AMIS 2020 Conference Structured Abstracts: Written Abstracts as a 'mini pitch'

Structured Abstract Design: AMIS 2020 submitters are invited to prepare a written 'mini-pitch' of their research paper by using the 6 core elements of <u>Faff's (2017)</u> template tool, with a maximum total of **250 words**. These abstracts will appear in the AMIS conference booklet.

| Idea? | Identify the 'core' idea that drives the intellectual content of this research topic. If appropriate: |
|---------------|---|
| | a. articulate the central hypothesis/prediction/proposition b. identify the key dependent ('explained') variable and the key test/independent ('explanatory') variable(s). |
| Data? | Make a brief statement about the data/sampling used in the study. For example: |
| | a. What data are used? e.g. country/setting; Unit of analysis? sample period; sampling interval? Type of data: firm specific vs. industry vs. macro vs? b. What is the sample size? Cross-sectionally? Time-series/longitudinal? c. Is it a panel dataset? d. Data Sources? Are the data commercially available? Any hand-collecting required? Are the data created based on authors own survey instrument? Or by interviews? e. Are there any problems with missing data/observations? f. Other data obstacles? |
| Tools? | State the basic empirical framework and research design. Is it a regression model approach? Survey instrument design? Interview design? |
| What's New? | What is really new about your study? Briefly state (up to) three key findings of the study. |
| So What? | Why is it important to know the answer? How will major decisions/behaviour/activity etc be influenced by the outcome of this research? What is the economic significance of the findings? |
| Contribution? | What is the primary essence of the contribution to the relevant research literature? |

EXAMPLE of Written Abstract (One of the previous winners)

Title: DETERMINANTS OF CORPORATE R&D ACTIVITY IN POLAND: DOES THE PARTICIPATION OF SCIENTISTS ON THE BOARD MATTER?

Authors: Mrs. Anna Bialek-Jaworska, University of Warsaw, Poland Mrs. Barbara Grabinska, Cracow University of Economics, Poland

Keywords: R&D; academic entrepreneurship; R&D subsidies; patents; internal finance

Abstract:

Idea: To examine the determinants of company R&D investment and verify the impact of academics participation within management or board of directors, taking into account financial constraints, subsidies and IP protection. To identify needs and barriers for the R&D outcomes commercialization by scientists engaging in business activity without university engagement as a shareholder.

Data: Panel data from annual reports of Polish private companies merged with data from the National Court Register (boards members), and data on patents and scientists employed at universities.

Tools: Tobit panel analysis based on a sample of 18,125 non-public Polish limited liability and joint-stock companies for 2003-2013.

What's new?: Three key findings: (1) financial constraints are a more important limitation for R&D investments of companies with a scientist on their management. (2) Important sources of financing of R&D investment of companies with a scientist on their management or supervisory board are government subsidies for research and infrastructure. (3) Companies with scientists on the management and/or supervisory board with lower growth opportunities increase spending on commercializing their R&D outcomes.

So what?: These findings could assist policymakers, investors, and scientists in effectively combining science with business in catching-up countries. They allow to learn the needs of companies established by scientists that are interested in commercialization of R&D outcomes.

Contribution: Identifying that companies with a scientist on their supervisory board are likelier to invest more in the R&D outcomes for commercialization. Private firms that conduct R&D activity resulting in patents are likelier to invest more in the R&D outcomes.