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Abstract
Building on a decade of effort and intellectual activity focusing on the Pitching Research Framework, PRF (e.g., Faff, 2015; Faff, 2021a; ... see References), the latest in the line of this research stream is Faff, et al., (2023). Faff et al. (2023) passively applies Faff’s (2022a) researcher profile pitch (RPP) template tool in accounting and across a range of Business School disciplines. Moreover, these authors argue that the RPP tool can provide the basis for developing a scalable interactive researcher exchange platform, especially enabling for interdisciplinary research endeavors. The current paper outlines some potential basic elements of such a platform – the “Worldwide InSPIR2eS Scholar Exchange” (WISEx) and prospectively pitches an initiating companion research project titled: “Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research: An Exploration of the Worldwide InSPIR2eS Scholar Exchange (WISEx)”.
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1. Introduction

Building on a decade of effort and intellectual activity focusing on the Pitching Research Framework, PRF (e.g., Faff, 2015; Faff, 2021a; ... see References), the latest in the line of this research stream is Faff, et al., (2023), accepted for publication in Journal of Accounting Literature (ABDC “A” journal). Indeed, Faff et al., (2023) is the primary key paper underlying the current new initiative, linking to an initiating research project and overarching long-term research program, as explained below.

Faff, et al. (2023) passively applies Faff’s (2022a) researcher profile pitch (RPP) template tool in accounting and across a range of Business School disciplines. Faff et al. (2023) 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 experience. Collectively, these examples and associated independent narratives allow the authors to identify common themes that provide informative insights to potential users.

There are three key insights from that study. First, the RPP tool is helpful for accounting scholars to portray their essential research stream. Moreover, the tool proved universally meaningful and applicable irrespective of research discipline or research experience. Second, it offers a distinct advantage over existing popular research profile platforms, 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.

---

1 Generative AI was a useful assistant in generating some rudimentary ideas and rough early drafts of some parts of this paper; namely, in Sections 4, 5 & 6.

2 Notably this paper brought together a large and diverse group of international researchers, as well as 6 scholars from BBS.
Third, they identify specific situations of added value e.g., initiating research collaborations and academic job market preparation.

The RPP tool can provide the basis for developing a scalable interactive researcher exchange platform. Indeed, Faff et al. (2023) discusses various aspects of research collaboration and profiling, with a particular emphasis on the creation of “Worldwide InSPlR2eS Scholar Exchange” (WISEx). WISEx is flagged as a future initiative within the InSPlR2eS network. It is envisioned as a "marketplace" for "researcher information exchange" to facilitate and accelerate cross-, multi-, and interdisciplinary research collaborations. The current paper briefly outlines some basic elements of a proposed online WISEx platform and prospectively pitches an initiating companion research project.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 outlines the InSPlR2eS/IC4RS Marketplace vision, transitioning ideas toward the WISEx portal. Section 3 showcases the central role of the RPP in WISEx Platform, while Section 4 proposes some preliminary ideas on the WISEx online platform architecture. Section 5 offers a preliminary and highly conservative 3-year plan for developing the WISEx portal. Section 6 prospectively proposes a companion research project based on the WISEx platform as an initiation of a potentially much larger research program. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper.
2. InSPiR²eS/IC4RS Marketplace Vision

The International Society of Pitching Research for Responsible Science (InSPiR²eS) is a globally-facing research network primarily aimed at research training and capacity building, resting on a foundation theme of responsible science.³ Part of the vision of InSPiR²eS is to create a Marketplace in which various research stakeholders can meet virtually to find a like-minded partner or collaborator. Moreover, this collaboration tool will be a major enabling framework of the InSPiR²eS Centre for Responsible Science (IC4RS) (see Faff, 2023). IC4RS:

“… provides a virtual platform for like-minded researchers to promote and engage in the principles and practices of Responsible Science. The primary vision and goal of IC4RS is to meaningfully facilitate a conducive environment, motivations, and incentives for the next generation of researchers to deliver high quality research that is credible, relevant, and independent. Moreover, the underlying vision of the IC4RS is to service, at scale, remote and under-resourced locations around the globe where research training and capacity building in line with the principles of Responsible Science, is, at best, a monumental challenge and, at worst, entirely non-existent.”

Figure 1 provides a broad “mud-map” of a multifaceted Marketplace vision centred on the WISEx concept. This vision would have as its main objective facilitating connections/partnerships/collaborations/tie-ups between key research stakeholders. The stakeholders/ perspectives/ “elements” envisaged include:

- Researchers (ECRs/MCRs/SCRs)
- Research students (aware/enabled/focused)
- Research mentors/ protégés
- Research institutions
- Publishers/Editors

---

³ See https://pitchingresearch.com/inspir2es-network/. The network currently has 1,000+ members, spread across all populous continents and encompassing 79 countries/jurisdictions worldwide.

⁴ See: https://pitchingresearch.com/ic4rs/. IC4RS currently has 65 Node Leaders spread across all 6 populous continents, spanning 27 different countries/jurisdictions.
To illustrate, Figure 1 depicts 8 alternative characterisations of marketplace setting. Within these cases we can think of three alternative types of marketplace scenario: (a) a “symmetry” pitch; (b) a supply-side pitch; (c) a demand-side pitch. I briefly discuss each of these settings below.

2.1 Researcher Team Creation

The “Type 1” market depicted in the figure is the situation in which researcher teams are formed, where “Researcher A” is actively seeking to find a good match with “Researcher B”. This is a classic case of a “symmetry” market since all parties to a prospective team can meaningfully share relevant information through a researcher profile pitch. A researcher pitch profile would be a base foundation of sharing key information that could facilitate a reasoned judgement about the potential for productive engagement and collaboration within a new research team.

2.2 Researcher Mentoring Relationships

The “Type 2” market setting depicted in Figure 1 takes on the perspective of a research mentoring relationship. Here we are aiming to facilitate a “hierarchical” style of collaboration in which the senior “guiding” role is taken by the more experienced researcher, whereas a junior “guided” role is taken by the less experienced researcher (sometimes referred to as an early career researcher (ECR) or a novice researcher). A mentor might choose to simultaneously lead more than one ECR in a team-mentoring situation. This mentoring
situation is also a case of “symmetry” market since both mentors and proteges will benefit from sharing profile information with their prospective research partners.

2.3 Prospective HDR Market

The “Type 3” market represents the situation of a prospective “higher degree by research” (HDR) student looking for a host training institution that will enable them to earn a research qualification (e.g., a PhD). As such, Type 3 is a case of “supply-side” market setting, in the sense that the researcher profile pitch comes from the prospective supply of a research student. The foundation underlying this setting requires the prospective HDR student to demonstrate sufficient research potential and a minimum threshold of prior training, to meet a given institution’s HDR entry requirements. Moreover, the prospective HDR student needs to show sufficient quality in their preliminary thinking around a potential topic that demonstrates that the topic is a meritorious and feasible one (i.e., a Type “3a” profile pitch) that adequately matches available supervisory expertise/capacity at a given research training institution. Additionally, it is not uncommon that such HDR students will require寻求 scholarship support from the institution, which has the effect of making the HDR position even more competitive (i.e., a Type “3b” in Figure 1).

2.4 PhD-qualified Researcher Job Market

The “Type 4” marketplace nuance shown in the Figure 1 mud-map is the “job-market” scenario. This is also a case of “supply-side” market setting, this time in the sense that the pitch comes from the prospective supply of a “post-doc” researcher. More specifically, we are thinking of those situations in which a “freshly-minted” PhD has a signature job-market paper that they are actively using to “sell” their case for a “rookie” academic employment.
2.5 Novice Journal Reviewer

The “Type 5” marketplace nuance depicted in the Figure 1 mud-map is the “novice journal reviewer” scenario in which we are thinking of an “undiscovered”/unknown junior researcher who is desperate to break through and gain reviewer experience. Here, the focus is on the “supply-side” market setting, in the sense that the pitch comes from the potential supplier of the reviewer service role.

2.6 Journal Outlet

The “Type 6” marketplace nuance depicted in the Figure 1 mud-map is the “research publication” scenario in which we are thinking of a given scholarly journal as a potential publication outlet. Here, the focus is on the “demand-side” market setting, in the sense that the pitch comes from the demander for research publications.

2.7 Research Funding

The “Type 7” market nuance depicted in the Figure 1 mud-map is the “grant funding” scenario in which we are thinking of a potential research project in need of research money, either: (a) to make it viable or (b) for it to be executed at optimal “scale” or over an optimal timely period. Here, the focus is on the “demand-side” market setting, in the sense that the pitch comes from the demander for research dollars. The AFAANZ Research Grant scheme is a perfect direct example, given that this grant scheme is predominantly based on Faff’s (2015, 2021) PRF.

2.8 P2P Learning

“Type 8”, the final market nuance depicted in the Figure 1 mud-map is the “peer-to-peer learning” scenario. Here, the focus is on “symmetry” market setting, in the sense that the pitch comes “equally” from two or more peer learners seeking to learn from each other.
3. Central Role of the RPP in WISEx Platform

3.1 Basic RPP Design

Faff’s (2022a) Research Profile Pitching (RPP) framework, designed to efficiently present a researcher’s profile information, is an adaptation of the original Pitching Research Framework (PRF). Figure 2 displays the cued-version of the RPP, as originally created in Faff (2022a), and exhibited and applied multiple times in Faff, et al. (2023). As clearly seen in the figure, the RPP maintains the 11-item structure of the original PRF, preserving familiarity. Three rules guide this adaptation: retaining the well-known structure, using similar item labels, and introducing fit-for-purpose "cues" and guidelines as the primary innovation. The RPP tool begins with "big picture anchors" that define a researcher's profile, with slight modifications to labels like "Research Bio Title" and "research question themes." Items (E) to (G) remain the same, focusing on core themes across signature papers or recent research trajectory. The two key questions and the bottom-line contribution are preserved, with a focus on identifying core themes. The final item, "other considerations," includes additional information such as career stage, collaboration type, areas of expertise, and target journal strategy.

The RPP, highlighting the researcher's unique attributes and research focus, is envisaged to take centre-stage of the WISEx enterprise, relevant for marketplace “Types 1, 2 and 3” described in the previous section. The online architecture needs to be designed to readily mobilise and facilitate seamless scholar engagement via tech-enhanced sharing and matching of RPP information across the IC4RS community. Mirroring a similar design for the existing and established online facility for PRF [https://pitchingresearch.com/create/dashboard.php], we will enhance the format with cued guidance in line with the RPP philosophy.
3.2 Some Possible Alternative Formats

While the standard RPP design should serve well as the main work-horse in the WISEx platform, as a generic and general format for presenting a scholar research profile, some potential variation of design will be helpful due to variation of context; scholar goals and/or type of user/use. Primarily, the variation enters not in a changed pitching structure ... the original PRF/RPP design is, for current purposes, assumed immutable. Rather, the variation in researcher profiling is manifest through altering the guiding set of cues that consequently deliver a different slant in the RPP outcome. Some examples of these variations are briefly addressed below.

3.2.1 Pitching a Job Market Paper

The researcher profile pitch format presented in Figure 2 will work for a job market scenario (“Type 4” in the previous section). However, given the established tradition of developing a dedicated “job market paper”, a more tightly focused version exclusive to the context of one “special” paper might be preferred. To this end, see Figure 3 that provides an alternative version of the PRF tool, with customised cues for a job-market paper. The two main differences here are that: (a) it is purely an ex-post “reverse engineered” pitch; and (b) the pitch is focused on one signature recent completed paper by the researcher seeking a job market position.

3.2.2 Pitching a Journal Reviewer Profile

Faff (2022b) introduces a “Certified Novice Reviewer Program” as a new initiative at the *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* (PBFJ), involving a process that invites a version of the RPP (in line with the “Type 5” novice reviewer role discussed in Section 2). As displayed in Figure 4, the RPP is now slightly modified (in terms of its cues) for pitching a novice researcher’s profile with a view to becoming an apprentice journal reviewer at PBFJ. Aside from modified cues,
Item (A) now becomes “Reviewer Bio Title”. While this version of the RPP is custom designed for an actual initiative at PBFJ, novice reviewers are encouraged to voluntarily adopt this tool and try it out on other journal editors, in line with their career development goals. What is there to lose? The worst that can happen is enduring the “sounds of silence”.

3.2.3 Pitching a Scholarly Journal Profile

Figure 5 shows a modification of the RPP in Figure 2, in which a journal Editor pitches a salient element of their research journal’s research profile, or a new journal initiative or special theme. This scenario aligns with the “Type 6” context discussed in Section 2. In Item (A), the journal name and showcased theme is required. Item (B) asks for the signature general theme of research question that lies at the heart of the journal initiative being showcased. Item (C) asks for 3 key papers that most saliently portray the chosen research theme. Item (D) then asks for the core academic motivation style or approach embraced by this journal, especially as it pertains to the showcased theme of the current pitch. For the remainder of the items (E) through (K), the cues ask the pitch to focus on one of the signature key papers identified in Item (C) above to illustrate the journal’s chosen theme for that showcased example.

Figure 6 illustrates this approach for the Pacific-Basin Finance Journal (of which I am the Editor-in-Chief). This PBFJ example, focuses on a recent real initiative at the journal to invite pre-registered reports. Notably, the pitch shown in Figure 6 uses the real example by Chai et al. (2019) to illustrate the PBFJ pre-registered research initiative in Items (E) through to (K).

---

5 For more details see: https://bit.ly/47JUBUS
4. Some Preliminary Ideas on the WISEx Online Platform Architecture

The concept of the WISEx platform architecture represents a sophisticated and multifaceted approach to facilitating interdisciplinary research collaborations. By considering the complex and diverse needs of various users, the platform should integrate advanced technologies, thoughtful design, and robust protocols to create a seamless and productive environment for scholarly collaboration. From nuanced user categorization to intelligent matching algorithms, real-time collaboration tools, and robust security measures, the architecture embodies a forward-thinking and comprehensive vision for global research networking. WISEx aims to set a new standard for digital collaboration in academia, reflecting the dynamic, interdisciplinary, and responsible nature of contemporary research. Accordingly, preliminary thoughts on some key dimensions that I envisage are briefly signposted below.

4.1 User Taxonomy

- **Individual Researchers:**
  - **Experience Level:** Categories like Early-career, Mid-career, Senior, with sub-categories for specific roles (e.g., Postdoc, Assistant Professor).
  - **Academic Discipline:** Detailed taxonomy including sub-disciplines (e.g., Organic Chemistry within Sciences).
  - **Geography:** Region-specific categorization, considering cultural and institutional differences.

- **Research Entities:**
  - **Scholarly Journals:** Categories based on impact factor, specialization.
  - **Journal Editors:** Roles based on seniority, experience.
  - **Scholarly Associations:** Types based on size, focus, global reach.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4553647
Academic Departments: Classification by institution type, department size, research output.

Stakeholders and End Users: Custom profiles for industry partners, policymakers, funding bodies, with specific interaction protocols.

4.2 User Interaction Protocols

Registration and Profile Creation:
- Multi-step process with verification, specialization selection, research interest tagging.

Search and Discovery:
- AI-powered search with filters, recommendations, saved searches.

Communication and Collaboration:
- Real-time collaboration tools, document sharing, project timelines, meeting schedulers.

Feedback and Rating System:
- Multi-dimensional rating (e.g., collaboration quality, communication), with dispute resolution mechanisms.

4.3 Researcher Team Building Protocols

Interest Matching Algorithm:
- Machine learning-based matching considering research interests, publication history, collaboration preferences.

Skills Compatibility Assessment:
- Skill mapping, gap analysis, complementary skill identification.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4553647
• **Synergy Optimization:**
  
  o Analytical tools to identify interdisciplinary innovation opportunities, cultural diversity benefits, alignment with Responsible Science.

• **Project Management Tools:**
  
  o Integrated Gantt charts, budget tracking, milestone setting, real-time collaboration.

4.4 Responsible Science Integration

• **Ethics and Compliance Module:**
  
  o Interactive guides, templates, compliance checklists, ethical consideration prompts.

• **Sustainability and Impact Tracking:**
  
  o Impact measurement tools, sustainability assessment, alignment with global goals (e.g., SDGs).

4.5 Security and Privacy

• **Data Protection:**
  
  o End-to-end encryption, GDPR compliance, regular security audits.

• **Access Control:**
  
  o Role-based access control, multi-factor authentication, activity logging.

4.6 Accessibility and Usability

• **User Interface Design:**
  
  o Adaptive design for various devices, user-friendly navigation, customizable dashboards.
• **Language Support:**
  
  o Multi-language support, translation tools for collaboration across language barriers.

• **Onboarding and Support:**
  
  o Interactive tutorials, dedicated support channels, community forums.

4.7 Analytics and Reporting

• **User Behaviour Analytics:**
  
  o Insights into collaboration patterns, research trends, user engagement.

• **Reporting Tools:**
  
  o Customizable reports for individual researchers, institutions, funding bodies, with export options.

5. A Three-year Plan for WISEx

Below, I present a very conservative 3-year plan providing a logical and staged approach to building the WISEx platform, starting with foundational elements and gradually adding more advanced features. By breaking down the development process into manageable (quarterly) pieces, the plan ensures that critical functionalities are prioritized, while also allowing time for testing, refinement, and continuous improvement. It represents a thoughtful and strategic roadmap for transforming the vision of WISEx into a fully functional and impactful platform for interdisciplinary ... indeed, all, research collaboration.

---

6 The 3-year horizon is chosen as a somewhat “worst-case” scenario (short of total project abandonment). The goal will be to build the WISEx portal much more rapidly, subject to funding availability and other capacity constraints ... and to have a fully serviceable prototype in place for serious beta testing in 6-9 months.
5.1 Year 1: Foundational Development

Q1:

- **User Taxonomy Design:**
  - Define categories for individual researchers, research entities, stakeholders.
- **Basic Security Protocols:**
  - Implement data protection measures, access control.
- **Initial Prototyping:**
  - Develop wireframes and prototypes for user interface.

Q2:

- **Registration and Profile Creation:**
  - Develop user registration, profile creation with verification.
- **Basic Search and Discovery:**
  - Implement search functionality with basic filters.
- **Alpha Testing:**
  - Internal testing of basic functionalities.

Q3:

- **Communication and Collaboration Tools:**
  - Develop messaging, information sharing.
- **Feedback and Rating System:**
  - Implement basic rating and feedback mechanisms.
- **Beta Testing (Phase 1):**
  - Limited external testing with selected users.

Q4:

- **Interest Matching Algorithm:**
  - Design and implement initial matching algorithms.
- **Project Management Tools:**
  - Integrate basic project management functionalities.
- **Feedback Integration:**
  - Implement feedback from beta testing.
5.2 Year 2: Intermediate Development

Q1:

- **Skills Compatibility Assessment:**
  - Develop skill mapping and compatibility assessment tools.
- **Ethics and Compliance Module:**
  - Implement interactive guides, compliance checklists.
- **Prototyping Advanced Features:**
  - Develop prototypes for synergy optimization, sustainability tracking.

Q2:

- **Synergy Optimization Tools:**
  - Design tools for interdisciplinary innovation opportunities.
- **Sustainability and Impact Tracking:**
  - Implement impact measurement tools.
- **Beta Testing (Phase 2):**
  - Expanded external testing with diverse user groups.

Q3:

- **Advanced Search and Discovery:**
  - Enhance search with AI-powered recommendations, saved searches.
- **Accessibility and Usability Improvements:**
  - Improve UI design, add multi-language support.
- **Feedback Integration:**
  - Implement feedback from second phase of beta testing.

Q4:

- **Analytics and Reporting Tools:**
  - Implement user behaviour analytics, customizable reporting tools.
- **Enhanced Security and Privacy Measures:**
  - Strengthen security with multi-factor authentication, regular audits.
- **Pre-Launch Testing:**
  - Comprehensive testing of all intermediate functionalities.
5.3 Year 3: Advanced Development

Q1:

- **Advanced Collaboration Tools:**
  - Integrate real-time collaboration tools, video conferencing.
- **Onboarding and Support Systems:**
  - Develop interactive tutorials, dedicated support channels.
- **Beta Testing (Phase 3):**
  - Testing of advanced features with a broader user base.

Q2:

- **Advanced Interest Matching Algorithm:**
  - Enhance matching algorithms with machine learning.
- **Advanced Project Management Tools:**
  - Integrate Gantt charts, budget tracking, milestone setting.
- **Feedback Integration:**
  - Implement feedback from third phase of beta testing.

Q3:

- **Community Building and Engagement:**
  - Implement community forums, engagement strategies.
- **Advanced Sustainability and Impact Tracking:**
  - Enhance sustainability assessment, alignment with global goals.
- **Final Prototyping and User Acceptance Testing:**
  - Finalize prototypes, conduct user acceptance testing.

Q4:

- **Final Testing and Quality Assurance:**
  - Comprehensive testing of all functionalities, quality assurance.
- **Launch and Continuous Improvement:**
  - Official launch with ongoing monitoring, feedback collection, continuous improvement.
- **Post-Launch Monitoring:**
  - Ongoing monitoring, feedback collection, continuous improvement.
6. Companion Research Project Summary

With a view to gathering evidence on the efficacy of the WISEx initiative, I have already instigated embryonic plans for an initiating research project that sets the foundation stone for an ongoing research program. The Working Title is: “Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research: An Exploration of the Worldwide InSPIR2eS Scholar Exchange”. This proposed research project aligns with the broader vision of InSPIR2eS and IC4RS, providing a pathway to explore a novel dimension of research collaboration and innovation. It can contribute to the ongoing efforts to build a more connected, responsible, and innovative research community. For a preliminary full research pitch refer to Figure 7.

6.1 Research Team

- Robert Faff (Bond University, University of Queensland, Australia)
- Catalin Albu (Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania)
- Chelsea Gill (Bond University, Australia)
- Sebastian Hoffmann (HHL Leipzig Graduate School of Management, Germany)
- Vishal Mehrotra (Bond University, Australia)

6.2 Research Objective

To investigate the usage, activity, and utility of researchers and scholars engaging with WISEx, focusing on how it fosters interdisciplinary collaboration, accelerates research innovation, and contributes to responsible science.

6.3 Justification

- **Fostering Collaboration**: WISEx aims to create a rich marketplace for researchers to connect and collaborate. Understanding how researchers engage with this platform
can provide insights into the effectiveness of such a system in breaking down disciplinary barriers.

- **Accelerating Innovation:** By facilitating cross-, multi-, and interdisciplinary research collaborations, WISEx has the potential to spur research innovations. Analysing the types of collaborations and outcomes can reveal the impact of WISEx on research advancement.

- **Aligning with Responsible Science:** As part of the InSPIR2eS network, WISEx aligns with the principles of responsible science. Investigating how WISEx promotes these principles can contribute to the broader goals of research training and capacity building.

### 6.4 Research Method

- **Data Collection:** Surveys, interviews, and analysis of collaboration patterns within WISEx.

- **Data Analysis:** Quantitative and qualitative analysis to understand the dynamics, benefits, and challenges of engaging with WISEx.

- **Tools:** Utilization of statistical tools, thematic content analysis, and bibliometric analysis.

### 6.5 Potential Impact

- **For Researchers:** Insights into how to leverage WISEx for collaboration and innovation.

- **For Academia:** Understanding the role of platforms like WISEx in shaping the future of interdisciplinary research.

- **For InSPIR2eS Network:** Guiding the further development of WISEx and aligning it with the network's goals.
7. Conclusion

A key objective of the current paper is to introduce and explain the concept of the “Worldwide InSPiR2eS Scholar Exchange” (WISEx) portal. Moreover, I sow a seed for the initiating companion research study: “Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research: An Exploration of the Worldwide InSPiR2eS Scholar Exchange”. I lodge this prospective pitch, to align with the principles of Responsible Science (e.g., Faff, 2021). Moreover, over time, while we carefully build the online WISEx portal, which is needed as a critical Tool for the companion research study, this research pitch will be advanced and expanded toward a full-blown pre-analysis plan (prior to collecting data and executing any analysis).
Figure 1: WISEx Vision ... to facilitate research connections/partnerships/collaborations/tie-ups between key stakeholders
### Figure 2: RPP Template Tool (source: Faff, 2022a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUR</th>
<th>Four Big Picture Research Profile Anchors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A) Research Bio Title</strong></td>
<td>Personal research bio for ... your name, current position, current affiliation, physical location including country (date).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(B) Research Question Themes</strong></td>
<td>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)? <strong>Optional:</strong> Nominate a secondary theme or signal an emerging new theme that you are currently seriously exploring ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C) Signature Key Papers</strong></td>
<td>List the 3 key papers which most saliently portray your recent research focus. Include brief information on journal rating, citations, altmetrics, etc <strong>Optional:</strong> include brief information on your role in collaborated works e.g., your % role, CRediT style attribution (Brand et al., 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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. |

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4553647
### Figure 3: Pitching a Job Market Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUR</th>
<th>Four Big Picture Research Profile Anchors... for the chosen job-market paper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Job Market Paper Title</td>
<td>Insert paper title here - complete reference details, if appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Basic Research Question</td>
<td>IN one sentence, define the key features of your research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Key Papers</td>
<td>Identify the 3 key papers which most critically underpin the topic (just standard reference details). Ideally, by “gurus” in the field, either recently published in Tier 1 journals or recent working paper e.g. on SSRN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</td>
<td>IN one short paragraph (say a max of 100 words) capture the core academic motivation. Relevant to your paper: (a) what is broadly known in the literature? And (b) what is the broad piece of knowledge absent (which you target for your work)? This focus on motivation might also include identifying a “puzzle” that you aim to help resolve – e.g. a divergence between theory and observed practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THREE</th>
<th>Three Basic Building Blocks ... for the chosen job-market paper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E) Idea?</td>
<td>Identify the “core” idea that drives the intellectual content of your research topic – this is now about the specifics of what your paper does and starting to address the question “how” it does it. If possible, articulate the central hypothesis(es); or the key predication; or broad parameters defining the scope and approach that has been used. If relevant, identify the key dependent (“explained”) variable and the key test/independent (“explanatory”) variable(s). Is there any theoretical “tension” that can be exploited? If relevant: is there any serious threat from endogeneity here? If so, briefly, what is your identification strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Data?</td>
<td>The focus here is on “the how” underlying your paper - broadly describe the key aspects of your data and sampling. Where relevant, give information on: (1) What data are used? Primary or secondary? e.g. country/setting; Unit of analysis? Individuals, firms, portfolios, industries, countries ...? sample period; sampling interval? Daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, annual, ...? Type of data: firm specific vs. industry vs. macro vs. ....? (2) What is the sample size? Cross-sectionally? In Time-series/longitudinal? (3) Is it a panel dataset? (4) Data Sources? Are the data commercially available? Any hand-collecting required? Were the data created based on authors own survey instrument? Or by interviews? Timeframe? Are they novel new data? (5) Were there any problems with missing data/observations? Database merge issues? Data manipulation/“cleansing” issues? (6) Other data obstacles? E.g. external validity? construct validity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Tools?</td>
<td>Again, the focus here is on “the how” underlying your paper. Capture the essence of your basic empirical framework and research design. For example: Is it a regression model approach? Survey instrument issues/design? Interview design?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWO</th>
<th>Two Key Questions ... for the chosen job-market paper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(H) What’s New?</td>
<td>Make a clear statement about where the true “newness” of your paper rests. This statement of “novelty” should not simply rely on stating your paper’s “new” results or findings – state what is “new” from an “ex ante” perspective? Also, is this novelty mostly linked to the idea/data/tools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) So What?</td>
<td>Why is it important to know the answer to your identified research question? For example: how will major relevant decisions/behaviour/activity etc be influenced by the outcome of your research? This statement of importance should not simply rely on your paper’s results or findings – state why is it “important” from an “ex ante” perspective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONE</th>
<th>One Bottom Line ... for the chosen job-market paper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(J) Contribution?</td>
<td>What is your paper’s primary source of the incremental contribution to the relevant research literature? While this is likely to be a “blend” of your paper’s “novelty” and “importance” dimensions, it should be more than this. For example: What new “doors” does your paper open in this field? What sub-areas of your research field benefit from the existence of your paper and in what ways does this (these) benefit(s) manifest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K) 3 Key Findings</td>
<td>Briefly list the three key findings/results or takeaways from your paper. Give emphasis to the main finding which helps illustrate your contribution from an ex-post perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Four Big Picture Reviewer Profile Anchors

### (A) Reviewer Bio Title

**PBFJ** reviewer 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)?

### (C) Signature Key Papers

List the 3 key papers which most saliently portray your recent research focus. Ideally, they should be your own research studies but if they are not your own, they should be very recent and strongly reflect your emerging research expertise and interests.

### (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?

### 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.

#### (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. Indicate your level of proficiency in understanding/executing these tools (e.g., expert; proficient, novice). Summarise your understanding of the issue of endogeneity and your approach to identifying reliable causal evidence in empirical research.

### 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.

#### (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.

### 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.

#### (K) Other Considerations

Identify your career stage: e.g., HDR student; PhD student; Post-Doc; ECR.

Identify up to 3 key areas of expertise that you offer to an editor/journal: e.g., qualitative; quantitative; mixed methods; general theory expertise; general method expertise; specific method expertise (specify which).
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### Figure 5: Pitching a Research Journal’s Research Profile, Journal Initiative or Special Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUR</th>
<th>Four Big Picture Research Profile Anchors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Journal Name &amp; showcased Theme</td>
<td>Journal name, publisher, ISSN (date): statement of the showcased theme. For example, the showcased theme could be a special issue of the journal; a new journal initiative or pilot approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Research Question Themes</td>
<td>Identify the signature general theme(s) of research question (RQ) that defines the journal initiative being showcased. Is there a timeframe constraint? Indicate what type of research being sought ... primarily: (a) quantitative; (b) qualitative; (c) mixed methods; or (d) other (please specify)? Is the journal open to publishing interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary research? If so, what scope limitations are envisaged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Signature Key Papers</td>
<td>List the 3 key papers which most saliently portray this research theme – papers that ideally have been published recently and ideally in the showcased journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Motivation style – Research Manifesto</td>
<td>What is the core academic motivation style or approach embraced by this journal, especially as it pertains to the showcased theme of the current pitch. If possible, summarise the journal’s research philosophy in terms of a type of “manifesto” – eligible scholarly paradigms, especially as it pertains to the showcased theme of the current pitch. If possible, briefly illustrate how this chosen showcased research philosophy/theme is exemplified in the Key papers of Item (C).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the remainder of the items, focus on one of the signature key papers identified in Item (C) above and illustrate the journal’s chosen theme for that showcased example.

Explicitly identify the chosen paper here ➔ “The above showcased theme for “Journal X” is illustrated below for “Paper Y” selected from the Key Papers listed in Item (C).”

THREE | Three Basic Building Blocks ... for the chosen signature paper. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E) Idea?</td>
<td>In line with Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF, identify the core research idea that underpins the chosen signature paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Data?</td>
<td>In line with Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF, Identify the essential elements of the data/datasets/data sources that underpin the chosen signature paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Tools?</td>
<td>In line with Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF, identify the primary research tools that underpin the chosen signature paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TWO | Two Key Questions ... for the chosen signature paper. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(H) What’s New?</td>
<td>In line with Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF, identify the core research novelty that underpins the chosen signature paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) So What?</td>
<td>In line with Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF, identify the primary research importance that underpins the chosen signature paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONE | One Bottom Line ... for the chosen signature paper. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(J) Contribution?</td>
<td>In line with Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF, identify the essential research contribution that underpins the chosen signature paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K) Other Considerations</td>
<td>In line with Faff’s (2015, 2021a) PRF, identify any salient additional perspectives about the chosen signature paper that have not been adequately captured above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Pitching a Research Profile Theme – Illustrative Example for the *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUR</th>
<th>Four Big Picture Research Profile Anchors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Journal Name &amp; showcased Theme</td>
<td>Pacific-Basin Finance Journal (PBFJ), Elsevier, 0927-538X (15/4/2022): showcased theme is supporting Responsible Science publication through a “Pre-registered Reports” process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Research Question Themes</td>
<td>Research questions must fall within the broad scope of PBFJ (e.g., avoid out-of-scope research that: exclusively employs US data; or focuses on a non-finance question, e.g., an accounting question like “earnings management”). Research questions can be from all the “normal” areas, as supported by PBFJ in the past, but focusing on the three pillars of Responsible Science: (a) credible research; (b) useful research; (c) independent research (see Faff, 2021b). Of these three pillars, a special focus will be given to the second, aiming to induce more research that is “real-world” relevant with engagement and impact (see Faff and Kastelle, 2016; Faff, et al., 2021).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Motivation – Research Manifesto</td>
<td>The over-riding manifesto for the chosen theme in PBFJ is embracing “re-registered” reports. This is a process in which research teams pitch an idea and write an approved protocol prior to data collection and analysis execution. By “taking off the table”, the perceived “need” for finding statistically significant results, through this “pre-registered report” initiative, PBFJ is striving to play a part in addressing concerns that there is a “crisis” in research. Aman et al (2019) elaborates on this idea and showcases a pilot exercise in which a virtual special issue (vSI) of PBFJ was built around the theme of celebrating the 50th anniversary of the iconic event study, Ball and Brown (1968) [BB68]. Berkman et al (2019) is one of the papers included in the vSI on BB68. One area of particular concern related to a “crisis” in research is replication “fails” i.e., growing instances that published papers fail to be replicated (for various reasons), and such failures have the effect of eroding confidence in published research. Chai et al (2019) is the inaugural example of PBFJs initiative to publish replication studies, also based on a “pre-registered report” process built around an ex-ante “replication pitch”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above showcased theme for *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* is illustrated below for Chai et al. (2019) selected from the Key Papers listed in Item (C).  

THREE | Three Basic Building Blocks ... for the chosen signature paper. |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| (E) Idea? | **Core idea:** The target replication paper is Fama and French (2018). The central purpose of the replication study is to use spanning regressions to choose among nested models for the Australian market – the Fama-French three-factor model versus the CAPM, the four-factor Carhart model versus the Fama-French three-factor model, the Fama-French five-factor model versus the Fama-French three-factor model, and the five-factor model versus a six-factor model that includes momentum. In addition, we assess the contribution of each factor on all other factors.  

**Central hypothesis:** All the Fama-French factors, including momentum, contribute to the pricing of average returns in Australia. The key variables are the Fama-French factors including momentum. Each factor will be used as the independent and dependent variables in our spanning regressions. The threat from endogeneity is minimal in our proposed study. We expect minimal diversion from the original paper’s idea as the accounting variables required to create the factors are available. |
| (F) Data? | **Data source:** The analysis will be conducted at the monthly level from 1983 to 2016 on the Australian equity market. We will download monthly share price information from the Share Price & Price Relative (SPPR) database of the Securities Industry Research Centre of Asia-Pacific (SIRCA). Accounting data required comes from two sources. For periods prior to 2006, we will utilize previously hand collected accounting data. For the period after 2006, we use the Morningstar Aspect Huntley database. The accounting data interval is yearly in nature. The type of data is firm specific data. The hand collected accounting data is not commercially available. |

---

8 We acknowledge with thanks, the authors for allowing us to quote verbatim the pitch they used in their published paper, Chai et al (2019).  
Sample size: On average, we have 1300 firms per year. We will form Fama-French factors throughout the sample period and conduct time-series analyses to answer the identified research questions.

Data issues: Minimal issues in data manipulation and cleansing.

Quality of the data: The data sources used in this study are reliable and given that we have a large sample size, the test variables will exhibit adequate variation to give good power.

Overall, we expect to encounter minimal data obstacles. We do not envisage any major differences compared to the original study that may create any form of replication bias. However, the conclusions may be different due to unique structure of the Australian equity market compared to the US.

(G) Tools?

**Empirical framework:** Following Fama and French (2018), we will perform spanning tests for nested models by running different specifications of the following equation:

\[ \text{Candidate factor}_t = \alpha + \text{existing factors}_t + \epsilon_t \]

where candidate factor is one of the Fama-French factors plus momentum – SMB (size), HML (book-to-market), RMW (profitability), CMA (investment) and UMD (momentum). Existing factors are those in the CAPM, the three-factor model, the Carhart four-factor model, and the five-factor model. A candidate factor has additional explanatory power and thus is useful if the intercept (alpha) is non-zero. This time series regression approach is considered as the gold standard, as it is used in leading recent asset pricing studies. The US factors (for comparison) will be downloaded from Kenneth French’s website. **Software for research:** SAS and/or Matlab will be used to perform the analysis.

TwoKey Questions ... for the chosen signature paper.

(H) What’s New?
The idea of spanning tests has been previously adopted in Fama and French (2015, JFE). The idea is formally discussed in Fama and French (2018, JFE) following the mathematical proof provided by Barillas and Shanken (2016, RFS). The test is used to identify factors that contribute to an existing model and is an alternative to the approach of first forming test portfolios and then performing asset pricing tests. The replication is the natural progression of the Australian asset pricing literature and has a potential to reconcile the debate on the most appropriate asset pricing model in this market. Our comprehensive dataset will also add strong out-of-sample evidence to the original study.

(I) So What?
The application of the Fama-French model includes but is not limited to (i) evaluating portfolio performance and (ii) measuring expected returns of an asset. The understanding of the factors and their contributions to Australian equity returns will help us identify asset pricing models that are suitable to the local market. Besides, most international equity markets are similar to the Australian market in that there is a small number of very large companies, and the majority of listed stocks are very small in size (relative to the US market). The findings from our study facilitate comparisons with other markets with a similar composition.

OneBottom Line ... for the chosen signature paper.

(J) Contribution?
This study makes the following contributions:
1. The study responds to the concern in Campbell et al. (1997, book) that the usefulness of multifactor models needs to be comprehensively tested out-of-sample.
2. The result from spanning tests will complement the existing Fama and French studies in Australia and help identify factors that are important in the Australian market.

The findings are meaningful given that a number of studies have demonstrated that the prices of internationally traded stock remain strongly influenced by local risk factors.

(K) Other Considerations
The existing Fama-French studies in Australia provide guidance on the process to conduct the investigation. The risk of this project is low.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4553647
### Four Big Picture Research Anchors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Working Title</th>
<th>Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research: An Exploration of the Worldwide InSPIR2ES Scholar Exchange (WISEx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B) Research Question</td>
<td>How does WISEx facilitate and accelerate cross-, multi-, and interdisciplinary research collaborations among scholars? What are the key factors influencing its effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Motivation</td>
<td>While collaboration platforms exist, the specific needs of interdisciplinary research remain unaddressed. WISEx offers a unique solution, but its effectiveness and impact on scholarly work need exploration. The puzzle lies in understanding how WISEx overcomes traditional barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration and what distinguishes it from other platforms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Three Basic Building Blocks ...

| (E) Idea? | The core idea is to investigate how WISEx serves as a "researcher information exchange," enabling scholars to engage in meaningful collaborations. The study will analyze its structure, functionality, and real-world applications, focusing on the usage/activity/utility of researchers engaging with WISEx. The idea extends to understanding how WISEx aligns with broader trends in digital collaboration and what theoretical frameworks underpin its design and operation. |
| (F) Data? | Data will be collected through surveys, interviews, and analysis of collaboration outcomes within WISEx. The sample will include scholars, administrators, and interdisciplinary research projects. The data collection will be guided by a robust methodology that ensures representativeness and validity, considering various disciplines, geographic locations, and collaboration types. |
| (G) Tools? | Survey tools, qualitative analysis software (e.g., NVivo), and statistical packages will be used to analyze the data. These tools are standard in social science research but will be customized to suit the specific needs of this study, ensuring that the analysis captures the nuances of WISEx's operations and impact. |

### Two Key Questions ...

| (H) What's New? | This study offers a novel examination of WISEx, focusing on its unique role in fostering interdisciplinary research. It will provide insights into how such platforms can be designed and utilized effectively. The novelty extends to the methodological approach, combining qualitative and quantitative techniques to offer a multifaceted view of WISEx. |
| (I) So What? | Understanding WISEx's impact will inform the design of future collaboration platforms, influence scholarly collaboration practices, and potentially enhance the quality and innovation of interdisciplinary research. The findings will have implications for academic institutions, funding bodies, and policymakers, shaping the future landscape of scholarly collaboration. |

### One Bottom Line ...

| (J) Contribution? | The research contributes to the understanding of digital collaboration in academia, offering a case study on WISEx that can guide future developments in scholarly collaboration platforms. It will bridge gaps between technology, collaboration theory, and practice, offering actionable insights that can drive improvements in interdisciplinary research. |
| (K) Other Considerations | Potential target journals include *British Journal of Educational Technology; Studies in Higher Education; Journal of Research on Technology in Education*. Ethical considerations include informed consent from participants, compelling a Research Ethics application. Downstream, taking into account "capacity to pay", funding will be sought from academic institutions interested in enhancing interdisciplinary research. In other instances, as a social objective, resource starved institutions (e.g., in Africa) will be permitted to use the resource free of charge/funding. The project will also consider potential risks, such as data privacy and the dynamic nature of digital platforms, and outline mitigation strategies. |
References