Pitching business school researcher profiles

Faff, Robert; Mathuva, David; Brosnan, Mark; Hoffmann, Sebastian; Albu, Catalin; Ali, Searat; Axelsen, Micheal; Cornwell, Nikki; Gepp, Adrian; Gill, Chelsea; Honey, Karina; Malik, Ihtisham; Mehrotra, Vishal; Moses, Olayinka; Ratiu, Raluca Valeria; Tan, David; Tuszkiewicz, Maciej Andrzej

Journal of Accounting Literature

DOI:
10.1108/JAL-10-2022-0105

E-pub ahead of print: 21/09/2023

Peer reviewed version

Pitching Business School Researcher Profiles

JAL Structured Abstract

Purpose: We assess the perceived utility of a researcher profile pitch (RPP) template tool in a Business School setting.

Design/methodology/approach: We document a diversity of worked examples of the RPP. Using an auto-ethnographic research design, each showcased researcher reflects on the exercise, highlighting nuanced perspectives drawn from their personal experience. Collectively, these examples and associated independent narratives allow us to identify common themes that provide informative insights to potential users.

Findings: First, from our experience, the RPP tool is universally meaningful and can be used irrespective of research discipline or research experience. Second, it offers a distinct advantage over existing popular research profile platforms (e.g., Scopus), because it demands a focused "less", that delivers a meaningful "more". Further, the conciseness of the RPP design makes it readily amenable to iteration and dynamism. Third, we have identified specific situations of added value e.g., initiating research collaborations and academic job market preparation.

Implications: The RPP tool can provide the basis for developing a scalable interactive researcher exchange platform.

Originality: We argue that the RPP tool potentially adds meaningful incremental value relative to existing popular platforms for gaining researcher visibility. This additional value derives from the systematic RPP format, combined with the benefit of easy familiarity and strong emphasis on succinctness. Additionally, we argue that the RPP adds a depth of nuanced novel information often not contained in other platforms e.g., around the dimensions of "data" and "tools". Further, the RPP gives the researcher a "personality", most notably through the dimensions of "contribution" and "other considerations".

Keywords: Pitching research; Researcher profile; Business school disciplines, Profile platforms

JEL classifications: G00; M00; A10; B00; D00; E00

1. Introduction

The field of academic research has seen a significant evolution in the way researchers present their profiles and communicate their work. Faff (2022) introduced the Research Profile Pitching (RPP) template tool, an adaptation of the Pitching Research Framework (PRF) initially proposed by Faff (2015, 2021a).[1] The RPP tool, like its predecessor, employs an 11-element/1,000-word design, but with a unique focus on showcasing a researcher's signature qualities (Faff, 2022).

The RPP template begins with four "anchors" that define a researcher's profile: research bio title, research question themes, signature key papers, and researcher motivation. It then incorporates three basic building blocks from the PRF: idea, data, and tools. However, in the RPP, these elements are used to identify core themes across a researcher's signature papers or broader research trajectory (Faff, 2022).

Maintaining this “core themes” perspective, the tool continues with three more elements that address key questions: what's new, so what, and contribution. Finally, it concludes with a catch-all item, "other considerations," applied to the researcher rather than a specific research project. This design aims to provide a cohesive and engaging pitch of a researcher's profile (Faff, 2022).

The motivation behind the RPP tool, as Faff (2022, p. 1) explains, is to address the common issue of researchers not effectively communicating their profiles. Traditional CVs, despite numerous advice on their design, often become long-winded and inefficient in portraying essential elements of a researcher's profile.

Our paper aims to extend Faff's (2022) work by presenting worked examples of the RPP in the accounting field and demonstrating its universality across various allied scholarly disciplines in a Business School setting. The paper also includes reflections from researchers

[1] See Bui (2021) for a detailed qualitative study that critically explores the extent to which key end users perceive and/or derive (net) benefit from Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF.

on their experience using the RPP tool, providing valuable insights for potential users.[2] Collectively, these examples and associated independent narratives allow us to identify some common themes that provide informative insights, especially, when every reader of our paper will inevitably ask themselves the obvious question: "Should I bother to give the RPP a try myself?"

In contrast to the publicly available online platforms that provide a researcher profile service (discussed in the next section), the conciseness of the RPP makes its design readily amenable to be iterative and dynamic. It can change as a researcher's interests, specialisations and research focus change. Rather than display a static historical list of publications with some key words and brief bio, the RPP's potential living nature is not lost on its users. When engaging with the RPP, one of the authors of this paper, data analytics Early Career Researcher (ECR) Cornwell, notes that the template was "*instrumental in getting me thinking about my strategic direction as a researcher – do I want to or should I be specialising…[as]opposed to remaining broad-based? I expect this will be guided by the outcomes of my research and will evolve over time, so I look forward to revisiting my researcher profile to reflect on this*". Dr Mehrotra, an ECR in Marketing, agrees that the RPP is "*iterative and must necessarily be approached as such*". While experienced Business Information Systems (BIS) researcher Dr Axelsen likewise cautions, "*discipline is needed in regularly revisiting and honing the pitch over the long term*".

[2] The lead author contacted a wide range of researchers who he knew had a meaningful prior exposure to the original PRF tool and who might be interested to be involved in a project that explored his idea of creating a "profiling" version of the PRF. He stressed the importance of achieving a diversity of disciplines and also to make sure we have good examples from Mentors and from ECRs. In line with this, the lead author targeted researchers with a wide range of research interests, across a spectrum of early, mid and later stage research experience. The lead author asked each potential collaborator for three related actions: 1. A completed researcher profile pitch to be exhibited as an example. 2. A few paragraphs of discussion/ reflections related to their profile pitch example. 3. A commitment to help polish the full paper write up. The lead author made it clear that a meaningful engagement on all three required tasks would justify and be rewarded by co-authorship on the paper. A total of 18 potential collaborators were approached, from which 16 enthusiastically delivered on the 3 required items and, thus, secured co-authorship rights on the submitted paper.

A group of key benefits that our users find is the way the RPP tool provides an introspective examination of their research achievements and goals. Data analytics Associate Professor Gepp, an experienced researcher, notes, "*I found this a helpful process as it challenges me to identify commonalities and clearly articulate research priorities*." While experienced finance researcher Dr Tan states, "*it forces me to identify the overarching themes in my research career and map out future trajectories.*" Similarly, Axelsen finds the framework useful to "*prioritise and develop your future research program*." The Accounting ECR Dr Brosnan finds the RPP framework useful in its "*ability to help me (initially) converse with myself as much as with other researchers.*"

The collaborating researchers on this paper found other, external benefits to their RPP experiences too. Gepp adds, "*the tool will be useful in early discussions with potential new research students and early-career research mentees to evaluate the alignment of research interests*." Axelsen finds the framework "*creates a document that makes your research narrative more accessible to others.*" Cornwall's research interests and experiences are linked closely to industry and the RPP provides a "*good reminder of the value of starting with the 'why' to capture the buy-in of others.*"

A common theme among the researchers using the RPP template tool is its potential role in the academic job market and promotion interviews. Finance ECR Dr Malik believes that the tool "*contains answers to most of the questions asked in a typical interview for academic (research) position*." Good news for soon to be on the job market BIS ECR Honey who now feels at least *"moderately prepared to pitch myself and my research in upcoming job interviews."* Similarly, Management ECR Dr Gill notes in hindsight, how useful the framework would have been in "*the interview process*" for a recent academic role. Alas, the template entered her toolbox after her interview, but she will no doubt have future opportunities.

Notably, while multiple benefits of the tool seem clear, approximately half the RPP pitchers in our research team specifically highlight that the process is challenging in some way.

Indeed, Mehrotra almost perversely notes, *"because of the challenging nature of this exercise, it was ultimately truly rewarding."* Fortunately, the pitchers also provide a common tip to getting the most out of the template – to follow the prompts/cues provided. Gill highlights, "*the cued template raised useful prompts for each of the items.*" Mehrotra again finds himself in agreement as, "*despite having experience with the PRF, I found the cues provided in Exhibit 1 of Faff (2022) were crucial in understanding and completing this template.*"

It is no coincidence that strong similarities exist between the PRF and RPP frameworks. The Faff (2022) RPP has a deliberate injection of "DNA" from the Faff (2015, 2021a) PRF. Both frameworks employ a "four-three-two-one+1" system of summation. Moreover, as Brosnan notes "*both templates aim to excel in distilling complex ideas into straightforward, yet manageable and linked, conversational chunks.*" The similarities make the transition a familiar one, but even so the differences are more than subtle. Dr Ali notes the "*PRF focuses on the research project – namely, the 'product', the RPP focuses on the researcher – namely, the 'producer'.*" A point not lost on Honey, as she perceptively positions the RPP tool in her career trajectory by observing, "*I started my doctoral studies by learning how to pitch research with Prof. Robert Faff. It seems appropriate to be concluding my doctoral studies by learning how to pitch myself (the researcher) with Prof. Robert Faff.*"

Even though the RPP is aimed at novice and early career researchers, the experienced researchers in our team also found benefits. Experienced interdisciplinary researcher Professor Hoffmann finds that the framework helps with communication. Specifically, he notes that it "*is essential for interdisciplinary researchers to communicate their research interests, contribution and relevance in a way that speaks to, and can be understood by, researchers from other disciplines, too.*" We argue that the RPP has immense value for researchers across the experience spectrum – from those at the very start of their research journey right through to those researchers with substantial experience. To support our claim that the RPP has universal utility, our paper provides evidence, in the form of exemplar pitches alongside narrative discussion from researchers of varying experience across multiple business disciplines.

We argue that Endenich and Trapp (2018) allude to one core aspect of what the RPP aims to achieve: that by building a network of credible, responsible and committed academics, this signals the research community to generate novel and innovative research output. In response to Endenich and Trapp (2018), Roberts (2018) calls upon accounting researcher communities to embrace substantive actions to further and develop broader, more relevant and inclusive research agendas. The perceived stagnation in accounting research requires joint efforts by accounting researchers to engage policy makers to intervene in resource realignment, with a view to stimulate innovative research in accounting (Wilkinson & Durden, 2015).

Extant scholarly profiles with bibliometric indicators (e.g., the h-index) are useful in ranking scholars (Luo et al., 2023). They however fail to provide a standardised and structured context tailored for scholarly engagement, with accompanying support infrastructure to spur research and academic engagement for higher impact. The RPP seeks to convey the human-to-human communication about a particular researcher's genome for his career growth, development, and progression right from novices, Higher Degree by Research (HDR) student, PhD student, Post-Doc, ECR, Mid Career Researcher (MCR), Experienced Researchers to Senior Research Professor.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides a brief contextualization of online researcher profiling platforms, culminating in a pitch for the special role that the RPP can play. Then, Section 3 briefly outlines Faff's (2022) adaptation of the PRF (Faff, 2015, 2021a), to create the RPP template tool. Section 4 showcases some worked examples of the RPP and associated reflections for accounting researchers, with a mix of research experience. Section 5 does the same for multi-disciplinary and non-accounting researchers. Section 6 provides a brief roundup discussion that pulls together some of the key themes emanating from the reflections presented in the prior two sections. The penultimate section speculates on a broader benefit of the RPP, specifically on how it can assist with "dismantling boundaries of accounting research". The final section concludes the paper.

2. Contextualizing online researcher profiling platforms

We acknowledge that there are many and varied publicly available online platforms that can be viewed as a means of achieving some type of researcher profile visibility. Prominent platforms include: Scopus; ORCID; Web of Science; Google Scholar; SSRN; ResearchGate; and Elsevier SciVal Benchmarking. Indeed, there is a growing literature that investigates the relative merits of alternative profiling approaches. For example, López-Hermoso et al. (2020) focus on analyzing and comparing the main systems for the creation of research profiles, such as online platforms or social research networks. Their advice when deciding which platform to use, academics should consider the content's accuracy, transparency and integrity as some sites can be manipulated via false quotes from the internet which increase citations.[3]

Mondal and Mondal (2022) discuss the importance of maintaining an online presence for researchers and authors, emphasizing the role of academic platforms, social media, and personal websites or blogs. The authors argue that online profiles are an integral part of modern scientific publications, providing a forum for showcasing academic details, publications, and peer reviews. They also highlight the necessity of regular updates and engagement with these profiles for optimum usage.

Online profiles are increasingly used to identify academic mentors, find collaborators, reviewers and editors as well as establishing and enhancing scholarly networks (Gasparyan et al., 2017). Researchers are confronted with a vast choice of established online profiling platforms. These include bibliometric-based scholarly platforms (for example, Google Scholar, Web of Science, Scopus and PubMed), social media platforms (for example, Twitter, Instagram

[3] The interested reader should note that there first three tables contain useful comparative summary information of the various platforms and bibliometric indexes.

and Facebook), and scholarly networking platforms, that blend elements of the first two (for example, ResearchGate and Academia.edu). Having to choose amongst a wide array of platforms begs two questions. First, which platform should researchers use? And, second, why do we need the RPP if so many other profiling platforms exist? We address both of these questions in the remainder of this section.

Social media platforms, and their associated indicators, such as tweets, shares, likes, blog posts and mentions, are an increasingly popular way for academics to disseminate scholarly news and updates (Ferreira et al., 2021). Such social media indicators are known as alternative metrics, or “altmetrics”. Notably, there is little correlation between altmetrics and traditional academic productivity indicators, such as journal citations and papers authored (de Winter, 2015; Haustein et al., 2015; Ferreira et al., 2021). Ferreira et al. (2021) conclude from these findings that social media is a way for researchers to gain “symbolic” capital. While researchers appreciate the customisability of their social media profiles, relative to traditional bibliometric-based scholarly platforms, the less stringent requirements for access to and the use of social media platforms has led to fake profiles (Gasparyan et al., 2017).

So why then do researchers engage in social media? Notable reasons include self-promotion, networking and popularising their science communications (Ferreira et al., 2021). While all these reasons are valid, they are only tangentially related to widely used and accepted indicators of scholarly productivity. Another important reason for researchers to embrace social media platforms is their growing dissatisfaction with traditional bibliometric-based scholarly platforms (Ferreira et al., 2021; Haustein et al., 2015). Dissatisfaction stems from frustrations with technical errors due to the automation of data processing; proliferation of predatory journal profiles and articles; lack of quality control with irrelevant and poor-quality items automatically added; the lack of consistency across different bibliometric platforms;[4] and the lack of customisability of user profiles (Gasparyan et al., 2017; López-Cózar et al., 2014).

Academic social networks such as ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and Mendeley not only provide the researcher with a profile but also offer them networking and communication opportunities. Academic profile platforms like Scopus, ORCID, and Web of Science allow researchers to create a unique ID for easy identification and provide access to their publications. Some of these profile platforms also offer tools for measuring the impact of a researcher's work. However, they do not provide a direct means of communication among researchers.

What sets RPP apart from other profile platforms is its focused approach. By demanding less, we argue that RPP delivers more meaningful results. Specifically, RPP engages researchers in a meaningful exercise to create their research profile (or research narrative) in a succinct and structured manner for pitching it to the specific audience (e.g., potential collaborators, employers, or even the researcher her-/himself) for a specific purpose, such as initiating research collaborations, preparing for the academic job market, and planning for career progression.

Moreover, RPP also creates a more level playing field for researchers as it does not discriminate in terms of the seniority of the researcher. Conventionally, by virtue of their additional time in the research field, veteran researchers will have better bibliometric indicators (for example article and citation counts) than novices. Social media platforms go some way to alleviating this disadvantage as a novice researcher can tweet, share or post from their very first article.

In essence, we argue that the RPP tool adds meaningful incremental value relative to these popular platforms. This additional value derives from the systematic RPP template

[4] Martin-Martin et al (2018) find, in their sample of 811 researchers from, ironically, the bibliometrics community, that Google Scholar displays a median citation count per article almost double that of Research Gate and two and half times that of ResearchID.

format, combined with the benefit of easy familiarity and strong emphasis on succinctness. Collectively, these features make the RPP tool a more practically accessible snapshot of information, that helps avoid many pitfalls that novice researchers easily fall for, if left to their own devices.[5]

Additionally, we argue that the RPP adds a depth of nuanced information often not contained in the other platforms e.g., around the dimensions of "data" and "tools". It also gives the researcher a "personality", most notably through the dimensions of "contribution" and "other considerations". This is something that most other platforms ignore. Moreover, the RPP template succinctly collates much of the information contained in other profile platforms into a single dynamic repository.

Established profile platforms extend the notion of a traditional CV, and encourage a comprehensive display of publication outputs. The RPP template requires a three-paper researcher snapshot. This can appear overly prescriptive, and for some users might be regarded as a critical flaw of this tool. However, we echo a core "pitching" message dating back to Faff (2015) that "more is less" and "less is more". By emphasising signature papers, the RPP provides the reader with a clear idea of the researcher's current research interests and direction(s), as opposed to a muddled and, possibly, turgid chronological history of past successes and, potentially, lapsed directions.[6]

[5] For example, anecdotal evidence suggests that (largely due to inexperience) novice researchers are more prone to excess verbiage, unfocussed narrative, relevant information omission, internal inconsistency, unclear messaging about the type of research collaboration needed or desired. As we will argue and illustrate below, these and other communication mistakes can be mitigated using the RPP.

[6] A good analogy, drawn from the discipline of physics, is speed (the raw rate of motion) versus velocity (directional speed). The researcher-focused platforms in effect accommodate raw "speed", in terms of the number of publications over time. In contrast, the RPP adds the dimension of direction, making it akin to a researcher measure of "velocity" (i.e., an insightful blend of publication speed and direction).

3. Faff's (2022) framework for pitching researcher capability/expertise[7]

Faff's (2015, 2021a) original PRF tool is designed to enable highly inexperienced researchers to meaningfully communicate on a research topic with an expert in the field. Faff (2022) argues that the basic design of the PRF is ripe for fruitful adaptation. Accordingly, Faff (2022) creates a simple variant of the pitching tool that readily achieves an efficient presentation of researcher profile information.

To this end, there are three simple, pragmatic "rules". First, he takes the view that the 11-item structure of the PRF is well-known and popular. Hence, likewise adopting here an 11-item structure will secure a major advantage of familiarity. Second, the perceived utility and appeal of the "co-ordinated harmony" that is collectively achieved with the set of PRF concepts suggests that, as much as possible, the same or very similar item labels to the original PRF, should be retained. Third, given that the PRF item labels are largely preserved, the primary source of novelty and utility to emanate from the current essay must derive from the creation of a set of fit-for-purpose "cues" and guidelines. In other words, it is the cued version of the adapted profile template that will constitute the main innovation of this essay, when compared to the original PRF tool.

Given the above discussion, Exhibit 1 presents the cued version of the adapted PRF. A brief discussion of the RPP template tool now follows, highlighting the most salient observations. First, as is the case with the conventional PRF, the RPP template begins with a set of items that define the "big picture anchors", but in this setting it's the big picture framing taken from the perspective of the research profile of a given researcher. Second, there are some slight modifications of the item labels that define the big picture. Instead of "working title" in Item (A), we see "Research Bio Title". Here, "bio" is short-hand for "biographical" and the

---

[7] The SSRN paper, Faff (2022), is written by the lead author of the current paper. As such, the current paper is, in effect, a revised and enhanced version of the SSRN paper. Most notably, Section 2 herein, borrows very heavily from the unpublished Faff (2022).

cues match this label requiring basic identifying information: the researcher's name, along with various key personal information regarding the current research/working context. Instead of "research question" [RQ] in Item (B), we have "research question themes". The idea here is for the researcher to think about any "signature" themes around RQs that they have researched. A persuasive and meaningful RQ theme can be indicative of some degree of strategic research thinking and, hopefully, might even reflect a live, ongoing, and vibrant research "program". Further, in Item (C), "key papers" become "signature key papers", while "motivation" is extended to (somewhat grandly) include "research manifesto" in Item (D).

Third, labels for Items (E) to (G), the three basic building blocks, remain the same as for the original PRF: Idea, Data and Tools. That said, the general thinking here is to focus on "… identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory".[8] Faff (2022) asks for "up to" 3 angles relevant to each item; up to 3 core research ideas; or up to 3 common themes in data; or up to 3 themes across research tools.

Fourth, labels for the two key questions are also preserved in Items (H) and (I): what's new? and so what?, as is for the one bottom line: contribution (Item (J)). But again, the general thinking for all of these is to focus on *identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory*. For each of these items [(E) to (J)], I ask for "up to" 3 examples – the choice of how many (1, 2 or 3) is left to the researcher's judgement e.g., on whether their signature works are sufficiently tightly themed, that they can be adequately captured with fewer than three angles.

Fifth, the final item "other considerations" [Item (K)] is also retained from the original PRF. Some quite useful additional researcher profile information can be conveyed here

[8] While there is no objective way to define "recent research trajectory", heuristically, one might wish to place an upper timeframe limit equal to the most recent 10 years or so for senior researchers (say, with > 30 years' experience) and that timeframe might narrow toward maybe the most recent five years for researchers who have much less experience (say, with 10 years or fewer).

including: current career stage; general type of research collaboration sought or offered; specific areas of expertise that you seek from and/or offer to a collaborator; your general target journal strategy; Top 3 ambitious target journals and your 3 “floor” journal targets.

Finally, in the cues for Item (C) “Signature Key Papers” and again in Item (K) “Other Considerations”, there is reference to CRediT i.e., the Contributor Roles Taxonomy.[9] The inclusion of these CRediT roles in the research profile pitch framework can be viewed as a subtle way to encourage researchers to embrace the principles of responsible science (Aman et al., 2019; Faff, 2021b). Faff (2022) argues that we should encourage researchers to seriously consider, ex-ante, the division of duties across the team of potential collaborators, both in terms of the type of roles landing with each person, as well as the balance of workloads across the team associated with each set of roles. Among other things, this process should then induce an ex-ante consideration of the threshold needed to justify co-authorship status.

[9] Adapted from Elsevier – see: https://bit.ly/2ZosKsd. See Brand et al. (2015).

4. Worked examples of the *RPP* template tool for accounting researchers[10]

4.1 Accounting researcher profile pitch – financial markets (Mathuva)

Exhibit 2 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I show how it applies to my situation as a mentor in the accounting space. Since my early interactions with Faff's (2015) PRF in November 2014, I have developed over time to be a "critical realist" in my approach to research. Initially, and as a very novice and quite "green" ECR then, it did not occur to me quite clearly what the PRF was meant to accomplish. One would easily "write it off" as an exercise in futility. However, this has not been the case.

Be it in my engagement with peers, doctoral and other students, and researchers generally, I find myself invoking the guiding principles in the PRF throughout my research engagement, from the project's inception to disposition. The framework, together with its accompanying pieces, has shaped my approach to research – with my initial experiences having been an uphill task. Originally, I would struggle when employing the PRF in lifting my research ideas off the ground. This was primarily evident as I worked through the research question, motivation and more importantly the three "building blocks" and contribution of my research projects. As is the case with most studies at inception, formulating a clear, succinct, and convincing research question was often a challenge, and a daunting task. Over the years, and with lots of sustained practice, consistency, and dedication, I have been able to, with relative ease, develop the various PRF parts, albeit having to revisit them time and again as I sharpen the focus of my research works-in-progress.

Fast forward, and seven years later, I have at a very personal level, "institutionalised" the PRF in all my research works, be they fundamental as well as applied, consciously and/or

[10] Note that: (a) for each of the sub-section examples in this Section, the narrative is written in first-person form, from the perspective of the RPP example "owner"; (b) The text discussion in this section does not work through any of the pitches in detail – such information can be gleaned directly from the relevant pitch exhibits. Rather our goal here is to give some relevant context to each example, which allows readers to decide whether they wish to look more closely at the full details in the pitches or not.; and (c) the RPP worked examples are relegated to an online Internet appendix to conserve journal space.

unconsciously. The PRF has become so central to me such that I have made attempts to "spread the gospel" to my peers, students and any research forum I find myself in, especially the ECR forums. Just as a preacher ensures that the Bible is very close at hand as they engage and for reference, I always utilise the PRF whenever I have a research project at hand. The PRF has helped me engage in critical reflections on research projects, not only with my peers, but also with doctoral, master-level students and ECRs.

Another important dimension in my sustained and consistent interactions with the PRF is the remarkable growth in the quality of research output as demonstrated in (i) the calibre of research journals in which my research projects have been published, (ii) the shorter period taken to shape my research papers to publishable quality, and (iii) the level of engagement with my peers, students and ECRs when providing feedback on their research ideas. In other words, the PRF has offered a "solution" to the age-old question: how can research be efficiently and effectively executed and taught in higher levels? Overall, the PRF has been a disruptive and evolutionary innovation toward demystifying the seemingly difficult experience in conducting meaningful and responsible research. The advent of the RPP to me, in a relative sense, is more of a challenge for those of us who have utilised the PRF over the years. I see the RPP mostly as a way of "self-reflecting" on what I have achieved over the years, and a very good check on the trajectory and journey I have taken as a researcher, right from a novice to where I am today.

4.2 Accounting researcher profile pitch – accounting as a social construct (Albu)

Exhibit 3 shows a worked example of the RPP template in which I pitch my researcher profile as an accounting researcher and educator. I heard about the RPR tool from attending a presentation by one of this paper's lead co-authors (Hoffmann) made at my university as part of a research seminar. I was impressed with the very idea of pitching individual researcher profiles in lieu of a resume or CV. I even suggested the possibility of extending this exercise to universities, departments, or schools, as they wish to integrate into an international world. I believe that this gives educators and researchers alike the chance to both reflect on their existing path and project on potential future options.

At first glance, I found the idea of writing such a piece for myself as challenging as I perceived it as a moment of truth, a reality check, a way to check whether my research has produced any "significant" results. While I think that the jury is still out on this, it gave me the opportunity to review my research and identify common ideas and themes. I must admit that it solidified my view that I am interested in conducting contextually informed research, one that starts (to my mind) from meaningful matters in the real world and explains differences as we live in an ever-globalized world. Speaking more to the point, my research is qualitative and interpretative in nature, mostly based on interview data. I find this method as being able to speak to the nuances and characteristics of various contexts and provide explanations for certain situations.

While completing this profile, I somehow felt that this only represents me partially, that is, only my research interests (and for good reason, of course). Two other important parts of my academic career, namely, teaching and administration, condition to a significant degree the extent to which I can conduct research. While the former of these "other" activities occupied a significant amount of time during my early academic career, the latter one represents a central part of my mid-career.

In conclusion, I believe that the RPP tool provides significant ways to intensify collaboration between researchers who are not familiar with the profile of other researchers. It also gives a researcher the opportunity to take stock of where s/he is as an academic, as well as to potentially find other research avenues that were overlooked before.

4.3 Management accounting researcher profile pitch (Moses)

Exhibit 4 shows the RPP template tool worked example to pitch my profile as a management accounting researcher. Although, by design, the RPP is estimated to take only a couple of hours, I found myself spending an entire day introspectively working on it. Rather than devoting most of this time on simply completing it, I found myself immersed in the critical evaluation of what now appears to be my researcher portfolio. This introspective process triggered several important and self-exploratory thoughts. The dominant internal debate revolved around whether, as an emerging MCR, my researcher portfolio has been well-articulated and is easy to communicate to others. I found the RPP a most valuable tool for my ensuing reflective journey.

What impresses me the most about using the RPP to pitch my researcher profile is the opportunity it provides to reflect on my publication portfolio. The issue I spent considerable time pondering was the importance of identifying an overarching theme that ties together my published works, in a manner that synthesises and distils their essence. In the end, I discovered that, while my research portfolio is intelligently linked across important areas of my research motivation, this coherence is not effectively signalled through my traditional CV, which merely lists them, without establishing any commonality across them.

Moreover, while I tend to refer to my research focus or interest as "XY" this claim has to be verified by a review of the collection of my works as highlighted in the RPP's "section C: Signature key papers". Notably, the result from the exercise in section C may either confirm one's initial claim or point out different emerging research themes. In the latter case, rather than affirming the XY domain, one might discover that one is rather drawn to "YZ" or "XYZ". While such insight is highly valuable, I suspect that researchers might not consciously notice the metamorphosis of their research interests (or, domains) amid the *publication chase*.[11] This is where the RPP is very useful, too. If updated regularly, the RPP can help capture and articulate one's changing research interests, areas of focus and trajectories. If engaged with continuously, the RPP can help the researcher discover their salient or innate underemphasised research prowess. I am pleased that I completed the RPP exercise at this time. The time spent on the tool was well invested in looking at the way my research portfolio has grown and diversified, yet with a strong commonality of motivations and a clear focus of what matters and what should be pursued.

Completing the RPP was not a burdensome task, thanks to the clear guidelines (cues) provided within each section. However, I did find sections (H) to (J) to be somewhat complementary, and I felt there was a risk of repetition had I not carefully thought through what was essential for each of these sections. Drawing from my experience, I found it helpful to reference the foundational source of the RPP, namely the PRF. Since my initial encounter with the PRF in 2015, it has been a useful tool for various research activities. I have utilised the PRF for research collaborations, teaching purposes, and grant applications. As a result, the flowthrough effect of the PRF in terms of engaging with the RPP is much appreciated.

Although the PRF and RPP are two separate and distinct tools, I believe that both are vital and should be used together by researchers. While the PRF can help convey a researcher's project-specific ideas, it does not provide potential collaborators with insights into one's research strengths, capabilities, or domain. This underscores the critical importance of viewing the RPP as a complement to the PRF. From my experience, utilising both tools creates a

[11] Arguably, it is not always a straightforward task for researchers to identify their competitive research advantage. They may struggle to recognise their own strengths and areas of interests. For instance, if a researcher determines their research value/interest based on the ranking of the journals in which their work is published or the number of citations it receives, they run the risk of overlooking their core signature papers and their related competitive advantage. This is particularly true if their signature papers are not published in top-ranked journals or do not receive the highest citation counts among their publications. Once again, careful introspection and reflection is crucial to ensure that the researcher effectively conveys their research personality to colleagues, potential collaborators, and employers. It is pivotal to reflect deeply in order to ensure one is indeed accurately communicating one's research identity and interests to others.

comprehensive informational set that showcases both my research projects and my researcher personality.

4.4 ECR Accounting researcher profile pitch – experimental accounting (Brosnan)

As an ECR researcher at the pointy end of their PhD, currently under examination, the RPP template tool entering my realm has had exquisite timing.[12] For me, the PhD has been a lonely journey. Suddenly I find myself in the wide-open world of experienced and reputable academic researchers, an exciting prospect as I seek collaborative opportunities that contrast starkly to the solitude of my PhD (mostly) solo grind.

I have always thought of my PhD as an apprenticeship in research. Like all "tradies", once qualified I am now ready to "ply my trade", namely to work on collaborative projects in multiple, larger, and more diverse teams on a wide array of interesting and exciting projects. But why would any of these teams want or need me? If I cannot adequately answer that question to my own satisfaction, how can I convey to others my involvement in projects that will make a meaningful contribution?

Exhibit 5 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as an Accounting ECR researcher. The RPP tool shares much of its DNA with its parent, the PRF. Both templates excel in distilling complex ideas into straightforward, yet manageable and interlinked, conversational chunks. The beauty of these conversational chunks is their ability to help me (initially) converse with myself as much as with other researchers. I find "self-conversations", for lack of a better term, are necessary for me to help arrest the feeling of imposter syndrome that has been ever present from the earliest stages of my academic career. No matter how much I learn and achieve, the only guaranteed result is seeing how much more there is to learn and achieve.

[12] The good news is that since drafting this initial reflection, I have now successfully passed the PhD examination.

The RPP process helps me understand myself as a researcher. It brings my skills, interests and potential contributions into sharper focus. For me, the real genius of the older PRF is not the process of formally completing and circulating the template, although that is an important outcome in its own right. But rather the real benefit is the instinctive training it provides for unplanned research conversations with colleagues. Much like a gymnast trains to commit their movements to muscle memory, an ECR, like me, can use the PRF template to commit to memory the key elements experienced researchers want and need to know. No matter what is your standing in the academic community, one certainty is that you will be time poor. The RPP tool has already begun to help fulfil the same function for pitching me as a researcher that the PRF has for pitching my research.

Therefore, the real benefits to the RPP tool, is the ability to get ideas straight in my own head. However, the flexibility of both frameworks allows the communication to travel beyond the bounds of my own thinking and into worthwhile conversations with my colleagues and peers. Although I have not had the chance to formally use the RPP template much beyond my initial preparation for the purpose of the current study, I have already begun to reflect on how to begin research projects with colleagues and effectively convey how my involvement will make a meaningful contribution to those projects. Post PhD, as I seek to supervise other HDR candidates, I will be encouraging the use of the RPP and PRF tools as ways of organising, developing, and communicating research (and researcher) thoughts and ideas.

4.5 Transitioning ECR Accounting researcher profile pitch (Ratiu)

Exhibit 6 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool portraying me as an accounting academic who is currently transitioning from ECR to MCR. Many years ago, at the crossroads of finishing my PhD and going on the job market, I asked Professor Faff permission to use the PRF which he had pitched several months earlier at the AMIS Conference in Bucharest in 2013. It was the first time I had used the PRF, and it helped me in getting a postdoctoral position. Based on this PRF, in 2015, I published "Financial reporting of European banks during the GFC: a pitch". The PRF is straightforward to use and throughout the years I have found it extremely helpful in organizing prospective research work and research proposals for grants. I continue to use the PRF also with the reverse engineering method, in particular to organize my literature reviews.

When the new RPP tool was publicly launched by Faff (2022) I immediately wanted to apply it for my own profile as a researcher. I am now at the crossroads between early and mid-career, almost ten years after I received my PhD. Even though I was familiar with the RPP format from having used the PRF numerous times over the past years, applying the RPP to myself did not come without challenges. It compelled me to delve deeper than I normally do when drafting a typical CV format profile, because I had to formulate a series of personal research statements for the first time in my academic life. What I found most challenging was writing my 'Research Manifesto'. While it is comparatively easy to write about the motivation of a research paper, formulating my own personal motivation was anything but easy and I am sure that every time I revisit my RPP, this motivation is the first element to review.

It was while working on my RPP that I was able to highlight a common theme of my main research papers which is finding new angles of analyzing companies' financial and sustainable performance, in the light of new reporting policies around the world. This exercise also helped me to better inform other parts of the RPP, such as items (I) and (J). It's not often you are put on the spot like this and asked to evaluate yourself in terms of how meaningful your research is and how you do contribute. Typical evaluations you get/do are more quantitative in nature (e.g., the number of papers published, the Journal Impact Factor (JIF) of the journal where your paper was published), but none of these are essentially about meaningfulness. For me, the items of the RPP template are very important because they will help me in the future to be more focused and keep an eye my goal as expressed in my Research Manifesto: to do meaningful, responsible research which makes a (small, incremental) difference.

Like many, I feel that the pandemic put me off course somewhat. As such, I will use the RPP to reconnect to the academic world and find new co-authors and new research projects. Moreover, using tools like the RPP, will keep me more “in touch” with myself.

4.6 ECR Accounting researcher profile pitch (Tuszkiewicz)

Exhibit 7 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as an accounting ECR researcher. When I first saw the tool, I thought it was an excellent idea for a young researcher because (1) we are often asked to give a brief note of ourselves, and (2) it is difficult to be concise and informative in such a task. I think completing the RPP is a bit easier than using the PRF tool because the RPP tool is somewhat retrospective, as you summarize yourself and your work, i.e. you essentially refer the things that are out there already. In contrast, when you use PRF, you try to shape a new research idea, which is sometimes still vague and often difficult to put into the PRF format.

It is certainly helpful to show a consistent image of yourself, and the RPP makes it easier to ensure all the pieces of your own researcher profile align. I found that the process helps focusing on underlying points relevant to my current research interests and the projects I want to be involved in in the near future. However, I noticed that demonstrating my interest in new topics or methods works only within the ‘other considerations’ section.

The three signature key papers entered in section C set a tone for further points, so selecting the most appropriate ones felt crucial to me. I have asked myself two questions: Should I or should I not include papers that are not written in English? Should I or should I not include papers written in English but published in local (national) journals? In the end I decided to focus on publications that show a cohesive stream of research. During the task, I also noticed how I portrayed myself as a researcher in a rather narrow stream of research, while I considered myself to be more diverse. Completing this task helped me revisit myself, my work, and get a better understanding of where I am and what I want to do in the future.

Looking at it now, finished, I am pleased with my profile outcome. Although it is a bit narrow in terms of my research interests, it shows a clear picture of me as a researcher. I think that the tool could also be utilized by researchers to craft different RPP applications, if they are working in a number of distinct research streams. The RPP showcases your strengths and weaknesses in any research area and it may be a good indicator of how you might be perceived by potential collaborators, mentors or even editors. In fact, that could help you assess what you may need to focus on to emerge and grow in a particular area of research expertise.

5. Worked examples of the *RPP* template tool for multidisciplinary researchers[13]

5.1 Interdisciplinary researcher profile pitch (Hoffmann)

Exhibit 8 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I emphasize how the tool can be applied to an interdisciplinary researcher in accounting. Specifically, it demonstrates how accounting may be interconnected with the social sciences, in particular history, politics, and sociology. While the exhibit is intended to stand for itself, I wish to offer the following comments. These are hoped to help understand my thinking in using the framework for the specific example and provide some inspiration for those interested to pitch their "interdisciplinary" profile.

You will note that in Item (B), I define both a primary and a secondary research theme. While the primary theme is a topic that is open to broad scientific inquiry by many disciplines, the secondary theme specifies how my research interest is located in the realm of accounting. This helps communicate both the interdisciplinary dimension of my work as well as how it connects with accounting (regulation). To further document my interdisciplinary profile, and also to give an idea of journals I consider relevant for my research early in the RPP template (and not only in Item (K)), I have selected papers in Item (C) which explore a variety of interdisciplinary perspectives on accounting, have emerged from work with colleagues of diverse backgrounds, and are not only published in accounting journals.

For Item (E) I chose to emphasize my interest in "the role of accounting" through all three ideas. One might argue that this is "cheating" a bit, since it may come across as being just one idea. However, I maintain that the three ideas are essentially different, and that

[13] Note that: (a) for each of the sub-section examples in this Section, the narrative is written in first-person form, from the perspective of the RPP example "owner"; (b) The text discussion in this section does not work through any of the pitches in detail – such information can be gleaned directly from the relevant pitch exhibits. Rather our goal here is to give some relevant context to each example, which allows readers to decide whether they wish to look more closely at the full details in the pitches or not.; and (c) the RPP worked examples are relegated to an online Internet appendix to conserve journal space.

continuously repeating "the role of accounting" serves to (a) connect the three ideas with each other, and (b) highlight prominently what is my overarching research interest.

In Items (H) through (J) I aim to flesh out what are the big statements, views, and arguments of my research. It is essential for interdisciplinary researchers to communicate their research interests, contribution and relevance in a way that speaks to, and can be understood by, researchers from other disciplines, too. Therefore, these items need to be carefully crafted not only to be persuasive to peers within the researcher's core discipline, but beyond, both in terms of topics and themes as well as terminology and language.

5.2 Data analytics researcher profile pitch (Gepp)

Exhibit 9 showcases a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a senior researcher in the realm of data analytics. While having a niche focus on corporate fraud, I have applied my skills in a wide variety of areas, so I found it tough to keep within the focused bounds of the RPP tool. However, I found this a helpful process as it challenged me to identify commonalities and clearly articulate research priorities. Once completed, I notice that there is a lot of information about my research in only a single page – this will be a very efficient tool to communicate my research profile to others. In particular, I think the tool will be useful in early discussions with potential new research students and early-career research mentees to evaluate the alignment of research interests and get on the same page. I think in the future I might complete another version of the RPP template for another research area, such as my new emerging interest in marketing analytics.

5.3 Finance researcher profile pitch (Ali)

Exhibit 10 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a finance academic who is currently transitioning from an ECR to the mid-career researcher (MCR) stage. My first formal use of PRF was as a PhD candidate at SIRCA's

Pitching Research Symposium in 2015. Since then, I have progressed from being a "beginner user" to the "expert user" of the PRF. I have published three Pitching Research Letters, with one receiving the best pitch paper award. Additionally, five of my research papers using the PRF have been published in ABDC A-ranked journals, with one receiving the best paper conference award from the Accounting and Finance Association of Australia and New Zealand (AFAANZ) in the corporate governance stream – a primary research theme as indicated in Item (C) of my RPP.

My extended experience of pitching research has also facilitated my success in recently securing two competitive research grants from AFAANZ (whereby the funding application must be prepared using the PRF) for projects related to my primary and emerging research themes – corporate governance and ESG. From those early days as a PhD candidate (2013 – 2017) and now a PhD supervisor (2020 to present), in intellectual terms I have travelled a distance and internalised the PRF to the extent that it has become second nature. Whether it is my own project or one of my student's proposals, the Items A–K of PRF serve the purpose of starting a conversation. Drawing from my experience, the PRF can assist researchers in competitive **G**rants, high-quality **P**ublications, and effective **S**upervision – which I often refer to as the research "GPS".

While PRF focuses on the research project – namely, the "product", the RPP focuses on the researcher – namely, the "producer". In 2021 (which I view as the final year of my ECR development), I participated in an ECR development program where I was exposed to strategies and tools to develop long-term research strategy for a successful career. I also joined a team of experienced academics to apply for an ARC Discovery project in which, among other things, we are required to prepare a statement of "Research Opportunity and Performance Evidence" (ROPE). Similarly, in my promotion application to Senior Lecturer in Finance, I was required to prepare an overarching research impact statement. All of these experiences strengthen my belief of how important it is to have a well-established research agenda, strategy and themes in place, which will then help drive and initiate new research collaborations, projects, and future impacts.

As I now emerge from my ECR cocoon, this RPP exercise challenges me to sit back and reflect on my research journey so far – where it started, where I am now and where I want to go in the future. Notably, it allowed me to reflect and visualize the connections of my research themes with research input, activities, output, outcomes, and benefits as per the ARC Research Impact Pathway. While this RPP focuses on my full research profile aimed mainly at three signature papers [Item (C)] aligned to my primary and secondary research themes [Item (B)], I acknowledge that there are also other notable papers aligned to my broader research themes with collaborators from domestic and international institutions. In the next phase, I plan to prepare an RPP aligned to one niche area of my research interest (namely, boardroom diversity) residing within my broader research theme of corporate governance.

5.4 Multidisciplinary researcher profile pitch (Tan)

Exhibit 11 showcases the worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a mid-career multidisciplinary researcher whose primary research area is in finance. My secondary areas of research include tourism and aviation management. Though my training is in corporate finance and governance, I have always enjoyed applying quantitative methods in periphery areas of research. I find that impact and/or contribution might be created at the intersection of financial econometrics and other (less quantitative) areas of research. The overarching theme of my research is applied econometrics. These tools are versatile and can be applied in many areas, such as – in my case – finance, tourism economics, and aviation management.

In Item (K), I highlight that I am open to collaboration with experts in related fields. I am always open to projects and collaboration in new areas of research and applications. For example, I have developed a keen personal interest in climate change risks, microfinance and development economics, and I am open to work with experts in those fields. I believe that research that engages industry is crucial, and I place emphasis on projects that involve industry partners, such as my TRA paper with a partner airline and my current project on travel insurance with a large insurer.

Generally, I enjoy using the RPP tool as it compels me to identify the overarching themes in my research career and map out future trajectories. This tool is also helpful in categorising my key contributions to the literature, and areas that require further development/collaboration. This tool is particularly helpful for new collaborators and ECRs.

5.5 BIS researcher profile pitch (Axelsen)

Exhibit 12 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a Business Information Systems (BIS) MCR researcher and teaching scholar. The tool requires a structured and succinct format. In contrast, our annual performance appraisal process requires a 20-page document and a BIS research 'short paper' by convention requires around an 8-page writeup. Presenting a one-page pitch is challenging but rewarding. In my reflection, I highlight three specific positive aspects of meeting the challenge and expectations of the RPP.

First, the process gets you focused on succinctly 'pitching' your profile and research program i.e., a body of work that comprises multiple projects that naturally fall within a broader theme of scholarly enquiry. Communication must be meaningful but purposeful without too much detail. Academic life is already full of well-crafted and detailed 'bureaucratese' that is rarely read. The researcher must hone their research narrative as a companion piece to long treatises that set out research gaps and objectives. Developing your pitch enhances the accessibility of your work to others.

Second, the process allows the researcher to reconceptualise their current research program. The process of developing the pitch has sharpened my own thinking about my research. I have had to harmonize my own work for myself in a way that I have not previously done. The iterative process sharpens the understanding of your own work.

Third, the process forces the researcher to contemplate more foundational questions. I have identified aspects of my research program that need more ‘retconning’ than others as the work did not quite ‘fit’ with the program. Naturally, the process forced a deeper and more critical contemplation of my research program. The result is a reconceptualization of one’s research narrative and a reprioritisation of one’s future research program.

In summary, I found the process of completing the RPP template of great benefit. The process helps increase the accessibility of your research narrative. It also sharpens the framing of the research narrative and allows the researcher to reconceptualize their research narrative and critically evaluate their future research program. Regularly revisiting and refining the pitch over the longer term will allow the researcher to achieve the fuller benefits of the RPP tool.

5.6 Management/Tourism ECR profile pitch (Gill)

Exhibit 13 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a Management/Tourism ECR researcher. When I read Faff’s (2022) SSRN paper on research profiles, it immediately struck a chord with me because I saw how valuable this process would have been in helping me prepare for my recent application for an academic role and job interview. Part of the selection process required me to prepare and deliver a 10-minute presentation on my previous and current research. I found it difficult to succinctly provide an overview of my research given I had been involved in several distinct research projects/contexts that, at face value, had no common thread tying them all together. Although my presentation highlighted the major projects in which I had been involved, and that led to several high-quality publications, using this template would have facilitated better articulation of the common themes across my research.

Initially I found it challenging to complete the research profile, as it required me to think in a very different way and deeply ponder common threads that were not readily apparent. The cued template raised useful prompts for each of the items. While it sounds simple, grouping my previous publications into just a couple of areas encouraged me to think conceptually, rather than chronologically or limited to a specific project. Some of my current and most recent research relates to my secondary theme of research which will likely become my primary focus moving forward, although I had not anticipated this. The emphasis on themes alleviated some unnecessary pressure to justify every project that I have ever been involved in and would have been a valuable insight during my interview presentation.

Having spent a couple of years within a central Teaching and Learning unit, I am familiar with the value of being able to articulate one's teaching philosophy. Yet I had never thought of considering my own research philosophy. The template prompt to do this was a lightbulb moment for me. This item came more easily for me at a broader level and is something I have talked about, yet never owned as part of my philosophy. Once I had written it in the template, I immediately saw how it applies across all the research I have done and plan to do in the future.

Item (E), the key idea, stumped me for a while. I was tempted to narrowly focus on each of my research themes but realized it would be more helpful to take a broader perspective as there are two key ideas common to most of my research. This understandably relates back to my research philosophy, but I had never recognised this link before. Similarly with the data and tools, I assumed my approach to collecting data was common, particularly within my discipline area. When I recognized the pattern of the data and tools I used in contrast to other academics in different disciplines, I appreciated that this is not a trivial detail. It is important to be aware of and articulate this, particularly when looking to collaborate with other academics.

The two key questions section provided opportunity to focus in on more specific details related to my research themes. The contribution section, once again linked back to my research philosophy, but I had never clearly articulated how it all tied together and its consistency with my values. The specific details within the other considerations section provided a useful way of pinpointing where I want to go in the next couple of years in terms of collaborators, projects, methods and clarified my thinking.

When I reflect on my completed researcher profile, it all seems so obvious and simple now. How could I have not seen these patterns and gleaned these insights earlier? Although initially I found it a challenging exercise to complete some sections in the researcher profile template, it has increased my confidence in being able to better articulate my previous, current, and future research. This newfound clarity enables me to now move forward intentionally with projects that align with my research profile and to own/communicate my research strengths. I encourage other researchers, particularly ECR's and PhD students, to engage with the researcher profile template even before applying for academic role/promotions as it may help shape a research brand/agenda and lead to significant insights.

5.7 Marketing ECR profile pitch (Mehrotra)

Exhibit 14 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a Marketing ECR researcher. As an early career researcher, crafting this RPP was equally exciting, challenging and ultimately rewarding. I spent the better part of four hours developing and iteratively writing it. The end-product was, in my humble opinion, a rather meaningful 'visualisation and presentation' of my current research profile.

Purely from this perspective, it was an effective and fit for purpose exercise. However, the true value of this effort was far deeper and richer. The entire process was exciting. I think particularly as an ECR, formulating a research manifesto, reviewing, and reflecting upon my research pipeline, the wonderful collaborations I have already built, the contributions I have made so far, the skills I have acquired, and the promise of so much more to come has been thrilling. My entire reason for entering academia was my passion for learning and teaching. In completing the research question themes, my motivations felt more tangible. While my research themes were salient to me, they were in fact latent and amorphous. Writing them down felt empowering. Equally empowering were (E) Idea, (F) Data and (G) Tools – the very fact that only a few years ago, I would have struggled to make sense of these "basic building blocks" of any research effort.

The process was also challenging on several fronts. First, the mechanics of writing. For purely semantic reasons, I was initially committed to the idea of completing each of the sections in sequence – following the four, three, two, one plus one framework from the original Faff (2015, 2021) Pitching Research Framework (PRF). I quickly found that after having completed (A) Research Bio Title, I jumped straight to (C) Signature Papers which anchored my thinking about (B) Research Question Themes and (D) Motivation – Research Manifesto. This is consistent with my experience with the PRF. Writing this research profile took time and should not be construed to be a 'quick-fix'. It is also iterative and must necessarily be approached as such.

Second, while (B) Research Question Themes provided the opportunity to present core areas of research interest, the rest of the template was focused only on the signature papers and primary discipline of research. This may have been different had I been able to incorporate my secondary research theme among the key papers. However, in my very early-career researcher stage, this was a limitation that proved challenging to ameliorate.

Third, despite having experience with the PRF, I found the cues provided in Exhibit 1 of Faff (2022) were crucial in understanding and completing this template. In the absence of the cues and prompts, I am not confident I would have produced a pitch worthy of presenting to mentors, colleagues, and collaborators. Using this template will require effort, and where appropriate, suitable training. I can imagine that for someone very early in their research journey, this effort might be daunting and, in extreme cases, discouraging and demotivating. Perhaps this is where supervisors and mentors need to carefully think about providing a roadmap and suitable support for ECRs when they work on pitching their research profiles. It will be hard. But research is hard.

In part because of the challenging nature of this exercise, it was ultimately truly rewarding. I spent four hours thinking (and writing) about “me”. As a researcher, as an educator and as a contributor to our relentless pursuit of knowledge. It was a time to reflect upon where I had come from as a researcher but more importantly, where I was going and why. I found myself being quite philosophical in my ruminations throughout this endeavour. Perhaps this was due to the fact that it was close to the end of a deeply satisfying semester, and I had completed teaching, or that it was Good Friday and the start of the long Easter weekend. Or perhaps it was the template itself. As I iteratively completed various sections, I found myself spending time reviewing my research agenda, priorities, partnerships, purpose, and future. I attached meaning to effort – both expended and forthcoming. I considered outcomes (e.g., how would my research inform my teaching?), choices (e.g., where should my priorities lie?) and consequences (e.g., what would I meaningfully contribute?). I pondered the bigger, deeper meaning of my research effort. And just for this, I am thankful to Professor Faff. I am not sure when, or even if, I might have made time to do this if it were not for the excellent adaptation of his PRF to researcher profiles.

5.8 Data analytics ECR profile pitch (Cornwell)

Exhibit 15 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a Data Analytics ECR researcher. As a final year PhD Candidate, I found completing the RPP to be a thought-provoking and valuable exercise to clarify and strategise my research interests and directions beyond my PhD. Completing the exercise at this early stage of my career (with one publication thus far) has allowed me to be more deliberate and refined in how

I stage my future research. In the longer term, this may lead to a more coherent and interconnected researcher profile.

As my research is closely linked to industry, I often feel it is strongly motivated. However, I enjoyed the challenge of articulating my research manifesto on a more personal or intrinsic level in Item (D). It was also a good reminder of the value of starting with the ‘why’ to capture the buy-in of others in the same way I am intrinsically motivated to do what I do.

I often approached my responses to various components of the framework in a reverse order to the guidance provided in the cues. For example, for Item (E), the cued framework suggests “Identify up to 3 core research ideas that underpin your signature papers [and then] ...emphasise any naturally common themes inter-linking the ideas across your signature papers.” I, however, started with the overarching idea of my primary research theme and then drilled down into key sub-themes or implementations that my research to date is exploring or I would like to explore in the future.

Item (G) was also instrumental in getting me thinking about my strategic direction as a researcher – do I want to or should I be specialising in a particular technique or set of data analytics methodologies, as opposed to remaining more general? I expect this will be guided by the outcomes of my research and will evolve over time, so I look forward to revisiting my researcher profile to reflect on this.

One final observation: As a very early ECR, I have only one publication that I was able to include in Item (C). An ECR with limited or no publications could consider repurposing this component of the framework to note papers in progress, ideas for future papers, the core papers/chapters of their thesis or perhaps key papers in their research area to highlight opportunities for collaboration.

The RPP not only helped me distil the essence of my research area, skills and impact, but the process also helped me to build a broader research agenda stemming from my PhD – importantly, an agenda with purpose-driven direction (centred on my research manifesto). The exercise reinforced how much I enjoy and see value in my research area and it has re-energised me to extend my research.

5.9 Finance ECR profile pitch (Malik)

Exhibit 16 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a Finance ECR researcher. As a recent PhD graduate and early career academic, I found this template very useful in highlighting my research interests and goals in a concise manner. This exercise made me explore myself as a researcher and helped gather my thoughts about what I have done so far and how it helps define my career going forward. It is very helpful that Faff (2022) provides a tool with cues to document one's research accomplishments and future research agenda in a succinct yet systematic way. After completing this exercise, I am confident in saying that it also contains answers to most of the questions asked in a typical interview for academic (research) positions, and it will help me in "not missing" any important bits during such interviews. Faff (2022) also helped me highlight my research domain, my collaboration stance and the contribution that I have made so far (or can make in future) in a way that is easy to understand and have a positive impact on the reader of "my profile".

In terms of completing the template, although I have been working with the PRF pitching tool since 2016, I found the pitch my research profile as per Faff (2022) to be different and not an easy task. When I first looked at the template, I thought: "Oh! Yes, I know how to do this, as I am very familiar with all the sections from my previous experience with the PRF, and I can complete this version within an hour". However, I was proven wrong. I had to think, rethink, write and re-write and if it were not for the cues and the example provided by Faff (2022), I would have struggled a lot. Now, after completing this exercise, I understand that pitching a research project is a lot different from pitching "yourself as a researcher" despite most of the "headers" being similar to the PRF. After all, I understood both tools are meant for different audiences and they serve a different purpose. One final thing that I realized is that this is an open-ended exercise in that I feel that the template itself somehow urges you to improve further (over time). I am hopeful that in the longer term, I can make my self-reflection pitch more “satisfying and coherent” relative to what I have provided this time around.

5.10 BIS ECR profile pitch (Honey)

Exhibit 17 shows a worked example of the RPP template tool in which I pitch my researcher profile as a BIS ECR researcher. First, I would like to give context to my reflection. My father left school at age 15, having been kicked out of home and needing to look for work. My mother, against difficult odds (her mother passed away during childbirth when she was 3), left school at 15 to become a nurse-aid at the local hospital. My parents never really understood education, but they encouraged me. I used to joke that if I came home from school with a smile and said proudly that I got an “E”, – they would ask, “Was the E for Excellent?” Fast forward a little and I gained a B “Bursary” and successfully secured a place at the University of Waikato within the School of Management.

Traversing tertiary education and understanding the institution’s traditions were quite an uphill task for me. Despite that, I was the youngest in a family of five children, and I was the first in my family to have the privilege of completing formal tertiary education. I completed my Bachelor’s degree (with Honours) in 1993 while also getting married, having my first child, and emigrating to Brisbane, Australia, before graduation.

My main driver for enrolling in a doctoral program was because I wanted to become a lecturer, and I had seen that this was a minimum requirement. As previously mentioned, the academic tradition was somewhat unfamiliar to me. I recall applying for a lecturer position once, thinking I had exceptional transferable skills and was disappointed when I didn’t even get an interview. So here I am, 47 years old, still confused by the world of academia, but nevertheless, I am in the final year of my part-time doctoral studies with the aim of submitting my PhD thesis in January 2023.

I started my doctoral studies by learning how to pitch research ideas using Faff's (2015) PRF. It seems appropriate to be concluding my doctoral studies by learning how to pitch myself (the researcher) using Faff's (2022) RPP. I have begun to build an academic resume, and I can relate well with the teaching requirements, but I still struggle with the research requirements. The framework has helped me tremendously. But I will confess that I hugely felt like an "impostor".

Section C asks for Signature Key Papers. My output in this area feels like zero as I have no research papers published in a journal. So, I have listed my conference papers, hoping that I will not be found to be an impostor. I know many students come from different experiences, have other supervisors, and have various journal outlet timeframes. I however know that it is essential for me to have at least a paper close to acceptance before graduation.

Completing all the other sections made me feel more assured. I enjoyed reflecting on my research journey and synthesising it. I certainly feel like I have come a long way, both due to advancing research on blockchain technology but also by learning and understanding more about academic traditions. My favourite section to complete was section D:

> "In a world where attentions are fleeting, and change is rapid, I seek to contribute to theory and practice in an accessible and consumable manner, reaching those that need guidance and answers promptly. I aim to enhance organisational practice in rational decision-making during ICT fads, FOMO (fear of missing out), and organisational demise. Additionally, I aim to contribute and (eventually) lead collaborative research, bringing together disciplines and industry in a manner that transcends traditional boundaries."

I have had five (5) years of learning (with some stumbles) and five (5) years of feeling like I do not quite fit into academia. But writing my manifesto made me realise that I do not want to fit; I want to grow, learn, and advance theory and practice. I suspect that is how everyone in academia feels. So, in 2023, I will be the first in my family line to earn the title of Doctor. In 2017, Prof. Faff helped me begin my research journey and learn how to frame and pitch research. Now, it is 2022, and with Prof. Faff's 'Pitch a Researcher' framework, I can at least feel moderately prepared to pitch myself and my research in upcoming job interviews.

6. Discussion

Drawing together themes cutting across the reflections reported in two preceding sections, there are some insights into the common challenges that researchers may face when using the RPP template tool. Generally, despite having prior experience with the PRF, RPP users tend to find the cues provided in Exhibit 1 very helpful or even crucial in understanding and completing the RPP template. Further, it is widely agreed that using the RPP template will require effort, and where appropriate, suitable training. For someone very early in their research journey, this effort might be daunting and, in extreme cases, discouraging and demotivating.

There is also an interesting contrast between how novice researchers view this profiling exercise compared to their experienced researcher counterparts. One might speculate that novice researchers complete a few research projects, and then see how each of them fits under one research program … one might say, "a bit hit and miss". In contrast, senior researchers might often set their research agenda/program first and find research projects aligned to the agenda/program. In this light, perhaps the pitching researcher profile is more like a reverse engineering exercise to finding a research program for early career researchers?

Based on these insights, some common challenges that researchers might face when using the RPP template include:

1. Lack of familiarity with the RPP template: Researchers who are not familiar with the RPP template may find it challenging to understand and complete the template. In such cases, it may be helpful to seek guidance from experienced researchers or attend training sessions on how to use the RPP template effectively.

2. Difficulty in identifying an overarching theme: Identifying an overarching theme that ties together one's published works may be challenging, especially for researchers who have worked on diverse topics. In such cases, it may be helpful to reflect on one's research journey so far and identify commonalities across different research projects.

3. Time and effort required: Completing the RPP template requires time and effort, which may be daunting for researchers who are already busy with other research projects. In such cases, it may be helpful to break down the task into smaller, manageable steps and set realistic deadlines for completing each step.

4. Lack of confidence: Researchers who lack confidence in their research abilities may find it challenging to complete the RPP template. In such cases, it may be helpful to seek feedback from mentors, colleagues, and collaborators to gain a better understanding of one's strengths and weaknesses.

7. Dismantling boundaries of accounting research

Informed by all the material above, in this penultimate section, we speculate about how the RPP template tool might be used as an enabling framework to help positively dismantle boundaries that have developed over time in the broad domain of accounting research. The naturalistic turn of accounting research in the 1960s and 1970s introduced paradigms and methods borrowed from the natural sciences to the study of accounting phenomena (Wahyudi, 1999). Soon, this became the "mainstream", and it has since been dominant over alternatives, such as interdisciplinary and critical accounting research (Chua, 1986). The paradigmatic divide of accounting research continues to be a challenge for the global accounting research community and its bodies of literature (Hoffmann & Brivot, 2023).

The insufficient communication between the "mainstream" and other accounting research communities has been identified as an important reason for this divide (Fogarty, 2014). This is evidenced, for example, by a lack of cross-references between mainstream and alternative articles and journals, respectively, such that cross-fertilization is practically absent (Baker & Bettner, 1997). Modell (2010) argues that there are substantive barriers to dialogue across the different accounting research communities, which tend to reinforce by a generational and elitist reproduction of a narrow set of paradigms within the distinct communities (Fogarty & Zimmerman, 2019).

These observations are concerning, because relevant, future-oriented and impactful scholarship in accounting research depends on dialogues that cross silos, communities and paradigms within and beyond the accounting research community (Lukka, 2010; Pimentel, Cho, & Bothello, 2023). We posit that the RPP template might provide a tool, which is useful to facilitate the communication of scholars across disciplines, paradigms and methodologies. Its structured approach to pitching one's researcher profile can help other scholars to efficiently identify common themes, topics, methods, and philosophies of interest across conventional boundaries more easily than by merely reading a broad range of articles, or by screening a variety of (unstructured) online resources.

Carnegie et al. (2022) and Carnegie and Parker (2023) argue for a redefinition of accounting as a technical, social, and moral practice, focused on sustainable resource use and proper accountability to stakeholders, shifting away from viewing accounting as a neutral, technical activity. They identify the need for an interdisciplinary approach to accounting research to address global challenges, and hence suggest the adoption of a broader, clearer, and more game-changing definition of accounting to understand it as an influential and multi-dimensional practice.

A similar rhetoric is presented in several academic papers. Basu (2012) argues that to spur innovations in accounting research, an appreciation of other disciplines such as law, physics, and psychology, is required. Interviewing editors of top interdisciplinary accounting journals and analyzing the topics of papers published within these journals, Maran et al. (2023) argue that an "impetus" is needed to incentivise innovation in accounting research. We argue that the RPP template tool can be an enabler for an inter- or multi-disciplinary turn of accounting as a field of scientific inquiry. The RPP's conceptual basis, the PRF, and its subsequent competitions[14] have helped spur research innovations in various disciplines. Indeed, the RPP is one such innovation that helps researchers think of how to embrace and integrate other disciplines in their own "researcher profile" as they build their careers. This however does not happen in isolation – researchers are expected to connect with others in forums aimed at promoting responsible, cross-, multi-, interdisciplinary research, for example in academic networks such as *InSPiR^{2}eS*.[15]

Basu (2012) also highlights that to succeed, accounting researchers need to innovate and solve common problems through strong, self-governed social networks at multiple levels which should be multi-disciplinary in nature. Dellaportas, Xu and Yang (2022) argue that cross-disciplinary accounting research is underpinned by conceptual integration, and that it tends to attract more citations, thus leading to higher impact. However, less emphasis is placed on the interaction and cross-pollination of ideas among researchers of multiple disciplines. The RPP aims to standardise scholarly profiles in a manner that they can be adopted to different fields, by leaving room for customisation. It can thus accommodate the specificities of any given discipline. If built under the premise of a robust research network, which is inextricably linked to the PRF and consequently draws on the RPP, an integrated ecosystem of accounting scholars can likely create outputs that redefine and possibly dismantle the current (traditional) boundaries of accounting research.

As a final suggestion, the RPP template might even facilitate the communication within universities, business schools, or accounting departments as it can help to share in a concise and easy to access form the specific interests of individual faculty by outlining what they are researching, how and why. Such communicative exchange could prove useful for both

---

[14] See https://pitchingresearch.com/competitions/

[15] The International Society of Pitching Research for Responsible Science (InSPiR^{2}eS) is a globally-facing research network primarily aimed at research training and capacity building, resting on a foundation theme of responsible science. For more details, visit: https://pitchingresearch.com/inspir2es-network/ While we note the existence of other similar research networks (Google Scholar, ResearchGate, Kudos, ORCID, Academic.edu, and Scopus), the deliberate emphasis of linking a community of researchers to generate innovative, cross-, multi- and interdisciplinary research is somewhat absent, with the notable exception of *InSPiR^{2}eS*.

individual faculty and academic management. Through the RPP template, faculty members may quickly develop an understanding of what fellow colleagues are interested in, and who to approach for specific topics, methods or research philosophies. Management could find it useful to understand what the strengths of their faculty are and use the individual pitching profiles as a starting point to derive a research profile at departmental, school or university level. From a leadership perspective, the RPP template might also enable management to suggest potential collaborations to individual faculty or stimulate the formation of specialty groups within their faculty.

8. Conclusion

At the heart of our paper are real, worked examples that illustrate how Faff's (2022) researcher profile pitching (RPP) template tool can be meaningfully applied across a range of Business School disciplines. Now, what are the key lessons that we have learned from this exercise? To answer this question, below we identify three broad themes that provide informative insights, to convince our readers to decide: "Yes, I should give the RPP tool a try myself!".

First, from our experience, there is a meaningful universality of purpose that shines through, irrespective of research discipline. Indeed, the RPP tool is deemed highly relevant and valuable even for interdisciplinary researchers. Moreover, as reflected by the diversity in our research team, this utility does not solely reside with ECRs – it is beneficial across all levels of research experience.

Second, the RPP tool offers a distinct advantage over existing popular research profile platforms – ironically, because it demands (a focused) "less" that delivers much "more". Indeed, and perhaps surprisingly, a prescriptive focus on 3 signature papers in the RPP is seen as a strength, rather than a weakness. Further, the conciseness of the RPP design makes it readily amenable to iteration and dynamism. This potential nimbleness is advantageous in capturing the natural evolution in personal interests, specialisations, and research focus over time.

Third, we have identified specific situations of added value e.g., initiating research collaborations and academic job market preparation. Perhaps, these scenarios are just the "tip of the iceberg' … as the old saying goes: "the proof of the pudding is in the eating"!

Based on our current work, where does the future lie regarding the RPP tool? One exciting possibility, foreshadowed by Faff (2022), is to take this researcher profile framework to an "organised" public domain and to gain a leverage-advantage from a growing research network like *InSPiR*^{2}*eS*. Indeed, one of the longer-term goals of *InSPiR*^{2}*eS* is to take on an intermediation role as a type of research collaboration "dating agency". A refined version of the RPP tool could lie at the heart of one dimension of this future initiative, the *InSPiR*^{2}*eS Researcher Exchange*. In so doing, *InSPiR*^{2}*eS* could provide members a rich "marketplace" or "researcher information exchange" to facilitate and accelerate cross-, multi- and interdisciplinary research collaborations.

Exhibit 1: An Adaptation of Faff's (2015, 2021a) PRF to Pitch an individual's Research Profile, with cues

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for … your name, current position, current affiliation, physical location including country (date).
(B) Research Question Themes	Identify the signature general theme(s) of research question (RQ) that defines your (recent) career work, especially in the past 3-5 years. Indicate what type of researcher you are … are you primarily: (a) quantitative; (b) qualitative; (c) mixed methods; or (d) other (please specify)? **Optional:** Nominate a secondary theme or signal an emerging new theme that you are currently seriously exploring …
(C) Signature Key Papers	List the **3 key papers** which most saliently portray your recent research focus. Include brief information on journal rating, citations, altmetrics, etc **Optional:** include brief information on your role in collaborated works e.g., your % role, CRediT style attribution (Brand et al., 2015).
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	What is the core academic motivation that drives your research – more from a personal (but objective) point of view? Can you summarise your personal research philosophy in terms of a type of "manifesto" – beliefs, aims and values? To the extent that you see any threat that your personal philosophy poses to producing independent research, how do you combat such a threat?
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	Identify up to 3 core research **ideas** that underpin your signature papers or your broader recent research trajectory. Emphasise any naturally common themes inter-linking the ideas across your signature papers.
(F) Data?	Identify up to 3 common themes in the **data**/ datasets/ data sources that underpin your signature papers or your broader recent research trajectory. Emphasise any unique (e.g., hand-collected) datasets that you have created which have further potential for positive future research exploitation.
(G) Tools?	Identify up to 3 core inter-linked themes across the research **tools** that underpin your signature papers or your broader recent research trajectory. **Optional**: indicate your level of proficiency in executing these tools (e.g., expert; proficient, novice).
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Identify up to 3 major examples of research **novelty** that underpin your signature papers or your broader recent research trajectory. Emphasise any naturally common themes inter-linking the novelty across your signature papers. **Optional:** identify the most compelling novelty that you have achieved in your recent research work.
(I) So What?	Identify up to 3 major examples of research **importance** that underpin your signature papers or your broader recent research trajectory. Emphasise any naturally common themes inter-linking the importance across your signature papers. **Optional:** identify the most important RQ that you have successfully researched in your recent research work and briefly indicate why it is so important.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	Identify up to 3 major examples of research contribution that underpin your signature papers or your broader recent research trajectory. Emphasise any naturally common themes inter-linking the contributions across your signature papers. **Optional:** identify the most compelling contribution that you have successfully researched in your recent research work and why it is so significant.
(K) Other Considerations	Identify your career stage: e.g., HDR student; PhD student; Post-Doc; ECR; MCR; Experienced Researcher; Senior Research Professor, … Identify type of research collaboration that you seek or that you offer: passive mentoring; active mentoring; formal collaboration (incl. co-authorship). Identify up to 3 key areas of expertise that you seek from and/or offer to a collaborator: e.g., qualitative; quantitative; mixed methods; general theory expertise; general method expertise; specific method expertise (specify which); expertise expressed in terms of the CRediT framework… Identify your broad target journal strategy ... e.g., main discipline; secondary disciplines; levels (e.g., A*/A ABDC list); … Identify your "ambitious" Top 3 journal targets: Identify your 3 "floor" journal targets: … i.e., journals at the lower end of ones you would normally view as just falling into your domain of journal targets.

References

Aman, H., et al. (2019). Responsible science: Celebrating the 50-year legacy of Ball and Brown (1968) using a registration-based framework. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 56, 129-150.

Baker, C.R. & Bettner, M.S. (1997). Interpretive and critical research in accounting: A commentary on its absence from mainstream accounting research, *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 8(4), 293-310.

Basu, S. (2012). How can accounting researchers become more innovative? *Accounting Horizons* 26(4), 851–870.

Brand, A., Allen, L., Altman, M., Hlava, M., & Scott, J. (2015). Beyond authorship: Attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit. *Learned Publishing*, 28, 151–155. https://doi.org/10.1087/2015 0211

Brennan, N.M. & Martyn, P. (2021). Introduction to special issue on innovations in research methods in accounting and governance. *Accounting, Finance & Governance Review* 27. https://doi.org/10.52399/001c.22169

Bui, B. (2021). A critical examination of the use of research templates in accounting and finance. *Accounting and Finance,* 61, 2671-2696.

Carnegie, G., Parker, L. & Tsahuridu, E. (2022). Accounting research for shaping a better world. *Knowledge Gateway, IFAC*. Accessed 10 July, 2023: https://bit.ly/44A8i6y

Carnegie, G. & Parker, L. (2023). Accounting and broad scope engagement: Leveraging interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches. *Knowledge Gateway, IFAC*. Accessed 10 July, 2023: https://bit.ly/46FZJJ6

Chua, W.F. (1986). Radical developments in accounting thought, *The Accounting Review* 61(4), 601-632.

Dellaportas, S., Xu, L. & Yang, Z. (2022). The level of cross-disciplinarity in cross-disciplinary accounting research: Analysis and suggestions for improvement. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 85, 102275.

de Winter, J.C.F. (2015). The relationship between tweets, citations, and article views for PLOS ONE articles. *Scientometrics* 102, 1773–1779. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1445-x

Endenich, C. & Trapp, R. (2018). Signaling effects of scholarly profiles - The editorial teams of North American accounting association journals. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 51, 4-23.

Faff, R. (2015). A simple template for pitching research. *Accounting and Finance* 55, 311-336.

Faff, R. (2021a). Pitching research. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2462059

Faff, R. (2021b). Responsible science matters. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3880341

Faff, R. (2022). Pitching Researcher Profiles. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4069379

Ferreira, M.R., Mongeon, P. & Costas, R. (2021). Large-scale comparison of authorship, citations, and tweets of Web of Science authors. *Journal of Altmetrics*, 4(1).

Fogarty, T. J. (2014). A dream deferred: Interdisciplinary accounting in the US. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 27(8), 1265-1270.

Fogarty, T. J. & Zimmerman, A. (2019). Few are called, fewer are chosen: Elite reproduction in U.S. academic accounting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 60, 1-17.

Gasparyan, A.Y., Nurmashev, B., Yessirkepov, M., Endovitskiy, D.A., Voronov, A.A. & Kitas, G.D. (2017). Researcher and author profiles: Opportunities, advantages, and limitations. *Journal of Korean Medical Science* 32(11), 1749-1756.

Haustein, S., Costas,R. & Larivière, V. (2015). Characterizing social media metrics of scholarly papers: The effect of document properties and collaboration patterns. *PLOS ONE* 10(5). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127830

Hoffmann, S. & Brivot, M. (2023). Quo vadis? The future of interdisciplinary accounting research. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 93, 102604, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2023.102604.

López-Cózar, E.D, Robinson-García. N. & Torres-Salinas, D. (2014). The Google Scholar experiment: How to index false papers and manipulate bibliometric indicators. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 65, 446-54. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23056

López-Hermoso, C., Gil-Navarro, M. V., Abdel-Kader-Martín, L. & Santos-Ramos, B. (2020). Online platforms and social networks for the creation of research profiles. *Farmacia Hospitalaria* 44(1).

Lukka, K. (2010). The roles and effects of paradigms in accounting research, *Management Accounting Research* 21(2), 110-115.

Luo, Y., Xu, M., Ji, Y., Xiao, F., Hu, C. & Shan, Z. (2023). Impact-oriented contextual scholar profiling using self-citation graphs. Cornell University. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.12217 (accessed 30 May 2023).

Maran, L., Bigoni, M. & Morrison, L. (2023). Shedding light on alternative interdisciplinary accounting research through journal editors' perspectives and an analysis of recent publications. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 93, 102420.

Martín-Martín, A., Orduña-Malea, E. & López-Cózar, E.D. (2018). Author-level metrics in the new academic profile platforms: The online behaviour of the bibliometrics community. *Journal of Informetrics* 12(2), 494-509.

Modell, S. (2010). Bridging the paradigm divide in management accounting research: The role of mixed methods approaches, *Management Accounting Research* 21(2), 124-129.

Mondal, H. & Mondal, S. (2022). How to enhance your profile on academic portals, social media, and personal websites? *ComoDerma* 2(7), 1-7.

Pimentel, E., Cho, C. H., & Bothello, J. (2023). The blind spots of interdisciplinarity in addressing grand challenges. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 93, 102475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2022.102475

Wadhwa, V. (2011). Black holes of innovation - Outside of a select group of sexy technologies, innovation is almost entirely absent. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* (November 13): B-1.

Wahyudi, I. (1999). Mainstream accounting and its paradigm: A critical analysis, *International Journal of Business* Vol. 1(2), 99-112.

Wilkinson, B.R. & Durden, C.H. (2015). Inducing structural change in academic accounting research. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 26, 23-36.

ONLINE INTERNET APPENDIX to accompany:

"Pitching Business School Researcher Profiles"

Exhibit 2: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative Mentor Example – David Mathuva

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Dr. David Mathuva, Senior Lecturer (Assistant Professor), Strathmore University Business School, Nairobi, Kenya (24/05/2022).
(B) RQ Themes	**Primary** research theme is on the interlinks between accounting information and financial markets behaviour. **Secondary** research theme is supporting ECRs, doctoral students and emerging scholars in conducting responsible and quality research. Primarily **quantitative** research oriented.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Mathuva, D.** and Nyangu, M. (2022). Does Banking Regulatory Regime affect the Quality of Bank Earnings in the East African Region? *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies, 12*(3), 433-467. [ABDC C, JIF = 0.607, citations = 1]. 2. **Mathuva, D.M.** and Nyangu, M.N. (2022). Revisiting earnings quality and bank efficiency among East African developing economies: Do systemic banking and financial crises matter? *Journal of Applied Accounting Research, 23*(3), 650-685. [ABDC C, JIF = 0.436, citations = 1]. 3. **Mathuva, D.,** Tauringana, V. and Owino, F. J. O. (2019). Corporate Governance and the Timeliness of Audited Financial Statements: The Case of Kenyan Listed Firms. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies, 9*(4), 473-501. (An award-winning paper in the 2020 Emerald Literati Awards) [ABDC C, JIF = 0.607, citations = 11]. 4. **Mathuva, D.M.** and Mboya, J.K. (2016). Cooperative social and environmental disclosure and financial performance of savings and credit cooperatives in Kenya. *Advances in Accounting, 35,* 197-206. [ABDC B, JIF = 0.354, citations = 23]. (All citations and JIFs are based on Scopus and SJR databases).
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Accounting information, largely financial in nature, has been utilised in decision making by a variety of users. With the emergence of newer, alternative reporting approaches embracing sustainability and integrated reporting, the role of accounting information in decision-making is likely to be enhanced. There is an ongoing need to examine whether these newer reporting frameworks add incremental value to the traditional accounting information in decision-making by financial market actors. Second, quality research in Africa has lagged over the years, hence the need to spur interest and motivate upcoming researchers to engage in higher quality, responsible research capable of informing policy and practice.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	My research ideas centre around (1) the role of accounting information in influencing organisational behaviour, with specific reference to financial markets; (2) the consequences of producing accounting information; (3) how accounting information shapes policy and regulatory decisions.
(F) Data?	(1) Data from typical data repositories – FitchConnect, DataStream, World Bank's and related datasets; (2) Manually (hand-collected) data from respective institutions and data repositories where data are held; (3) Primary data collected from the respective actors, depending on the nature of the study.
(G) Tools?	(1) Empirical modelling using accounting quality models, primarily inspired by seminal works of Ball and Brown (1968); (2) Difference-in-difference and varied (relevant) regression approaches; (3) Limited primary data models – PCA-Factor analyses and some SEM.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	My research attempts to bring out, as far as possible: (1) the unique methodological approaches – for instance, the use of composite indices to measure certain phenomena, e.g. corporate governance; (2) novel datasets, given the challenges in acquiring data in developing and emerging economies; (3) attempts to address endogeneity in modelling through, say a 2-step generalised method of moments (GMM) estimator among other approaches.
(I) So What?	The works I have published (1) emphasize the need for risk-based approaches to financial institution regulation, supervision, management and auditing (in the JAEE paper #1); (2) highlight the role of accounting information in influencing banking behaviour (both at individual- and organisation-level) with a view to devising mechanisms to managing this behaviour (in my JAAR paper #2); (3) demonstrate the need to appreciate the remarkable shifts from societal engagement to purely profit maximization motives by inherently socio-economic-oriented institutions (in my AiA paper #4); (4) highlight the need to view corporate governance construct holistically, and not in a disaggregated manner, as we assess the contribution of governance quality on economic outcomes (reflected in the award-winning JAEE paper #3).
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	(1) the JAEE paper #1 brings in a whole new dimension in examining bank earnings quality – the role systemic banking crises play, away from global financial crises, in influencing bank earning's quality; (2) the JAAR paper #2 helps bank managers appreciate the need to manage bank efficiency for improved earnings quality; (3) the JAEE paper #3 is useful in informing corporate governance codes and frameworks by considering board composition wholesomely, and a closer look at board diversity characteristics and its contribution to improved accounting information quality; (4) the AiA paper #4 is useful in demonstrating the need to manage cooperative organisations prudently without necessarily deviating from the very essence of their establishment – that of socio-economic common bond model.
(K) Other Considerations	* Career stage: Accounting Mentor/MCR, quite focused on certain, specific research with advice to encouraging researchers in developing and emerging economies to conduct quality, responsible and impactful research.

	* "Go to" journals for submission are: (1) *Accounting and Finance* ("A"); (2) *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy* ("A"); (3) *Advances in Accounting* ("A") and building the profile of *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies* ("B"). * Open to collaboration on new projects that: (1) demonstrate the nexus between Accounting and Financial Markets behaviour; (2) application and the use of PRF in teaching, research, student supervision and application for research grants.

Exhibit 3: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative Mid-career Researcher Example - Catalin Albu

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Cătălin Albu, Professor of Accounting, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania (28/5/23).
(B) Research Question Themes	The primary research theme over my career is the way western accounting ideas and tools travel and are implemented in emerging economies, particularly the former communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). An emerging new theme that I am currently seriously exploring is the involvement of the accounting profession in nonfinancial reporting.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1) Albu, N, **Albu, C.N.**, Cho, C., Pesci, C. (in press) Not on the ruins but with the ruins of the past – Inertia and change in the financial reporting field in a transitioning country, *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Available online 4 November 2022 [ABS 3, ABDC A, JIF = 5.538] 2) Albu, N, **Albu, C.N.**, Apostol, O, Cho, C. (2021) The past is never dead: the role of imprints in shaping social and environmental reporting in a post-communist context, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 34(5), 1109-1136 [ABS 3, ABDC A*, JIF = 4.893] 3) **Albu, C.N.**, Albu, N., and Hoffmann, S. (2021). The Westernisation of a financial reporting enforcement system in an emerging economy, *Accounting and Business Research* 51 (3), 271-297 [ABS 3, ABDC A, JIF = 2.89]
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	I firmly believe that research should inform our understanding of how and why accounting is <u>not</u> objective and non-contextual. In doing so, my research tries to illuminate the modification and alteration of (global) accounting tools as they are implemented in emerging contexts. I strongly believe that talking to key relevant informants contributes to our in-depth understanding of how accounting works as a social phenomenon. The validity and credibility of such research is ensured by a rigorous methodological approach (following an interview protocol, using a theoretical lens to explain the findings, rigorous data treatment).
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	My research is based on the idea that accounting is a social construct, despite the attempt to regulate and standardize it. Relevant sub-topics relate to 1) how accounting practices become global <u>and</u> remain local; 2) the role of the communist remnants in financial and non-financial reporting in CEE countries; and 3) how the adoption of western ideas may be delayed until the local environment is prepared to receive them.
(F) Data?	My research mostly uses primary data resulting from interviews with key informants. These data are complemented with secondary data in the form of (mainly accounting related) regulation and business documents that serve as the background of the paper. Some of my research is also informed by survey data.
(G) Tools?	Interview transcripts and publicly available documents are mobilized to inform my research. These are coded and interpreted according to a specific theory to make sense of the field realities. In doing so, I specifically do not use any qualitative data analysis computer software package, as data is coded manually.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	I am particularly interested in how the implementation of western models and tools cannot be assumed to be a linear, context-free, process. Thus, accounting is modelled by the context in which it operates and influences the host environment.
(I) So What?	In a world where the global becomes increasingly important for the regulation and standardization of accounting in large sense, one cannot ignore the inertia and agency manifested in local environments. International bodies and accounting regulators should acknowledge these phenomena when considering transposing international concepts to local markets, particularly when their context is very different from the one where the ideas originate.
ONE	One Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	My research shows how the local context cannot be ignored when it hosts international ideas.
(K) Other Considerations	I am a mid-career researcher actively engaged in researching topics that passion me. My research must be theoretically informed but fundamentally anchored in the context of the research. I am also very involved in supporting accounting scholars from emerging post-communist economies to get training and research opportunities. In this respect, I am still lacking the time to research all the ideas that I would like. I prefer collaborating with reliable enthusiastic people who aim for international publications in relevant (mainly accounting) journals such as *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal; Critical Perspectives on Accounting;* or *European Accounting Review;* but also *Accounting in Europe; Accounting Forum; or Journal of International Accounting Auditing and Taxation.*

Exhibit 4: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative MCR Example – Olayinka Moses

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Dr Olayinka Moses, Senior Lecturer, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, (27/05/2023).
(B) Research Question Themes	**Primary**: Environmental accounting and sustainability reporting practices. **Secondary:** Intersection of management accounting and sustainability practices in developing countries and their underrepresentation in published accounting research. **Primarily** a mixed-method researcher with a quantitative focus.
(C) Signature Key Papers	**Moses, O**., & Hopper, T. (2022). Accounting articles on developing countries in ranked English language journals: A meta-review. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 35(4), 1035-1060. [ABDC- A*, 16 citations – Google Scholar] Bui, B., **Moses, O.,** & Houqe, M. N. (2020). Carbon disclosure, emission intensity and cost of equity capital: Multi-country evidence. *Accounting & Finance*, 60(1), 47-71. [ABDC- A, 95 citations on Google Scholar] **Moses, O**., Houqe, M. N., & van Zijl, T. (2018). What is the economic value of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) information disclosure? *Journal of Contemporary Accounting & Economics*, 14(2), 216-233. [ABDC- A, 27 citations on Google Scholar]
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	The increasing demand for environmental and sustainability accounting information in crucial strategic decision-making processes across companies and countries highlights the need for continuous and emerging insights. I am motivated by the necessity for empirical research that enhances our understanding of broader environmental accounting and sustainability issues, with a special interest in developing countries. The overarching aim is to contribute valuable insights into the intersection of management practices and sustainability, providing meaningful guidance for decision-makers.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	The core research ideas encompass: (i) exploring non-financial information disclosures and accountability. (ii) investigating the relationship between the cost of capital, decarbonisation efforts and firms' performance. (iii) assessing the state of sustainability accounting practices in developing countries and their underrepresentation in accounting research.
(F) Data?	I utilise multiple sources of data for my work, encompassing hand-collected data, archival data obtained from sources such as COMPUSTAT, CDP, Refinitive, web data, documentary sources, and interviews. Furthermore, I have created a data repository based on one of my papers, which is accessible for replication and further research at the following link: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.4818549.v9. This repository allows other researchers to replicate and build upon my findings, fostering transparency and facilitating further advancements in the field.
(G) Tools?	Given the mixed-method approach of my research, I employ a diverse range of quantitative and qualitative tools and techniques to conduct my investigations. These include widely used software such as STATA, NVIVO, and Leximancer, among others. Depending on the nature of the study, I utilise various analytical techniques such as empirical models – regressions, dashboard, and data visualization, as well as thematic analysis.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	(1) I demonstrate that investors consider both the extent of disclosure and the underlying environmental performance when assessing the risk associated with firms which subsequently affect their cost of capital. (2) My study is one of the only few to provide new evidence that investors pay attention to and positively respond to information disclosures under the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). (3) My work highlights the importance of addressing neglected issues in accounting research in developing countries that encompass critical areas of sustainability accounting and corruption. An important novelty of my work in the spirit of responsible research is the development of a publicly available data depository.
(I) So What?	My research encompasses several significant insights that have practical implications for various stakeholders. (i)The importance of considering both the extent of disclosure and environmental performance when evaluating firm risk. (2) Evidence on the impact of extractive information disclosures on investor

	behaviour. (3) The recognition of neglected issues in accounting research within developing countries and the need to address critical areas such as sustainability concerns based on unique challenges in these countries.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	(i) The work on EITI provides the first-time evidence that investors take note of EITI information disclosures, and that the disclosures have a positive impact and are value relevant. (ii) The cost of capital study is among the first corpus of studies to document the impact of carbon performance on cost of capital using international evidence. (iii) I document the most exhaustive analysis of accounting research on developing countries which traces the journals that have published such research, when, on which countries, on what topics and by whom. Besides, I make available raw data and detailed analyses online consistent with protocols adopted in responsible science research to encourage accounting researchers to do likewise to enable further testing of results and claims and build knowledge cumulatively. Collectively, my research portfolio continues to provide practical insight for stakeholders i.e., investors, policymakers, researchers, and the broader society. This resonates with my desire for practical impact for policy and decision making based on empirical evidence from accounting research.
(K) Other Considerations	**Career stage**: I am a Mid-career researcher (MCR) **Type of research collaboration I seek or offer:** I welcome collaboration in sustainability accounting research and allied disciplines. I do have a special interest also addressing developing countries accounting issues via my research – and am happy to provide mentorship in this regard. Also, I can offer mentorship in projects that align with my primary research interest and emerging focus. I bring with me with skills for qualitative and quantitative research. Broadly, I target publications in A* and A ranked accounting journals on the ABDC ranking. **Ambitious journal targets**: *Management Accounting Research; Accounting, Organizations and Society; Review of Accounting Studies.* **Floor journal targets:** *Australian Accounting Review; Social and Environmental Accountability Journal; Advances in Environmental Accounting and Management.*

Exhibit 5: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative ECR/Protege Example – Mark Brosnan

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Mark Brosnan, Senior Teaching Fellow, Bond University, Queensland, Australia (April 2022).
(B) RQ Themes	**Primary** research theme is the use of the experimental method to improve understanding of cognitive decision making. **Secondary** theme of research is the topic areas of accounting, specifically non-GAAP disclosures and including financial reporting knowledge, and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Primarily experimental methods of research with a quantitative focus but seeking collaborators who can add a qualitative element.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Brosnan,** M., Duncan, K., Hasso, T., & Hollindale, J. (2023). Non-GAAP earnings and executive compensation: An experiment. *Accounting & Finance*, forthcoming, doi.org/10.1111/acfi.13098 2. **Brosnan**, M., Duncan, K., Hasso, T., & Hollindale, J. (2023). Happy 20 Year Anniversary Non-GAAP Earnings: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, forthcoming, 10.1108/JAL-02-2023-0035 3. **Brosnan**, M. & Hasso, T. (2022). The Effect of Using Whiteboard Animation in Teaching Introductory Accounting. Working Paper.
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Research should meaningfully contribute to our shared understanding of not just *"what"* is observed, or real, but also *"why"* and "*how*". The experimental method peeks behind correlations to help understand the decision-making process. Be it users of financial statements or students' understanding of classroom topics, the *"why"* and *"how"* decisions are made gives insight into improving the presentation of financial statements and developing education techniques to enhance students' academic outcomes.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	Research themes include: (1) employing the experimental method to understand participants' judgment and decision-making processes; (2) identifying mediating and moderating variables affecting participants' decisions; (3) the scholarship of teaching and learning to improve student outcomes.
(F) Data?	Typically, my data come from the responses of experimental participants, both online and in person. This unique data is supplemented by public and proprietary financial data utilised developing the experimental materials.
(G) Tools?	(1) Qualtrics survey software to design and administer experimental materials; (2) Online panel providers such as Cint and Mturk; (3) data analysis tools such as R, SPSS and Lighthouse Studio by Sawtooth.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	My research is first to explore the potential effects of qualitative non-GAAP disclosures on the judgments of financial statement users. In a traditionally quantitative research environment, the experimental method provides financial phenomena to be examined through a different lens – the perspective of financial statement users.
(I) So What?	Triangulation of results across multiple modes of research is something I feel does not happen enough. Understanding a research problem from various perspectives should better help understand the issues and underlying factors. We all know the saying 'correlation does not equal causation'. Experiments are uniquely positioned examine causal lines of enquiry and draw meaningful inferences. Taking inspiration from quantitative and qualitative research, experiments can test the findings in a controlled environment and explore the mechanisms driving the observed results.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	My first paper is the first to explore the qualitative requirements of SEC filings for non-GAAP disclosures. It answers the call of several financial accounting scholars to explore the non-financial aspects of regulatory reports. My second paper examines the educational benefits of multiple modes of teaching. A particularly salient research question in the current environment of multimodal learning. My third paper examines the link between information demand and availability (the ability to search the internet) and stock returns. Although a niche setting, the results are generalisable.
(K) Other Considerations	I am an early career researcher and am actively seeking all and any forms of research collaboration with other researchers. My research interest in experiments allows (I hope) to provide opportunities to work with scholars in other disciplines. I see an opportunity for my experimental skills to complement other methodologies to create relevant and interesting mixed methods publications. However, my limited experience has led me to the conclusion the somewhat niche field of experimental research is not well understood by traditional qualitative and quantitative researchers. And therefore, my challenge is to promote and "sell" the benefits of experiments to other academics with already set fields and methodologies. Having recently completed my PhD, I am willing to help mentor and guide HDR students, particularly those wanting to design, administer and analyse experiments as part of their journey.

Exhibit 6: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative Transitioning Example - Raluca Valeria Ratiu

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Raluca Valeria Ratiu, Assistant Professor of Accounting, IE University, Segovia/Madrid, Spain (29/3/2023)
(B) Research Question Themes	Primary research theme is analysing the market impact of financial and non-financial reporting, specifically exploring accounting for goodwill and other intangible assets and environmental, social and governance (ESG) factors. Secondary and most recent research theme is dedicated to a deeper comprehension of corporate governance, specifically in relation to gender issues and their impact on the decision-making process within a company. Primarily quantitative research.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. Hodgson, A., Lhaopadchan, S. and **Ratiu, R. V.** (2018), Is advertising under-resourced in a growth market? Intangible endogeneity and informed trading issues. *Accounting & Finance*, 58: 343-373. (ABDC A, JIF 2.473, citations 4) 2. Dong, H., Gil-Bazo, J., **Ratiu, R.V.** (2021), Information demand during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 40, Issue 6. (ABDC A, JIF 3.629, citations 8) 3. Tarkovska, V., Gabaldon, P. and **Ratiu, R.V.** (2023), The importance of a critical mass of women on boards to reduce the gender pay disparity among non-executive directors. *Gender in Management*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-12-2021-0386. (ABDC C, JIF 3.337)
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Globally, the demand for non-financial (ESG) reporting has far-reaching implications, generating policy changes and reshaping companies' disclosed reports. These reports are created by diverse C-suite teams composed of members of different genders and distinct personal and professional characteristics. Current research results are mixed when the effects of financial and ESG reporting are both analyzed. This is why in my research I choose to focus on two main drivers of company performance: intangibles and corporate governance factors. I am personally dedicated and strive that my research has a meaningful impact and be read and understood both within and beyond academia.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	Main research ideas looking at: (1) Financial market effects of ESG activity and reporting where (2) Executives' gender significantly impacts the decision-making process of companies, beyond the typical correlation-based research to why and how this affects corporate financial and social performance. (3) Moreover, executives decision to invest in intangible assets and their subsequent accounting gives companies an upper hand in the face of economic distress.
(F) Data?	(1) Conventional databases for financial and non-financial reporting such as: EIKON, BoardEx, COMPUSTAT, etc. (2) ESG ratings from EIKON, Morningstar, etc. (3) More recently a unique database created with the purpose of understanding corporate financial and social performance and the factors which promote both.
(G) Tools?	(1) For empirical tests I use STATA or EViews. (2) Bibliometric analysis tools like RStudio for literature review papers.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	The novelty in my papers: (1) A&F paper- we show that advertising expenditures should be closely watched and adjusted in parallel to investments in other intangibles, as they are a form of intangibles which generate abnormal returns. (2) JAPP paper- we use a unique database from Google Trends to show that during the most intense months of the COVID-19 pandemic, financial information demand by retail investors declined significantly. (3) GiM paper- we show that gender pay disparity at board level, specifically Non-Executive Directors, can be reduced when women reach a critical mass of 33% of board members and when they are included in influential committees.
(I) So What?	The importance in my papers: (1) A&F paper: we show that insider trading, conditioned on advertising expenditures, extracts 60-day arbitrage returns of 22.5 percent, thus making advertising investments as or more significant than other intangible assets. (2) In the JAPP paper we send a strong signal to regulators that in times of distress, information dissemination should be facilitated a lot more to individual investors. By reducing information asymmetry, individual investors would better overcome the extreme circumstances, such as the ones of a pandemic, that heavily impact the financial markets, as well as their personal lives. (3) We provide evidence that gender pay disparity on boards of directors starts to be reduced, when minimum thresholds and conditions of inclusion on influential committees are met.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	My research is interdisciplinary with an accounting starting point. I focus on understanding the effects of newer forms of sustainability reporting and corporate governance on the financial and social company performance. I have co-authored with professors from accounting, finance and management in order to broaden and increase the significance of the results of my research.

(K) Other Considerations	Career stage: ECR, Assistant Professor on Tenure Track. Interested in formal collaborations for top journal papers on accounting, financial and ESG reporting topics. Target journal strategy- main discipline: accounting; secondary disciplines: ESG reporting in A*/A ABDC list, 4,3,2 ABS list. Top 3 journal targets: *Journal of Accounting Research; Contemporary Accounting Research; Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*. 3 "floor" journal targets: *Accounting in Europe, Journal of Applied Accounting Research, Journal of International Accounting Research*.

Exhibit 7: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative ECR Example – Maciej Tuszkiewicz

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Maciej Tuszkiewicz, Assistant, University of Economics in Katowice, Poland (13.06.2023).
(B) Research Question Themes	My research theme is built around accounting and people. Within accounting, I focus on the quality of accounting information, mainly financial reporting. Regarding people, I am interested in what influences accounting information preparers' and users' decisions targeting factors such as the use of accounting information systems, experience, control linked to the position occupied, and workload. I primarily use quantitative research: surveys and experiments.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Tuszkiewicz, M.,** Maruszewska, E.M., Grzybek, O. (2021). An experimental study of the effect of AIS automation and customization on project recommendation decision, *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 192 s. 1629-1638. (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.08.167) 2. Maruszewska, E.M., **Tuszkiewicz, M.** (2023). The effect of supervisor's control and workload on AIS users' perceived usefulness and approach to misuse an automated system output. The moderating role of experience of AIS practitioners. in: Raban, D.R., Włodarczyk, J. (ed.) Elgar *Companion to Information Economics*. Edward Elgar Publishing (after revision, in print). 3. **Tuszkiewicz, M.,** Maruszewska, E.M. (2023). Use of automated accounting information systems and operational risk in preparation of financial statements: An experiment study. in: Nga N.T.H, Agarwal S., Ziemba. E. (ed.). *Analytics in Finance and Risk Management*. Taylors & Francis Group (after revision, in print).
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	While we have many methods to faithfully represent a company's situation in accounting and specifically in financial reporting, we have a significant lack of understanding of **why** people do not always (or rarely) choose a tool that is rational. Therefore, a better understanding of the decision-making process is crucial to enhance the quality of accounting information.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	(1) the role of accounting information systems in accounting for preparers' and users' decision-making; (2) the role of personal and organizational factors influencing the judgement of preparers and users of accounting information.
(F) Data?	(1) data collected in experimental settings; (2) data collected from surveys; (3) data from financial statements.
(G) Tools?	(1) experiments; (2) surveys; (3) data statistical tools (mostly SPSS).
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Understanding the role of accounting information systems together with personal and organizational factors in judgement and decision making in accounting, for example: (1) how managers change their approach to recommending certain accounting solutions based on the characteristics of accounting information systems; (2) the role of experience as a moderator of behaviour – respondents with different experience levels are influenced differently by the same factors; (3) the role of workload on the ability to misuse accounting information systems.
(I) So What?	The importance of the research presented in the key papers: (1) Show differences in judgement and decisions between users of automated/customized accounting systems, (2) suggest that some factors (e.g., experience, age, gender) may play a moderating role in how accounting information systems users respond to other factors, a risk/danger to incorporate material errors into the financial statement.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	The key papers: (1) present factors that influence the judgement and decisions of preparers and users of accounting information; (2) demonstrate the importance of understanding accounting information systems, the relation between system and its users and its impact on accounting information quality; (3) underline the practical need to encompass the individual users needs and to adjust the working environment based on that to mitigate the risks of irrational decisions in terms of quality of financial statements
(K) Other Considerations	• Career stage: ECR, working on my PhD thesis

	• Seeking formal collaboration as well as mentoring in performing experiments and surveys, mainly focusing on financial reporting and behavioural research in accounting. I am also open to archival research in financial reporting, for which I have lesser experience and liked. However, recent projects were too time-consuming to maintain activity in that area, but I am happy to return to it when the right opportunity arises. • Ambitious journal targets: *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance; Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research; Behavioral Research in Accounting.* • Journal strategy: indexed in ABDC, Scopus and/or WoS; the higher, the better.

Exhibit 8: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative Experienced Researcher Example – Sebastian Hoffmann

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Professor Sebastian Hoffmann, Research Professor of Accounting, HHL Leipzig Graduate School of Management, Leipzig, Germany (30/9/2022).
(B) Research Question Themes	**Primary** research theme is what can we learn from past experiences (aka. history) to address current and future societal challenges. **Secondary** research theme is better understanding of practices of accounting regulation. Primarily **qualitative and interpretive** research.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Hoffmann, S.**, and Walker, S.P. (2020). Adapting to Crisis: Accounting Information Systems during the Weimar Hyperinflation, Business History Review 94 (3), 593-625 [ABS 4, ABDC A, JIF = 1.09] 2. Detzen, D., and **Hoffmann, S.** (2020). Accountability and ideology: The case of a German university under the Nazi regime, Accounting History. 25 (2), 174-192 [ABS 2, ABDC A, JIF = 0.95] 3. Albu, C.N., Albu, N., and **Hoffmann, S.** (2021). The Westernisation of a financial reporting enforcement system in an emerging economy, Accounting and Business Research 51 (3), 271-297 [ABS 3, ABDC A, JIF = 2.89]
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Research needs to be (a) relevant, (b) thorough, and (c) clear. I am intrigued to understand how accounting shapes our lives. I am on a trajectory to make explicit the interdependencies and interrelations between any form of accounting and the social, economic, and political in the world.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	(1) The role of accounting in the regulation of markets, (2) The role of accounting in the development of countries and economies, (3) The role of accounting in socially, politically, or economically "critical" situations
(F) Data?	(1) Unique datasets emerging from interviews, field studies, etc., (2) Publicly available archival repositories, (3) Ethnographic data more generally.
(G) Tools?	(1) Interviews, (2) Document/content analysis, (3) Observation.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Novelty in my research: (1) Connecting accounting with social phenomena that are not conventionally thought to be "driven by numbers"; (2) Demonstrating how socio-economic disturbances impact on the operation and evolution of accounting systems; (3) Researching accounting "in situ" by means of "being in the field"
(I) So What?	Importance of my research: It argues that accounting (1) is rather a social than a technical number-crunching exercise, (2) shapes and is shaped by cultural and political considerations, and (3) is omnipresent in human life.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	(1) BHR paper shows how accounting systems respond and adapt to stress caused by a macroeconomic shock; (2) AH paper illuminates how personal and institutional accountability concerns infiltrate and dominate an entire organization; (3) ABR paper documents the prerequisites to implement global institutions in distinct local settings.
(K) Other Considerations	* Career stage: Mid-career Research Professor * Type of research collaboration: Open to all types of research collaboration (but I am very picky with who I collaborate). No special areas of expertise are sought. * I am open to also publish in non-accounting and non-business journals. * Journal targets (in accounting): *Accounting, Organizations & Society; Critical Perspectives on Accounting; Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal; but also ("flooring") Accounting History; Accounting Forum; Accounting in Europe.*

Exhibit 9: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Experienced Researcher Example – Adrian Gepp

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Dr Adrian Gepp, Associate Professor of Data Analytics, Bond Business School, Bond University, Queensland, Australia (14/4/2022).
(B) RQ Themes	**Primary** research theme is using data analytics to reveal unique insights about problems of economic and social importance, with a focus, or **secondary** research theme, of combatting the problem of corporate fraud. Primarily **quantitative** research.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Gepp, A.,** Kumar, K. and Bhattacharya, S. (2021), "Lifting the numbers game: identifying key input variables and a best-performing model to detect financial statement fraud", *Accounting & Finance*, Vol. 61, No 3, 4601-4638 [ABDC A, JIF = 2.942, citations = 2] 2. **Gepp, A.**, Linnenluecke, M K., O'Neill, T.J. and Smith, T. (2018), "Big data techniques in auditing research and practice: Current trends and future opportunities", *Journal of Accounting Literature*, Vol. 40, pp. 102-115. [ABDC A, citations = 207] 3. **Gepp, A.,** Kumar, K. and Bhattacharya, S. (2010), "Business failure prediction using decision trees", *Journal of Forecasting*, Vol. 61, No 6, 536-555 [ABDC A, JIF = 2.306, citations = 164]
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Data have always been ubiquitous, but now we have the ability to store and analyse datasets on a huge scale. The way of the future for business and research is to uncover relevant, reliable (repeatable) and objective insights from the data available to advance our understanding. This is particularly true in the fight against corporate fraud, where data analytics can, among other things, be used to flag suspicious patterns and identify cases that are more likely to be fraudulent.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	Core research idea is researching different ways analytic and predictive models can assist addressing problems of economic and social importance, particularly in the fight against fraud and for data-informed allocation/monitoring of resources (such as advertising resources, risk monitoring resources, financial resources and more)
(F) Data?	My research largely uses unique data sourced from organisations via strategic collaborative research agreements, with industry partners from fields such as advertising, health, retail, government, accounting and professional services, insurance and not-for-profits. Other standard business data sources are used, including Bloomberg and CapitalIQ. Data extracted from US SEC Accounting and Auditing Enforcement Releases has also been a key source of fraud-related data.
(G) Tools?	Wide range of quantitative tools including modern statistical learning and machine learning that span parametric, semi-parametric and non-parametric techniques. Examples include tree-based methods, neural networks, generalised linear models, traditional and modern survival analysis techniques, and more recently considering reinforcement learning and deep learning.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Novelty in 3 of my papers: (1) Using a specifically devised performance criterion, a novel ensemble model for financial statement fraud prediction that outperforms 31 others in the most comprehensive comparison at the time (2) Discovering that auditing is lagging behind in the use of valuable big data techniques, despite there being many opportunities for their use. (3) A detailed comparative evaluation of traditional and tree-based methods for business failure prediction using a relatively large data set.
(I) So What?	Importance in 3 of my papers: (1) Findings enable practitioners and researchers to make an informed choice for a financial statement fraud detection model, rather than defaulting to popular, yet dated, models. (2) Points out the need for, and specific opportunities in, big data analytics research applied to auditing, as well as calling for a greater alignment to practice. (3) Suggests that more modern approaches and updated models can outperform old traditional business failure models that are being widely used in research and practice.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	Research that leverages modern data analytic techniques using relatively large datasets can substantially enhance detection and prediction models across a wide range of areas, including financial statement fraud detection (paper 1) and business failure prediction (paper 3). It is important for future research to take advantage of these advances in analytics and the ability to apply them based on increased computing power – this again applies to many areas including auditing (paper 2).
(K) Other Considerations	* Career stage: Senior Researcher. Open to all types of research collaboration. Expertise in a domain in which data analytics can be applied is sought for collaboration, along with other data analytics researchers * "Go to" analytics journals include Decision Support Systems ("A*" ABDC journal), but commonly application domain-specific journals are targeted because that is where the interested readership is - Accounting and Finance ("A") as an example. * Open to collaboration on new projects that apply modern statistical learning or machine learning techniques in novel ways or to novel data sets that have the potential to provide insights about issues of important economic/social consequence.

Exhibit 10: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative Experienced Researcher Example – Searat Ali

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Searat Ali, Senior Lecturer in Finance, University of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia (24/06/2022).
(B) Research Question Themes	**Primary** research theme is to understand the implications of the strong or weak corporate governance mechanisms for investors and corporations. **Secondary** or **emerging** research theme is to understand the implications of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) activities for investors and corporations. Primary research method is **quantitative** in nature.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Ali, S.**, Liu,B., Su, J.J. (2022). Does corporate governance have a differential effect on downside and upside risk? *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting, forthcoming.* [ABDC A*, ABS 3, Q1, JIF = 2.709, Citations = 3]. <u>CRediT</u>: This paper is from the third empirical chapter of my PhD thesis. 2. Atif, M., **Ali, S.** (2021). Environmental, Social and Governance disclosures and default risk. *Business Strategy & Environment, 30 (08), 3937-3959.* [ABDC A, ABS 3, Q1, JIF = 10.801, Citations = 19]. <u>CRediT</u>: Corresponding author; conceptualization of research idea; research methodology; empirical analyses; interpretation of results 3. Nadarajah, S., Duong, H.N., **Ali, S.**, Liu, B., Huang, A. (2021). Stock liquidity and default risk around the world. *Journal of Financial Markets,* 55, 100597. [ABDC A*, ABS 3, Q1, JIF = 3.095, Citations = 20]. <u>CRediT</u>: This paper is from the PhD thesis of the 1st author. As an expert in the stock liquidity and default risk areas, my role was to provide mentoring support including conceptualising of the idea, literature review and theoretical framework, data collection and programming, and empirical methodology.
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Personally, I believe that high ethical and religious values are important to overcome conflict of interests, promote the common good, and generate long-term value. Given these personal beliefs, I am motivated to conduct research which addresses: (1) a real-world problems in the field of finance, (2) an important knowledge gap in the academic finance literature, and (3) a triple bottom line i.e., People (Social), Planet (Environmental) and Profit (Financial).
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	Research idea themes looking at the role of: (1) corporate governance mechanisms including board independence and diversity in the corporate finance or capital market research settings; (2) ESG disclosure and performance in the corporate finance or capital market research settings; (3) Firm-level and Country-level factors in corporate finance or capital market questions.
(F) Data?	(1) SIRCA for Australian corporate governance and financial data and Bloomberg/Refinitiv for international ESG, financial and market data; (2) Credit Research Initiative for international default risk data; (3) Self-constructed corporate governance index following Howarth corporate governance methodology for Australian firms [Used in 5 publications]
(G) Tools?	(1) Panel regression using STATA. (2) Main results using Pooled Ordinary Least Squares and Firm Fixed Effects. (3) Addressing endogeneity using Two-Stage Least Squares, Generalised Method of Moments, Propensity Score Matching, Entropy Balancing, and Difference-in Differences. High level expertise in using these tools.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Novelty in 3 of my papers: (1) The first to examine the differential effect of corporate governance on firm risk by bifurcating total risk into two important components: downside and upside risks. (2) Used ESG disclosure dataset from Bloomberg to investigate its influence on default risk. (3) First to examine the effect of stock liquidity on default risk in the international markets.
(I) So What?	Importance in 3 of my papers: (1) JBFA paper raises concerns about monitoring focused ASX corporate governance principles and recommendations making managers extra cautious in their decision-making, thus resulting in the reduction of not only downside risk but also upside potential. (2) BSE paper provides insights for debtholders to consider a firm's sustainability initiatives (i.e., ESG) in their credit decisions. (3) JFM paper highlights the importance of country setting for investors in understanding the effect of stock liquidity on default risk around the world.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	(1) JBFA paper makes an important contribution towards corporate governance and risk-taking literature by classifying the total risk into downside risk and upside potential which was never been done before (2) BSE paper provides a rationale of considering the firm life cycle stages to understand the influence of ESG disclosure on default risk. (4) JFM paper suggests that the negative effect of stock liquidity on default risk is stronger in countries with poor investor protection and information environments.
(K) Other Considerations	*Career stage: MCR. *Collaborations: Open to all types of research collaboration including mentoring and co-authorship in particular with researchers (1) expert in the environmental and social sustainability issues faced by the corporations; (2) expert in qualitative research method, artificial intelligence, and systematic literature reviews; (3) from international institutions providing an opportunity to mentor juniors and being mentored by the seniors * Primary: ABDC A/A* in the FOR 1502 (Finance). Secondary: ABDC A/A* in the FOR 1501 (Accounting) and 1503 (Business). *"Ambitious" journals: (1) *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis (A* ABDC); (2) Journal of Corporate Finance (A*); (2) British Accounting Review* (A*). *"Go to" journals: (1) *International Review of Economics and Finance (A ABDC); (2) Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics (A); (3) Business Strategy and Environment* (A).

Exhibit 11: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative Experienced Researcher Example – David Tan

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Dr. David Tan, Senior Lecturer in Finance, University of Wollongong, North Wollongong, Australia (25/6/2022).
(B) RQ Themes	**Primary** research theme is the application of finance theory and financial econometrics to the areas of tourism and aviation management. **Secondary** research themes include testing finance trading strategies, and firm-level decision making surrounding corporate governance and social responsibility. Primarily engaged in **quantitative** research.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. Johar, K., **Tan, D.**, Maung, Y., & Douglas, I. (2022), "Destination Marketing: Optimizing Resource Allocation Using Modern Portfolio Theory", *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(6), pp. 1358-1377. [ABDC A*, JIF = 10.982] 2. Milunovich, G., Shi, S. & **Tan, D.** (2019), "Bubble Detection and Sector Trading in Real Time", *Quantitative Finance*, 19 (2), pp. 247-263. [ABDC A, JIF = 2.222, citations = 17] 3. Perera, S. & **Tan, D.** (2019), "In Search of the "Right Price" for Air Travel: First Steps Towards Estimating Granular Price-Demand Elasticity", *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 130, pp. 557-569. {ABDC A*, JIF = 5.594, citations = 7]
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	The decision-making process of individuals, organisations and policymakers can be significantly improved with appropriate and rigorous quantitative analysis. My future direction is in developing quantitative tools derived from finance theory for tourism marketing organisations and airlines; assessing financial trading strategies; and studying the corporate decision-making process of firms.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	Core themes include: (1) quantitative analysis relating to an economic outcome of interest, (2) applicability of findings to the organisation, individual or policy-level. These can span across the realms of corporate finance, trading strategies, tourism destination marketing, or airline financial management.
(F) Data?	(1) Corporate finance and security pricing data available from Refinitiv's Eikon (2) Tourism data typically available from Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) and Bureau of Infrastructure and Transport Research Economics (BITRE) (3) Proprietary airline revenue pricing and booking data is made available by partner airlines
(G) Tools?	(1) Difference-in-difference regressions and quasi-experimental designs, (2) Optimization and simulations, (3) Two-stage least squares regressions and dynamic panel GMM models.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Novelty in 3 of my papers: (1) JTR paper: The first study to implement a derivation of the Markowitz portfolio framework to tourism marketing organisations (TMOs) that incorporates budget constraints and heterogeneity in effectiveness of marketing across tourism markets. This study provides direct practical guidance to TMOs as to how to obtain optimal portfolios; (2) QF paper: The first to apply the real-time PSY bubble indicator to a stock trading strategy with success; (3) TRA paper: Using detailed and disaggregated airline ticket booking data, we use a novel instrument and are the first to estimate airline ticket price elasticity at the flight-level. This granular measure of elasticity is directly relevant to an airline's revenue manager who is pricing airfares.
(I) So What?	Importance in 3 of my papers: (1) JTR paper: Assist TMOs in rebuilding their inbound tourism flows in a resilient and sustainable manner particularly in the post-COVID era; (2) QF paper: We identify inefficiencies in financial markets relating to asset pricing bubbles and develop potential trading strategies to exploit them; (3) TRA paper: Improve airline revenue management as granular elasticity estimates free from endogeneity can be used by practitioners.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	The core themes across my research profile include: (1) application of financial econometrics/concepts to tourism and aviation in novel ways; (2) identifying financial market inefficiencies (such as asset price bubbles) using econometric tools; and (3) uncovering causality across corporate governance and firm outcome relationships.
(K) Other Considerations	* Career stage: MCR. Open to formal collaboration with experts in same/periphery fields and industry. * "Go to" journals for submissions are: (1) *Journal of Travel Research ("A*" ABDC journal), (2) Journal of Banking and Finance ("A*" ABDC journal), (3) Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* ("A*" ABDC journal). Journal target strategy is A*/A in the ABDC list. * Open to collaboration on new projects concerning climate change risk, microfinance, and development economics.

Exhibit 12: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative Experienced Researcher Example – Micheal Axelsen

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Dr. Micheal Axelsen, Senior Lecturer (Business Information Systems), The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia (30th June 2022).
(B) RQ Themes	**Primary research theme** is on the **use and role of information technology (IT) in the audit and governance of information in business**. The focus is on 'fitness for purpose' and data quality, with an **emerging theme** being the increasing use of *artificially intelligent* technologies that 'learn' from data. I am a **primarily qualitative** researcher adopting a **critical realist** perspective.
(C) Signature Key Papers	**Axelsen, M.,** Green, P., & Ridley, G. (2017). Explaining the information systems auditor role in the public sector financial audit. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, *24*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2016.12.003 **Axelsen, M.** (2018). Successful Nonprofit Leadership in An IT World. In *Transformational Leadership and Not for Profits and Social Enterprises*. New York: Routledge. **Axelsen, M. S**., Green, P. F., Ridley, G., Coram, P. J., & Ferguson, C. (2014). *IT Audit Methodologies in the Australian Public Sector: Addressing Mandatory Requirements of International Standards*.
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Good decision-making requires good data, **but once gathered improving data quality for large data sets is difficult.** I aim to **improve understanding** of how technologies support **information audit and governance** to ensure that the data **is fit for purpose.** Data whose **provenance, data quality, and relevance** in the decision's context is not understood may lead to **poor decisions** or decisions may be made according to **other factors**. **Understanding how the provenance, data quality, and relevance of the data in the decision's context affects decision-making is a key concern when investing in information technology in the information age**.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	The effectiveness of a *technology* lies in *how* it is used by *people*. Technologies supporting **information audit and governance** are *part* of the information system (IS) and *determine* the quality of the **data available for decision-making**. Good decision-making **requires understanding how fit-for-purpose the data is, and this understanding requires information audit and governance**. A decision-maker can use the data or **emerging intelligent technologies** can learn from the data to **make decisions without intervention**. Technologies support information audit and governance processes as the data **gathered grows exponentially**.
(F) Data?	**Linking data quality and business context** with **complex and emerging technologies** requires access to the **technical, assurance, and decision-making areas** of the business in **different contexts** for comparative analysis. **Qualitative interviews** enhance *understanding*. **Quantitative evidence** is required as **research models** are *refined*.
(G) Tools?	(1) **NVivo** for thematic content analysis (2) **Text Analysis (Python)** for automated content analysis and (3) Bibliometric analysis for literature reviews.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	The research's **novelty** arises from **considering information audit and governance as part of the wider IS context**. Further, this research **considers data quality as dynamic rather than static -** that is, **the data's quality shifts and moves** as the **purpose** it is applied to and the **business context** it is used for also **changes over time**.
(I) So What?	The **research impact** arises from the recognition of data quality as **dynamic and contextual** while also acknowledging that **the data itself does not change.** This means that the decision-maker must understand the **provenance, data quality, and relevance of the data in the decision's context**. As **data volume, velocity, and variety grows**, and more data is gathered, the **use of technology to support information audit and governance** is of increasing importance to **effective decision-making**.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	This research program (1) **develops models** setting out the **understanding of the use of technology in the audit and governance of information** using data quality in context. The research program also (2) **informs business** when **investing in technologies** that allow decision-makers to contextualise the provenance, data quality in context, and relevance of the data for the context of the decisions they make. Finally, the research program (3) **provides a basis for educators** to link the **curriculum** of programs and courses in decision-making and business information systems to **data-based decision-making in the context of information audit and governance**.
(K) Other Considerations	**Career Stage:** MCR. **Research Collaboration:** Cross-disciplinary research with accounting discipline as co-author and supervising/mentoring accounting IS HDR students and ECRs. **Expertise sought:** Industry relationships, audit and governance, decision-making theory. **Expertise offered:** data quality, rigorous qualitative analysis, and development of research models. **Target journal strategy:** A, A* journals in accounting, assurance, information systems and governance disciplines. **Top 3 Journals:** *Journal of Information Systems; International Journal of Accounting Information Systems; Decision Support Systems*. **3 Floor/Edge Journals:** *Journal of Information Systems Education; Australasian Journal of Information Systems; Accounting, Auditing, and Accountability Journal.*

Exhibit 13: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative ECR/Protege Example – Chelsea Gill

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for Assistant Professor Chelsea Gill, Assistant Professor of Management, Bond University, Queensland, Australia (8/4/22).
(B) RQ Themes	**Primary** research theme has been the restorative potential, experiences and outcomes of retreats for leaders. **Secondary** theme of research is education focused and explores the design of effective learning and teaching practices, including the Pitching Research Framework. Earliest theme of research related to marketing of small and large events. Primarily mixed-methods research; focus on qualitative.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Gill, C.**, Packer, J. & Ballantyne, R. (2019). Spiritual retreats as a restorative destination: Design factors facilitating restorative outcomes, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79(13). [ABDC A*, JIF = 9.011, citations = 14] 2. Mitchell, M., **Gill, C.** & Brodmerkel, S. (2022). Academics' narratives of productive learning cultures during COVID-19 Emergency Remote Teaching in Australia, *Student Success Journal*, 13(1). [JIF = 1.01] 3. Chien, M., Kelly, S. & **Gill, C.** (2018). Identifying objectives for mega-event leveraging: a non-host city case, *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 36(2). [not on ABDC list anymore, SJR = 0.745, citations = 11].
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Research should meaningfully engage with, and contribute to, industry practice. Industry practice should be based on scientific evidence that demonstrates effective approaches and outcomes. I seek to contribute to the praxis between scholarly and meaningful engagement with industry and the application of research findings to inform practice. My aim is to enhance practice and build capacity through valuable research and education initiatives across sectors and disciplines.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	A common theme amongst my past research papers is (1) the exploration of how various experiences lead to particular outcomes, (2) the practical implications for leveraging effective design features. My research has accomplished this in the context of retreats for leaders, learning and teaching within higher education, as well as small- and large-scale events.
(F) Data?	My primary research theme used a hand-collected unique longitudinal qualitative and quantitative data set emerging from several types and styles of retreats conducted within Australia. It has potential for further investigation through the lens of various theoretical perspectives. A common theme is that I have relied on self-reported survey/interview data across research projects.
(G) Tools?	(1) SPSS, (2) thematic content analysis.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Novelty in my core research papers: (1) the first to explore the restorative experiences / outcomes of retreats for religious leaders and present design factors for restorative retreats, (2) undertaking empirical research during COVID-19 to explore academics perspectives in cultivating productive learning cultures provides insights for practice which can be further investigated in the context of hyflex/multi-modal learning environments.
(I) So What?	Importance in 3 of my papers: (1) ATR paper demonstrated the types of activities/experiences that foster restoration and how to effectively design retreats for restoration – this is crucial for the sector as no prior research had investigated the value of retreats despite them being an almost mandatory annual requirement for leaders to attend; (2) SS paper provided evidence of effective university teaching and learning practices during the pandemic when no previous research had explored learning cultures through a socio-cultural lens in this context.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	(1) ATR paper distinguished between educational and reflective retreats and the participants' resultant experiences and outcomes, providing a useful categorization for further exploration; (2) SS paper delivered practical strategies on Emergency Remote Teaching learning cultures and managing boundaries with students.
(K) Other Considerations	Career stage: ECR, first year of academic appointment since receiving PhD.

	"Go to" journals for submission are within management/leadership and education research disciplines such as: (1) *Work and stress* ("A" ABDC); (2) *Studies in Higher Education* ("A" ABDC). I seek formal collaboration (including co-authorship) and mentoring within the management/leadership discipline and education research, particularly on projects that use qualitative / mixed methods approaches. Open to collaboration on new projects that: (1) explore retreats / professional development for leaders; (2) investigate Pitching Research processes and resources; (3) higher education research related to teaching and learning initiatives and employability outcomes.

Exhibit 14: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative ECR/Protege Example – Vishal Mehrotra

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Vishal Mehrotra, Senior Teaching Fellow, Bond Business School, Bond University, Gold Coast, Australia (April 2022).
(B) RQ Themes	Primary research theme is "marketing" with a core focus on gamification and consumer behaviour. Secondary research theme is "Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SoTL)" with a focus on how students plan and pitch research as well as the role of gamification in pedagogy. Keen to explore a tertiary theme of the influence of gamification in a range of contexts and across multiple disciplines. Primarily quantitative research but very interested in (and currently working on) mixed method.
(C) Signature Key Papers	Mehrotra, Roy & Kumar (2022), Untangling Rewards from Complex Game Systems: Towards a Novel Gamification Rewards Classification Scheme. [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Mehrotra, Roy & Kumar (2022), You WON! How Rewards Affect Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Brand Connections in Gamified Marketing Implementations [Manuscript in preparation]. Bond Business School, Bond University. Mehrotra, Roy & Kumar (2022), The Role of Gamification and Pay What You Want Pricing in Self-Interest Versus Other-Interest Altruistic Giving. [Manuscript in preparation]. Bond Business School, Bond University.
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	At the intersection of entertainment, communication and persuasion, gamification is an evolving, multi-disciplinary field of research. The goal of gamification is to motivate positive human behaviours and foster user engagement, outcomes that are strategic imperatives across multiple domains. My research aims to better understand how, when, and for whom gamification works and do so in a wide range of contexts and disciplines. The underlying goal is to better inform the design, development and implementation of targeted, effective, and meaningful systems that ultimately improve the human condition.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	Delving into the anatomy of gamification via a deep examination of the role of: (1) different gameful affordances (game design elements, mechanics and components that make up complex gamified systems); (2) the psychological mediators they drive (human motivation); and (3) the behavioural outcomes they aim to deliver.
(F) Data?	Custom survey data. Depth interview and focus group data.
(G) Tools?	(1) Experimental design; (2) parametric inferential statistics; (3) predictive correlation and regression methods (including proficiency with structural equation modelling).
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	(1) My first key paper presents and tests a novel gamification rewards taxonomy grounded in human motivation theory. The Tangible Verbal Symbolic Scheme (TVSS) for gamification rewards classification provides a unique and valuable method of explicating all possible gamification rewards and extricating them from other gameful affordances to allow them to be isolated and studied; (2) My second paper studies the interactive relationship between reward type, achievement goals, achievement orientation and intrinsic motivation – a valuable interaction that does not appear to have been interrogated in the extant literature; (3) My third paper presents novel experimental research into the effect of gamification on pay what you want pricing (PWYW) in altruistic giving.
(I) So What?	(1) Rewards are a cornerstone of gamification. However, because they occur as part of complex gamified systems, their individual effects are confounded and conflated by other gameful affordances. My first paper develops and tests an actionable method of extricating rewards from other gameful affordances within complex gamification systems so that they may be meaningfully studied; (2) My second paper responds to a call for empirical research that can enhance our understanding of how gamification works by focusing on the user rather than the focal organisation (the designer of gamification systems); (3) Building on the substantial self-interest versus other-interest charitable giving literature, my third paper examines the influence of gamification on the unique PWYW pricing methodology.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	(1) The novel rewards classification grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT), proposed in my first paper, responds to a call by several gamification scholars for rewards to be extracted from other gameful affordances. In doing so, it extends gamification and rewards literature and contributes to Cognitive Evaluation Theory (a sub-theory of SDT); (2) By proposing and empirically testing a parsimonious model that can enhance the understanding of how, when and for whom gamification works my second paper extends rewards, motivation, and goals literature; (3) My third paper makes a valuable contribution to PWYW literature and extends altruism literature by a first of its kind study that examines the influence of gamification on the unique PWYW pricing method within altruistic settings.

(K) Other Considerations	* As an ECR, actively seeking all forms of research collaboration with early-career, mid-career and experienced researchers in marketing and SoTL. Also keen to work with researchers in multiple disciplines who wish to explore gamification in its many forms. * My ambitious Top 3 journal targets in my primary discipline are: (1) *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (A* ABDC journal); (2) *International Journal of Information Management* (A* ABDC journal); (3) *Journal of Business Research* (A ABDC journal). * Having recently navigated the HDR process, I have the knowledge, experience and expertise to mentor and guide other HDR students. Together with a highly experienced team of supervisors (an Associate Professor of Marketing and a Professor of Statistics), I am seeking to co-supervise marketing-focused M.Phil. or Ph.D. candidates.

Exhibit 15: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative ECR/Protege Example – Nikki Cornwell

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	**Nikki Cornwell**, PhD Candidate, Bond University, Queensland, Australia (11/05/2022)
(B) Research Question Themes	Leveraging **data and analytics** for more objective and real-time **operational risk management** (ORM) [Quantitative research methods]
(C) Signature Key Papers	**Cornwell, N.**, Bilson, C., Gepp, A., Stern, S., & Vanstone, B. J. (2022). The role of data analytics within operational risk management: A systematic review from the financial services and energy sectors. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/01605682.2022.2041373 *[ABDC A, JIF 2.860, Cornwell CRediT = Conceptualisation, Investigation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing, Visualisation]*
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	Centred on the aim for more **effective and efficient operations** in organisations for the betterment of their customers, people and wider society, my research seeks to contribute innovative solutions, driven by data that enable **intelligent risk-informed decision-making**. With risk simply representing deviations from the intended objectives, I believe organisations' operational data should be leveraged with a risk mindset to proactively, continuously and objectively manage risk, in turn driving safe and quality business. I conduct rigorous research that directly engages industry to ensure relevant and timely improvements to this complex problem in practice.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	The core idea of my signature research theme is to apply and develop various data analytics modelling techniques that can harness the value of data collected from an organisation's day-to-day business operations for ORM purposes. My recent research trajectory approaches this from several perspectives: • critically analysing existing ORM practices and **strategising the data-driven future of ORM**; • developing a more rigorous and quantitative, data-driven approach to **causal factors analysis**; and • operationalising a real-time operational **risk mitigation recommender** or decision-making system.
(F) Data?	Broadly, my research is underpinned by two types of data: • **Risk, incident and loss data** – information on historical event-level operational incidents or losses and associated mitigation and remediation actions; and • **Operational data** – information relating to monitoring internal processes, systems and people in an organisation. Such data are almost exclusively sourced from organisations and thus requires strategic and formal industry research collaborations. Engagement with a variety of organisations enables my research to have a direct and meaningful impact to business and their people.
(G) Tools?	I utilise various data analytics techniques throughout my research, ranging from traditional to advanced **statistical and probabilistic learning** methods and **machine learning** algorithms. Open-source programming languages are used for data manipulation and statistical analysis and modelling, such as **R and Python**.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	The overarching theme interlinking the novelties of my research lies at the intersection of two disciplines: **operational risk management** and **data analytics**. Several novelties follow from this, including: • leveraging **raw data** generated from an organisation's operating environment augmented with existing incident data, rather than relying on static and subjective expert elicitation as in existing ORM tools and previous studies; and • quantifying operational risk as a **continuous probability**, rather than as bucketed risk ratings to enable more detailed risk insights.
(I) So What?	Data-driven ORM insights on a continuous probabilistic scale provide risk managers with a more real-time, objective and detailed understanding of their operational risk profile to **prioritise resources** and **inform proactive decision-making** and targeted mitigation efforts. Ultimately, this **reduces the occurrence of operational incidents** in organisations, that may otherwise result in direct or indirect financial or physical losses.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.

(J) Contribution?	My research has contributed to the academic field and industry practice by providing both **parameterised models** and **strategic commentary** on how to advance ORM by implementing a data-driven approach. Key contributions include: • an effective, computationally efficient and interpretable approach to model the probability distributions of operational loss events with respect to their causal factors, which was applied and rigorously tested across various use cases; and • a structured framework outlining the role of data and analytics for different purposes in managing operational risks (Cornwell et al., 2022).
(K) Other Considerations	**Career Stage:** PhD Candidate [Final year] ECR **Research Collaborations:** I am seeking additional industry partners to further develop and implement data analytics solutions for ORM with, and I am also open to collaborations with other researchers or research students interested in this inter-disciplinary field. **Target Journals:** *Journal of the Operational Research Society* [ABDC A], *Decision Support Systems* [ABDC A*], *Risk Analysis* [SJR Q1], *Safety Science* [ABDC A]

Exhibit 16: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative ECR/Protege Example – Itisham Malik

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Ihtisham Malik, Lecturer in Finance, University of Queensland, Australia (April 2022).
(B) RQ Themes	Primary research theme is "asset pricing" with a core focus on extreme weather events and investment strategies. Secondary research theme is related to "sustainability issues" primarily green premium, carbon risk pricing etc. I see myself as quantitative analytic with plans to work on big data in the near future.
(C) Signature Key Papers	Malik, I, Faff, R. W., & Chan, K. F. (2020). Market response of US equities to domestic natural disasters: Industry-based evidence. Accounting & Finance 60(4), 3875-3904 (Impact Factor: 2.94). Malik, I. A., & Faff, R. (2022). Industry market reaction to natural disasters: Do firm characteristics and disaster magnitude matter? Natural Hazards, 111(3), 2963-2994. (Impact Factor: 3.230). Chan, K & Malik, I. (2022). "Climate policy uncertainty and the cross-section of stock returns" available on SSRN.
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	I believe that research should be problem focused, and impactful and not just for the sake of research. I really think that climate finance i.e., intersection of climate related issues (like GHG emissions, climate policy uncertainty, carbon risk) and finance (be it corporate or asset pricing) is an area that is relatively unexplored and needs more attention. This is because ethe implications of such research are far reaching from companies to investors and even the general public.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	1. Role of Climate policy uncertainty in asset pricing models. 2. Role of greenness (brownness) & asset pricing 3. Corporate policies, GHG emissions and investor sentiment.
(F) Data?	Range of datasets (from typical data repositories to hand collected data related to finance to environmental variables). E.g. Bloomberg, Carbon Disclosure Project, CRSP, DataStream, SHELDUS etc.
(G) Tools?	(1) Empirical modelling mainly event study and other regressions models using variety of econometric/statistical software like Stata, R etc.
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	My research provides evidence that investors have been pricing climate policy uncertainty for a long time (paper 3). Further, my research provides insight into how financial markets behave in the wake of "extreme weather events/natural disasters" (papers 1 & 2)
(I) So What?	My research suggests: 1. Investment strategies to "avoid loss/make money" during extreme weather crisis and highlight "safe industries" to invest in. 2. Investors to closely follow insider traders if investors are not capable of interpreting technical extreme weather event forecasts and what does it mean for companies they have invested in. 3. Trading strategies in the wake of high(low) policy uncertainty.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(J) Contribution?	A new factor to be included in the existing asset pricing models. Risk & return theory tested using climate risk across a range of measures/industries
(K) Other Considerations	Career Stage: ECR. Looking for research collaborations (international and local) especially researchers in the area of climate finance and expertise in sophisticated analytical tools. *Go to* journals for submission are Q1/ABS 3 or higher journals. Open to new research projects and other ideas related to empirical finance and/or climate finance

Exhibit 17: Pitching a Researcher Profile – Illustrative ECR/Protege Example – Karina Honey

FOUR	**Four** Big Picture Research Profile Anchors
(A) Research Bio Title	Personal research bio for PhD Student, Karina Honey, Business Information Systems, Business School, University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia
(B) RQ Themes	**Primary** research theme has been exploring the viability and suitability of blockchain technology within an organization context. **Secondary** theme of research is investigating the appropriateness of Transaction Cost Theory in a digital setting such as Blockchain. Earliest theme of research related to the survivability of blockchain "claiming" projects. A new theme of future projects is the governance models that approve the adoption and use of emerging technologies within organizational contexts. Primarily mixed-methods research; focus on qualitative.
(C) Signature Key Papers	1. **Honey, K.**, Robb, A., Rohde, F., (2018). Deadwood Revisited?", *International Conference of Information Systems – SIG ASYS, San Francisco December 2018.* 2. **Honey, K.**, Robb, A., Rohde, F., (2019). Literature Review Challenges for Emerging Technologies", *Australasian Conference of Information Systems, Perth, Australia, December 2019.* 3. **Honey, K.**, Robb, A., Rohde, F., (2022). Are we contributing? The who, when, where, & what of the Blockchain Research landscape", *International Conference of Information Systems, Copenhagen, December 2022*
(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto	In a world where attentions are fleeting, and change is rapid, I seek to contribute to theory and practice in an accessible and consumable manner, reaching those that need guidance and answers promptly. I aim to enhance organisational practice in rational decision-making during ICT fads, FOMO (fear of missing out), and organisational demise. Additionally, I aim to contribute and (eventually) lead collaborative research, bringing together disciplines and industry in a manner that transcends traditional boundaries.
THREE	**Three** Basic Building Blocks … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(E) Idea?	A common theme amongst my past research is (1) the exploration of how organizations investigate, assess, and implement new technologies, (2) and the embracing of collaborative research with industry, government, and cross-discipline partners. My research has accomplished this in the context of collaborative research with the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, Scholarship awards from Data61/CSIRO, and engagement on Federal government led – National blockchain roadmap, as well as creating executive education vignettes on Blockchain.
(F) Data?	My primary research theme used secondary (and triangulated with primary data) longitudinal qualitative and quantitative data sets. Primary research focuses on understanding the complexity of the phenomenon, first through exploring large quantitative data sets to ensure the breadth of the phenomenon is understood, and then second, through carefully selected subjects (informed by quantitative work) I turn to rich qualitative primary data sets (such as case studies and ethnography) to deeply understand the phenomenon.
(G) Tools?	(1) SPSS, (2) thematic content analysis, (3) Bibliometric analysis
TWO	**Two** Key Questions … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.
(H) What's New?	Novelty in my core research: (1) the first to explore viability of blockchain projects over a four-year duration, (2) the first to explore a cross-case analysis of established companies versus blockchain start-ups in a determination of the viability and suitability of blockchain technology.
(I) So What?	Importance in 3 of my papers: (1) 2018 paper demonstrated the types of actors undertaking blockchain projects and key indicators of Machiavellian participants – this is crucial for the industry sector as no prior research had investigated blockchain projects to this breadth; (2) 2019 paper highlighted key challenges faced in conducting literature reviews on rapid-changing technology in an organizational context; (3) 2022 paper highlighted key technological features and business requirements that can be chosen when considering blockchain technology solutions.
ONE	**One** Bottom Line … identifying core themes across your signature papers or more broadly from across your recent research trajectory.

(J) Contribution?	(1) 2018 research highlighted the Machiavellian actors more prevalent for companies formed between 2014-2015; (2) 2019 paper highlighted the difficulty in building on academic literature as the technology evolved so rapidly; (3) 2022 paper highlighted the breadth of research and researcher contributing to design science research in blockchain technology.
(K) Other Considerations	Career stage: PhD Student in the final year, ECR. I am currently completing my PhD part-time while working as a Teaching focused academic. I seek my first Teaching and Research focused position within the Business Information System discipline.