to negative individual and organisational outcomes?

A plethora of studies indicate interpersonal deviance in the workplace (e.g., bullying, sexual harassment) leads to several negative outcomes both for individual targets, and their organisations. These outcomes not only reduce organisational effectiveness and are directly financially costly, but also have several ripple effects extending from individuals into the wider community and the nation as whole. However, very little is known as to what causes mistreatment, nor how and why these negative outcomes manifest – i.e. the processes that underpin or factors that influence what happens between incident and outcome. These various unknowns, from cause and outcome, represent a puzzle that, if solved, provides opportunity

for evidence-based strategies interventions that may prevent mistreatment's occurrence, and/or reduce its negative effects.

#### 4. Discussion: How did *PR4EI* Influence the Strategies Employed by the Pitchers?

This section illustrates how the use of the *PR4EI* has positively affected the authors of the pitch examples shown in sub-sections 3.1 to 3.4, in terms of their strategies on engagement and impact.<sup>23</sup> While we emphasise actual engagement and actions, in some cases, due to the more hypothetical nature of the example, the discussion is more of a prospective reflection of going forward – either with the project itself or with a similar/related research activity. Also, as with all things in the “engagement and impact” space, we caution readers that any claims of causal links are fraught / potentially spurious due to the multiplicity of simultaneous factors (known or unknown) that inevitably occur. “Causal” impact is even more challenging in this regard, and is complicated further by the typically much longer horizons required to observe demonstrable changes in industry/stakeholder practice brought about by any given researcher-end user interaction.

##### 4.1 CSIRO Antecedents (Kastelle)

Before moving to the four examples, as background, it is worthwhile adding a brief commentary on some highly relevant antecedent activity by co-author Kastelle in his relationship with CSIRO (referred to in Section 2.4). As mentioned above, the program with the CSIRO had a direct influence on the development and content of the *PR4EI* Template, and the outcomes from that program provide some insight into the potential impact of using this kind of approach.

Between 2014 and 2020, the CSIRO Lean LaunchPad and ON accelerator programs<sup>24</sup> ran more than 80 cohorts, with an average of 10 research projects per cohort, consisting of teams of 3-8 researchers and business development people per team. Collectively, these teams conducted over 40,000 stakeholder interviews, constituting a substantial investment in research engagement. To date, over 50 research-based spinouts have been created from these projects. Within the CSIRO, this represents an 8-fold increase in annual spinout rate, a 200% increase –

---

<sup>23</sup> We thank an anonymous referee for pushing us to elaborate on this important perspective.

<sup>24</sup> <https://oninnovation.com.au/Programs/ON-Accelerate>

both in the percentage of spinouts that receive venture capital funding and in average funding amount (Burt, 2020).<sup>25</sup>

#### 4.2 International Finance (Walsh)

A prime example of an engagement outcome in Walsh's use of the *PR4EI* pitch (Figure 6), relates to a keynote address she delivered at a conference on Financial Liberalisation and the Renminbi in Auckland, New Zealand in October 2017.<sup>26</sup> The presentation required a distinct focus on the regulatory framework and contemporary outcomes as the audience was predominantly official sector and market practitioners. The keynote drew heavily on the value proposition in *PR4EI* noting Sydney's competition with other RMB hubs around the world. While there is only one percent of Australia's Trade with China settled in RMB there is considerable scope for growth. Walsh is quoted in the New Zealand financial press as saying "While many Chinese and Australian corporates were not using Renminbi for trade invoicing, some had begun to test the water with corporates trialling a small number of trades, with firms seeing it as a trial or a leap of faith".<sup>27</sup>

#### 4.3 Business Model Evolution (Brosnan)

In the case of Brosnan's *PR4EI* pitch (Figure 8), engagement with the industry partner was deepened via the pitching process. The industry partner is a large, government-owned investment company with a significant focus on the ownership and management of infrastructure assets.<sup>28</sup> Interacting with the industry partner, with regard to the current project, has created other research project opportunities. Although the original project is in an early stage of development, a pipeline of future projects is already under discussion. The *PR4EI* tool helps facilitate these discussions by distilling clarity of the research question from the

---

<sup>25</sup> Personal communication with David Burt David, Manager of CSIRO's ON accelerator program.

<sup>26</sup> See <https://bit.ly/3cxjWEP>

<sup>27</sup> See <https://bit.ly/32MEdBO>

<sup>28</sup> For confidentiality reasons, the identity of the organisation is kept anonymous.

perspective of the industry partner. Viewing the retail shopping issue from an industry perspective was extremely helpful in distilling clarity and engaging with the real-world problem facing the prospective partner. In the current climate where academic research is increasingly expected to fund itself, strengthening industry engagement by creating long-term relationships is seen as a valuable means to the (funding) end.

#### **4.4 Intelligent Decision Aids in Auditing (Axelsen)**

In the case of Axelsen's *PR4EI* pitch (Figure 10), the project addressed whether and how intelligent technologies might dominate an auditor and constrain the development of their professional knowledge. The industry partners are all stakeholders in the domain of public sector auditing. At the outset of the project, the pitching process assisted with understanding the needs of the industry partners and refining the pitch for obtaining stakeholder's willing and informed consent. For the project team, the pitching process ensured deeper consideration of the potential practical contributions both during the project and at its completion.

The pitching process also encouraged industry partner engagement such that during the project, presentations were made to some stakeholders and relevant professional bodies (e.g., ISACA) of preliminary findings. Practically, this level of engagement led, in part, to changes in how some stakeholders used their intelligent decision aids.

Toward the completion of the project, the pitching process provided guidance in identifying dissemination opportunities in practitioner-oriented forums such as professional journals and conferences. Lastly, the pitching process helped to 'close the loop' in support of future research. That is, the pitching process provided a basis for considering future research with the original industry partners (as a long-term research project) and new industry partners (from non-audit professional domains).

#### 4.5 Workplace Management (Michalak)

Finally, in the case of Michalak's *PR4EI* pitch (Figure 12), engagement and impact outcomes are more easily defined. In line with her *PR4EI* strategy, Michalak leveraged two specific engagement tools – 1) an industry report communicating her research findings that incorporated implications for policy and practice not only for her industry partners, but for individuals, businesses, and government, and 2) speaking engagements, to help achieve her engagement and impact objectives. As a direct outcome of the first tool, her research was featured in more than 40 non-academic outlets (including the Australian Financial Review<sup>29</sup> and other news media, industry magazines, blogs, and trade publications) in several different countries, indicating global reach and impact. Two such media references related to special taskforce policy announcements and reports - one legal profession specific, in the UK<sup>30</sup>, and one relating to national mental health, in Canada.<sup>31</sup> As an example of cross-industry engagement and impact, Michalak's research featured in a top business media outlet piece announcing the development of a national code of behavioural conduct - for the entertainment industry.<sup>32</sup> In addition, Michalak was invited to, and delivered a number of industry keynotes, presentations, and workshops, as well as participated in several expert panels both domestically and internationally, with audience numbers reaching the thousands.

Four notable, discrete impact examples can be directly attributed to these engagement tools. First, Michalak was interviewed about her applied research on prime-time breakfast radio in the USA, reaching hundreds of thousands of listeners. Second, Michalak was requested and subsequently appeared as a subject matter expert in a documentary mini-series on the international #MeToo and TimesUp movements produced by the Australian National Broadcaster, ABC.<sup>33</sup> Third, and consistent with a strengthening and expansion of her original

---

<sup>29</sup> <https://bit.ly/2XDYWHz>

<sup>30</sup> <https://bit.ly/2z6hyG3>

<sup>31</sup> <https://bit.ly/2RHLn63>, and <https://bit.ly/2XCFM4U>.

<sup>32</sup> <https://bit.ly/2VAcuRB> (6 April, 2018)

<sup>33</sup> Series viewership: 1 million plus; series rating: second place nationally, for all three episodes.



industry partnerships, Michalak was engaged by the lead legal profession regulator in NSW to design and assist in implementing an evidence-based, state-wide behavioural cultural change program, incorporating her research findings and recommendations for practice.<sup>34</sup> Fourth, the NSW regulator project, directly affecting 33,000 lawyers and 7,000 legal practices, was then featured as a positive case study example in “Respect@Work - Sexual Harassment National Inquiry Report (2020)”<sup>35</sup>, with the potential to trigger a further wave of research engagement and impacts.

## 5. Conclusion

We present and illustrate, through four diverse examples, Faff and Kastle’s (2016) *PR4EI* tool. The tool delivers a simple but effective engagement and impact approach, to scholarly research projects. We motivate this effort in the context of the ever-growing expectations and demands on university-based researchers to choose scholarly projects with more real-world problem solving relevance. In so doing, over time, academics should become better placed to achieve more broadly useful research – research that appropriately engages stakeholders and research that is impactful both for the scholarly and non-scholarly communities.

---

<sup>34</sup> <https://bit.ly/2XLGfSa>

<sup>35</sup> <https://bit.ly/34LEnKP>

## References

- Aman, H., et al. (2019a), “Responsible Science: Celebrating the 50-year Legacy of Ball and Brown (1968) using a Registration-based Framework”, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 56, 129-150.
- Aman, H., W. Beekes, M. Chang, and M. Wee, (2019b), The role of credibility in the relation between management forecasts and analyst forecasts in Japan, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 55, 29-45.
- Anderson, J. R. (1993). *Rules of the Mind*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Anderson, J. R., Fincham, J. M., & Douglass, S. (1997). The role of examples and rules in the acquisition of a cognitive skill. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23(4), 932-945. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/xlm/23/4/932.pdf>
- Arnold, V., & Sutton, S. G. (1998). The Theory of Technology Dominance: Understanding The Impact Of Intelligent Decision Aids On Decision Makers’ Judgments. *Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research*, 1(1), 175-194.
- Asbi, A., Ramiah, V., Yu, X., Wallace, D., Moosa, N., and Reddy, K., (2020) “The determinants of recovery from the Black Saturday bushfire: demographic factors, behavioural characteristics and financial literacy”, *Accounting and Finance*, forthcoming.
- Baldauf-Cunnington, M., (2014), “The Rise of Retailtainment: Convergence of Leisure Entertainment and Retail”. Retrieved June 2019, Retrieved from <http://www.iqpc.com/media/1001491/42546.pdf>
- Ball, R., and P. Brown, (1968), An Empirical Evaluation of Accounting Income Numbers, *Journal of Accounting Research* 6, 159-178. Available from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2490232>.
- Ball, R. and P. Brown, (2019), Ball and Brown (1968) after fifty years, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 53, 410-431.
- Bennett, G. B., & Hatfield, R. C. (2016). Staff Auditors’ Proclivity for Computer Mediated Communication with Clients and its Effect on Skeptical Behavior. Retrieved from <https://business.lsu.edu/Accounting/Documents/Bennett%20and%20Hatfield.pdf>
- Berkman, H., J. Jona, and N. Soderstrom, 2019, Firm value and government commitment to combating climate change, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 53, 297-307.
- Bohmann, M., D. Michayluk, V. Patel, and K. Walsh, 2019, Liquidity and earnings in event studies: Does data granularity matter?, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 54, 118-131.
- cRRBM, 2017, A Vision of Responsible Research in Business and Management: Striving for Useful and Credible Knowledge. Available from [https://rrbm.network/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Position\\_Paper.pdf](https://rrbm.network/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Position_Paper.pdf).
- Carr, N. (2008). Is Google Making Us Stupid? *The Atlantic Monthly*, 302, 56-58,60,62-63.
- Clinch, G., J. D. Lyon, and M. Pinnuck, 2019, A review of the impact of Ball and Brown (1968) on research in the Asia-Pacific Basin, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 53, 268-277.
- Dowling, C., Leech, S. A., & Moroney, R. (2008). Audit Support System Design and the Declarative Knowledge of Long-Term Users. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, 5(1), 99-108.
- Eichengreen, B., Walsh K., and G. Weir, (2014) “Internationalisation of the Renminbi: Pathways, Implications and Opportunities”, CIFR Research Report, March
- Faff, R., (2015), “A Simple Template for Pitching Research”, *Accounting and Finance* 55, 311-336.
- Faff, R., (2016a), “Pitching Research”, Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2462059> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2462059>
- Faff, R., (2016b), “Mapping “Pitching Research” Tasks into the RSD7 Framework: A Pedagogic Perspective”. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2724451>

- Faff, R., (2016c), "The "Pitching Research" Concept: 2015, a Year in Review", Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2721528> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2721528>
- Faff, R. and Kastle, T., (2016), "Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact" (July 22, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2813096>
- Fargher, N., and M. Wee, 2019, The impact of Ball and Brown (1968) on generations of research, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 54, 55-72.
- Gregor, S. (2006). The nature of theory in Information Systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 30(3), 611-642.
- Groen, M., (2019), "Zero growth: A grand challenge for the Asia-Pacific region", *Australian Journal of Management* 44, 632-647
- Han, J., M. K. Linnenluecke, Z. Pan, and T. Smith, 2019, The wealth effects of the announcement of the Australian carbon pricing scheme, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 53, 399-409.
- Hanbury, M., (2018), "50 Haunting Photos of Abandoned Shopping Malls across America", *Business Insider Australia*. Retrieved June 2019, Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com.au/american-retail-apocalypse-in-photos-2018-1?r=US&IR=T>
- Hatzvi, E., Nixon, W. and M. Wright, (2014) "The Offshore Renminbi Market and Australia" RBA Bulletin, December.
- Hillier, D., and T. Loncan, (2019), Political uncertainty and Stock returns: Evidence from the Brazilian Political Crisis, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 54, 1-12.
- Hillson, D. (2016). Introducing risk 01. *The Risk Management Handbook: A Practical Guide to Managing the Multiple Dimensions of Risk*, 1.
- Howieson, B., 2019, Frankenstein's Monster or the Birth of Venus? Perceptions of the Impact and Contributions of Ball and Brown 1968, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 55, 299-328.
- Kastelle, T., King, S., Verreynne, M.-L. and P. Kambouris, (2018), "Experiences Using a Science-Based Lean LaunchPad Program and its Impact on National Innovation System Evolution", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 35(3), 356-370.
- IIRC. (2013). The International Framework: Integrated Reporting <IR>. Retrieved from <http://www.theiirc.org>
- Karniouchina, E. V., Carson, S. J., Short, J. C., and Ketchen, D. J., (2013). "Extending the firm vs. industry debate: Does industry life cycle stage matter?", *Strategic Management Journal* 34(8), 1010-1018.
- Lazarus, R. S. (2006). Emotions and interpersonal relationships: Towards a person-centred conceptualization of emotions and coping. *Journal of Personality*, 74(1), 9-46.
- Lillis, A. M. (1999). A framework for the analysis of interview data from multiple field research sites. *Accounting and Finance*, 39(1), 79-105.
- Locke, K., & Golden-Biddle, K. (1997). Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and "problematizing" in organizational studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5), 1023-1062. doi:10.2307/256926
- McCall, H., Arnold, V., & Sutton, S. G. (2008). Use of Knowledge Management Systems and the Impact on the Acquisition of Explicit Knowledge. *Journal of Information Systems*, 22(2), 77-101.
- Michalak, R. and Ashkanasy, N., (2020, forthcoming), "Working with monsters: Counting the costs of workplace psychopaths and other toxic employees", *Accounting and Finance*, forthcoming.
- Quayle, A., Grosvold, J. and Chapple, L., (2019), "New modes of managing grand challenges: Cross-sector collaboration and the refugee crisis of the Asia Pacific", *Australian Journal of Management* 44, 665-686.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.

- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive Load During Problem Solving: Effects on Learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257-285.
- Whittemore, R., Chase, S. K., & Mandle, C. L. (2001). Validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(4), 522-538.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., and Shuen, A., (1997). “Dynamic capabilities and strategic management”, *Strategic Management Journal* 18(7), 509-533.
- Walsh, K. and Weir, G., (2015) “Renminbi Internationalisation and the Evolution of Offshore RMB Centres: Opportunities for Sydney” Industry Research Report, November.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 1-74.
- White, R., (2010), “Retail-Tainment; the Next Big Thing for Retail and Shopping Centers?”, Retrieved June 2019, Retrieved from <https://www.whitehutchinson.com/leisure/articles/downloads/retail-tainment.pdf>
- Xue, R., Gepp, A., O'Neill, T., Stern, S. and Vanstone, B., (2020, forthcoming) “Financial well-being amongst elderly Australians: The role of consumption patterns and financial literacy”, *Accounting and Finance*, forthcoming.

### Appendix: Some Possible Indicators of Engagement

The indicators listed below come from page 45 of the ARC report “Engagement and Impact Assessment Pilot 2017 REPORT”, under the heading of potential indicators for optional use in the engagement narrative:

- Co-authorship of research outputs with research end-users
- Co-funding of research outputs with research end-users
- Patents granted, PCT applications, triadic patents
- Citations in patents to traditional research outputs
- In-kind support from end-users
- Licencing agreements
- Confidentiality agreements
- Number of contracts for research, consulting, expert witness and testing
- Number of licences, assignments and options
- Number of different clients with contracts worth greater than a threshold value
- Philanthropy linked to research support and in-kind support
- Book sales
- Repeat business with industry
- Start-up/spin-out companies
- Serving on external advisory boards
- Consultations with community groups, professional/practice organisations, government bodies
- Consultation with/advice to Government
- Expert witness in court cases
- Contributions/submissions to public enquiries on industry-research related issues
- Public lectures, seminars, open days, school visits
- Presentations to practitioner communities
- Connections to cultural institutions, seminars/workshops, internships and engagement with the public
- HDR students in internships/placements
- HDR student destinations
- Support for cultural events/institutions—e.g. Writers’ Festivals, Film Festivals, Vivid Sydney, etc.
- Evidence of significant institutional partnerships—e.g. Sydney Health Partners; various global research consortia, OECD, World Bank, World Health Organisation, UN, UNESCO
- Co-designing and collaborating on performances and exhibitions
- Mobility of researchers (i.e. researchers employed or placed outside academia, for example embedded with research end-user partners, and/or research end-user employees that are employed or placed within academia)
- Mentoring external research partners
- Established networks and relationships with research users
- Involving users at all stages of the research, including working with user stakeholder and participatory groups
- Memoranda of Understanding (MOU)/Agreements
- Collect data around performance and the different types of public activities in which researchers generally report their work to the community or use their research capacity to further the work of community organisations
- Event participation statistics (public lectures, cultural events, exhibitions, etc.)
- Outreach activities (public lectures, policy engagements, media engagements, community events)
- Media coverage of exhibitions and new works
- Modification of traditional 'commercialisation' metrics such as 'spin-offs' to capture arts entrepreneurship such as setting up galleries, ensembles, groups and other professional practice entities
- Metrics which capture social media activity

**Figure 1: Faff's (2015, 2019) Pitching Research "Scholarly" Focus Template**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four aspects of BIG picture scholarly framing</b>
(A) Working Title	
(B) Basic Research Question	
(C) Key paper(s)	
(D) Motivation/Puzzle	
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three core aspects of any empirical research project</b>
(E) Idea?	
(F) Data?	
(G) Tools?	
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key questions</b>
(H) What's New?	
(I) So What?	
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>
(J) Contribution?	
(K) Other Considerations	

**Figure 2: Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact (PR4EI) Template**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four</b> aspects of BIG picture non-scholarly framing
(A) Working Title	
(B) Basic Engagement and Impact Goal	
(C) Key Industry/External Triggers	
(D) Motivation/Problem	
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core engagement and impact dimensions
(E) Stakeholders/ End Users?	
(F) Value Proposition?	
(G) Resources?	
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key engagement and impact signals
(H) Communication Strategy?	
(I) Metrics?	
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
(J) IMPACT?	
(K) Other Considerations	

**Figure 3: Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact Template – Cued Version**

Pitcher's Name	Your name here	Area of Impact	eg regulatory, governmental, community, social, environmental, economic	Date Completed	Insert date here
<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four</b> aspects of BIG picture non-scholarly framing				
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Succinct/informative title here – a title that emphasises the impact agenda in mind (but in a way that is fully compatible with the academic working title).				
<b>(B) Basic Engagement &amp; Impact Goal</b>	IN one sentence, describe the way in which your research will “change the world” – clearly identifying the relevant part of the world most affected.				
<b>(C) Key Industry/External Triggers</b>	Identify up to THREE key industry or “external” triggers” which most critically underpin the topic – for example, highly relevant credible/influential industry reports; government inquiries/publications/reports; controversial/attention grabbing events, ...				
<b>(D) Motivation/Problem</b>	IN one short paragraph (say a max of 100 words), describe the “real world” problem that you are trying to address. In most cases, there will be several – but give emphasis to the “signature” one. It is likely that this motivation/problem picks up on ONE of the items listed in (C) above – and elaborates on it a bit more.				
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core engagement and impact dimensions				
<b>(E) Stakeholders? End Users?</b>	<p>Identify the key stakeholders/ end users that have an interest in the problem that you are trying to address. Choose a maximum of THREE to highlight.</p> <p>For each key stakeholder (or at least for the NUMBER ONE stakeholder), answer these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is their interest in the problem?</li> <li>• What steps are they currently taking to try to solve it?</li> <li>• What does a win look like for them?</li> <li>• What knowledge/expertise gaps do they currently have?</li> <li>• Are they willing to invest money into solving this problem? What are the parameters for this?</li> <li>• Can they block a solution?</li> </ul> <p>How do all of the stakeholders relate/interact with each other? Cooperatively or competitively? As partners or through market transactions? Can you map out the interrelationships between the stakeholders?</p>				
<b>(F) Value Proposition?</b>	For each key stakeholder (or at least for the NUMBER ONE stakeholder), identify the value that your research/work can provide them. Frame this in terms of their needs, and the problems that they are actively trying to solve – what relieves a pain for them? What creates a gain? What can they do differently to achieve their goals?				
<b>(G) Resources?</b>	<p>What resources do you need access to in order to realise this impact? This includes time, money, people, intellectual property, commercialisation skills, etc.</p> <p>How will you access these resources? Grants, partnerships, philanthropy, internal University capabilities, commercialisation revenue?</p>				



<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key engagement and impact signals</b>
<b>(H) Communication Strategy?</b>	<p>How will the stakeholders find out about your work? Which of these channels will you use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry publications</li> <li>• Social media</li> <li>• General publishing (newspapers, The Conversation, etc.)</li> <li>• Public talks and presentations</li> <li>• Mentoring stakeholders</li> <li>• Advisory group participation</li> <li>• Consulting</li> <li>• Partnerships or joint ventures</li> <li>• Collaborative problem solving</li> <li>• Face to face meeting (formal and informal) – this has the highest impact; Conference; Phone call; Email</li> </ul> <p>Note that impact and effort are closely related here, and the choices here also determine the depth and nature of the relationships that you will have with stakeholders.</p>
<b>(I) Metrics?</b>	<p>How will you know if it's working?</p> <p>Possible metrics include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication reach</li> <li>• Social shares</li> <li>• People directly spoken to</li> <li>• Consulting or commercialisation revenue</li> <li>• Direct impacts on people/organisations</li> </ul>
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>
<b>(J) IMPACT?</b>	<p>What is the primary essence of the IMPACT? State this in one or two focused sentences. Is the research aimed at affecting, e.g., policy, managerial and professional practices, social behaviour or public discourse?</p>
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<p>Does the impact perspective, meaningfully, adequately, articulate with academic objectives? Is there threshold compatibility eg in time horizons, independence, ..?</p> <p>Is <b>Collaboration</b> needed/desirable? – what type of collaboration? What about <b>IP ownership</b>? Check out your rights – per your university policy. What expectations will/does any industry partner have regarding IP ownership? Can this be negotiated? Are there any aspects of potential <b>commercialisation</b> that are not fully covered earlier in the template?</p> <p>“<b>Risk</b>” assessment from an impact perspective [“low” vs. “moderate” vs. “high”: “no result” risk]; “competitor” risk (ie being beaten by a competitor); risk of “obsolescence”; other risks? Are there any serious challenge(s) that you face in executing this plan? What are they? Are they related to the Stakeholders? The Value Proposition? Resources? Are there confidentiality considerations? Embargo? As a supplement, consider creating a matrix or list of likely risks. For example, stakeholder risk might be considered in terms of strategic risk (reputation, partner/alliance), environmental risk (competition, market), and operational risk (compliance, process).</p>



**Figure 4: Worked Example of Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact: Economic – Research Commercialisation (Kastelle)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four aspects of non-scholarly BIG picture framing</b>
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Using Lean LaunchPad for Researchers to Maximise Research Impact
<b>(B) Basic Engagement and Impact Goal</b>	We research to try to change the world, but a lack of engagement can make it impossible to realise the impact we are aiming for – our approach can help you maximise the impact of your research.
<b>(C) Key Industry/External Triggers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the past 15 years, there have been 15 different national reviews of the Australian National Innovation. One finding that is consistent among all of them is that we are great at discovery, and terrible at research commercialisation. This is an important issue for economic health and well-being.</li> <li>The issue isn't just in Australia – in the US the National Science Foundation has formed an organisation called Innovation Corps which uses lean startup methods (the specific program is called Lean LaunchPad, or LLP) on research projects to increase the impact of the research.</li> <li>The NSF has now made completing an LLP program through I Corps a requirement for all research teams that are applying for an NSF Commercialisation Grant, which suggests that this is an effective method.</li> </ul>
<b>(D) Motivation/Problem</b>	The issue underlying all of trigger points is that too often our research is based on what interests us, and the problems that we are capable of addressing. However, these problems often don't line up with the problems of those we are ostensibly trying to serve. Too often, researchers believe that the quality of research is measured by the quality of the idea. If we care about impact, this is untrue. The quality of our research must be measured by the value that we create for our stakeholders. In order to create this value, we must be in closer touch with the problems that are important to them, and solve those. That is what the LLP for Researchers program is designed to address.
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three core engagement and impact dimensions</b>
<b>(E) Stakeholders? / End Users?</b>	<p>Key Stakeholders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governments: Federal, State and Local governments all want to encourage innovation in order to spur economic growth. They currently support many programs designed to support innovation. Most of these focus on innovation inputs – e.g. R&amp;D spending, research grants, startups formed, etc. There are few programs aimed at outcomes – e.g. value created through innovation, new industry growth, etc. and, ironically, these are all the things that represent wins for this group. They invest a lot of money into this problem, but the 15 reports in 15 years mentioned above show that there are still significant issues with outcomes. One of the biggest information gaps is in metrics for outcomes.</li> <li>Research Organisations (Universities, CSIRO, Industry groups) and Researchers: they do the research funded by the governmental groups. Their interests include maintaining that funding, increasing external impact and engagement (often as another form of funding, but this time via industry), and increasing profile. A win for this group is a breakthrough innovation that has a big impact (e.g. Gardasil for UQ, Wifi for CSIRO). This group also has a metrics problem, which is inherited in part from the funding bodies. They also invest substantial money in this problem. Researchers are mostly affiliated with these organisations. They aim for impact, but are often constrained by working to the success measures</li> </ol> <p>These stakeholders should all be working together to solve this problem, but often don't. The funder/fundee relationship creates competition among the Research Organisations, so best practice often doesn't spread, unless it's promoted by the funding bodies.</p>
<b>(F) Value Proposition?</b>	<p>Value Propositions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Governments: LLP for Researchers is the best way to promote their desired economic outcomes from innovation. It is now the international standard for creating research impact, and one of the only programs that has an explicit focus on generating innovation outcomes, not just inputs.</li> <li>For Research Organisations and Researchers: LLP for Researchers is the best way to maximise the impact of research. This in turn leads to desired outcomes in terms of profile and income.</li> </ol>
<b>(G) Resources?</b>	<p>We've already started to realise this impact through our collaboration with the CSIRO. This has enabled us to build a small team of people that can facilitate LLP for Researchers programs. Things we need in order to expand further include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More facilitators – this requires a relatively unique skill set, which is not widespread.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient income to develop and pay the facilitators – this will most likely come through further commercialisation revenue. It could also come through a partnership with the Australian Research Council if we want to integrate this program with ARC Linkage Grants as per the NSF Commercialization Grants in the US.</li> <li>• Time, or additional resources to help with program administration.</li> <li>• More research on the effectiveness of the program. We are currently working on publications based on the initial work with the CSIRO.</li> </ul>
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key engagement and impact signals</b>
<b>(H) Communication Strategy?</b>	<p>We will communicate to stakeholders through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnerships – the collaboration with the CSIRO has already led to further opportunities with Universities, including UQ itself!</li> <li>• Social media – especially blogs. Communication through my blog has already helped generate new opportunities (see: <a href="http://timkastelle.org/blog/category/lean-startup/">http://timkastelle.org/blog/category/lean-startup/</a>), and further publications on Harvard Business Review Blogs and possibly The Conversation are being planned. All of these are supported by social media sharing via Twitter, Facebook and LinkedIn.</li> <li>• Public talks: already happening, lower impact than the blogging to date.</li> <li>• This program would also benefit from formal Business Development activity – so far I have done all of that myself, when time has been available, which has limited growth (although so has delivery capacity).</li> </ul>
<b>(I) Metrics?</b>	<p>The short-term impact metrics include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Research Organisations adopting this approach. Right now, there is one (CSIRO), with several further prospects.</li> <li>• Executive Education or consulting revenue provides a good measure of value being created.</li> <li>• Research publications through the data generated (secondary to the other two)</li> </ul> <p>Long term metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australian research commercialisation performance (e.g. OECD rankings)</li> </ul>
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>
<b>(J) IMPACT?</b>	The primary impact is Australian research commercialisation performance – an ambitious goal!
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	This is an interesting program from an IP perspective. The core tools originate in the US under Creative Commons Licenses. Our local knowledge is embedded in know-how – how to implement this program, particularly with researchers, as adapted for the Australia context. So there is not much of a defensible legal IP position. However, there are significant network effects, so getting to national scale fast is important.

**Figure 5: Worked Example of Pitching Research for a Scholarly Expert: International Finance (Walsh)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four</b> aspects of scholarly BIG picture framing
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Internationalisation of the Renminbi (RMB): Implications and opportunities for Australian Financial Markets
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	The rapid pace of reform in China associated with the objective of internationalising the RMB has seen major financial centres around the world vying for a piece of the action. While trading in RMB has been possible in Australia for a number of years, the recent establishment of an official RMB settlement facility in Sydney has piqued interest in Australia becoming a more fully developed RMB business centre. However, Australia needs a clearer understanding of where the main opportunities lie and how it could best interact with existing offshore centres and hubs in the region and beyond.
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	Eichengreen, Walsh and Weir (2014 CIFR Report) provides a broad overview of the internationalisation of the RMB and its implications for Australia. Hatzvi, Nixon and Wright (2014 RBA Bulletin) notes that the proportion of Australian trade with China that is invoiced and settled in RMB is very small – less than 1%. This could mean that the opportunities for RMB business in Australia are very small or that there is considerable scope for growth.
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	While China is the world’s biggest trading nation its financial links with the rest of the world are still limited, due primarily to capital controls. China is looking to the development of offshore RMB markets to progress the internationalisation of the RMB. This has led to financial centres around the world jostling for status as an RMB offshore hub. Do the centres compete with each other for the same business or do they specialise? What is the nature of the financial links between these centres? How can Australia best take advantage of and fit into this existing network? And what role will offshore centres play once Chinese capital controls are fully removed?
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	RMB internationalisation is moving at a fast pace and is without precedent so quantitative investigation techniques are not applicable. Instead we will conduct in depth interviews with officials and practitioners in RMB centres around the world including Singapore, Hong Kong, Seoul, Shanghai, Frankfurt, Luxembourg, London and Paris. We will then benchmark this data against interviews with domestic participants and determine scope for RMB business in Australia.
<b>(F) Data?</b>	Data will be drawn primarily from interviews and will be supplemented with official data in Australia from the Reserve Bank, the Treasury and official sources in China. Market data will be sourced from ANZ, CBA, HSBC and Standard Chartered.
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	Content analysis of interview data triangulated with official data and subsequent interviews.
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key questions
<b>(H) What’s New?</b>	Eichengreen, Walsh and Weir (2014) and Hatzvi, Nixon and Wright (2014) are the only papers to put RMB internationalisation in an Australian context but neither look at the competition with other RMB centres. Having the infrastructure in Australia to conduct RMB business is not sufficient to ensure that RMB business will gravitate here.
<b>(I) So What?</b>	The NSW Government is committing considerable resources to developing Sydney as an RMB centre but needs a clear economic justification for why RMB business in Sydney would be viable.
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	The Chinese Government remains committed to financial market reform and liberalisation. This report is about what Australia needs to do to benefit from it.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	Any research on China is coupled with some political sensitivities. Trying to get Chinese officials to talk freely in interviews will be a challenge.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acf.12704>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).



**Figure 6: Worked Example of Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact: International Finance (Walsh)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four aspects of non-scholarly BIG picture framing</b>
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Internationalisation of the Renminbi (RMB): Opportunities and Implications for Australian Financial Markets
<b>(B) Basic Engagement and Impact Goal</b>	This research will provide financial market policy recommendations to enable Australia to benefit from the opening up of China's capital markets and the internationalisation of the RMB.
<b>(C) Key Industry/External Triggers</b>	The Reserve Bank of Australia has published several bulletin articles looking on the offshore Renminbi Market and Australia's use of RMB in cross border trade settlement. They note the use of RMB in Australia is increasing from a very low base and there is considerable scope for growth. The offshore RMB market is now one of the fastest growing currency markets in the world. Global bank, HSBC, commissioned several comprehensive studies surveying more than a thousand businesses and corporates across 14 markets and provide key insights into how businesses worldwide are preparing for China's changing financial landscape. Hong Kong and Australia have held three RMB Trade and Investment Dialogues facilitated by the Hong Kong Monetary Authority (HKMA), Australian Treasury and the Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA). The dialogues focus on the investment and funding opportunities associated with the internationalisation of the RMB.
<b>(D) Motivation/Problem</b>	There is an imbalance between Australia's trade and financial relationships with China. While China is Australia's number one trading partner our financial relationships remain with the US and Europe. However, as history shows, finance follows trade and as the trade relationship with China deepens trading firms will require an increasing number of financial contracts and more substantial levels of two-way investment. China's trading partners could benefit substantially from the opening up of China's capital markets however they will need to have the necessary policy setting and financial architecture in place.
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three core engagement and impact dimensions</b>
<b>(E) Stakeholders/End Users?</b>	The NSW Government is committed to establishing Sydney's position as a regional financial hub and is therefore looking to grow Sydney as an RMB hub. While they can establish official level relationships with China the establishment of a hub needs to be market driven and independent research outlining the business case for RMB transactions and the scope for growth is required. The government will need clear policy recommendations and targets to ensure the framework is in place to allow growth in RMB business. However it is the Federal Government who is responsible for ensuring that Australia's tax and regulatory frameworks do not unnecessarily discourage cross-border financial relations and that ongoing negotiations with China on market access issues are productive. This research will provide financial market policy recommendations to enable Australia to benefit from the opening up of China's capital markets and the internationalisation of the RMB.
<b>(F) Value Proposition?</b>	It's estimated 30 per cent of China's total trade will be settled in RMB by the end of 2015, so today's announcement ensures Australia can take advantage of this major opportunity. The NSW Government had been a major driver behind the push for Sydney to become an RMB hub and had previously established the Sydney for Renminbi initiative. While Sydney is a natural home for an Australian RMB hub it is in competition with 17 other hubs around the world. Business will not naturally flow to Sydney unless the right policies are in place. Only one per cent of Australian trade with China is currently settled in RMB so there is considerable scope for growth.
<b>(G) Resources?</b>	The report will take 12 months to complete but two researchers using 30% of their FTE time. They will need to undertake interviews with official and market sector people in several hubs around the world and therefore a substantial travel budget is needed. The research will need to be verified by RMB committees in each of the hubs and checked for government sensitivities. A full time bilingual (Mandarin/English) research assistant is also required. A combination of grant funding and ANU resources is required.
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key engagement and impact signals</b>
<b>(H) Communication Strategy?</b>	Stakeholder communication will be managed through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RMB Committees have been formed in each of the hubs and are eager to engage with research on RMB growth</li> <li>• We have maintained a database over the past 4 years and have a list of 300 people who are interested in reading our research.</li> <li>• A PR firm will be employed to handle the launch of the project and will ensure that media releases in English and Mandarin are widely distributed.</li> </ul>

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).

	We have been invited to talk on this issue at government level dialogues and industry conferences. We will also continue our involvement with banking led roadshows.
<b>(I) Metrics?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy adoption at the state and federal level</li> <li>• Government adoption of targets</li> <li>• Incorporation in government led Dialogues</li> <li>• Media reach measure by total viewer readership and number of words in leading publications</li> </ul> Citations in financial markets publications
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
<b>(J) IMPACT?</b>	Recommendations stemming from this research will allow Australia to fully benefit from China's financial development. The implementation of policy changes at the state and federal level will signal the deepest impact of this research.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<p>One drawback of this research is that China-Australia policy research is highly unlikely to be published in A* journals.</p> <p>In addition some of the policy recommendations will be unpopular (politically) or expensive so communication management is key.</p>



**Figure 7: Worked Example of Pitching Research for a Scholarly Expert: Business Model Evolution (Brosnan)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four</b> aspects of scholarly BIG picture framing
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Creating shareholder value through business model evolution: A retail shopping centre context
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	Is the business model evolution, towards entertainment destinations, creating shareholder value for retail shopping centre owners?
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	1. Karniouchina, E. V., Carson, S. J., Short, J. C., & Ketchen, D. J. (2013). Extending the firm vs. industry debate: Does industry life cycle stage matter? <i>Strategic management journal</i> , 34(8) 2. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. <i>Strategic management journal</i> , 18(7) 3. IIRC. (2013). <i>The International Framework: Integrated Reporting &lt;IR&gt;</i> . Retrieved from <a href="http://www.theiirc.org">www.theiirc.org</a>
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	Globalisation of capital markets is making competition for capital increasingly fierce. Economic theory suggests capital will flow to those organisations that utilise it most efficiently, to create shareholder value. Internal and external forces act on businesses, products and industries causing them to move through life cycles. In response to these life cycle forces, organisations need to adapt and evolve their business models and processes in order to continue to create shareholder value. This proposal seeks to use the retail shopping industry to examine if those businesses adapting and evolving their business models, in response to technological pressures (the rise in popularity of online shopping), are creating more shareholder value than those business models stagnating.
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	Firms and organisations need to evolve their business models and offerings in response to external pressures. Industries, firms and products move through different life cycle stages - fermentation, growth, maturity and decline. External pressures can include changes in consumer sentiment, advent and rise in competition, economic and political influences as well as technological advances (known as 'digital disruption'). The goal of business is to create shareholder value. The core idea of this research is that those firms and industries that can evolve most effectively in response to the external pressures will maintain their business in a healthy life cycle range and therefore be successful in creating and maintaining shareholder value.
<b>(F) Data?</b>	Data are to be obtained from the owner of multiple retail shopping centres. The data will be available for 10 shopping complexes for approximately 8-10 years. The type of data will include shopping centre tenancy turnovers, leased area and floor plans (present and historical). It will be a mix of monthly and annual. The shopping centres are located in Australia and the US. The above data are proprietary in nature and commercially sensitive. Non-disclosure and other usage agreements are being arranged. Data cleansing will take place once these agreements are finalised and the data collected. It is envisaged moderate manipulation may be necessary, particularly for instances of missing data. Demographic and economic data will also be collected from publicly available sources in order to help moderate the specific shopping centre information. The option of funding from various industry and research bodies will be explored once more details are confirmed.
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	The analytical methods will be quantitative and qualitative in nature. The use of regression models and other tools suited analysing time series data. More information will be available once the exact nature of the data is known. Reconciling surveys and interviews with retail centre management, industry analysts, tenants and customers are anticipated to form the basis of a second study.
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key questions
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	Testing the academic theories (disruptive innovation theory, life cycle theory, integrated reporting and thinking, value-based management) in a retail shopping context. As well as comparing these theories to that of industry analysts in a quantitative and qualitative capacity.
<b>(I) So What?</b>	Billions of dollars are invested in retail shopping centres (land, buildings, infrastructure, surrounding residential and commercial real estate and businesses). Prompting a need to make evidence-based investment decisions. Significant sums of superannuation money are invested in retail

	shopping centres. Many employees and local economies depend on retail shopping centres. It is important to ensure these expensive and important retail shopping centre assets are achieving the desired returns the shareholder require to continue to invest their capital. Retail shopping centres take time to renovate, remodel and lease. The future vision and business strategies of the centre needs to be decided well in advance as significant changes to strategy/vision are not possible in short term.
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	The core contribution of this study will be the testing of some well-established theories (disruptive innovation theory, life cycle theory, integrated reporting, value-based management) in a retail shopping context. Testing of integrated reporting framework and integrated thinking through qualitative mechanisms. Compare the alignment of academic literature with practicing professionals and analysts and support findings with data.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	Collaboration is necessary as obtaining the proprietary data is critical. Non-disclosure and other agreements are being arranged. Use of time series data will mean seeking out specialist advice with the statistical analysis. High quality journal is being targeted e.g. Strategic Management Journal, Journal of Retailing. Low competitor risk as data is proprietary and existing relationships have been forged. Cooperation from retail centre management, industry analysts, tenants and customers for the interview stages. The initial scope is broad as the project seeks to cover many aspects of the industry via interviews. The final paper(s) will narrow the scope and bring the literature and interviews together.

**Figure 8: Worked Example of Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact: Business Model Evolution (Brosnan)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four aspects of non-scholarly BIG picture framing</b>
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Optimisation of Tenancy Mix in Retail Shopping Centres (Malls)
<b>(B) Basic Engagement and Impact Goal</b>	This research seeks to inform shopping centre owners regarding optimal tenancy mix as they evolve their business models in the face of online competition.
<b>(C) Key Industry/External Triggers</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “Retail-tainment; the next big thing for retail and shopping centers?” - <a href="https://www.whitehutchinson.com/leisure/articles/retail-tainment.shtml">https://www.whitehutchinson.com/leisure/articles/retail-tainment.shtml</a></li> <li>2. “The Rise of Retailtainment: Convergence of Leisure Entertainment and Retail” - <a href="http://www.igpc.com/media/1001491/42546.pdf">http://www.igpc.com/media/1001491/42546.pdf</a></li> <li>3. “50 haunting photos of abandoned shopping malls across America” - <a href="https://www.businessinsider.com.au/american-retail-apocalypse-in-photos-2018-1?r=US&amp;IR=T">https://www.businessinsider.com.au/american-retail-apocalypse-in-photos-2018-1?r=US&amp;IR=T</a></li> </ol>
<b>(D) Motivation/Problem</b>	<p>Online shopping is becoming increasingly popular due to lower prices, faster delivery times and a more convenient experience. As a result, consumer traffic at retail shopping centres is declining. Online retailing is expected to grow at 8.9% for the next five years while shopping centres expect 1.8% growth.</p> <p>Retail shopping centres (or malls) need to evolve their business model to allow them to remain relevant and even grow their customer base. One way to do this is to offer consumers services that are not available online – such as experiences and entertainment. These experiences include going to the movies, eating out at restaurants, ten pin bowling, health care facilities, motor vehicle showrooms and other services difficult to digitally substitute.</p> <p>But what is the right mix of entertainment/experience/service and traditional retail tenancies? Which tenants, and what tenancy mix, best supports the shopping centre evolution (symbiotic relationship)?</p>
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three core engagement and impact dimensions</b>
<b>(E) Stakeholders?/ End Users?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shopping centre owners need to provide a return on their costly real estate assets. Evolving their business model to attract customers allows tenants to afford rental payments. Only successful tenants will survive, keeping vacancy rates low. However, shopping centre owners have resource limitations in making strategic changes as renovations and remodelling are expensive and time consuming.</li> <li>2. Customers – vital for the prosperity of the shopping centre.</li> <li>3. Current and future tenants - entrepreneurial opportunity to get the mix correct.</li> </ol> <p>All stakeholders are invested in a mutually beneficial outcome. Owners seek to maximise their returns, customers enjoy their shopping/entertainment experience and tenants seek a successful business venture.</p>
<b>(F) Value Proposition?</b>	Shopping centre owners seek an optimal tenancy mix in their assets to extract maximum returns from their real estate assets. As consumer desires are increasingly satisfied by online retailers, bricks and mortar retailers are experiencing declining sales. Less sales translates into lower rents for shopping centre owners. In order to increase sales, shopping centre owners need to entice customers back to the malls. Identifying the optimal retail tenancy mix provides customers reason to consider shopping centres relevant. Thus giving customers cause to spend time and money utilising their facilities, vital for the survival of shopping centre owners and tenants.
<b>(G) Resources?</b>	<p>Partnering with shopping centre owners and management is crucial in obtaining the necessary data. Quantitative data sources already owned by shopping centre owners. Data cleansing will be required. Researchers time required to prepare, conduct and analyse survey responses.</p> <p>Other potential data sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualitative survey of customers – what do they think they want?</li> <li>Qualitative survey of tenants – what do they think their customers want?</li> <li>Quantitative use of shopping centre data/metrics – what does the data tell us about what goods and services customers are using?</li> <li>Access to data from shopping centre owners. Time series data (tenancy turnover, current and past tenancy mix, shopping centre floor plans).</li> <li>Access to this information will need to be as a partnership with industry participants and industry groups (such as Shopping Centre Council of Australia).</li> </ul>

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).



<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key engagement and impact signals</b>
<b>(H) Communication Strategy?</b>	Direct relationship with the shopping centre industry and shopping centre owners required to obtain the data. Given the commercially sensitive nature of the data, there will not be wide distribution of the project specifics. However, once the analysis run it can form the basis of meetings with shopping centre owners to discuss their current strategies and what they might change about their business going forward. Presentation of findings to partner shopping centre owners a viable project close out strategy. Specific asset details can be presented privately to individual owners.
<b>(I) Metrics?</b>	In an academic sense the contribution back to theory is the key metric. How do findings resonate with current knowledge? Publications would also be an academic goal. However, the main goal is industry reach and real world outcomes. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A better understanding of the key business drivers of the shopping centre industry</li> <li>- A better understanding of customer needs and wants</li> <li>- A better understanding of tenant needs and wants</li> </ul> All of the above will hopefully lead to increased sales and patronage in shopping centres and therefore profits and returns to the owners and members (superannuation funds are heavily invested in this sector of the economy).
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>
<b>(J) IMPACT?</b>	The impact of this project is to optimise the tenancy mix at shopping centres in order to attract and retain both tenants and customers by making the best use of the available infrastructure (and real estate). More shoppers provide financial success to tenants and ultimately translate to increased profitability for shopping centre owners.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	Creating the relevant industry partnerships is vital. Once a few have been created there should be enough critical mass to gain more. Competition risk – owners presently conduct in-house research. How can this add value to what they already do? The answer lies in the rigour of the academic process. Selling this benefit to the owners will be vital. The data collected will be extremely commercially sensitive. Data management will be an important part of this project. Shopping centre ownership is moderately concentrated – meaning there are many potential owners to collaborate with. The benefit is that there are a few owners who own many complexes and the Shopping Centre Council of Australia (industry group) is well respected organisation. Alignment between academic goals and industry outcomes is required. Fortunately they appear well aligned at this early stage.

**Figure 9: Worked Example of Pitching Research for a Scholarly Expert: Intelligent Decision Aids in Auditing (Axelsen)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four</b> aspects of scholarly BIG picture framing
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	The effects of continued use of intelligent decision aids (IDAs) on auditor knowledge
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	Does the continued use of IDAs reduce the auditor’s professional skills in terms of their ability to form their own professional judgment?
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	Arnold, V., & Sutton, S. G. (1998). The Theory of Technology Dominance: Understanding The Impact Of Intelligent Decision Aids On Decision Makers’ Judgments. <i>Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research</i> , 1(1), 175-194. Dowling, C., Leech, S. A., & Moroney, R. (2008). Audit Support System Design and the Declarative Knowledge of Long-Term Users. <i>Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting</i> , 5(1), 99-108. McCall, H., Arnold, V., & Sutton, S. G. (2008). Use of Knowledge Management Systems and the Impact on the Acquisition of Explicit Knowledge. <i>Journal of Information Systems</i> , 22(2), 77-101.
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle`</b>	Many modern audits are undertaken according to strict methodologies using rules set out in an IDA, and the audit practice may restrict the auditor to the methodology contained in the IDA. Although they increase consistency of audit scope and approach, there are concerns that this approach reduces the auditor’s skills. Prior research (e.g. Dowling, Leech & Moroney, 2008) indicate the potential loss of ‘declarative’ knowledge does occur, such as knowing which auditing standard to apply (‘know-what’); however no studies address the loss of ‘procedural’ knowledge or how to run an audit (‘know-how’). The puzzle is, does the long-term use of an IDA de-skill the auditor user in ways that matter – for example, their ability to run audits effectively, with or without an IDA?
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	IDAs have been used for a sufficiently long period that we can use a method (for example, qualitative research) other than the “traditional scientific method” (Arnold & Sutton, 1998) to investigate the relationship between IDA use and auditor knowledge.
<b>(F) Data?</b>	(1) We have a convenience sample of senior public sector auditors from the UK, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. The unit of analysis is the individual auditor using an IDA. We know that identifying procedural knowledge in particular is very difficult. Data will take the form of interviews with senior auditors in the field. (2) We will use a cross-sectional (not longitudinal) sample of approximately 10 audit practices (7 Australian and one each for UK, Canada, and New Zealand) with approximately 6 auditors in each – so sample size is expected to be in the order of 60 interviewees. (3) We will not be using a panel dataset. (4) Data will be derived from interviews. Transcription approximately 30 (60 interviews at half an hour each) hours (252,000 words) of interviews will be needed, perhaps more. Content analysis requires coding, so dual-coding assistance will also be required. With such a large corpus automated text analysis techniques will be used. (5) Interview transcripts will require intensive cleansing for preparation for automated text analysis. (6) Validity questions are a limitation for this approach – as the data is cross-sectional, only implications to longitudinal propositions can be identified. Similarly, public sector auditors are only broadly reflective of auditors in the private sector. Accordingly, generalizability is a limitation of this approach. However, senior auditors are likely to provide high quality data. (7) As qualitative data gathered according to a non-traditional scientific method, measuring the criteria of validity needs to be considered in that context (Whittemore, Chase & Mandle, 2001). The data needs to be gathered, analysed, and illustrated to address

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).

	the primary criteria of valid qualitative research of credibility, authenticity, criticality, and integrity. Secondary criteria are also addressed, namely explicitness, vividness, creativity, thoroughness, congruence, and sensitivity. The data gathered for this research and the proposed analytical approach (using automated text analysis and the approach set out in Lillis, 1999) support these criteria.
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	Interviews will be recorded using a voice recorder (preferably two), and content analysis tools (Leximancer for automated analysis and NVivo for manual text analysis). Semi-structured interviews will be undertaken using the Lillis (1999) approach to the gathering and analysis of qualitative data. Some standard statistical work (e.g. standard deviation, average, etc) will be undertaken using R.
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key questions
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	Using the Locke and Golden-Biddle (1997) taxonomy, several sources of novelty are apparent. First, bringing together cognitive psychology theories to extend proposition 7 of Arnold and Sutton's (1998) Theory of Technology Dominance as its own theoretical work demonstrates 'synthesised coherence'. Prospective theoretical bases to synthesise include Sweller's (1988) cognitive load theory and Anderson's (1993) ACT-R theory. Prior research has identified and discussed declarative knowledge but not procedural knowledge (e.g. McCall, Arnold & Sutton, 2008; Dowling, Leech & Moroney, 2008) and thus 'progressive coherence' is demonstrated. To an extent, the research also demonstrates 'non-coherence' in that some research shows the benefits of IDA use, rather than identifying problems with de-skilling (e.g. Anderson, Fincham & Douglass, 1997). Accessing the long-term elements of Procedural Knowledge, which has not been done in the field previously, is a source of novelty. Finally, using automated text analysis for content analysis is novel, and builds upon Lillis' (1999) method.
<b>(I) So What?<sup>36</sup></b>	(1) Policy: Potentially, this research may inform the future design of auditing standards to consider the unintended consequences of the need for auditors to follow methodologies strictly. (2) Managerial practice: Potentially, this research may inform the design of audit teams and the execution of the audit function through over-reliance upon an IDA. (3) Professional practice: Potentially, this research may inform the design of professional courses designed to mitigate de-skilling and, further, the development of professional programs and monitoring of professional audit firms.
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	This research contributes to theory development through the extension of Proposition 7 of the Theory of Technology Dominance (Arnold & Sutton 1998) – that is, the 'de-skilling' proposition – to a basis of a theory that aims to explain and predict the de-skilling phenomenon (Gregor, 2006).
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	The large data gathering and the geographical spread across Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the UK means that collaborative support with other institutions is desirable. There are two "A" journals that have an interest in IDA research. These include: International Journal of Accounting Information Systems and Journal of Information Systems. The risk assessment of the actual research to participants is assessed as low – interviews with adult auditors are not high-risk, and the research topic is not classified as sensitive or contentious. The research risk is moderate in terms of results and competitor risk. As

<sup>36</sup> Davies, Nutley & Walter (2005) identify several approaches to assessing the implications of research for practice – the 'so what?' question. They identify five avenues of practical contributions: policy, managerial and professional practices, social behaviour and public discourse.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).

qualitative research, there is the chance that de-skilling is too difficult to identify through interviews. As for competitor risk, this is moderate as the research in this area is thin. Ethics clearance will be required as human subjects and primary data are required.



**Figure 10: Worked Example of Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact: Intelligent Decision Aids in Auditing (Axelsen)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four aspects of non-scholarly BIG picture framing</b>
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Technology Impeded Knowledge Acquisition and Retention: The effects of long-term use of intelligent decision aids (IDAs) on auditor professional knowledge
<b>(B) Basic Engagement and Impact Goal</b>	Financial Audit teams will use the practices and mechanisms identified to minimise the de-skilling that arises as a result of the long-term use of Intelligent Decision Aids.
<b>(C) Key Industry/External Triggers</b>	The International Standards on Auditing have become so complex, and so mandatory, that audit firms lose flexibility in their application of the auditing standards. Things must be done, by mandate. To ensure that things are done, decision support aids are used to ensure that audits are consistent and address all requirements. Auditors are therefore highly reliant upon technology to carry out their audits. Practice-oriented authors make the link between an over-reliance on technology and a decline in the professional skills held by the professionals that rely upon the tools (for example, Carr, 2008). That is, professionals increasingly use the tools and never develop the professional judgment they need. Accordingly, can we trust auditors to exercise appropriate auditor skepticism or simply follow the ‘Computer Says No’ mantra?
<b>(D) Motivation/Problem</b>	The problem to be cured is that we do not know whether ‘auditor de-skilling’ happens in a meaningful way, and what strategies might mitigate the impact of auditor de-skilling, if it does exist. We do not know how to balance the need for thorough application of auditing standards and consistent auditing with the need for auditors to develop their good judgment and professional abilities.
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three core engagement and impact dimensions</b>
<b>(E) Stakeholders?</b>	<p>Audit firms (private and public):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is their interest in the problem? <i>Audit firms invest in the technologies and have a profit imperative (i.e. cost management) to automate audit processes. However, they also have extensive professional liability that arises from these audits</i></li> <li>• What steps are they currently taking to try to solve it? <i>Currently they implement systems and have mitigation strategies they devise for any de-skilling (e.g. training, job rotation, managerial review).</i></li> <li>• What does a win look like for them? <i>An evaluation process that allows the firms to implement audit process implementation while mitigating any risk of professional de-skilling.</i></li> <li>• What knowledge/expertise gaps do they currently have? <i>The knowledge that matters – e.g. how to run an audit, professional judgment – is difficult to measure objectively. Further, although each practice has its own mitigation solutions, they rarely share these practices and don’t assess how effective they are.</i></li> <li>• Are they willing to invest money into solving this problem? What are the parameters for this? <i>There is a considerable liability here if it is shown that the auditors’ systems are reducing professional judgment. Most regulatory regimes enforce a substantial penalty upon auditors if it is shown that they did not ask sufficient questions or simply followed the methodology without exercising judgment.</i></li> <li>• Can they block a solution? <i>Ultimately, audit firms are the arbiter of any improved use of tools.</i></li> </ul> <p>Market regulators (policy setters and the profession):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What steps are they currently taking to try to solve it? <i>Monitoring and observation.</i></li> <li>• What does a win look like for them? <i>Better understanding of the reliability of audit processes.</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What knowledge/expertise gaps do they currently have? <i>Little knowledge of the role of systems use in de-skilling. As noted there is a difficulty to measure de-skilling.</i></li> <li>• Are they willing to invest money into solving this problem? What are the parameters for this? <i>Yes – market regulators can incorporate insights and practices from the research into existing educational programs if the suggested interventions are cost-effective and reliable.</i></li> <li>• Can they block a solution? <i>Yes – they can also mandate the solution and override any concerns of an audit firm.</i></li> </ul> <p>These stakeholders interact cooperatively through membership of professional societies and government consultative mechanisms.</p>
<b>(F) Value Proposition?</b>	The management of audit firms needs to better understand the relationship between system ‘intelligence’, structured audit methodologies, computer mediated communication, professional knowledge and audit outcomes. This understanding allows them to better select and design the systems they use, and improve their mitigating mechanisms such as training, supervision, and job rotation. Policy setters and the profession similarly require an understanding of these relationships given their regulatory role in tandem with the audit firms.
<b>(G) Resources?</b>	Access to practices and senior auditors who have exposure and experience in the ongoing application of these tools. Travel funds, accommodation required to meet with and undertake site studies. Incidental technology support (e.g. analytical software) will be needed.
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key engagement and impact signals
<b>(H) Communication Strategy?</b>	<p>The communication strategy identifies several channels to inform the profession of our work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry publications (<i>InTheBlack, Charter</i>)</li> <li>• Social media (<i>participation in LinkedIn groups e.g. the CPA Australia Public Practice LinkedIn group</i>)</li> <li>• General publishing: (<i>The Conversation</i>)</li> <li>• Public talks and presentations (<i>Participation in professional symposia through CAANZ and CPA Australia; others as identified</i>)</li> <li>• Mentoring stakeholders: (<i>None identified</i>)</li> <li>• Advisory group participation: (<i>None identified</i>)</li> <li>• Consulting: (<i>Some prospects, though these are secondary</i>)</li> <li>• Partnerships or joint ventures: (<i>None identified</i>)</li> <li>• Collaborative problem solving: (<i>None identified</i>)</li> <li>• Face to face meeting (formal and informal) – this has the highest impact; Conference; Phone call; Email: (<i>None identified</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>(I) Metrics?</b>	Very difficult to measure qualitative research outcomes. As the impact centres on policy, management, and professional influence, the relevant KPI might be citation in policy development documents and active participation in policy-setting forums.
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
<b>(J) IMPACT?</b>	At a policy level, this research has the potential to inform the future design of auditing standards to consider the unintended consequences of auditor de-skilling. At the practice level, this research informs audit firm management of the implications of their chosen IDA as part of the audit approach on professional judgment. At the level of the profession, this research informs the design of professional courses and professional programs that mitigate the prospect of auditor de-skilling arising through over-reliance upon an IDA.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	No issues additional to those already raised in the companion scholarly pitch – see Item (K) of Figure 9.



**Figure 11: Worked Example of Pitching Research for a Scholarly Expert: Workplace Mistreatment (Michalak)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four aspects of scholarly BIG picture framing</b>
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	A dual theory, process-and-variance model of workplace mistreatment and its effects in organisations from the individual target's perspective
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	What causes workplace mistreatment, and how and why does it lead to negative individual and organisational outcomes?
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 38(2), 555-572. Lazarus, R. S. (2006). Emotions and interpersonal relationships: Towards a person-centred conceptualization of emotions and coping. <i>Journal of Personality</i> , 74(1), 9-46. Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. <i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i> , 18, 1-74.
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	A plethora of studies indicate interpersonal deviance in the workplace (e.g., bullying, sexual harassment, <b>mistreatment</b> , incivility) leads to several negative outcomes both for individual targets (including lowered psychological and physical wellbeing), and their organisations (e.g., lowered job performance, job satisfaction, and commitment, and increased turnover). These outcomes not only reduce organisational effectiveness and are directly financially costly, but also have several ripple effects extending from individuals into the wider community and the nation as whole. However, very little is known as to what causes mistreatment (including target and organisational context antecedents), nor how and why these negative outcomes manifest – i.e. the processes that underpin or factors that influence what happens between incident and outcome. These various unknowns, from cause and outcome, represent a puzzle that, if solved, provides opportunity for evidence-based strategies interventions that may prevent mistreatment's occurrence, and / or reduce its negative effects.
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three core aspects of any empirical research project</b>
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	First, that mistreatment occurs as a function of <i>three categories of antecedents</i> : target characteristics, perpetrator characteristics, and workplace characteristics, thus all three categories should be considered when investigating causal factors.  Second, that mistreatment is <i>both a stressor and an affective event</i> , thus mistreatment's negative outcomes can be much better explained by <i>integrating</i> the Transactional Theory of Psychological Stress (TTPS; a micro-structure) with Affective Events Theory (AET; a macrostructure).  Within this integrated model, which captures both process and variance aspects of the phenomena, <i>differentiation</i> must occur between primary, secondary and tertiary appraisal processes, between emotion-focussed and problem-focussed coping, between affect-driven and judgement-driven behaviour, and between individual wellbeing outcomes and organisational outcomes.  As a newly proposed, triple-mediated, moderated model, the model core relationships (i.e., hypotheses) will be tested in a stage-based fashion, removing identification issues.
<b>(F) Data?</b>	Survey data, 2 applied samples (Australian lawyers {min $n = 200$ ; industry data; homogenous, informant sample} vs. white collar professionals {min $n = 200$ ; panel data}); pilot study ( $n = 40$ ); Unit of analysis = the individual employee.  Survey instruments mainly established, reliable and validated scales; others developed, expert reviewed (2 experts) and validated in pilot, Compulsory responding to prevent missing data.  Data must pass assumptions for statistical tests; CFA to reduce measurement error; equal form invariance testing (cross-validation) within and between samples; Various reliability and validity tests (Cronbach's alpha, AVE, Discriminant validity, etc).  Externally valid as applied samples; possible risk of poor response rate from lawyer sample.
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	Post-positivist paradigm, critical realist ontology, and modified dualist/objective epistemology.  Two, two time-point, self-report online survey studies designed using Dillman (2000) design and salience-leverage (Groves, Singer, & Corning, 2000) survey participation theory principles; anonymous and confidential; data matched using unique code generated for and by each respondent.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).

	<p>Survey website hosted by external research company; two time-point data matching included; screened in/out autoscoring and skip-logic design features</p> <p>Core analysis techniques: Descriptives, within- and between-survey attrition analysis, correlations, regression, EFA, CFA, SEM.</p> <p>Software: SPSS, AMOS / Mplus</p>
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key questions
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	<p>Adopts a criminology lens to antecedent investigation; specifically, builds a profile of likely targets (passive and active provocative victims) and propitious environments for mistreatment.</p> <p>First to map TTPS microstructure onto AET macrostructure, answering long-standing call to add flesh to AET skeleton by incorporating processes.</p> <p>First to propose and test tertiary appraisal (process resulting in changeability and controllability variable) as a moderator of the affective response - coping – adaptation mediatory relationship.</p>
<b>(I) So What?</b>	Model will provide insights for possible prevention and intervention, reducing negative impacts on individual mistreatment targets and their organisations.
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	The integration of two existing theories into a comprehensive, multi-stage model that, in being tested, answers a number of existing calls for further research, redirects a three-decade long, ill-informed debate, and problematises antecedent research by adopting and incorporating a criminology lens.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<p><b>Collaboration:</b> industry partners and support required to access applied sample (lawyers).</p> <p><b>Target Journal(s):</b> AMR, AMJ, JOB, Human Relations, BJM (All A* / A); plus book chapters; targeted conference submissions already planned</p> <p><b>“Risk”</b> assessment: Expedited ethical review as low risk to respondents and using industry associations removes employer / employee ethics power problem; “competitor” risk present but lowered by extensive domestic and international network of advisors; no risk of “obsolescence” (deviance is an ongoing and common workplace problem; plus increasingly knowledge-worker economy; OSH law requirements); web-survey collapse risk: minimal as using well-known, international and reputable hosting provider with 24/7 back-up processes; travel risks: minimal as following UQ travel risk assessments and procedures.</p> <p><b>Scope:</b> Ambitious, but well placed at intersection of at least 2 two popular research domains.</p>

**Figure 12: Worked Example of Pitching Research for Engagement and Impact: Workplace Mistreatment (Michalak)**

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Four</b> aspects of non-scholarly BIG picture framing
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Causes and consequences of work-related psychosocial risk exposure: A comparative investigation of lawyer and non-lawyer professionals
<b>(B) Basic Engagement and Impact Goal</b>	To determine how lawyers compare to other white collar employees in reference to <i>employee psychological and psychosomatic health wellbeing and levels of exposure to various work-related psychosocial risks</i> , with a view to inform changes to legal profession policy and practice, identify possible intervention points and strategies.
<b>(C) Key Industry/ External Triggers</b>	<p>Comcare. 2015. <i>Compendium of WHS and Workers' Compensation Statistics (6th ed.)</i>. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, Australia.</p> <p>URBIS, 2014. <i>The national attrition and re-engagement study (NARS) report</i>. Prepared for the Law Council of Australia (NARS 2014).</p> <p>The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia. (2012). <i>Workplace Bullying: We just want it to stop</i>. House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Employment, Canberra, October, 2012 (Parliamentary Bullying Enquiry 2012).</p> <p>Kendall, C. 2011. <i>Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Psychological Distress and Depression in the Legal Profession</i>. Prepared for the Council of the Law Society of Western Australia.</p> <p>Kelk, N., Luscombe, G, Medlow, S. &amp; Hicke, I. 2009. <i>Courting the blues: Attitudes towards depression in Australian law students and legal practitioners</i>. Brain and Mind Research Institute: University of Sydney, Camperdown, NSW (BMRI 2009).</p>
<b>(D) Motivation/Problem</b>	Poor mental health costs the economy \$190 billion per annum (12% of GDP; HALE Index, 2013). Various reports highlight lawyers as having the worst mental health of all professional occupation groups nationally, suffering the highest rates of depression, anxiety disorders and substance abuse. While these reports have raised concerns, existing 'change' efforts to address the issues are focussed on the individual lawyer as "the problem"; with developing resilience and practising mindfulness "the cure." Work content and context ('work-related') psychosocial risks that cause or aggravate mental health issues are ignored. Research and anecdotal evidence suggest high levels of poor interpersonal behaviour and toxic workplace cultures are prevalent in legal. However, legal employers have largely resisted change efforts, criticised previous research citing validity and reliability issues, and continued to fail to primary prevent exposure to these risks. This failure is in violation of Australian Occupational Health and Safety (OSHS) law. National workers compensation statistics and trend data show increases in psychological and psychiatric injuries over the last decade, with the top mechanisms of these stress-related injuries (min. four-fold all other mechanisms) being bullying and harassment, and overwork (both known work-related psychosocial risks).

THREE	Three core engagement and impact dimensions
<b>(E) Stakeholders?</b>	<p><b>State and Territory Law Societies (Focal stakeholder):</b> <sup>37</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What is their interest in the problem?</i> As ‘membership’ based organisations, they are obliged to appropriately serve their members, and ensure their members, in turn, serve the public in upholding Australian law (Lawyers must be “fit and proper” to “hold public office”). This obligation includes but is not limited to identifying and addressing issues facing the profession to ensure it is sustainable.</li> <li>▪ <i>What steps are they currently taking to try to solve it?</i> They have various <i>incremental change</i> programs in place including individual member EAP (Lawcare) services, resilience and mindfulness (wellbeing) initiatives; however, these initiatives are very “individual lawyer as the problem” focussed and the pace of change achieved so far very slow.</li> <li>▪ <i>What does a win look like for them?</i> An independent investigation that examines the issues reliably and validly, and provides evidence to inform and support change efforts.</li> <li>▪ <i>What knowledge/expertise gaps do they currently have?</i> They do not hold expertise in organisational behaviour, human resources, OSH, psychology, etc, and they do not know how to design and conduct the research required, nor analyse the data.</li> <li>▪ <i>Can they block a solution?</i> Potentially; however, to do so is not in their own interest, and all indications are they do not want to – they seek to support and drive / facilitate the changes required to more effectively address the issues.</li> </ul> <p><i>How do all of the stakeholders relate/interact with each other? Cooperatively or competitively? As partners or through market transactions?</i> Key relationships: Law Societies and related associations typically work collaboratively amongst themselves and in ‘partnership’ with other stakeholder groups; clients and legal services providers have a market-based relationship; individual law firms are hyper-competitive with other firms and vary in their level of support of the relevant law society / related associations and other stakeholder groups. Stakeholders can loosely be divided into those in recognition of the issues and supportive of need for change, and those who refute / deny / issues and oppose need for change.</p> <p><i>Can you map out the interrelationships between the stakeholders?</i> Yes, and power differentials between / influence capacity of each stakeholder group are well understood, both formally and informally (e.g., researcher has previously worked in a senior management role within the legal profession that involved liaison with multiple stakeholder groups).</p>
<b>F) Value Proposition?</b>	<p><b>Essentially covered under “What does a win look like for them?”</b> An independent, valid and reliable investigation of the issues that may provide evidence to inform and support change efforts, including (if relevant) other, more ‘transformational’ (confronting) change initiatives, and inform more specific services with greater utility to effectively address the issues and reduce the current negative impacts on their members.”</p>
<b>(G) Resources?</b>	<p><i>Required resources:</i> Access to law society membership to gather data, promotion of research to members to encourage participation, and channels to share progress reports / research findings.</p>

<sup>37</sup> Key stakeholders: Lawyers / barristers / judiciary, legal service clients, employees, employers / business, insurers (Workers Comp, Private Health, Life and Professional Indemnity), State and Territory Law Societies and related associations (e.g., Queensland Law Society {QLS}, various Legal Services Commissions {LSC}, Australian Legal Practice Management Association {ALPMA}, Australian Legal Sector Alliance {AusLSA}, Law Council of Australia), government (e.g., Comcare, Worksafe, and State and Federal Mental Health Commissions), mental health NGO’s and NFP’s (including Beyondblue, Lifeline, Black Dog Institute, Tristan Jepson Memorial Foundation, Wellness for Law Network), mental health service providers (e.g., psychologists / psychiatrists / counsellors / rehabilitation providers / emergency services and hospital staff), education providers (e.g., law schools, College{s} of Law) and community / society.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Faff, R., Kastle, T., Axelsen, M., Brosnan, M., Michalak, R., & Walsh, K. (2020). Pitching research for engagement and impact: a simple tool and illustrative examples. *Accounting and Finance*. which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12704>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).

<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key engagement and impact signals</b>
<b>(H) Communication Strategy?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Industry publications (The Professions Report {agreed consulting deliverable for industry partners} and invited Proctor feature articles; Proctor is the QLS' member publication)</li> <li>▪ Social media (Researcher's consulting company's website, plus Twitter x 2, FB and LinkedIn accounts)</li> <li>▪ General publishing (media releases, AFR Legal Affairs feature article, Lawyers Weekly articles, radio interview)</li> <li>▪ Public talks and presentations (QLS Annual Conference, TC Beirne School of Law Mental Health Forum, Industry Seminar for TC Beirne School of Law School, NQLA Conference, ASORC Conference, ALPMA Summit, Wellness for Law Network Annual Forum)</li> <li>▪ "Mentoring" stakeholders (e.g., AusLSA development and expansion of social responsibility reporting)</li> <li>▪ Advisory group participation (afoot; currently liaising with 2 key stakeholders RE: Expert advisory group membership)</li> <li>▪ Consulting (see <a href="http://www.psychsafeconsulting.com.au">www.psychsafeconsulting.com.au</a>; including expert opinions in psychological / psychiatric injury in OSH / common law cases)</li> <li>▪ Collaborative problem solving (Member, Wellness for Law Network)</li> <li>▪ Face to face meetings (formal and informal); Phone calls; Emails</li> </ul>
<b>(I) Metrics?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Invited presentations / publications</li> <li>▪ Publication reach</li> <li>▪ Social shares, new connections / followers on social media, registered Google "recommendations" of company website (specifically News and Resources page)</li> <li>▪ People directly spoken to</li> <li>▪ Consulting or commercialisation revenue (including expert opinions requested)</li> <li>▪ Direct impacts on people/organisations (e.g. evidence of new or revised services, programs, policies, etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>
<b>(J) IMPACT?</b>	Evidence of demonstrated increased awareness and understanding of the impact of work-related psychosocial risks exposure on employee psychological and psychosomatic wellbeing, increased commitment amongst the various stakeholder groups to addressing the identified issues, revised and new policies, services, initiatives and practices, and a shift towards a primary prevention (rather than cure) approach to psychosocial risk management within the legal profession and amongst employers more generally.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<p><i>Does the impact perspective, meaningfully, adequately, articulate with academic objectives?</i> The impact perspective translates a complex psychological, human resources and organisational behaviour research project into key research findings, key discussion points, and implications and recommendations for policy and practice that a non-academic audience comprised of multiple stakeholders can easily digest; the impact includes clear WIIFM and WIIFB outcomes.</p> <p><i>Collaboration needed/desirable?</i> Ideally, all 8 Australian law societies will support the research, facilitating a national, representative, applied data collection.</p> <p><i>Possible risks:</i> The main stakeholder categories likely to oppose the research (individual lawyers, and individual law firms / legal profession employers) have been bypassed by focussing on the law societies as providers of access to the desired sample, promotion of the research and channels to share progress reports / research findings; nominal risk to focal stakeholder group includes opposition from individual firms / law society members – these opposing parties may create noise but cannot dictate that the law societies withdraw their support as a gatekeeper agreement has already been signed; possible risk of vocal opposition whilst presenting at conferences, will be managed by researcher who is experienced in dealing with problematic audience members; independence of researcher to individual respondents, anonymity and confidentiality of data collection, and reporting of aggregated data removes any need to have the research findings embargoed / restricted (commercial) in-confidence.</p>