

Appendix C: Anonymous Feedback on Earlier Versions of this Paper

Feedback item #C.1:

“...While I thought it will take no time to fill in the 3/2/1 template blanks, it turns out I was very wrong, plus I am sure you will have suggestions to rewrite it.”

Feedback item #C.2:

“...Thank you for the introducing this 'pitching' exercise to us. I find it tremendously helpful in shaping my research direction and my perspective about research overall.”

Feedback item #C.3:

“...Thanks it looks good.I noticed that this brings together a lot of things we had to work out for ourselves over the years.”

Feedback item #C.4:

“...it really seems very useful and not only to PhD students...”

Feedback item #C.5:

“... Can you send me any updated versions when they occur. I plan to include the paper in my research methods class.”

Feedback item #C.6:

“...Thank you for your paper. It seems really interesting and useful. I think we will use this format for our PhD students as they need to prepare a proposal by the end of their first year.”

Feedback item #C.7:

“...[I] find [it] very useful especially for our junior faculty members as well as for experienced faculty members who are interested in applying for a research grants. .. Your contribution to our profession is very much appreciated.”

Feedback item #C.8:

“...I have read your pitching paper and completed the template for my current project. It forced me to look at my idea from different angles and to critically reassess it. Thus, I think your paper is extremely helpful for every PhD/post-doc who wants to put his idea to an acid test.”

Feedback item #C.9:

“... Pros:

-Very good and structured approach for an early career. Especially for students who need guidance or come from an international background where they are told what they need to deliver, this paper surely help their work by decreasing uncertainty.

-Appreciated that you mentioned the important of highlight potential risks (i.e. 3.5 other considerations). Not many think about this, especially when excited about their own project... including myself!

Cons:

-Almost exclusive importance given to top-tier journals: I do understand the rationale but I wouldn't like the target audience to build their 'research habitus' with the idea that anything outside that league is rubbish (however I have noticed that in the example you used, one of the three key papers doesn't come from the Big4 fin journals).

-The example you used needs financial literacy: I do acknowledge that you stated the target audience at the outset (i.e. finance and accounting) but given the relevance of your article (beyond researchers in such fields), is there any chance you could choose more 'accessible' theories? Obviously, this comment originates from the fact that I do not know such theories and, although used only to contextualise the example, I found myself frustrated by trying to follow concepts. I just think you could broaden your audience.”¹

¹ This feedback came from a PhD student in the management area.

Feedback item #C.10:

“I have now had a chance to read your paper. I like it a lot and the structured approach you propose to developing a research idea appeals very much to my sensibilities.

I disagree with your assessment that the template will have limited value outside quantitative studies. I think you are selling it short. I think it is an equally useful tool for clarifying embryonic thinking that will use qualitative research methods; or indeed mixed methods, as is increasingly the case in management. I'm not sure why you think it is not applicable in these contexts, but I would be interested to know your thinking there. I wonder whether you think that because the structured nature of the template is naturally aligned with positivism that by its nature it has no business trying to talk to interpretive scholars? If so, I disagree. I don't think it matters what one's ontological or epistemological bent is vis a vis the process that takes place before an idea is developed. I also believe that some research questions are best tackled from the perspective of objectivism and some are best tackled from the perspective of subjectivism and this template allows the best methodology to emerge. I lament that almost always scholars proceed down the road of the paradigm simply for which they own the toolkit. My view is that when one is at peace with (D) and (E) on your template, then (F) and (G) kind of "write themselves". If one views the world from an interpretive lens, then one's responses to (D) and (E) on the template would naturally lead to employing qualitative Data and Tools. Indeed, from what I have observed, it is often those novice scholars who do work with qualitative methods who are most bogged down by a million competing ideas in the early stages of their research.”

Feedback item #C.11:

“...I personally find this template a fantastic tool, and hope I could have done this template before conducting my research. I will certainly follow this guideline when proposing future empirical studies, and would recommend it to anyone I know. Thank you very much for introducing such a great research tool to me (and potentially to other empirical researchers).”

Feedback item # C.12:

“... [I] think the template could be quite a useful tool ... I don't see why it couldn't work for a qualitative/mixed methods project. Some of the prompts in figure 2 about data and tools would point to different issues, but the general framework is still highly applicable.”

Feedback item # C.13:

“... Please keep in mind that my feedback is strongly influenced by my disciplinary background ... [not finance or accounting] ... and may or may not be relevant to the paper that you pitch for accounting and finance. I really enjoyed reading your paper, thanks again for sharing.

1. Motivation: I wonder if it would be useful to refer to Davis's classic article (attached) about what makes research interesting. Some of those ideas are already in your section on motivating the research, but referring to it as a way to think through other options may be useful. The AMJ paper is attached on the same topic.
2. Data/Tools: regarding the variables used, are there no use of 'scales' in a psychometric tradition in your field? Is it worth mentioning?
3. Qualitative research: I know colleagues in accounting who are using qualitative research methods. Should your methods (tools) section make mention of that? Perhaps just

say something about how qualitative questions are set. And in terms of tools add document/content/discourse analysis?

4. What is new: Davis's article could be useful here too, as could be some of the work that Jorgen Sandberg has been doing with Mats Alveson.

5. What is new: in my field we refer to those studies that just use a similar method in a new context (country, industry) as replication studies, and unless they extend the theory, they are not seen positively for PhD studies (similar to you).

6. What is new (end of section): I think the Mickey Mouse idea needs a bit more explanation for a novice audience.

7. Contribution: does it have to be only one contribution like the heading says? ..."

Feedback item # C.14:

"... Idea- a common problem with research is to establish the idea...one often starts off at the top of the glass and gets to the bottom only to find the idea isn't worth drinking! This process is less common among established researchers as they normally have a better idea...but for PhD students it can be especially demoralising..."

[and then]...in many instances, especially in our case where we are broad empiricists its often the case that the PhD student is interested in something that we've not done a lot of work in. It doesn't take much time before the student actually has a better idea of the area than us...and although we can most likely more easily pick up the ideas it still isn't like the Professor of Chemistry who has control of the lab and directs all the research along a narrow path specific to his/her research...or for that matter a more theoretical academic who directs students to areas of which the academic has considerable knowledge, or even a more specific empiricist who directs students to only look at CAPM issues etc. I believe this issue results in PhD students being easily demotivated or becoming depressed from drinking out of the glass to the bottom and finding it empty and having to start again...

... I wonder how your paper could help in that case which seems to be the case often for Hons students...it's the Idea that causes the hiccups..."

Feedback item # C.15:

"From what I read, the core messages of the paper are very relevant to psychology researchers. However, psych is very particular in only using psych resources, as we have a particular writing style and report structure. Some of the business terms are not generaliseable/common in psychology. E.g. we would never use the terms "idea, data and tools" rather "hypothesis/research question, sample and statistical analyses". Great paper though!!"

Feedback item # C.16:

"I have just finished reading your paper and what a fantastic piece of work! I love your analogies (i.e. the cocktail glass and micky mouse) and will find these extremely useful for my Post Grad research methods course.

I see no reason why this template cannot be applied to tourism research, or any social sciences research for that matter, I managed to work through the template using a couple of ideas I have for my own research agenda (just mentally) and could see no problem in addressing any of the criteria."

Feedback item # C.17:

“I appreciate you sending through the revised version of the paper. Great to see that cross-discipline templates have been established to give further credence to a great research resource! I will be using this for all future honours, masters and PhD students, and I will be applying it to the Summer Research program project that I will be facilitating! Happy to share any of these resources with you if you like!

I'll also pass on this link to other scholars in various disciplines.”