

Bond University  
Research Repository



## Pitching research: 'qualitative cousins' and the 'extended family'

Faff, Robert

*Published in:*  
Accounting and Finance

*DOI:*  
[10.1111/acfi.12348](https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12348)

*Licence:*  
Other

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

*Recommended citation(APA):*

Faff, R. (2020). Pitching research: 'qualitative cousins' and the 'extended family'. *Accounting and Finance*, 60(1), 227-269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12348>

### 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: “Qualitative Cousins” and the “Extended Family”**

### **Abstract**

This paper has two related goals – one very specific and one more general. The specific goal is to constructively engage with Lodhia (2017) on the issue of whether and to what extent “qualitative cousins” are well served by Faff’s (2015) original pitching research (PR) template. Using this “cousins” focus as a primer, the more general goal is to update the agenda created by Faff (2015) and in so doing, explore the “extended family” of PR work/resources now available.

**Keywords:** pitching research; new research ideas; pitching; template; research proposal; novice researcher; qualitative research.

**JEL classifications:** G00; M00; B40; A20; B00; C00; D00; E00; F00; H00; I00; J00; L00; Q00; R00; Z00

## 1. Introduction

Faff's (2015) *pitching research*<sup>®</sup> framework<sup>1</sup> provides a simple, succinct and methodical tool – a 2-page or 1,000 word pitching template – to help a novice academic researcher efficiently, effectively and interactively communicate their ideas to an expert in the field.<sup>2, 3</sup> Since the time of its publication, Faff (2015) has generated a considerable degree of interest and activity across academia.<sup>4</sup> For example, in the space of less than 3 years, there have been in excess of 230 unique and distinct “pitching events” within Australia and around the globe. Notably, as of January 2018, the pitching paper/concept has been presented/exposed: (a) at 37 of Australia's 40 universities; (b) more than 110 universities worldwide; (c) in 47 different countries/jurisdictions (the most recent new venue being Vietnam in October 2017);<sup>5</sup> (d) across a diverse range of academic discipline audiences (e.g. accounting and finance: AFAANZ; management: ANZAM; international business: ANZIBA; marketing: ANZMAC);<sup>6</sup> (e) across a wide variety of educational levels (year 12; second year undergraduates; Honours students; and PhD students); (f) as part of many pitching

<sup>1</sup> The Pitching Research<sup>®</sup> logo is a registered Trademark in Australia, trade mark number 1694403.

<sup>2</sup> This project and its core tool, has been recently identified as one of 30 “Innovations that Inspire” across the AACSB network worldwide Business Schools. These projects were heralded at the 2016 ICAM conference in Boston. See online: <http://bit.ly/29EUbX7>

Also, for a 70-second video related to the AACSB accolade, see: <http://bit.ly/IT1HggK>

<sup>3</sup> The pitching research framework can also be viewed as a tool for dealing with “threshold concepts” in research education (Kiley and Wisker, 2009). A “threshold concept” is: “something distinct within what would typically be described as ‘core concepts’; that is, more than a building block. A threshold concept is one that, once grasped, leads to a qualitatively different view of the subject matter and/or learning experience and of oneself as a learner.” (Kiley and Wisker, 2009, p. 432). These authors further argue that threshold concepts are transformative, often “liminal”, irreversible, integrative, bounded and likely represent “troublesome” knowledge. “Liminality” refers to a protracted period that precedes actual crossing of the threshold – a period in which “... students may mimic the language and behaviours that they perceive are required of them, prior to full understanding. It is while in this state that doctoral students are often likely to feel ‘stuck’, depressed, unable to continue, challenged and confused.” [Kiley and Wisker (2009, p. 432)].

<sup>4</sup> Linnenluecke, Chen, Lin, Smith and Zhu (2016), examine emerging trends in Asia-Pacific finance research. In a companion paper, Linnenluecke, Chen, Lin, Smith and Zhu (2017), review the fifty most influential Tier 1 publications in finance and future research trends. Both of these articles, identify Faff (2015, 2017) as a leader in a research stream linked to “research process” – ripe for future work – and as one of the (relatively) highly cited papers in the identified citation network. Indeed, as of January 2018, Faff (2015) has already logged 66 Google Scholar citations.

<sup>5</sup> Beyond Australia (including the 37 universities), the countries/jurisdictions are: the US; Columbia; Argentina; Mexico; Jamaica; Ghana; India; Malaysia; Singapore; New Zealand; Fiji; Thailand; Japan; South Korea; China; Pakistan; Kenya; Indonesia; South Africa; Taiwan; Ireland; Vietnam; Austria; Scotland; England; Wales; Netherlands; Belgium; France; Spain; Portugal; Croatia; Italy; Serbia; Slovenia; Switzerland; Romania; Hungary; Ukraine; Czech Republic; Poland; Germany; Estonia; Finland; Sweden; Norway; Ireland.

<sup>6</sup> ANZAM: Australia and New Zealand Academy of Management; ANZIBA: Australia and New Zealand International Business Academy; ANZMAC: Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy.

competitions; (g) with industry engagement and impact as a focus (Faff and Kastle, 2016); and (h) in webinars – as a means of “reaching the unreachable”.<sup>7</sup>

A further measure of the rapid growth in the “reach” of *pitching research* is the current stable of related papers: e.g. Faff (2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2017a, 2017b).<sup>8</sup> Moreover, *pitching research* spans many alternative types of research approach – not simply, “quantitative archival”. Indeed, there are now numerous non-quantitative examples based on: qualitative research, mixed methods and conceptual research.

Recently, Lodhia (2017) brings further positive attention to Faff (2015). Specifically, he reviews Faff’s pitching template, highlights its usefulness and makes a case for enhancing the tool’s utility by proposing a slight adaptation for qualitative researchers (the so-called “qualitative cousins”). In essence, Lodhia’s (2017) suggested modification involves two aspects: (1) the basic “building blocks” of Idea, Data and Tools (“IDioT”) are replaced by Theory, Context and qualitative Methodology (“TCM”); and (2) the scope of Contribution is expanded beyond the research literature to explicitly take in theory, practice and policy. Notably, there is significant common ground in much of the structure and philosophy underlying both Faff (2015) and Lodhia (2017), and upon close inspection even Lodhia’s proposed modifications do not really constitute a major divergence in thinking between the two.

Given the foregoing context, there are two related goals of the current paper – one specific and one general. The specific goal is to engage with Lodhia (2017) on the issue of whether and to what extent “qualitative cousins” are well served by Faff’s (2015) original *pitching research* (PR) template. Using this “cousins” focus as a primer, the more general

---

<sup>7</sup> The inaugural *pitching research* webinar on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2016, was hosted by Imperial College of Business Studies, Lahore, Pakistan. Webinars have been held in: Columbia; Jamaica; Ghana; Pakistan; Kenya; South Africa; Taiwan; Ukraine.

<sup>8</sup> Additionally: Faff, Godfrey and Teng (2016); Faff, Ali, et al (2016); Faff and Kastle (2016); Faff, Li, Nguyen and Ye (2016); Faff, Wallan, et al (2016); Faff, Lay and Smith (2017); Faff, Carrick, Chen, Dallest et al. (2017) and Faff, Carrick, Chen, Escobar et al. (2017a, 2017b, 2017c); Nguyen, Faff and Haq (2017); Teng and Faff (2017); Faff, Baladi, et al. (2017); Faff, Shao, et al. (2017); Faff, Gill, et al. (2017); Faff, Babakhani, et al. (2017).

goal is to update the agenda created by Faff (2015) and in doing so, explore the “extended family” of PR work/resources now available. Accordingly, the remainder of the current paper is organised as follows. The next section addresses the “cousins” issue, while Section 3 broadens the discussion to capture the “extended family”. Section 4 concludes.

## **2. What about your “Qualitative Cousins”?**

Lodhia (2017, p. 2) argues that Faff’s (2015) pitching template is “skewed towards quantitative research”. While there is no doubt that this “skew” exists, answering the question of what (if anything) needs to be done about it is not so obvious. The discussion in the remainder of this section tackles this question, from several related angles, referring back to specific aspects of Lodhia (2017) where needed/appropriate.

### **2.1 Don’t exclusively focus on Faff (2015)**

A good starting point is to echo the strong theme pervading Faff (2015) – that paper was never intended as the final word – only a static first pass at establishing the basic pitching template concept. To help give this message real meaning, the Acknowledgements of Faff (2015, p. 311) clearly refers to the companion SSRN working paper in: “Pitching Research” (SSRN ID 2462059). Moreover, as stated in Faff (2015, p. 326), the SSRN paper [and its future updated versions] “... is designed as the “clearing house” for the broader “pitching research” program.” Notably, due to an overload of information and content, this SSRN paper as a dynamic “living” document has now evolved into a “pigeon” pair: Faff (2017a) (being the core work, now in its 15<sup>th</sup> version) and Faff (2017b) (the “resource centre”). So, interested researchers should not solely rely on Faff (2015) – they should look for the most recent update of “Pitching Research” on SSRN, currently manifested in Faff (2017a and 2017b).<sup>9, 10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The original version of the *pitching research* paper was lodged on SSRN on 3 July, 2014. As of January, 2018 the core paper has logged > 11,400 downloads, reaching an all-time SSRN ranking of **260** (out of > 500,000 downloadable papers).

<sup>10</sup> As Faff (2015, p. 334) states: “...this SSRN companion paper will be updated on a regular basis.” The full version history of Faff (2017) to date: **V1**: 3 July, 2014 – 27 July, 2014; **V2**: 28 July, 2014 – 10 August, 2014; **V3**: 11 August, 2014 – 28 August, 2014 ; **V4.0**: 29 August, 2014 – 1 September, 2014; **V4.1**: 2 September – 5

## 2.2 Pitching Research is not really about Perfecting a Template Design

Faff (2015, p. 323) ask/states: "... Is this design "perfect"? The answer must be no. Does it matter that the design is not perfect? Again, the answer must be no. In terms of the specifics, getting (even close to) unanimity over the "ideal" design of such a template is impossible – the nature of research is highly individualistic. But it is important that the template design has all the major bases covered, such that its "adaptive" use will benefit in a vast number of circumstances.<sup>8</sup>" Moreover, as Faff (2015, p. 323, Footnote #8) states: "... the basic building blocks are here – *individual users are encouraged to creatively adapt the template to suit their personal preferences.*" [emphasis added]

## 2.3 "TCM" versus "IDioT"

In the context of the "qualitative cousins", Lodhia's (2017) most substantive suggestion is for an adapted version of the template in which "IDioT" (Idea, Data, Tools) is replaced by "TCM" (Theory, Context, Methodology). A suggestion of this broad nature is no big surprise. In anonymous feedback received on an earlier version of Faff (2017), the reasonable point was made that the "idea", "data", "tools" labels don't work across all areas of research.

However, Faff (2015, p. 316, Footnote #5) argues that e.g. even: "(t)hough the issue of "data" naturally invokes thoughts of quantitative research, ["data"] also applies to qualitative work: e.g. see Kaczynski et al. (2014) for a fresh look at qualitative research in finance." Moreover, (and somewhat ironically) Figure 1 of Lodhia (2017) does a great job of pitching the qualitative "cousins" research using the original Faff (2015) template – notwithstanding the use of IDioT rather than TCM.

Notably, under the section headed "Advice on Alternative ways of using/adapting the Pitch Template", Faff (2015, p. 328) states: "...the template comes with a set of terms that might be obscure in some disciplines/fields – for example, in the sciences. Template guides

---

September, 2014; **V4.2**: 6 September – 15 September, 2014; **V5**: 16 September – 26 October, 2014; **V6**: 26 October – 10 December, 2014; **V7**: 11 December, 2014 - 10 January 2015; **V8**: 11 January 2015 -22 March 2015; **V9**: 23 March 2015 – 15 July 2015; **V10**: 16 July 2015 – 31 January 2016; **V11**: 1 February 2016 – 11 June 2016; **V12**: 12 June 2016 – 16 January 2017; **V13**: 17 January 2017 – 22 April 2017; **V14**: 23 April 2017 – 16 August 2017; **V15**: 16 August 2017 - ...

for such other areas can be devised to aid such applications.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, as indicated in Faff (2015, p. 328, Footnote #20) such an example has already been created for mechanical engineering.<sup>11</sup> To illustrate in this case, the term “tools” was translated into the interpretation “resources” for the mechanical engineering research community (without changing the generic template label). My preference is to change the interpretation, rather than the label.<sup>12</sup>

Whatever labels one chooses, in my mind these variations are more distractions than about substance. My attraction to the acronym “IDioT” partly relates to the broad scope that each element easily conveys, as well as the “memorability” factor delivered by this playful mnemonic itself. Finally, the other positive thing to note here is – irrespective of labelling, it seems that a common power comes from the “trichotomy”. So what is the bottom line? A simple mapping from “IDioT” to “HSS” or to “TCM” is encouraged!

#### **2.4 Extensive Array of Existing Qualitative Examples using Faff’s (2015) Template**

I would argue that Faff’s (2015) original template design is remarkably durable and universal. Aside from Lodhia’s (2017) own example shown in his Figure 1, the *pitching research* online “elibrary” provides quite a range of examples of non-quantitative pitches.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Indeed, as a “soft” form of “proof of concept”, Table 1 displays a list of 44 such cases from the elibrary. While the list shows an encouraging diversity of research topics, five notable examples relevant to an accounting and finance audience are displayed in Figures 1 to 5: (a) Figure 1 – management accounting; (b) Figure 2 – public sector accounting; (c) Figure 3 – impact investing; (d) Figure 4 – business information systems; and (e) Figure 5 – corporate taxation.

---

<sup>11</sup> See online examples A8.1: generic advice and A8.2 (<http://bit.ly/2jG84s9>): “Investigation of a theoretical function to describe damping in conveyor belts under non-steady state conditions”.

<sup>12</sup> As a further counter example, in psychology, rather than “idea/data/tools” a more accepted labelling might be: “hypothesis/sample/statistical analysis” (HSS).

<sup>13</sup> Either pure qualitative, theory or mixed methods.

<sup>14</sup> See online library at: <https://www.business.uq.edu.au/supplementary-material-pitching-research>

## 2.5 The Role of Theory

It is hardly controversial to argue that using relevant, convincing theory is fundamental to the conduct of meaningful research. Nevertheless, Faff (2015) took the decision to deny theory an explicit place in the *pitching research* template. The simple logic underlying this seemingly controversial omission relates to the strong desire to keep the template streamlined and the view that the early stage of “pitching” is often one of providing an embryonic plan that only requires key threads of theoretical reasoning. Fully opening the door to theory, too soon, could induce a “paralysis” of complexity and so easily be counter-productive to developing innovative ideas.

Most notably, in Faff’s (2015) template, theory can play an implicit role to help: (a) provide a broad context for the research in item (D) Motivation/puzzle and (b) properly inform any statement of a central hypothesis in item (E) Idea. By explicitly excluding (while implicitly allowing the influence of) theory, things are kept much simpler. Indeed, a distinct advantage of this treatment of theory is that it reduces the “liminality” challenge highlighted by Kiley and Wisker (2009, p. 432), when it comes to crossing threshold concepts in research education. In contrast, Lodhia (2017) asks for explicit recognition of theory – and, notably, to replace the “Idea” item of the template.

In the context of qualitative research projects, a simple reconciliation of Faff (2015) and Lodhia (2017) is to apply the universal Faff (2015) tool at the very early stage of the research development and, then, transition to Lodhia’s (2017) adaptation (as deemed necessary), once a threshold barrier has been reached. The appropriate “transition trigger” is a call made by the research mentor, taking into account issues such as “sanity checks”, relevance, feasibility.

## 2.6 Contribution to Practice and Policy

Lodhia (2017) constructively argues that Contribution at Item (J) of the template should include contribution to practice and policy, rather than solely contribution to the relevant



academic/scholarly literature. This is a very good suggestion. Indeed, Faff's (2015) original template is fully compatible with this view. This multi-faceted view of contribution can easily be picked up in the "So What?" question, Item (I). Additionally, a cued public policy and regulation (PP&R) version of the original template is available online.<sup>15</sup> For example, this "PP&R" variation includes a cue at Item (I): "With a particular emphasis on the policy/regulation dimension, how will major decisions/behaviour/activity be influenced by the outcome of this research?" And at Item (J), supplementing the standard "What is the primary source of the contribution to the relevant research literature?" a cue asks: "What is the core policy/regulatory contribution?" Also, as part of the expanding PR stable (see Section 3 below), Faff & Kastle (2016) present alternative companion template designed for "pitching research for engagement and impact".

## 2.7 Backup Plan

In Item (K) of the template, "Other Considerations", Lodhia (2017, p. 7) links the "risk assessment" approach advocated by Faff (2015), to a "... backup plan should the research accessibility not be achieved in the first instance". I agree that this a highly useful extension to the original template cues.

## 3. What about the Extended Family?

Faff (2017a) argues that the *pitching research* tool provides multi-faceted benefits – its basic framework simultaneously serves as a research **planning** tool; a research **skills development** tool (Faff, 2016b); a research **learning** tool (Faff, Ali, et al., 2016; Faff, Wallin, et al., 2016 and Ratiu, 2016); a research **agenda-setting** tool (Maxwell, 2017); a research **mentoring** tool (Faff, Godfrey and Teng, 2016; Ratiu, Faff and Ratiu, 2016); a research **collaboration** tool (Wallin and Spry, 2016); a research **engagement & impact** tool (Faff & Kastle, 2016); research-led **teaching** tool (Faff, Li, Nguyen & Ye, 2016); and a research "**discoverability**"

---

<sup>15</sup> Go to: <http://bit.ly/2ivGq0L>

tool (Faff, Alqahtani, et al., 2017). As such, these various dimensions effectively represent many facets of the “extended family” of Faff’s (2015) *pitching research*, as discussed below.

### **3.1 *Pitching Research* as a Research Planning Tool**

Various recent published articles acknowledge Faff’s (2015) template as a critical research planning tool, e.g. Chang and Wee (2016); Menzies, Dixon and Rimmer (2016); Dang and Henry (2016); Mathuva (2016); Mathuva and Kiweu (2016); Sivathaasan, Ali, Liu and Haung (2017); Dupire and M’Zali (2017); Ali, Liu and Su (2017); Unda, Ahmed and Mather (2018). Figure 6 displays a range of such papers, linking them to their associated *ex ante* pitches as logged in the PR elibrary.

### **3.2 *Pitching Research* as a Research Skills Development Tool**

Faff (2016a) maps versions of the *pitching research* template designed for student tasks/assessment into the research skill development (RSD) framework of Willison and O’Regan (2007). Moreover, using the 7-level RSD7 version, Faff (2016a) explains how meaningfully layered pitching tasks can be designed to give a wide range of students an appropriately calibrated research challenge – from elite year 12 students at high school, all the way through to PhD students at university. This mapping exercise is built around four key dimensions of the *pitching research* setting that enables a clear and easily implementable pedagogic strategy. Specifically, the four dimensions relate to whether the pitch/pitch task: (a) is a partial vs. a full exercise; (b) is reverse-engineered on an existing paper vs. a “real” pitch on a yet to be executed study; (c) is totally prescribed by the “pitchee” (educator/supervisor) vs. full choice unrestricted pitch; (d) is a “third-party” exercise vs. totally “owned” by the pitcher. Faff, Carrick, Chen, Escobar et al. (2017a) is a good example.

### **3.3 *Pitching Research* as a Learning Tool**

Several papers illustrate the research learning potential provided by the *pitching research* template in a pitching exercise, conducted in a PhD course [“The Research Process”] at the University of Queensland. Students attending the course were asked to engage in a group

exercise to pitch a “fantasy” light-hearted research topic.<sup>16</sup> Faff, Ali, et al., (2017) report on three groups (of five) who pitched three “fun” topics: (a) Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles; (b) Wipe-a-Baby; (c) Quality of Dairy Products: The Happiness of the Cow Does Matter. In the following semester, using a fresh student cohort, Faff, Wallin et al. (2016) extend upon Faff, Ali, et al. (2016), outlining a similar fantasy research pitch exercise with four groups: (a) Star Wars; (b) Pokemon Go; (c) R&D; and (d) Uber.<sup>17</sup> Fantasy Pitching III: Faff, Carrick, et al. (2017b) and Fantasy Pitching IV: Faff, Baladi, et al., (2017); are also available on SSRN.

### **3.4 Pitching Research as a Research Agenda Setting tool**

Maxwell (2017) argues different angles on the potential for using the pitching framework to help set a research agenda/find an idea. Maxwell (2017, p.380) states: “The pitching template was used once for the research proposal submitted when applying for the PhD program and twice more during the early months of the program. Use of the pitching template framework appears to have helped progress my thinking about and communication of my research agenda. This may be seen as anecdotal evidence of the pitching template’s benefits for researchers.”

### **3.5 Pitching Research as a Mentoring Tool**

Faff, Godfrey and Teng (2016), provides a narrative about a visiting undergraduate Chinese exchange student to the University of Queensland, Jie Teng, seeking opportunities to learn about research. Recognizing that the student had only limited exposure to research and an unknown appreciation of what it entails, the mentor devised a program of incremental “discovery” and learning, based on the *pitching research* template tool. Under close guidance, Jie was asked to choose a recent academic paper of interest to him and then to reverse engineer a “pitch” for that chosen paper. The target for this exercise was Acharya and Xu (2013, NBER) (now a forthcoming paper in Journal of Financial Economics, Acharya and

---

<sup>16</sup> While the final exercise was completed in a 90-minute timeframe (60 minutes of brainstorming, followed by 30 minutes of reporting back to the full group), the cohort had already been exposed to 5 x 90 minute sessions of related material over the weekend PhD module.

<sup>17</sup> Also from a “learning tool” perspective, Ratiu (2016) and Salehudin (2017) make a case for reverse engineering applications of the pitching template.

Xu 2016): a paper examining the topic of “Innovation and Financial Dependence”. The pitching process was completed, in 10 small stages, over a period of about 5 weeks.

### **3.6 *Pitching Research as a Collaborative Tool***

Wallin and Spry (2016) show the application of the pitch template to a marketing research topic. The context for the application of the pitch template here is that the first author is in the process of developing a pipeline of research post PhD. A key component of a sustained academic career is collaboration with other academics, so in this instance the application of the template was used as an exercise to clarify the details and direction of a research study between collaborating authors. The authors argue that “the simple and systematic approach of the pitch makes it a useful tool to stimulate discussion between co-authors across the components of a research project.”

### **3.7 *Pitching Research as an Engagement and Impact Tool***

Faff and Kastle (2016) present and outline a research pitch tool targeting non-academic external stakeholders in which engagement and impact (E&I) is deemed to be an important objective. Using Faff’s (2015) *pitching research* template as a base (first phase pitch), the E&I (second phase) pitch retains the underlying philosophy of the original academic tool. The main purpose of the original pitch template is “starting a conversation” with an academic expert and to make the initial research proposal as “future proof” as it can be. Faff and Kastle (2016) makes a first stab at extending the pitching concept to the often more challenging (concomitant) goal of orientating one’s research toward relevant non-academic stakeholders i.e. to think about the non-academic engagement and impact of a proposed new research project, while maintaining its goal to achieve quality academic output.

### **3.8 *Pitching Research as a Research-led Teaching Tool***

Based on Faff’s (2015) template tool, Faff (2016a) explains how meaningfully layered *pitching research* tasks can be designed to accommodate a wide range of student mastery, that enable a clear/easily implementable pedagogic strategy. Faff, Li, Nguyen and Ye (2016)

describe a real example of this strategy, piloted for three UQ Winter Scholars sponsored by the UQ Advantage Office – as part of a program aimed at undergraduate and coursework masters students.

### 3.9 *Pitching Research* as a Research “Discoverability” Tool

Discoverability or visibility is a challenge that faces all researchers worldwide – with an ever increasing supply of good research entering the scholarly marketplace; this challenge is only becoming intensified as time passes. There are two dimensions of “discoverability” in thought here: (a) language impediment and (b) “ignorance” impediment.

*Language.* The global language of scholarly research is English and so the obstacle of getting noticed is magnified manyfold when the article is not written in the English language. Indeed, despite rapid advances in technology, the “tyranny of language” creates a segmentation inhibiting scholarly research and innovation generally. Mass translation of non-English language articles is neither feasible nor desirable. Faff, Shao, et al (2017) propose a strategy for remedying this segmentation – such that, the work of non-English language scholars become more discoverable. The core piece of this strategy is a “reverse-engineering” [RE] application of Faff’s (2015, 2017) *pitching research* template. More specifically, they provide translated versions of the template across **thirty three** different languages.<sup>18</sup> Further, Faff, Shao, et al (2017) showcase illustrative dual language examples of the RE strategy for the Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese and French cases.

*Ignorance.* Arguably, many academics seem to still take the “traditional” view that all they have to do is create high quality research and then readers and other interested researchers will quickly recognise this and “beat a path to your door”. I say: **WRONG**. Such an approach might have been appropriate and “worked” for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – but now it is safest to assume that “ignorance” prevails. Moreover, the way of the 21<sup>st</sup> century –

<sup>18</sup> Namely: (1) Arabic; (2) Chinese; (3) Dutch; (4) French; (5) Greek; (6) Hindi; (7) Indonesian; (8) Japanese; (9) Korean; (10) Lao; (11) Norwegian; (12) Polish; (13) Portuguese; (14) Romanian; (15) Russian; (16) Sinhalese; (17) Spanish; (18) Tamil; (19) Thai; (20) Urdu; (21) Vietnamese; (22) Myanmar; (23) German; (24) Persian; (25) Bengali; (26) Filipino; (27) Italian; (28) Afrikaans; (29) Khmer (Cambodia); (30) Danish; (31) Finnish; (32) Hebrew; (33) Turkish.

with the rapid advance of technology – is for smart “consumers” of new information to massively filter and strategically skim. As such, this puts the onus heavily back on the “producers” of research to market their “wares” in clever/honest ways that attract attention and gain visibility. Striving to keep up with the latest trends, I have embraced this challenge through a series of “pitch of the week” (PoW) posts on LinkedIn<sup>19</sup> – focused on the *pitching research* framework, but giving a personal context that engages contemporary readers. Faff, Lay and Smith (2017) review the PoW series, showcasing a dozen of the more prominent LinkedIn posts.<sup>20</sup>

### **3.10 Learning from *Pitching Research* Events, Competitions and Winners**

Faff (2016b and 2016c) reviews experiences and draws insights from a series of workshops, pitch days, competitions, webinars and other events based on the *pitching research* template tool. Major events and activity include: the UQuAPS pitching competition (2018 will be the 4<sup>th</sup> edition), the SIRCA “pitching symposium” (2015, 2016, 2017), the FIRN “pitch my research” competition, the ANZAM Doctoral workshop and the AIC2016 pre-conference pitching workshop. Faff (2016c) reviews these events, with a particular focus on the winning pitches and the winning pitchers. Faff, Babakhani, et al (2017) take a closer look at the insights gained from the 2015 and 2016 pitching competitions held at the University of Queensland. Undoubtedly, the most ambitious of these competitions is the recently launched All-Pakistan Pitching Research Competition (APPRC 2017-18). With enormous support from University of Haripur Pakistan, APPRC is open to research students (PhD and Masters) across ALL disciplines, enrolled at any of the universities in Pakistan.

### **3.11 Doctoral Symposia and Doctoral Education**

There have been several groups of PhD students exposed to the pitching concept at doctoral/ECR symposia around the world. This all began with the paper development

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.linkedin.com/in/robertfaff>

<sup>20</sup> A second example for using the pitching framework to fight against research “ignorance”, to aid discoverability, is through the medium of a “digest” format. At the UQ, the UQBS Research Digest showcases research produced by our School’s academics and research students, available at: <https://researchdigest.business.uq.edu.au/>

workshop sponsored by IAEER/ACCA in June 2013, held at the Bucharest University of Economic Studies. The International Accounting and Finance Doctoral Symposium (IAFDS) has also hosted pitching themes in 2013 (University of Bologna, Italy); 2014 (Trondheim University, Norway); 2015 (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia); 2016 (University of Strathclyde, Glasgow); 2017 (Warsaw School of Economics).<sup>21, 22</sup>

### 3.12 Research Grants

AFAANZ have an annual grants program designed to provide “seed” funding for small research projects, particularly focused on early career researchers. Since its inception over 10 years ago, this grant scheme has disbursed a total approaching \$2 million in competitive funding to worthy novice researchers. In all years prior to the 2015 funding round, a very traditional “long-form” and paper-based approach has been used for such grant applications. Persuaded by the argument that applying for research funding is a classic case of the challenges faced by research novices, in 2015 AFAANZ adopted the pitch template as a core part of its required grant application. In the most recent funding rounds, 2016 and 2017, a web portal submission process hosted by [PitchMyResearch.com](http://PitchMyResearch.com) received around 100 grant applications.

### 3.13 YouTube Video Resources<sup>23</sup>

Several of the “pitching” sessions have been recorded and freely available for anyone to view/use. One of the earliest workshops presented at Monash University on 14 August, 2014 was recorded and the video is available on YouTube.<sup>24</sup> Similar recordings are available from presentations at the University of Queensland for UQAPS and for TRI-PACE.<sup>25</sup> In a follow

---

<sup>21</sup> A similar session was run at the Doctoral Symposium linked to the Scottish BAFA in August 2016. The 2016 ANZAM Doctoral Workshop had a vibrant set of pitch submissions spanning the management discipline – see <http://bit.ly/2jiXQdX>

<sup>22</sup> Additionally, PhD/Honours students presenting at the University of Queensland Business School annual Research Colloquium in 2015, 2016 and 2017, submitted written pitches, which were collated into a “Pitch Booklet” for the benefit of all attendees. PhD students at the AFAANZ Doctoral Symposium were exposed to the pitching concept in 2014 (Auckland); 2015 (Hobart); 2016 (Gold Coast) and 2017 (Adelaide).

<sup>23</sup> For a full set of video resource see the playlist at: <http://bit.ly/29GI4WY>

<sup>24</sup> The workshop is also accessible from the “supplementary material” weblink on my UQ webpage (scroll down): <http://bit.ly/29LatgM>

<sup>25</sup> The former video is available at: <http://bit.ly/2jZwUDn>, while the latter can be found at: <http://bit.ly/29oXalM>

up session at the University of Queensland,<sup>26</sup> four example pitches are recorded: (a) sustainable systems;<sup>27</sup> (b) accounting;<sup>28</sup> (c) chemistry;<sup>29</sup> and (d) archaeology.<sup>30</sup> Figure 7 provides details, including weblink addresses, of various additional YouTube videos. Specifically, Panel A lists a video capture of *pitching research* webinar PowerPoint slides; Panel B lists videos of all finalists in the 2015, 2016 and 2017 UQuAPS “pitching” competitions held at the University of Queensland; and Panel C lists three short animation videos.

### 3.14 Pitching Research Letters

In 2016, the editors of *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* (JAMIS) launched *Pitching Research Letters* (PRL), a new dedicated section in JAMIS. As stated by the JAMIS Editors, PRL is a “letters” style section of JAMIS targeting PhD students and, more generally, novice researchers in the accounting, information systems and finance disciplines (broadly defined) – that is, targeting novice researchers in the research domain traditionally serviced by JAMIS. Such researchers are invited to complete a research “pitch” and write a brief discussion of their pitch according to a prescribed “letter” format – along the lines of Beaumont (2015), Ratiu (2015) and Unda (2015).<sup>31</sup> Examples of these JAMIS letters are: Rad (2016); Rekker (2016); Shahzad (2016) and Xue (2016). Similarly, the *Accounting Research Journal* published a set of seven PRLs in 2017.<sup>32</sup> Figure 8 displays the full set of PRLs published in these two journals to date – distinguishing whether the pitches are: (a) an

<sup>26</sup> A video of the Introduction to this “pitch examples” session is available at: <http://bit.ly/2jiRuLM>

<sup>27</sup> This video is available at: <https://youtu.be/QBo2wU0z18o>

<sup>28</sup> This video is available at: <https://youtu.be/mjBBRnN6gwY>

<sup>29</sup> This video is available at: <https://youtu.be/PmjM9XfxZ4E>

<sup>30</sup> This video is available at: <https://youtu.be/AylMABE4Cc>

<sup>31</sup> As stated in the publicity from JAMIS, this unique opportunity is designed to provide a range of developmental objectives: (a) serve as an important exercise for novice researchers, allowing them to explain their research plans clearly and succinctly; (b) allow them to publicly “stake a claim” over a specific research question [in effect to serve as a “registered” PRL pitch]; and (c) offer novice researchers a meaningful publication avenue that they would not readily find elsewhere. Crucially, JAMIS have wisely notified that upon request from submitting authors, the editors will agree to an “embargo” period of up to 12 months – that is, the accepted PRL paper in question will have an agreed minimum delay in publication as measured from the date of acceptance.

<sup>32</sup> Also, recently the *Makerere Business Journal* have published a PRL by Mugumya (2017).



actual *ex ante* pitch; (b) a reverse-engineered pitch of an existing paper; or (c) a fantasy pitch of a hypothetical project.

### 3.15 Dedicated Websites

Two dedicated websites now exist to provide further help, guidance and resources for users of the pitching tool. The “one-stop shop” destination is [pitchingresearch.com](http://pitchingresearch.com) – here you will find everything pitching. The second site is a web portal specifically dedicated to simplify the process of creating a research pitch: [PitchMyResearch.com](http://PitchMyResearch.com).<sup>33</sup> As a service to the global research community, both sites are accessible free, without cost.

### 3.16 Assessing Pitches

In most circumstances there will be no need to formally (or even informally) “assess” the quality of a given pitch. But in some situations where there is such a need/desire, what should we look for? Perhaps the more obvious approach is to directly use the structure of the tool itself to guide the exercise – to grade each element with individual numerical scores and then simply aggregate to an overall figure. However, I prefer an alternative approach that looks for a coherent flow of ideas; that recognizes the initial “engagement” benefit of the pitch and that only indirectly captures an assessment of each component’s content. Specifically, this alternative is defined around 5 elements:

- (a) **Clarity:** Does the pitch have clarity?
- (b) **Meaningfulness:** Is the pitch meaningful? (e.g. does it involve appropriate technical content?)
- (c) **Effort:** Does the pitch reflect a bone fide effort?
- (d) **Connectivity:** Is the pitch well connected?
- (e) **Conversation:** Does the pitch start a conversation? (to an academic expert in the field).

---

<sup>33</sup> This web portal version is an AFAANZ-sponsored project that I have jointly with Dr Keith Godfrey (University of Western Australia). Registration is free. Users are able to create private pitches (default) or make them public.

To keep things simple, I score each category out of 10, then aggregate and convert these scores into a number out of 100.<sup>34</sup> The final aspect of assessment is to decide what weighting each of these five dimensions should have? While simplicity suggests 20% each, personally, I prefer giving a considerably heavier weighting to the final element of “starting a conversation” – indeed, in actual applications I have assigned up to 40% for this, to reflect my conviction that initiating an effective communication is a fundamental goal/benefit that the pitching tool can deliver. But, in the end, assessing pitch quality should be a call made by each individual “assessor” – based on their own view of the relative importance of each category.

### 3.17 Pitching Research versus 3MT?

The three-minute thesis (3MT) competition serves an important and impactful role in encouraging thesis researchers to succinctly communicate the essence of their work. According to the 3MT webpage, the “...competition cultivates students’ academic, presentation, and research communication skills. Presenting in a 3MT competition increases their capacity to effectively explain their research in three minutes, in a language appropriate to a non-specialist audience. Competitors are allowed one PowerPoint slide, but no other resources or props.” [<https://threeminutethesis.uq.edu.au/about>]

There will always be an important role for the skills encouraged by 3MT. So, you might well ask: is there really a need for *pitching research* too? And, if so, how does *pitching research* differ from or relate to 3MT? In answer to this question, Figure 9 captures a range of distinguishing characteristics.

The first listed item has been highlighted above and echoes a theme “hammered” Faff (2015, 2017a) – the core pitching concept is about starting – about starting a “conversation”, whereas 3MT is about convincingly “orating” a reasonably well-advanced research. Second,

---

<sup>34</sup> A guide to assigning a numeric score out of 10 is as follows: 1 = “pathetic”; 2 = extremely weak; 3 = very weak; 4 = weak; 5 = average; 6 = above average; 7 = strong; 8 = very strong; 9 = extremely strong; 10 = the very best that you could ever possibly imagine a novice researcher producing.

pitching encourages interactive/ bi-directional communication between the pitcher and pitchee – whereas, 3MT is one-directional. Third, pitching targets a specialist audience – an academic expert, using appropriately technical language, whereas 3MT is meant for a “lay” person, expressed in everyday language. Fourth, pitching is a combination of both written and oral, and if anything the concept is more about the written, while 3MT is purely oral. Fifth, pitching can be either private or public, though its real value is as a private tool. In contrast, 3MT is fully public. Sixth, pitching explicitly accommodates feedback, and then of a technical nature, whereas feedback is not really part of the 3MT mantra. Seventh, while 3MT is definitionally a three-minute presentation activity, the pitching presentation can be anywhere from 8-15 minutes (with a further 15-20 minutes assigned to the “first cut” at feedback, in the context of a 30 minute supervision meeting). Eighth, pitching is conceived as part of an ongoing/long-term strategy, whereas 3MT (at least directly) is short term, single event, focused. Ninth, pitching is NOT just about thesis-based research, whereas 3MT is. In the PhD thesis context, 3MT is primarily about post-confirmation work – and typically, somewhere nearer the end of the PhD journey. In contrast, pitching is best thought of (though not exclusively so) as a task for pre-confirmation students (e.g. in the Australian setting, PhDs in their first 12 months of candidature). Finally, pitching is a structured, simple, methodical, clear & focused written research tool.

#### **4. Conclusion**

This paper has two related goals – one specific and one general. The specific goal is to constructively engage with Lodhia (2017) on the issue of whether and to what extent Faff’s (2015) *pitching research* (PR) template works for the “qualitative cousins”. Lodhia (2017) suggests: (1) the basic “building blocks” of Idea, Data and Tools (“IDioT”) be replaced by Theory, Context and qualitative Methodology (“TCM”); and (2) the scope of Contribution be expanded beyond the research literature to explicitly take in theory, practice and policy.

Notably, there is significant common ground in much of the structure and philosophy underlying both Faff (2015) and Lodhia (2017), and upon close inspection Lodhia's proposed modifications do not really constitute a major divergence in thinking between the two. As argued above, a simple reconciliation is to apply the universal Faff (2015) tool at the very early stage of the research development and, then, transition to Lodhia's (2017) adaptation (as deemed necessary).

Using the above "cousins" focus as a primer, our more general goal is to update the agenda created by Faff (2015) and in doing so, explore the "extended family" of *pitching research* work/resources now available. The extended family outlined and discussed includes applying the *pitching research* framework from a variety of different perspectives. In addition, the "extended family" part of the paper explores several other angles including: how we can learn from pitching competitions and PR winners; how PR is used in doctoral education and symposia; research grant applications based on PR; PR YouTube video resources; pitching research letters; and supporting web site facilities.

## References

- Ali, S., 2016, Corporate governance and stock liquidity in Australia: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(3), 624-631.
- Ali, S., 2017, Women in the boardroom and their impact on default risk: A pitch, *Accounting Research Journal*, Vol. 30(2), 137-146.
- Ali, S., B. Liu, and J. Su, 2017, Corporate governance and stock liquidity dimensions: Panel evidence from pure order-driven Australian Market, *International Review of Economics and Finance* 50, 275-304.
- Ashraf, H. and N., Manzoor, 2017, An examination of customer loyalty and customer participation in the service recovery process in the Pakistani hotel industry: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(1), 199-202.
- Atif, M., 2016, CEO compensation and firm's cash holding: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(3), 605-611.
- Beaumont, S., 2015, An investigation of the short and long run relations between executive cash bonus payments and firm financial performance: A Pitch, *Accounting and Finance* 55, 337-343.
- Brenner, M., 2016, Investigating chef-leader behaviour impacts on subordinate work team identification: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(4), 826-834.
- Chang, M. and M. Wee, 2016, The effect of voluntary versus mandatory adoption of trading policies on the returns to insider trades, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 38, 76-87.
- Clout, V., 2017, Corporate boards, monitoring and securities class actions: A pitch, *Accounting Research Journal* 30(3), 242-248.
- Dang, M. and D. Henry, 2016, Partial-control versus full-control acquisitions: Does target corporate governance matter? Evidence from eight East and Southeast Asian nations, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 40, 251-265.
- Dupire, M. and B. M'Zali, 2016, CSR Strategies in response to competitive pressures, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-21, (doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2981-x).
- Dvoulety, O., 2017, Determinants of Nordic entrepreneurship: A reverse engineered pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* Vol. 16(3), 420-426.
- Ellis, P., 2016, To find a standard format that measures the activities of a micro, small or medium business entity. A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(2), 420-427.
- Faff, R., 2015, A simple template for pitching research, *Accounting and Finance* 55, 311-336.
- Faff, R., 2016a, Mapping "pitching research" tasks into the RSD7 framework: A pedagogic perspective, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2724451>
- Faff, R., 2016b, The "pitching research" concept: 2015, a year in review, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2721528>
- Faff, R., 2016c, Learning from 'pitching research' competition winners: Insights and reflections, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2891650>
- Faff, R., 2017a, "Pitching research<sup>®</sup>", Version 15 (or beyond) available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2462059>
- Faff, R., 2017b, Pitching research<sup>®</sup>: A comprehensive resource center supplement, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3018939>
- Faff, R., K. Godfrey, and J. Teng, 2016, Pitching research evolution: An illustrative example on the topic of 'innovation and financial dependence', available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2776959>
- Faff, R., N. Babakhani, K. Dallest, L. Daunt, G. Foley, S. O'Brien, and T. Tran Le Nghi, 2017, Book of pitches: UQAPS 2016 pitching research competition final, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2967736>
- Faff, R., J. Baladi, D. Buce, G. Du Plessis, C. Du Plessis, B. Dwyer, K. Honey, D. Melton, F. Oktaviani, S. Shen, L. Steele, D. Suhodo, M. Tanner, C. Unger, S. Wong, J. Xu, and S.

- Zou, 2017, Fantasy Pitching IV: Batman, Donald Duck, Fast Food, Superpowers, Self-Determination, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2939489>
- Faff, R., C. Gill, J. McCullough, J-E. Noh, S.N.D. Mahmud, N. Ndugwa, P. Eats, and S. Ghorbani Gorji, 2017, Book of pitches: UQAPS 2015 pitching research competition final, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2953842>
- Faff, R., J. Lay, and M. Smith, 2017, PoW! Using social media to leverage research visibility – “Pitch of the Week” posts in LinkedIn, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2894069>
- Faff, R., and T. Kestelle, 2016, Pitching research for engagement and impact, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2813096>
- Faff, R., Y. Li, B. Nguyen, and Q. Ye, 2016, Pitching research: A pilot experiment with UQ Winter scholars, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2816233>
- Faff, R., A. Wallin, M. Brosnan, N. Carrillo, D. Darmawan, A. Dorris, M. Groen, N. Listiani, V. Maxwell, F. Orole, A. Pham, I. Salehudin, M. Simons, D. To, J. Tsoi, C. Wong, K. Woods, N. Yossa, and K. Zhaunerchyk, 2016, Fantasy pitching II: Star Wars vs. Pokemon vs. R&D vs. Uber, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2827425>
- Faff, R., Ali, S., Atif, M., Brenner, M., Chowdhury, H., Crudas, L., Joubet, A., Malik, I., Nagar, V., Mi, L., Pullen, T., Siegrist, M., Smythe, S., Stephenson, J., Zhang, B., and Zhang, K., 2017, Fantasy pitching, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(2), 360-379.
- Faff, R., N. Babakhani, R. Carrick, A. Chen, K. Dallest, L. Daunt, M. Escobar, G. Foley, C. Gill, M. Khong, M. Liu, D. Mahmud, J. McCullough, N. Ndugwa, B. Nguyen, S. O'Brien, F. Orole, A. Qureshi, H. Rad, S. Rekker, K. Shahzad, M. Smith, T. Tran Le Nghi, W. Tunny, and A. Wallin, 2017, Motivating postgrad research students to pitch their ideas: What have we learned from 'pitching research' competitions at UQ?, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2899942>
- Faff, R., R. Carrick, A. Chen, M. Escobar, M. Khong, B. Nguyen, and W. Tunny, 2017a, Pitching research: A reverse-engineer “Sparring” experiment with UQ Summer research scholars, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2903811>
- Faff, R., R. Carrick, A. Chen, M. Escobar, M. Khong, B. Nguyen, and W. Tunny, 2017b, Fantasy pitching III: UQ Summer research scholars – the role of “money” in the 21st Century, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2906617>
- Faff, R., Carrick, A. Chen, M. Escobar, M. Khong, B. Nguyen, and W. Tunny, 2017c, UQ Summer research scholar program: Insights and reflections from the pitching research “I-Templates” team, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2919027>
- Faff, R., X. Shao, F. Alqahtani, M. Atif, A. Białek-Jaworska, A. Chen, G. Duppati, M. Escobar, M. Finta, Y. Li, M. Machado, B. Nguyen, J-E. Noh, H. Sakawa, E. Vaportzis, L. Widyawati, S. Wijayana, C. Wijesooriya, Q. Ye, and Q. Zhou, 2017, Increasing the discoverability of non-English language research papers: A reverse-engineering application of the pitching research template, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2948707>
- Iqbal, H., and H. Ashraf, 2017, Impact of behavioral factors towards the adoption of mobile learning among higher education students in public and private universities: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(3), 406-412.
- Kaczynski, D., M. Salmona, and T. Smith, 2014, Qualitative research in finance, *Australian Journal of Management* 39, 127-135.
- Kiley, M., and G. Wisker, 2009, Threshold concepts in research education and evidence of threshold crossing, *Higher Education Research and Development* 28(4), 431-441.
- Kong, M., and M., Escobar, 2017, New money: Are we ready to take on the impacts of a cashless society? A fantasy pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(4), 641-647.

- Lee, G., and M. Turner, 2017, Do government administered financial rewards undermine firms' internal whistle-blowing systems? A pitch, *Accounting Research Journal* 30(1), 6-11.
- Linnenluecke, M., X. Chen, X. Lin, T. Smith, and Y. Zhu, 2016, Emerging trends in Asia-Pacific finance research: A review of recent influential publications and a research agenda, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 36, 66-76.
- Linnenluecke, M., X. Chen, X. Lin, T. Smith, and Y. Zhu, 2017, Research in finance: A review of recent influential publications and a research agenda, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 43, 188-199.
- Lodhia, S., 2017, What about your qualitative cousins? Expanding the "pitching research" template, *Accounting and Finance*, forthcoming.
- Martinek, S., 2017, The investment strategies of sovereign wealth funds: A reverse engineered pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(4), 648-656.
- Mathuva, D., 2016, Drivers of financial and social disclosure by savings and credit cooperatives in Kenya: A managerial perspective, *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management* 4, 85-96.
- Mathuva, D., and J. Kiweu, 2016, Cooperative social and environmental disclosure and financial performance of savings and credit cooperatives in Kenya, *Advances in Accounting, incorporating Advances in International Accounting* 35, 197-206.
- Maxwell, V., 2017, Developing a research agenda through pitching, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(2), 380-395.
- McCredie, B., 2017, Equity market consequences of the social media revolution, *Accounting Research Journal* 30(2), 132-136.
- McKay, W., and T. Haque, 2016, A study of industry cost of equity in Australia using the Fama and French 5 Factor model and the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM): A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(3), 618-623.
- Menzies, G., P. Dixon, and M. Rimmer, 2016, In praise of (some) red tape: A new approach to regulation, *Economic Record* 92, 631-647.
- Mugumya, E., 2017, Firm characteristics, innovation, financial resilience under austerity and survival of firm: A pitch, *Makerere Business Journal* 13, 179-186.
- Nguyen, B., and J. Chen, 2017, Gender impact of chasing dirty money policies: A fantasy pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(4), 633-640.
- Nguyen, N. H., and T.P. Truong, 2017, Regulatory enforcement, financial reporting quality and investment efficiency: A pitch, *Accounting Research Journal* 30(1), 12-18.
- Nguyen, B., R. Faff, and M. Haq, 2017, Pitching research lite: A reverse-engineering strategy for finding a new research direction, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2909549>
- Qureshi, A., 2016, Conceptualizing Schwartz values in university preference decisions: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(3), 612-617.
- Rad, H., 2016, Pairs trading and market efficiency using an adaptive market hypothesis framework: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(1), 178-185.
- Rahman, D., 2016, Investor sentiment, executive compensation, and investment – some international evidence: A Pitch, *Journal Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(2), 428-433.
- Ratiu, B., 2016, A reversed engineered pitch based on Rietveld (2016), "Creating value through the freemium business model: A consumer perspective, *Journal Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(4), 810-818.
- Ratiu, R. V., 2015, Financial reporting of European banks during the GFC: A pitch, *Accounting and Finance* 55, 345-352.

- Rekker, S., 2016, Converting planetary boundaries into action, a new approach to meeting global greenhouse gas targets: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(1), 160-167.
- Salehudin, I., 2017, "Reverse engineering" the pitching research template: A simple tool to help understand the academic literature, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 16(1), 203-210.
- Shahzad, S. K., 2016, Private firms' adaptation to climate change within the context of developing countries: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(1), 168-177.
- Sinnewe, E., 2017, Examining the economic consequences of concise integrated reports: A pitch, *Accounting Research Journal* 30(4), 356-361.
- Sivathaasan, N., 2016, Corporate governance and leverage in Australia: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(4), 819-825.
- Sivathaasan, N., S. Ali, B. Liu, and A. Haung, 2017, Stock liquidity, corporate governance and leverage: New panel evidence, *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, forthcoming.
- Teng, J., and R. Faff, 2017, A "snowballing" pedagogic strategy for pitching research: An illustrative example in finance, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2906127>
- Unda, L., 2015, Board of directors characteristics and credit union financial performance: A pitch, *Accounting and Finance* 55, 353-360.
- Unda, L., K. Ahmed, and P. Mather, 2018, Board characteristics and credit union performance, *Accounting and Finance*, forthcoming.
- Wallin, A., and A. Spry, 2016, The role of corporate versus product brand dominance in brand portfolio overlap: A Pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(2), 434-439.
- Wong, C., 2017, How did they make it? An examination of online personal branding: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* Vol. 16(3), 413-420.
- Xue, R., 2016, Study of the contagion mechanism for opening risk of emerging equity markets in BRICS countries: A pitch, *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(1), 154-159.
- Zhang, Y., 2017, Client importance and audit quality, office level evidence from the banking industry: A pitch, *Accounting Research Journal* 30(2), 147-152.



**Table 1: Summary of Qualitative Exemplar Completed Pitches using Faff's (2015) Pitching Template available in the Online elibrary**

This table lists a set of *pitching research* template examples that involve qualitative research. The elibrary can be accessed at:

<https://www.business.uq.edu.au/supplementary-material-pitching-research>

	<b>elibrary Appendix #</b>	<b>Topic Area</b>	<b>Pitch Title</b>	<b>Pitcher(s)</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
1	A5.1	Qualitative (EG1)	"Understanding why ECRs might use a Pitching Template"	Ingrid Nielsen	Deakin University, Australia
	A5.2	Taxation	"Understanding the emergence, adoption and perceived impacts of corporate tax practices in Australia"	Mattia Anesa	University of Queensland
2	A11	Theoretical Physics	"Going Around the Loop: Modelling fermions in a Sagnac Interferometer"	Harry Mulgrew	University of Queensland
3	A12	Healthcare	"Negotiating role identities of Thai and Japanese healthcare interpreters at Thai private hospitals"	Wanvipha Hongnaphadol	Kasetsart University, Thailand
4	A17	Energy Policy	Expediting the transition to low-carbon electric power systems in developing economies: A comparative study of China and India using a Sectoral Systems of Innovation (SSI) framework approach	Paul Newbury	University of Queensland
5	A19	Research Policy	"How do universities engage with controversial industries? A case-study of onshore/unconventional gas research programs funded by industry"	Liz Hardie	University of Queensland
6	A23	Public Policy & Regulation	"Are member needs being better met under MySuper?"	Geoff Warren	CIFR
7	A29	Management Accounting	"The role of heteroglossic dialogue in performance evaluation: a case study of a non-government organization"	David Smith	University of Queensland
8	A31	Accounting Theory	"A General Theory of Accounting"	Gabriel Donleavy	University of New England
9	A32	Accounting History	"The gap between just price and fair value"	Gabriel Donleavy	University of New England
10	A35	Humour	"Mickey Mouse & Climate Change"	Robert Faff	University of Queensland
11	A38	Public Sector Accounting	"Public Sector Financial Accountability: Reforms for Improved Accountability"	Graham Bowrey and Greg Jones	University of Wollongong
12	A40	Consumer Behaviour	"Controversial Leisure: 'Legally' High Youth"	Alison Joubert	University of Queensland
13	A42	Philosophy	"Ethical theory for business ethics: can it be both unified and practical?"	Simon Burgess	University of New England
14	A43	Research Advice	"Generating Innovative Research Ideas"	Robert Faff	University of Queensland
15	A44	Research Student Creativity	"Training creative problem solving skills in higher degree research students"	Jennifer Gippel	Australian National University
16	A47	Education for Sustainability	"Systems Thinking Approach to Education for Sustainability: A Case Study of University Kebangsaan Malaysia"	Siti Nur Diyana Mahmud	University of Queensland
17	A48	Public Health	"Psycho-social Early Childhood Development (ECD) and public health: a health systems approach"	Zina Ndugwa	University of Queensland
18	A50	Sociology	"From a normative discourse to contextualised practices: A case study of a Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) in Bangladesh"	Jae-Eun Noh	University of Queensland
19	A55	Orthopaedic Medicine	"Head and neck injury risks: the link between head banging and heavy metal"	Marita Smith	Australian National University
20	A65	Financial Literacy	"Forex Retail Online Trading: Why does this business continue to grow?: A Pitch"	Athanasios Fassas	University of Sheffield Thessaloniki, Greece
21	A76	Sustainability Practice	"Understanding the Practise of Sustainability in Organisations"	Liz Nicholls	University of Queensland
22	A80	Virtual Learning	"Nature of Formative Assessment in Virtual Learning Environments"	Chinthake Wijesooriya	University of Queensland
23	A103	Consumer Research	Dolbec, P.-Y. & Fischer, E. (2015). Refashioning a field? Connected consumers and institutional dynamics in markets. <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i> , 41 (6), 1447-1468. (reverse engineered)	Alison Joubert	University of Queensland
24	A107	Impact Investing	Höchstädter, A. K & Scheck, B 2015, 'What's in a Name: An Analysis of Impact Investing Understandings by Academics and Practitioners', <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> , vol. 132, iss. 2, pp. 449 - 475. (Reverse Engineered Paper)	Tim Pullen	University of Queensland
25	A109	Glocalisation	Gond, J.-P., & Boxenbaum, E. (2013). The glocalization of responsible investment: Contextualization work in France and Quebec. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> , 115(4), 707-721. (Reverse Engineered)	Kun Zhang	University of Queensland

	<b>eLibrary Appendix</b>	<b>Topic Area</b>	<b>Pitch Title</b>	<b>Pitcher(s)</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
26	A128	Business Information Systems	“Improving Situation Awareness with Digital Representations”	Mark Bremhorst	University of Queensland
27	A130	Corporate taxation	“Field-level legitimization of corporate tax minimization”	Mattia Anesa	University of Queensland
28	A132	Innovation/Collaboration	“Exploring Inter-organisational Collaboration Practices for Open Innovation”	Janine Lay	University of Queensland
29	A133	University Entrepreneurs	“The competing logics of university entrepreneurship collaborators in social sciences”	Dinah Joesoef	University of Queensland
30	A134	Strategic Decision Making	“Leadership Practices in Strategic Decision Making”	Richard O’Quinn	University of Queensland
31	A135	Strategic Decision Making (2)	“Dominant stories and strategic decision-making in complex, dynamic and ambiguous business environments.”	Bruce Mortimer	University of Queensland
32	A136	Leadership	“Investigating chef-leader behaviour impacts on subordinate work team identification”	Matt Brenner	University of Queensland
33	A138	Leadership Learning	“Cricket balls, rolling pins and gourds: Artefacts and stories of leadership significance”	Emma Watton	Lancaster University
34	A140	Organisational Psychology	“Responding to jerks at work: When and why employees prefer to reintegrate or punish workplace offenders”	Mylyn C. Dat	University of Queensland
35	A143	Telehealth	“Improving Telehealth value propositions for sustainability: development of a decision tool to aid health services and consumers”	Kathy Dallest	University of Queensland
36	A145	Architecture	“Communities of Faith: Modern church architecture in Queensland 1950-1980”	Lisa Daunt	University of Queensland
37	A146	Gender & Risk Tolerance	“Women and Finance in contemporary world : Case of Select Indian Cities”	Kanchan Sehrawat	University of Delhi
38	A148	Marketing	“A classification schema of Co-production of goods: an open-systems perspective”	Imam Salehudin	University of Queensland
39	A194	Coaching Culture	“Coaching Culture Development in Australian Organisations”	Susanne Knowles	University of Queensland
40	A195	Public Sector	“Invisible Taxation: Fantasy or just good Service Design?”	Jo’Anne Langham	University of Queensland
41	A197	Disaster Housing	“Community participation in post-natural disaster housing reconstruction projects – significance, barriers and solutions”	Kamran Shafique	University of Queensland
42	A203	Brand Complexity	“Embracing Brand Complexity: Conceptualising and Understanding the Positioning Challenges of ‘Broad Brands’”	Claudia Gonzalez	University of Queensland
43	A207	Nature-Based Tourism	“Adaptive Co-Management as an Innovative Governance Approach for Nature-Based Tourism Destinations”	Wasiul Islam	University of Queensland
44	A215	In-Apps Purchase Behaviour	“To Pay or Not to Pay: Conceptualising In-Apps Purchase Behaviour using Netnographic Insights”	Imam Salehudin	University of Queensland

**Figure 1: Illustrative Qualitative Pitch Template Example in Management Accounting**

<b>Pitcher's Name</b>	David Smith	<b>FoR category</b>	150105	<b>Date Completed</b>	20/2/15
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	The role of heteroglossic dialogue in performance evaluation: a case study of a non-government organization				
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	How do the dimensions of dialogic accounting practice influence understandings in relation to performance texts?				
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	<p>Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). <i>The dialogical imagination</i>. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.</p> <p>Brown, J. (2009). Democracy, sustainability and dialogic accounting technologies: taking pluralism seriously. <i>Critical Perspectives on Accounting</i>, 20(3), 313-342.</p> <p>Chenhall, R., Hall, M., &amp; Smith, D. (2013). Performance measurement, modes of evaluation and the development of compromising accounts. <i>Accounting, Organizations and Society</i>, 38(4), 268-287.</p>				
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	A dialogic approach to accounting information has been proposed as a means of overcoming the tendency for accounting systems to reduce accounting information to a single focus, or meaning (Macintosh & Baker, 2002; Brown, 2009). However, little work has been done on understanding the key characteristics of accounting information that constitute it as a dialogic tool. The focus of this study is to shed light on the key characteristics of accounting information that allow a dialogic appreciation and understanding of performance and impact. In order to investigate these characteristics in detail, we adapt the notion of <i>heteroglossia</i> from Bakhtin (1986a; 1986b, 1986c, 1986d; 1992), and apply it to build knowledge of the processes through which understanding is derived from accounting information.				
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three core aspects of any empirical research project i.e. the "IDioTs" guide</b>				
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	We focus on the three dimensions of heteroglossic dialogue (Bahktin, 1986) and apply these to a performance measurement context: unfinalizability, addressivity/answerability and chronotopes. Arguably, the most important of these is the first – unfinalizability, which relates to the idea that performance measurement information is never finalised. This creates an interesting counterpoint to recent management control literature that focuses on efforts to 'finalize' performance measurement systems, or to seek to make 'incomplete' information more complete. Moreover, it suggests that such efforts are unhelpful and a suboptimal use of managerial and organizational resources.				
<b>(F) Data?</b>	We use a case study approach of a single case study. Two researchers to be present at the conduct of all interviews, to enhance reliability. Interviews are recorded and transcribed. In addition to interview data, access to internal company documentation, and some observation of operations.				
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	Case study approach featuring interviews, analysis of organizational documents, and some observation of operations.				
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key questions</b>				
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	Novelty is in the idea – identifying the characteristics of performance measurement information that may constitute it as a dialogic approach, and linking this to the recent literature on the imperfection of performance measures.				
<b>(I) So What?</b>	This is important because it, as mentioned, suggests that efforts to refine or continually improve performance measures may be ill-directed.				
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>				
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	The paper, in focusing on the inherent unfinalizability of accounting information, provides a counterpoint to the literature on the imperfection of performance measures. This literature indicates managers either make do with imperfect performance measures, or direct effort towards refining and/or replacing imperfect measures. If findings suggest that the conceptualisation of performance measurement information is potentially unhelpful, it may redirect efforts towards the continual reworking of the performance measurement system, which, in fact, can never be finalized.				
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<p>Collaborating with Susan O'Leary, Monash</p> <p>Target Journal(s)? A* journal</p> <p>Risks for a project of this nature are moderate. There is always competitor risk, although this is ameliorated to an extent by having a unique data set.</p> <p>In general, for case study research, there is the risk of losing access to the field site during the data collection phase. However, we have already completed data collection.</p>				

**Figure 2: Illustrative Qualitative Pitch Template Example in Public Sector Accounting**

<b>Pitcher's Name</b>	Dr Graham Bowrey and Dr Greg Jones	<b>FoR Category</b>	Public Sector Accounting	<b>Date Completed</b>	17 July 2015
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Public Sector Financial Accountability: Reforms for Improved Accountability				
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	To critically evaluate the contribution the Estimates Hearings make to the discharge of public sector financial accountability.				
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chang L 2015</b>, ‘Accountability, Rhetoric, and Political Interests: Twists and Turns of NHS Performance Measurements’, <i>Financial Accountability &amp; Management</i>, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 41-68.</li> <li>• <b>Mulgan, R 2008</b>, ‘The accountability priorities of Australian Parliamentarians’, <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 457-469.</li> <li>• <b>Thomas, P.G 2009</b>, ‘Parliament scrutiny of government performance in Australia’, <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 373-398.</li> </ul>				
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	The Budget Estimates Hearings of the Federal Parliament’s Senate Legislation Committees is a key accountability process which provides Senators the opportunity to examine and report on the expenditure proposals of the government. This proposal will critically evaluate the contribution the Estimates Hearings make to the discharge of public sector financial accountability. Specifically, it will identify those aspects of the Estimates Hearings which could be improved to increase transparency and understandability of funds allocated to achieve government's policy objectives.				
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project i.e. the “ <b>IDioTs</b> ” guide				
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	<b>The primary aim of this study is to critically evaluate the current contribution made by the Estimates Hearings of the Senate Legislation Committees in relation to the discharge of public sector financial accountability.</b> This study will be based on the analysis and review of the Estimates Hearings of the three central agencies (Departments of Finance, Treasury, and Prime Minister and Cabinet) for the financial years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15. This study will identify areas for improvement in this accountability process, specifically in relation to the effectiveness of the budget Estimates Hearings process, and will contribute to the Australian Government’s Strategic Research Priority of <i>Lifting Productivity and Economic Growth</i> .				
<b>(F) Data?</b>	This study will be based on the analysis and review of the Estimates Hearings of the three Central Agencies (Departments of Finance, Treasury, and Prime Minister and Cabinet) for the financial years 2013-14, and 2014-15. The data used in this study will be sourced from the 2013-14, and 2014-15 Hansard transcripts of the Estimate Hearings, Additional Estimates Hearings and Supplementary Estimates Hearings. All of these Hansard transcripts are freely available via the Parliament of Australia website. In addition, the Portfolio Budget Statements of these Central Agencies will also be used to identify significant Government measures in each financial year.				
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	The research methodology of this study is based on an approach which allows the interpretation of discourse from the perspective of and influences on the story which is presented in its sanitised coherent form (the Hansard transcripts and the Portfolio Budget Statements). This research is supported by the application of thematic analysis to identify key aspects of the ‘story’ and intertextuality analysis on the influences of the ‘story’. This method of analysis is based on a recognition of dependence in the creation of discourse on the societal context, language and history (Fairclough 1992a, 1992b). This dependence and connection contributes to the intertextuality analysis’ emphasis on the heterogeneity of discourse “and highlight[s] the diverse and often contradictory elements and threads that make up a text[discourse]” (Fairclough 1992b, p. 272). A key aspect of this approach is that it is reliant on the researcher to identify, interpret and justify the inclusion (and exclusion) of the different aspects of the societal context, language and history in the study. This aspect is particularly relevant to this study as the topics (macrosemantics) raised and the subsequent discussions in the Estimates Hearings are determined by the participants.				

	A key aspect of this study is attendance at both the Additional Estimates Hearings in March 2016 (based on 2014-2015 Federal Government measures introduced by the Treasurer in May 2014) and the Estimates Hearings in May 2016 (based on 2015-2016 Federal Government measures introduced by the Treasurer in May 2015). Attendance at these hearings will provide a significant contextual component to our study.
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key questions
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	The idea upon which this research is based is that one of the key processes by which government financial accountability is discharged has not been fully explored nor has the taken-for-granted assumption that this process 'does adequately' discharge financial accountability been challenged. While Parliamentary discourse presented via Hansard transcripts (but not on Budget Estimates) has been previously explored the research approach applied has been primarily based on positivistic methodologies. This study will address both of these gaps in the academic accounting literature.
<b>(I) So What?</b>	Senators and senior public servants spend a considerable amount of time preparing for and participating in Budget Estimates Hearings where they are required to examine and report on the expenditure proposals of the government (\$83 billion in 2013-14). This study will identify opportunities for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of these Hearings to identify potential savings and make recommendations for the enhancement of transparency and discharge of fiscal accountability.
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	Currently there is limited academic literature which explores and evaluates the Budget Estimates Hearings process and its impact and contribution to public sector financial accountability. The majority of the academic literature on public sector financial accountability focuses primarily on the notion of accountability, and its various forms, in its broadest sense rather than on specific processes such as the Budget Estimates Hearings of the Senate Legislation Committees.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<b>Collaboration:</b> This study will be undertaken in collaboration with Dr Greg Jones from University of Southern Queensland.  <b>Target Journal(s)?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The empirical data collected from the thematic analysis from this study will be the basis of a journal paper which will be submitted to Financial Accountability &amp; Management (FAM).</li> <li>• Another journal paper will be prepared outlining the identified process improvement(s) for submission to the Australian Journal of Public Administration.</li> <li>• AFAANZ 2016 Conference paper(s)</li> </ul> <b>Risk</b> assessment: The main risk to the completion of this project is time. However, with proper planning and agreement from the Head of School and Head of Discipline the likelihood of this risk eventuating is low. In addition as the data is readily accessible and the methodology not reliant on specific external tools there are no other risks to the completion of this project.

**Figure 3: Illustrative Qualitative Pitch Template Example in Impact Investing**

Pitcher's Name	Tim Pullen	FoR category	Finance	Date Completed	8 April 2016
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Höchstädter, A. K & Scheck, B 2015, 'What's in a Name: An Analysis of Impact Investing Understandings by Academics and Practitioners', <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> , vol. 132, iss. 2, pp. 449 - 475. [ <b>Reverse Engineered Paper</b> ]				
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	How is impact investing understood at the definitional, terminological and strategic levels?				
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	<p>Harji, K &amp; Jackson, E. T 2012, <i>Accelerating impact: Achievements, challenges and what's next in building the impact investing industry</i>. The Rockefeller Foundation, New York.</p> <p>Mair, J, Battilana, J &amp; Cardenas, J 2012, 'Organizing for society: A typology of social entrepreneuring models', <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>, vol. 111, iss. 3, pp. 353 - 373.</p> <p>Sandberg, J, Juravle, C, Hedesström, T. M &amp; Hamilton, I 2009, 'The heterogeneity of socially responsible investment', <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>, vol. 87, iss. 4, pp. 519 - 533.</p>				
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	Impact investing is still relatively new, having been first coined in 2007 at a Rockefeller Foundation convening. Since then, it has attracted much interest and activity from around the globe. This is evidenced by the rapid emergence of specialized intermediaries, the involvement of mainstream financial players and governments, the inclusion of related subjects at renowned universities and the myriad of practitioner contributions. Despite all this, there has been a paucity of academic contributions. Together with this, there has been repeated criticism that a uniform definition is absent, alternative terms are being used interchangeably and boundaries to related concepts are unclear.				
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project i.e. the <b>"IDioTs"</b> guide				
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	This research represents a crucial first step in examining how impact investing is understood by key academics and practitioners at the definitional, terminological and strategic levels. Specifically, it seeks to identify the core elements around which impact investing is commonly defined. It also seeks to analyse how impact investing overlaps with and is delineated from closely related terms such as social investment and socially responsible investment (SRI). It also seeks to investigate the full scope of strategic options that are typically available to impact investors across different geographic locations, sectors and asset classes, amongst many others. Ultimately, this research seeks to help foster this specific investment approach and guide future academic research.				
<b>(F) Data?</b>	<p>Given the dynamics of the motivation/puzzle, the data is comprised of both academic and practitioner contributions. The academic contributions were sourced in June 2013 and June 2014 through a systematic search of the term "impact invest*" in the title, topic/subject, headings/subject terms and abstract of ABI/INFORM Complete (ProQuest 2014), EBSCO Business Source Complete (EBSCO 2013), JSTOR (JSTOR 2014), and Web of Knowledge (Thomson Reuters 2013). For quality reasons, the search only included peer-reviewed contributions. Similarly, to ensure comprehensive coverage, the reference list of all identified contributions was also screened for the term "impact invest*". The final sample included 16 academic contributions.</p> <p>The 140 practitioner contributions were sourced on 1 June 2013 from the research section of the Global Impact Investing Network's (GIIN) website. This source was chosen as GIIN is widely recognised as the "de facto impact investment industry body" (Arosio, 2011, pp. 36). The contributions from this website are regularly updated and are authored by both third parties as well as representatives from the GIIN.</p>				

<b>(G) Tools?</b>	<p>Using content analysis, the sample of contributions were analysed in terms of how they used the term impact investing. In line with the framework developed by Sandberg et al. (2009), this analysis focused on the similarities and differences in the usage of the term at a definitional, terminological and strategic level.</p> <p>The analysis at the definitional level consisted of an inductive coding procedure similar to that utilised by Mair et al. (2012). This procedure was comprised of 3 distinct coding phases that included the use of in vivo codes. A key feature of this particular procedure is that it allowed categories to emerge during the content analysis rather than drawing upon pre-defined categories.</p> <p>The analysis at the terminological level focused on whether the terms social investment and SRI have been used as synonyms, superordinate concepts, subordinate concepts or related but distinct concepts relative to the term impact investing. The terms social investment and SRI were chosen via a preliminary analysis of the impact investing descriptions previously identified.</p> <p>The analysis at the strategic level consisted of both a closed and open coding scheme. The categories for the closed coding were based on an adapted version of the framework used by Schwartz (cited in Nicholls &amp; Schwartz, forthcoming). This particular approach was used as it specifically addressed different dimensions of social value creation. Coupled with this, the open coding allowed sub-categories to emerge based on the in vivo codes.</p>
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two key questions</b>
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	<p>There is considerable scope for novelty simply due to impact investing being relatively new and the paucity of the relevant academic contributions. Against this background, the primary source of novelty is the idea to provide a timely first examination of the extant contributions given the recent, repeated criticisms regarding the conceptual clarity of impact investing. Coupled with this, the coverage of the data is also novel as it includes contributions of both academics and practitioners.</p>
<b>(I) So What?</b>	<p>There are 4 primary reasons why a lack of definitional, terminological and strategic clarity regarding impact investing is problematic and thus should be examined. Firstly, it could put at risk the credibility of the entire idea, including associated organisations, due to resultant issues such as "impact washing". Secondly, it could inhibit market growth and broad adoption as mainstream investors would find it difficult to readily understand what it is and thus form an opinion about it to invest. Thirdly, it could hinder key government actors in their pivotal role to establish the relevant infrastructure and a supportive market ecosystem. Fourthly, it could make it difficult for impact investing to gain legitimacy and for respective theories to develop within the academic field.</p>
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One bottom line</b>
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	<p>This research represents a crucial first step to examine how impact investing is understood at the definitional, terminological and strategic levels in order to help foster this specific investment approach and guide future academic research.</p>
<b>(K) 3 Key Findings</b>	<p>The 3 key findings of this research are: "(1) It highlights the agreement on the fundamentals of impact investing... (2) it clarifies terminological aspects with regard to synonymous terms... and (3) it illustrates the various strategic options for impact investing..." (Höchstädter &amp; Scheck, 2015, pp. 460)</p>

**Figure 4: Illustrative Qualitative Pitch Template Example in Business Information Systems**

<b>Pitcher's Name</b>	Mark Bremhorst	<b>FoR category</b>	Business Information Systems	<b>Date Completed</b>	10/6/2016
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Improving Situation Awareness with Digital Representations				
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	How does our frame-of-reference influence the meaning and usefulness of computer representations?				
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	<p>Serrano, C., &amp; Karahanna, E. 2016. The Compensatory Interaction between User Capabilities and Technology Capabilities in Influencing Task Performance: An Empirical Assessment in Telemedicine Consultations. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 40: in press.</p> <p>Endsley, M.R. 2015. Situation Awareness and Misconceptions and Misunderstandings. <i>Journal of Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making</i>, 9: 4-32.</p> <p>Weber, R. 2012. Evaluating and Developing Theories in the Information Systems Discipline. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 13: 1-30.</p>				
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	Given the computational power and diversity of decision support systems, why does human judgment still dominate human decision-making? How do decision makers acquire information from computer representations and incorporate the meaning of those representations into their actions?				
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project i.e. the “ <b>IDioTs</b> ” guide				
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	<p><b>Core Idea:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attempts to augment human judgment with computer representations proceed from the belief that computational processes model cognitive processes. On the subject of representations that model events (changes to the states of things) I propose a new theoretical model, labelled comparative-cognition, to describe the factors that inform human judgment as it occurs in the mind of a decision-maker when they refer to a decision support system.</li> <li>2. The concept of state tracking derives from Representation Theory. The state tracking model provides a theoretical model to describe how computers represent real-world events. The concept of frame-of-reference misfit derives from information systems fit literature and frames-of-reference literature. Frame-of-reference misfit describes decision-making behaviour in which individuals apply generally accepted decision rules to resolve a judgment problem caused by imperfect information.</li> <li>3. In the proposed comparative-cognition model, poor state tracking implies poor event-representation by a decision support system which leads to lower situation awareness in the decision-maker. In contrast, good state tracking implies good event-representation which leads to higher situation awareness. I also posit that state tracking's influence on situation awareness is influenced by frame-of-reference fit. High frame-of-reference misfit weakens the influence of state tracking on situation awareness because of the conflicts between representations' and individuals' respective real-world conceptualisations. Conversely, low frame-of-reference misfit strengthens the influence of state tracking on situation awareness. These predicted effects lead to the following proposition.</li> <li>4. <b>Proposition 1:</b> <i>The quality of state-tracking and the extent of frame-of-reference misfit, jointly influence situation awareness.</i></li> <li>5. When state-tracking is poor, situation awareness will be poor, but when state-tracking is good, the benefit for a decision-maker's situation awareness will depend on the frame-of-reference misfit, with greater benefits resulting from lower misfit.</li> </ol> <p><b>Tension:</b> Proposition 1 should extend information systems research leading to new predictions rather than challenge existing theories.</p>				



<b>(F) Data?</b>	<b>Country:</b> Australia. <b>Reason:</b> Convenient and amenable to the case study. <b>Unit of Analysis:</b> Aggregate information system. <b>Observation Sampling:</b> Longitudinal. <b>Data Type:</b> Industry specific (health care). <b>Sample Period:</b> Q1-2016/Q4-2018. <b>Sample Size:</b> 25-40 interviewees. <b>Data Sources:</b> Interviews based on approved case study protocol. <b>Missing Data:</b> Unlikely to be a problem given the nature of the study. <b>Test Variables:</b> Preliminary interviews suggest the variables demonstrate sufficient variation to observe the operational linkages among them.
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	<b>Research Design:</b> I employ a case study to explore the proposed model because a theory of “comparative-cognition” is the first attempt to link Representation Theory’s state-tracking model to a cognitive theory of situation awareness. The proposed model therefore lacks substantive theoretical support. Moreover, using a case study methodology permits observation of the purported operational links among the model’s constructs which should support detailed explanations of how the constructs influence each other (Yin, 2009:9). <b>Sampling:</b> I employed purposeful sampling and selected a health services information system for this case study. The health services context matches the social context required to explore the proposed model because the model describes information systems with relatively stable data definitions that are made available in social arenas governed by well-defined rules.
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key questions
<b>(H) What’s New?</b>	The novel idea that frames-of-reference directly influence the relationship between computer representations and cognition by enabling and constraining comparisons.
<b>(I) So What?</b>	Understanding elements of commonality between the deep structures of both computer representations and cognition will increase our ability to design computer representations that improve decision makers’ judgment.
<b>ONE</b>	<b>One</b> bottom line
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	<b>Theoretical Contribution 1:</b> The model provides a general theory describing how decision support systems contribute to human judgment through computer representations which could provide common ground among the fragmented areas of the decision support literature (Arnott and Pervan, 2005). <b>Theoretical Contribution 2:</b> This research project will extend theories that explain which aspects of digital representations contribute to better human decision-making.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<b>Target Journals:</b> A* journals such as MIS Quarterly or Information Systems Research <b>Risk:</b> Ethical clearance and site access were granted in April 2016. The risks for this study include access to participants and risk of not finding empirical support for the model. Researching the so-far unexplored state tracking model lowers the risks from competitors but increases the risk to the proposed model’s acceptance among the information system’s research community. <b>Scope:</b> The flexibility of the case study method will cater for scope adjustments if required.

**Figure 5: Illustrative Qualitative Pitch Template Example in Corporate Taxation**

<b>Pitcher's Name</b>	Mattia Anesa	<b>FoR category</b>	Corporate taxation	<b>Date Completed</b>	24/06/16
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	Field-level legitimization of corporate tax minimization				
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	Understand the legitimization process of corporate tax minimization.				
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bourdieu, P. 1990. The logic of practice. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.</li> <li>• Gracia, L., &amp; Oats, L. 2012. Boundary work and tax regulation: A Bourdieusian view. Accounting Organizations and Society, 37(5): 304-321.</li> <li>• Malsch, B., Gendron, Y., &amp; Grazzini, F. 2011. Investigating interdisciplinary translations: The influence of Pierre Bourdieu on accounting literature. Accounting, Auditing &amp; Accountability Journal, 24(2): 194-228.</li> </ul>				
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	Despite persistent accusations of irresponsibility for the employment of tax avoidance practices and a strong narrative suggesting that private actors ought to contribute more to public finances, day-to-day tax minimization remains unchallenged and is essentially regarded as good business practice.				
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project i.e. the “ <b>IDioTs</b> ” guide				
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	Shared societal beliefs are one of the critical components underlying the enactment of practices. Such factors are reinforced through power occurring in field-level interactions. These dynamics are central to explaining the legitimization process of firmly institutionalized practices such as tax minimization strategies. However, the interdependency between beliefs and power within institutionalized fields has been hardly researched. We argue that a concurrent and in-depth analysis of these factors is needed to explain why tax minimization maintains its legitimacy. Hence we adopt a Bourdieusian perspective – a theoretical framework that focuses exactly on field-level struggles for power – to examine the legitimization process of tax minimization strategies.				
<b>(F) Data?</b>	The context chosen is Australia where in 2014 the released of a report offering a list of the effective tax rates (ETR) paid by ASX200-listed companies has sparked public debates on the appropriateness of current corporate tax strategies. These pressures have caused the start of a Senate Inquiry on corporate tax avoidance which in turn has seen some companies responding with public justifications for their tax positions. This chain of reactions offered the rare opportunity to examine the phenomenon of legitimization unfolding in real time and during what can be seen as a legitimacy test to the institutionalized practice of tax minimization. Since the factors under examination are socially-constructed, I decided to elicit them interpretatively through the view of field actors involved in the enactment of tax strategies. 77 semi-structured interviews, conducted between July 2014 and May 2016, were used as the primary data collection method. I started from the assumption that the only reality that I – as researcher – have access to is the one contextualized by ongoing narratives, hence I turned to media narratives on corporate taxation to identify an initial pool of actors influencing the field. From this initial sampling, I then utilized my extended professional networks to get access to more actors and further proceeded through snowball sampling until theoretical saturation was reached. The general limitations of this study are in line with the ones of other interpretive work.				
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	The analysis involved the identification of the four foundational Bourdieusian concepts – field, capital, habitus and doxa – within data. This was facilitated through coding and the use of NVivo software. The media narratives informing the initial sampling were also used to identify an initial set of shared beliefs – doxa – with regards to tax. We then proceeded into our interview data to refine the mapping of the field and to delineate relationships and power structures through the examination of actors’ habitus and available capitals. In a final phase, we collected an additional set of media article – appearing after one year of public debates – to check the robustness of our findings. Finally all sources of data were compared to reconstruct the legitimization process of tax minimization strategies through the interaction of the concepts of field, capital, habitus and doxa.				
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Two</b> key questions				
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	There is a core methodological novelty, which consists in the inductive interpretative mapping of the field. I contend that this is a critical epistemological advancement that could explain why previous research – in particular neo-institutional theories – struggle to account for the complexity of the legitimization process and maintenance of institutionalized practices.				
<b>(I) So What?</b>	Given the current relevancy of the topic at societal level (e.g. Panama papers), this work is important to academic, practitioners as well as policy-makers to achieve a better understanding of why tax has become a prominent issue for public debate. In particular, by unpacking the details of what tax minimization ‘mean’ for the field and what aspect are seen acceptable and which aren’t, my work gives an opportunity to better research, manage and regulate the legitimacy of what can be considered an instance of corporate irresponsibility.				

ONE	One bottom line
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	First, I integrate extant work within the literature on legitimacy that examines change (in fact maintenance) of institutionalized practices by assessing how corporate tax minimization is legitimized and its legitimacy reinforced through its practical enactment. Second, I advance the critical management literature, and particularly the Bourdieusian stream, by characterizing the field inductively through the voices of its participants instead of superimposing a set of players as done previously. By doing this I also integrate extant accounting work on the dominance of individual actors (e.g. corporates, advisers, etc.). Finally, I extend current CSR debates on tax (ir)responsibility by shifting the focus from a blaming of corporates to a more critical and reflexive consideration of how we are all (e.g. public and academics) involved in the legitimization of business practices.
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	We had initial concerns with regards to the ambitions of the project, in particular, considering the ethical nature of the issues touched upon, with respect to the level of individual needed to make this study worth pursuing. These fears did not materialize. Target for this paper is Accounting, Organizations and Society which focuses on critical interpretative theories (including Bourdieu) for the study of management accounting issues.

**Figure 6: A Selection of Published/Accepted Articles with a *Pitching Research Pedigree***

	<b>Paper</b>	<b>elibrary appendix #</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
1	<b>Dupire</b> , M. and M'Zali, B., (2016), "CSR Strategies in response to competitive pressures", <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> , 1-21.	<b>A3</b> accessible at: <a href="http://bit.ly/2uE20pK">http://bit.ly/2uE20pK</a>	Marion Dupire attended 7 <sup>th</sup> International Accounting and Finance Doctoral Symposium in Trondheim, Norway, in June 2014, where she was exposed to the PR framework.
2	<b>Menzies</b> , G., Dixon, P. and Rimmer, M., (2016), "In Praise of (Some) Red Tape: A New Approach to Regulation", <i>Economic Record</i> 92, 631-647.	<b>A219</b> : <a href="http://bit.ly/2DEy9in">http://bit.ly/2DEy9in</a>	Gordon Menzies participated (& 2 <sup>nd</sup> place) in the Centre for International Finance and Regulation Pitching Research Symposium, Sydney, May 2015.
3	<b>Unda</b> , L., Ahmed, K. and Mather, P., (2018), "Board Characteristics and Credit Union Performance", <i>Accounting and Finance</i> , forthcoming.	<b>A15</b> : <a href="http://bit.ly/2wYLO7k">http://bit.ly/2wYLO7k</a> <b>A63</b> : <a href="http://bit.ly/2vylFq0">http://bit.ly/2vylFq0</a>	Luisa Unda participated in (& winner of) the LaTrobe University Business School 2014 "Pitching Research Symposium."
4	<b>Ali</b> , S., Liu, B. and Su, J., (2017), "Corporate Governance and Stock Liquidity Dimensions: Panel Evidence from Pure Order-driven Australian Market", <i>International Review of Economics and Finance</i> 50, 275-304.	<b>A56</b> : <a href="http://bit.ly/2wK2bNX">http://bit.ly/2wK2bNX</a>	Searat Ali participated in the SIRCA 2015 "Pitching Research Symposium."
5	<b>Dang</b> , M. and Henry, D., (2016), "Partial-control versus Full-control Acquisitions: Does Target Corporate Governance Matter? Evidence from Eight East and Southeast Asian Countries", <i>Pacific-Basin Finance Journal</i> 40, 251-265.	<b>A61</b> : <a href="http://bit.ly/2uWA0cm">http://bit.ly/2uWA0cm</a>	Man Dang participated in the LaTrobe University Business School 2014 "Pitching Research Symposium."
6	Chang, M. and <b>Wee</b> , M., (2016), "The Effect of Voluntary versus Mandatory Adoption of Trading Policies on the Returns to Insider Trades", <i>Pacific-Basin Finance Journal</i> 38, 76-87.	<b>A79</b> : <a href="http://bit.ly/2w7I7XM">http://bit.ly/2w7I7XM</a>	Marvin Wee participated in (& winner of) the Centre for International Finance and Regulation Pitching Research Symposium, Sydney, May 2015.

**Figure 7: Pitching Research YouTube Videos**

Video Presenter(s)	Title/Theme	weblink	Video duration
<b>Panel A: PR Seminar/Workshop</b>			
Robert Faff (PPTs + audio)	Pitching Research Webinar	<a href="https://youtu.be/19s-2Mear5I">https://youtu.be/19s-2Mear5I</a>	1 hour 9 minutes
<b>Panel B: UQ Association of Post Graduates (UQuAPS) PR Competition Pitches</b>			
<b>2015</b>			
Jon McCullough (Winner)	Mining Engineering	<a href="http://bit.ly/2jSOwwz">http://bit.ly/2jSOwwz</a>	13 minutes 48 seconds
Zina Ndugwa (Runner-up)	Public Health	<a href="http://bit.ly/2jqU1WG">http://bit.ly/2jqU1WG</a>	12 minutes 34 seconds
Chelsea Gill (Runner-up)	Tourism	<a href="http://bit.ly/2iBrTFH">http://bit.ly/2iBrTFH</a>	13 minutes 04 seconds
Jae-eun Noh	Sociology	<a href="http://bit.ly/2iGwL5M">http://bit.ly/2iGwL5M</a>	12 minutes 39 seconds
Siti Nur Diyana Mahmud	Education	<a href="http://bit.ly/2jiZENE">http://bit.ly/2jiZENE</a>	12 minutes 55 seconds
Sara Ghorbani Gorji	Food Science	<a href="http://bit.ly/2jEep3U">http://bit.ly/2jEep3U</a>	11 minutes 06 seconds
<b>2016</b>			
Shari O'Brien (Winner)	Human Movement	<a href="http://bit.ly/2nY34RI">http://bit.ly/2nY34RI</a>	9 minutes 26 seconds
Gabe Foley (Runner-up)	Bioinformatics	<a href="http://bit.ly/2olzYrF">http://bit.ly/2olzYrF</a>	10 minutes 17 seconds
Kathy Dallest (2 <sup>nd</sup> Runner-up)	Telehealth	<a href="http://bit.ly/2o7Doiu">http://bit.ly/2o7Doiu</a>	10 minutes 54 seconds
Nazila Babakhani	Tourism	<a href="http://bit.ly/2o7jbJs">http://bit.ly/2o7jbJs</a>	9 minutes 01 second
Lisa Daunt	Architecture	<a href="http://bit.ly/2nlLWIQ">http://bit.ly/2nlLWIQ</a>	10 minutes 27 seconds
Tran Le Nghi Tran	Education	<a href="http://bit.ly/2nVq6rW">http://bit.ly/2nVq6rW</a>	10 minutes 54 seconds
<b>2017<sup>35</sup></b>			
Kyna Conn (Winner)	Medicine	<a href="https://youtu.be/gSkZdcNeilo">https://youtu.be/gSkZdcNeilo</a>	10 minutes 19 seconds
Cerys Downing (Runner-up)	Health	<a href="https://youtu.be/sW0E2AZDYVI">https://youtu.be/sW0E2AZDYVI</a>	9 minutes 40 seconds
Natalie Vear (2 <sup>nd</sup> Runner-up)	Human Movement	<a href="https://youtu.be/lxX3JidkRS0">https://youtu.be/lxX3JidkRS0</a>	8 minutes 54 seconds
Arun Balaji	Nanotechnology	<a href="https://youtu.be/KMAh94ycmwc">https://youtu.be/KMAh94ycmwc</a>	8 minutes 45 seconds
Imam Salehudin	Marketing	<a href="https://youtu.be/XYYYxgIsHCs">https://youtu.be/XYYYxgIsHCs</a>	10 minutes 15 seconds
<b>Panel C: PR Animations</b>			
Pitch Doctor	Primer #1: Pitching Research	<a href="http://bit.ly/2gZD6cG">http://bit.ly/2gZD6cG</a>	9 minutes 12 seconds
Pitch Doctor	Primer #2: Reverse Pitching	<a href="http://bit.ly/2DnxMbX">http://bit.ly/2DnxMbX</a>	9 minutes 25 seconds
Pitch Doctor & friends	Primer #3: Pitch "Sparring"	<a href="http://bit.ly/2rxxj4q">http://bit.ly/2rxxj4q</a>	6 minutes 21 seconds

<sup>35</sup> At their request, two finalist's pitches are embargoed until further notice: Daeul Jeong (Education) and Leslie Roberson (Biology).

**Figure 8: Summary of Pitching Research Letters (PRL)**

This figure lists existing Pitching Research Letters (PRL) published in the *Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems* (Panel A) and the *Accounting Research Journal* (Panel B). The PRLs are classified into one of three categories: (a) Real – an actual ex ante pitch; (b) Reverse – a reverse-engineered pitch of an existing paper; (c) Fantasy – a fantasy pitch of a hypothetical project.

	Year	Vol(No)	PRL	Type	Title
<b>Panel A: Journal of Accounting and Management Information Systems</b>					
1	2016	15(1)	Xue (2016)	Real	“Study of the contagion mechanism for opening risk of emerging equity markets in BRICS countries”
2	2016	15(1)	Rekker (2016)	Real	“Converting planetary boundaries into action, a new approach to meeting global greenhouse gas targets”
3	2016	15(1)	Shahzad (2016)	Real	“Private firms’ adaptation to climate change within the context of developing countries”
4	2016	15(1)	Rad (2106)	Real	“Pairs trading and market efficiency using an adaptive market hypothesis framework”
5	2016	15(2)	Ellis (2016)	Real	“To find a standard format that measures the activities of a Micro, Small or Medium Business Entity”
6	2016	15(2)	Rahman (2016)	Real	“Investor sentiment, Executive compensation, and Investment – Some International evidence”
7	2016	15(2)	Wallin & Spry (2016)	Real	“The role of corporate versus product brand dominance in brand portfolio overlap”
8	2016	15(3)	Atif (2016)	Real	“CEO compensation and firm’s cash holding”
9	2016	15(3)	Qureshi (2016)	Real	“Conceptualizing Schwartz values in university preference decisions”
10	2016	15(3)	McKay & Haque (2016)	Real	“A study of industry cost of equity in Australia using the Fama and French 5 Factor model and the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM)”
11	2016	15(3)	Ali (2016)	Real	“Corporate governance and stock liquidity in Australia”
12	2016	15(4)	Ratiu (2016)	Reverse	“A reversed engineered pitch based on Rietveld (2016), “Creating value through the freemium business model: A consumer perspective”
13	2016	15(4)	Sivathaasan (2016)	Real	“Corporate governance and leverage in Australia”
14	2016	15(4)	Brenner (2016)	Real	“Investigating chef-leader behaviour impacts on subordinate work team identification”
15	2017	16(1)	Ashraf & Manzoor (2017)	Real	“An examination of customer loyalty and customer participation in the service recovery process in the Pakistani hotel industry”
16	2017	16(1)	Salehudin (2017)	Reverse	“Reverse Engineering” the Pitching Research Template: A Simple Tool to Help Understand the Academic Literature”
17	2017	16(2)	Maxwell (2017)	Real	“Developing a Research Agenda through Pitching”
18	2017	16(3)	Iqbal & Ashraf (2017)	Real	“Impact of behavioral factors towards the adoption of mobile learning among higher education students in public and private universities”
19	2017	16(3)	Wong (2017)	Real	“How did they make it? An examination of online personal branding”
20	2017	16(3)	Dvoulety (2017)	Reverse	“Determinants of Nordic entrepreneurship”
21	2017	16(4)	Nguyen & Chen (2017)	Fantasy	“Gender impact of chasing dirty money policies”
22	2017	16(4)	Khong & Escobar (2017)	Fantasy	“New money: are we ready to take on the impacts of a cashless society?”
23	2017	16(4)	Martinek (2017)	Reverse	“The investment strategies of sovereign wealth funds: A reverse engineered pitch”
<b>Panel B: Accounting Research Journal</b>					
24	2017	30(1)	Lee & Turner (2017)	Real	“Do Government Administered Financial Rewards Undermine Firms’ Internal Whistle-Blowing Systems?”
25	2017	30(1)	Nguyen & Truong (2017)	Real	“Regulatory enforcement, financial reporting quality and investment efficiency”
26	2017	30(2)	McCredie (2017)	Real	“Equity market consequences of the social media revolution”
27	2017	30(2)	Ali (2017)	Real	“Women in the boardroom and their impact on default risk”
28	2017	30(2)	Zhang (2017)	Real	“Client Importance and Audit Quality, Office Level Evidence from the Banking Industry”
29	2017	30(3)	Clout (2017)	Real	“Corporate boards, monitoring and securities class actions”
30	2017	30(4)	Sinnewe (2017)	Real	“Examining the economic consequences of concise integrated reports”

**Figure 9: Pitching Research versus Three-minute Thesis (3MT)**

<b>Communication Dimension</b>	<b>Pitching Research</b>	<b>3MT</b>
Scope	About starting – starting a “conversation”	Oration
Dimensionality	Interactive/ bi-directional	One-way communication
Language	Technical concepts/language	Everyday language only
Target audience	Specialist audience – academic expert	“Lay” audience
Mode	Written/oral	Oral only
Privacy	Private/Public	Public only
Role of feedback	Facilitating technical feedback	Not really about feedback
Duration	8-15 minutes	3 minutes
Impact	Ongoing/long term	Short term
Role of thesis	Not just thesis research	Thesis focussed
Written Tool	Structured, simple, methodical, clear & focused	NA