

Research Impact Through Matchmaking (RITM):  
How and Why to Connect Researchers and Practitioners

Adam Seth Levine  
Associate Professor of Government, Cornell University  
President, research4impact

October 30, 2018

**\*\*\*DRAFT; Please do not cite.\*\*\***

Abstract

Researchers and practitioners increasingly want to learn from each other and work together to solve complex problems. Yet because they often belong to very different social networks, matchmaking is valuable. Here I present results from a novel, evidence-based approach to matchmaking called *Research Impact Through Matchmaking* (RITM). It leverages research on organizational diversity to initiate working relationships between strangers who are diverse in several ways. In this paper I describe the method and present data from 37 initial matches between practitioners working at nonprofits and social scientists. To my knowledge, this is the first large N dataset describing how a variety of nonprofit practitioners value social science research. I also document the impact of these matches. Overall, these results are of interest to researchers and practitioners that (a) may wish to initiate connections across diverse spaces themselves and/or (b) are currently engaged in matchmaking and may find RITM valuable.

Word Count: 3,644

Many thanks to the Rita Allen Foundation and Sage OCEAN for generous funding that made this project possible.

Social scientists produce research that aims to understand, explain, and help solve society's most pressing problems. Practitioners have direct, field-based expertise on the nature of those problems and want to know what works.

Both groups are intensely curious. They increasingly want to learn from each other and work together to identify and solve complex problems. Yet they also face intense demands on their time and belong to different social networks, which means they lack an efficient means to connect (Newman et al. 2016, Green 2017).

In short, there is demand for matchmaking that arranges personal interactions between credible partners. Here I describe and present results from a novel, recently-implemented approach to it. As president of research4impact,<sup>1</sup> I reached out to several practitioners' listservs in 2018 and invited them to share problems they were facing in their work in which they thought research might be helpful. In response I would match them with a social scientist one-on-one. I targeted listservs composed of non-partisan, non-profit organizations with a mission to remedy social ills. 37 practitioners responded over several months.

I then developed an evidence-based matchmaking method rooted in research on organizational diversity. I call this method *Research Impact Through Matchmaking* (RITM). The goal is to initiate working relationships between strangers who have diverse professional experiences (and who are often diverse with respect to many other attributes as well).

This paper makes two contributions. First, to my knowledge I present the first dataset that captures a wide variety of practitioners' perspectives on the value of social science research. This is important because academic-practitioner relationships often start from the perspective of doing "collaborative research," which immediately places "practitioners on academics' terms, in the conduct of research activities in which [academics] are far more expert than [practitioners]"

(Bartunek 2007:1328). Here, instead, the relationships start from the perspective of practitioners.<sup>2</sup> Second, I describe the scientific foundations of RITM, give examples of some of its techniques, and present data on its impact. I expect these results to interest researchers and practitioners that (a) may wish to initiate connections across diverse spaces themselves and/or (b) are currently engaged in matchmaking and may find RITM helpful.

### **How do Practitioners at Nonprofits Value Social Science Research?**

In 2018 I posted an announcement to five practitioner-oriented email lists inviting them to “learn about research that can help solve some of their organization’s trickiest problems”. The lists were composed of practitioners who work at non-partisan, nonprofit organizations with a public interest mission. They are advocates and organizers addressing social problems such as poor nutrition, climate change, child abuse, low voter engagement, low political knowledge, traffic congestion, pollution, and so on. The announcement asked them to fill out a very brief online form. I would then follow-up for a more detailed scope call. Over a three-month period 37 people from 10 countries responded, and I connected them with researchers from 12 academic disciplines: public policy, public health, environmental studies, sociology, communication, economics, political science, psychology, law, business, city and regional planning, and human development.

I categorized their requests into four types of goals (see Table 1). Those in the first three were matched with researchers for a short (< 60 minutes) conversation. Those in the fourth were matched with the expectation of a longer-term collaboration.

*Table 1: Goals of Nonprofit Practitioners*

<i>Goal 1: To receive an overview of a large research literature</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Goal 2: To make an immediate evidence-based decision</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Goal 3: To gain ideas about how to measure impact</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Goal 4: To collaborate with a researcher on a new project</i>	<i>9</i>

*(Numbers do not add up to 37 because two practitioners stated multiple initial goals.)*

Afterwards I shared this coding with five professionals who have each worked in advocacy and organizing for at least fifteen years. All of them verified that it resonated with their personal experiences. Although this dataset is surely not representative of all practitioners that could benefit from connecting with a social scientist (it is difficult to imagine how one would define this population), it does describe how a wide variety of practitioners value social science research. I describe each category below.

*1. To receive an overview of a large research literature*

This was by far the most common request: practitioners wanted a curated overview of a large body of literature. Typically the person who reached out was leading a new initiative within the organization. While they could search online for relevant information, doing so entailed severe concerns about volume and quality. A more efficient starting point would be a personalized conversation with a subject matter expert, in which they could learn about existing research most relevant to their goal. For example, one person was part of an organization that was starting to give grants to local communities to spur civic engagement. She needed an overview of the latest research on links between civic engagement and public safety. A second person wanted to learn about research encouraging people to take public transportation and/or use bikes instead of driving. Summing up his experience with a conversation like this, a third practitioner said: “We got a dose of years’ worth of research expertise in a 45 minute phone call.”

## *2. To make an immediate evidence-based decision*

Some practitioners were facing an immediate decision in their work and wanted to ensure it was informed by evidence. For instance, one person who worked for a membership-based organization needed to measure members' political ideology. His question pertained to survey methodology – what is the most effective way to measure how conservative or liberal someone is? Another person posed a survey question pertaining to networks of social movement leaders: What is the best way to measure individuals' social ties within a group? A third person was expanding her organization's get-out-the-vote efforts and needed to learn about messages that resonate with low-propensity voters.

## *3. To gain ideas about how to measure impact*

Some practitioners were seeking advice about how to measure the impact of their existing work. Such questions arise internally within mission-driven organizations as well as externally from donors. In each case they were already collecting some outcome data, but it did not always align most closely with their theory of change. If the initial conversation with the researcher went well then they were typically open to a longer-term research collaboration.

For example, one person worked for an organization that had developed a new app to encourage healthy eating behavior. It was easy to measure the number of users, but the organization's goal was ultimately to change behavior. She wanted to talk with a researcher about possible behavioral measures. Another example came from someone who worked for an organization that provided online information about polling locations and candidates. He already

had web traffic data, yet wanted to assess the site's impact on other outcomes such as turnout and political trust.

#### *4. To collaborate on a new project*

Some practitioners reached out because they wanted to collaborate with a researcher on an entirely new project. They already had organizational, financial, and/or administrative resources in place, and were looking to collaborate with a researcher that would bring research skills and credibility. Unlike the previous category of respondents who only wanted to evaluate current programs, these practitioners expected to formulate hypotheses in partnership with the researcher. For example, one person was looking to develop and test new ways of designing government forms for social benefits. Someone else wanted to brainstorm and test creative ways to raise awareness of economic insecurity among college students.

#### **RITM: An Evidence-Based Matchmaking Method**

Next I developed RITM as the matchmaking procedure. It focuses on the initial set-up – establishing a firm foundation for a successful working relationship, whether that relationship lasts for one conversation or extends beyond that. RITM answers the question: What is the best way to initiate working relationships between strangers who are diverse in terms of professional experience as well as possibly many other salient attributes?

On the one hand, conversations between diverse individuals can produce more creative and effective decision-making (e.g. Phillips et al. 2004, Sommers 2006) by surfacing a much broader set of perspectives and task-relevant knowledge (Galinsky et al. 2015, Page 2017). At the same time, people do not always share what they know (Stasser and Titus 2003), especially if

status differentials are present and/or people are anxious about saying something wrong (Crosby and Monin 2007).<sup>3</sup> Diverse teams are also more likely to produce interpersonal conflict (Galinsky et al. 2015).

RITM maximizes the likelihood of informational gains and minimizes the possibility of tension and self-imposed reticence. For matchmakers it entails three steps: conducting a scope call, recruiting a match, and then introducing the researcher and practitioner.

### Scope call

RITM begins with a 30-minute scope call to learn more about the goals of the person who initiated the match. In what follows I assume this is the practitioner (as that was the case with the 37 matches described earlier), though the method would certainly apply to researcher-initiated matches as well.

These calls begin with an “opener” that prompts the practitioner to speak first. People are more willing to share information with others who explicitly signal that they want to listen and be helpful (Miller et al. 1983). The opener invites them to share more details about their organization, their role within it, and how research could be helpful.

Ensuring that the practitioner speaks first is also vital because of conversational dynamics. As Pickering and Garrod (2004) show, individuals engaged in dialogue often pursue “interactive alignment” in which they align their language with what was said beforehand. During the scope call this helps ensure the matchmaker is using similar language as the practitioner, and also minimizes the unintentional use of jargon such as “experiment” and “subjects”.

As the conversation proceeds, follow-up questions should be affirming and responsive to the information being shared. People are more willing to share detailed information with those who explicitly demonstrate interest and offer positive feedback (Taylor et al. 1969).

With at least ten minutes left the matchmaker needs to recap the practitioner's goals in his/her own words. This forces a higher level of active processing (Petty et al. 1995), thus ensuring that the matchmaker can accurately describe the goals when recruiting a match. Practitioners are then asked to share the "ways in which what was said were either inaccurate or correct". Survey researchers find that the way you ask questions affects the kinds of considerations that are salient when people answer them (Tourangeau et al. 2000). Deliberately phrasing the question in this way encourages practitioners to canvass both types of considerations and also reduces the likelihood that they "go along to get along" (Chen et al. 1996) by not offering corrections.

Lastly, the matchmaker needs to avoid pressuring people into a match prematurely. The final question should be whether they "are ready for a match or want to wait for a while" while also noting that it is "totally understandable if they want to wait". This statement leverages normative language to legitimize the option of waiting. In my case, 5 of the 37 practitioners decided to wait.

### The match

After the scope call the matchmaker recruits a researcher with topical expertise who is likely to enjoy speaking with and learn from the practitioner. They are then formally introduced via email.

The success of the match depends upon not just *who* is recruited, but also *how* they are recruited and *how* they are introduced to each other. In advance of diverse conversations people

often think about what they are going to say (Lloyd et al. 2013), and how the conversation is framed affects this pre-meeting elaboration (Vorauer et al. 2009). The emails to recruit researchers and formally initiate the match should employ the following three strategies.

*1. State each person's unique expertise*

People in groups often do not share unique task-relevant information that they bring to the conversation, and others may not carefully consider it even when they do share it (Stasser and Titus 2003). Moreover, status differentials exacerbate these patterns. When people join new task-oriented groups they walk in the door with performance expectations that are based on “shared cultural beliefs” that certain individual characteristics are associated with “greater social worthiness and competence” (Ridgeway 2001:357). These performance expectations are impactful because:

“The greater the expectation advantage of one actor over another, the more likely the first actor is to be allowed chances to perform in the group, the more likely she is to speak up and offer task suggestions while the second actor hesitates, the more likely she is to have her suggestions positively evaluated, and the less likely she is to be [influential] when there are disagreements.”

In the United States, for example, there are several individual characteristics that are widely accorded higher status, including educational attainment, occupation, gender, and race (Ridgeway 2001). Many researcher-practitioner matches are likely to differ along some of these lines.

One way to reduce the impact of status differentials is to communicate each individual's expertise to the entire group upfront. As Sunstein and Hastie (2015:112) write: “If a group wants to obtain the information that its members hold, all group members should be told, before deliberation begins, that different members have different, and relevant, information to contribute.” This method increases the likelihood that each person shares his/her unique

information and that others incorporate it to the broader conversation (Stasser et al. 1995). For this reason, recruitment and match emails should include short paragraphs that explicitly identify each person's task-relevant expertise. They should also minimize biographical details, thus talking about expertise in terms of what people have done (e.g. they have done research on x) and not who they are (e.g. that they are a professor).

### *2. Describe the conversation as a mutually beneficial learning opportunity*

Focusing on each person's task-related expertise also facilitates framing the match as an opportunity for both the researcher and practitioner to learn from one another (i.e. the matchmaker should note that they will "enjoy talking to one another" and both "learn a lot."). As Galinsky et al. (2015) note, group leaders should ensure that a diverse work group "is framed inclusively, highlighting the benefits" for everyone involved. Ely and Thomas (2001:266) echo this point, noting that leaders should encourage group members to work within a "cognitive frame" that explicitly values the opportunity to learn from each other. They observed that a "learning" frame produced high-functioning work groups in which members were more likely to feel valued and report that the group was successful.

### *3. Re-state the goal of the conversation*

Each email should re-state the goal to ensure that it is always common knowledge. As Phillips (2017:241) writes, "Having a common goal is one of the most important prerequisites for success in groups...repeat it often." This provides an opportunity to explicitly convey not just that each person has expertise, but also how that expertise is useful for achieving the conversation's goal. It also provides a clear benchmark for post-conversation evaluation.

In sum, RITM leverages these three strategies, along with the scope call, to provide the strongest possible foundation for a successful match.

### **Assessing RITM's Impact**

I applied RITM to the 37 practitioner-initiated requests mentioned earlier, and then assessed the matches in several ways (see Table 2). First, for the 9 practitioners that wanted to talk about collaborating on a new project, 7 (78%) had proceeded to the design and/or data collection stage as of this writing. Six involve new data collection (likely randomized controlled trials) and one involves analyzing administrative data. In the other two cases the researcher and practitioner spoke amicably several times but could not agree on a mutually-beneficial project.

In addition, there were 30 requests for short conversations, of which 25 asked to be matched after the scope call (the other five chose to wait for various reasons). I was able to find matches for 24 of them. Afterwards I followed up with practitioners and asked if the conversation provided useful information addressing their current needs. 94% responded affirmatively and noted that they would be using the information going forward.<sup>4</sup> I also asked the researchers if the conversation was worthwhile. Here again 94% reported that it was, using terms like “gave me lots of ideas,” “helpful,” and a welcome opportunity to reflect on “what we know and what we don’t know”. Overall, this feedback provides strong evidence that RITM provided direct and immediate mutual benefits.

*Table 2: Summary of RITM's Impact*

<b>Among those matched for a short conversation (goals 1-3 in Table 1):</b>	
% of practitioners who said the conversation provided useful information to address current needs	94%
% of researchers who found the discussion worthwhile	94%
<b>Among those matched to talk about a possible collaboration (goal 4 in Table 1)</b>	
% who began a collaboration	78%

*See notes for more details on these calculations.*

To conclude, RITM is a promising path forward for initiating personalized connections between practitioners and researchers. For researchers, matchmaking compliments other forms of public engagement such as blogging (Sides 2011), writing policy briefs (Skocpol 2014), and performing public service (Bowers and Testa 2018). As external bodies such as donors and governments increasingly demand evidence of research impact (Nyhan et al. 2015), matchmaking efficiently enables one direct and immediate form. It also exposes researchers to new perspectives and new questions. Lastly, as interest in academic-practitioner relationships grows (Han and Stenhouse 2015, Butler 2018) RITM principles may be applied to other kinds of matches with a variety of other practitioners and also extended to provide support beyond the initial match.

## Bibliography

Bartunek, Jean M. 2007. "Academic-Practitioner Collaboration Need Not Require Joint or Relevant Research: Toward a Relational Scholarship of Integration." *Academy of Management Journal* 50: 1323-1333.

Bowers, Jake and Paul Testa 2018. "Social and Behavioral Science Theory, Methods, and the Evidence-Informed Policy Movement." *Annual Review of Political Science*.

Butler, Daniel M. 2018. "Facilitating Field Experiments at the Subnational Level." *Journal of Politics*.

Chen, Serena, David Shechter, and Shelly Chaiken. 1996. "Getting at the Truth or Getting Along: Accuracy- Versus Impression-Motivated Heuristic and Systematic Processing." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 71: 262-275.

Crosby, Jennifer Randall and Benoit Monin. 2007. "Failure to Warn: How Student Race Affects Warnings of Potential Academic Difficulty." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 43: 663-670.

Ely, Robin J. and David A. Thomas. 2001. "Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46: 229-273.

Galinsky, Adam D., Andrew R. Todd, Astrid C. Homan, Katherine W. Phillips, Evan P. Apfelbaum, Stacey J. Sasaki, Jennifer A. Richeson, Jennifer B. Olayon, and William W. Maddux. 2015. "Maximizing the Gains and Minimizing the Pains of Diversity: A Policy Perspective." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10: 742-748.

Green, Duncan. 2017. "The NGO-Academia Interface." Impact of Social Sciences Blog: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/79530/>. Accessed September 19, 2018.

Gulati, Ranjay. 2007. "Tent Poles, Tribalism, and Boundary Spanning: The Rigor-Relevance Debate in Management Research." *Academy of Management Journal* 50: 775-782.

Han, Hahrie and Neil Stenhouse. 2015. "Bridging the Research-Practice Gap in Climate Communication: Lessons from One Academic-Practitioner Collaboration." *Science Communication* 37: 396-404.

Miller, Lynn Carol, John H. Berg, and Richard L. Archer. 1983. "Openers: Individuals Who Elicit Intimate Self-Disclosure." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 44: 1234-1244.

Newman, Joshua, Adrian Cherney, and Brian W. Head. 2016. "Do Policy Makers Use Academic Research? Reexamining the "Two Communities" Theory of Research Utilization." *Public Administration Review* 76: 24-32.

Nyhan, Brendan, John Sides, and Joshua Tucker. 2015. "APSA as Amplifier: How to Encourage and Promote Public Voices within Political Science." *PS*, 90-93.

Page, Scott E. 2017. *The Diversity Bonus*. Princeton University Press.

Phillips, Katherine W. 2017. "What is the real value of diversity in organizations? Questioning our assumptions." In Scott E. Page, *The Diversity Bonus*. Princeton University Press.

Phillips, Katherine W., Elizabeth A. Mannix, Margaret A. Neale, and Deborah H. Gruenfeld. 2004. "Diverse Groups and Information Sharing: The Effects of Congruent Ties." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 40: 497-510.

Pickering, Martin J. and Simon Garrod. 2004. "Toward a Mechanistic Psychology of Dialogue." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 27: 169-226.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2001. "Social Status and Group Structure." In *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes*, Ed. Michael A. Hogg and R. Scott Tindale.

Sides, John. 2011. "The Political Scientist as a Blogger." *PS*, 267-271.

Skocpol, Theda. 2014. "How the Scholars Strategy Network Helps Academics Gain Public Influence." *Perspectives on Politics* 695-703.

Sommers, Samuel R. 2006. "On Racial Diversity and Group Decision Making: Identifying Multiple Effects of Racial Composition on Jury Deliberations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90: 597-612.

Stasser, Garold and William Titus. 2003. "Hidden Profiles: A Brief History." *Psychological Inquiry* 14: 304-313.

Stasser, Garold, Dennis D. Stewart, and Gwen M. Wittenbaum. 1995. "Expert Roles and Information Exchange during Discussion: The Importance of Knowing Who Knows What." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 31: 244-265.

Sunstein, Cass R. and Reid Hastie. 2015. *Wiser*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski. 2000. *The Psychology of Survey Response*. Cambridge University Press.

Vorauer, Jacquie D., Annette Gagnon, and Stacey J. Sasaki. 2009. "Salient Intergroup Ideology and Intergroup Interaction." *Psychological Science* 20: 838-845.

---

<sup>1</sup> Research4impact is a new organization that builds relationships between researchers and practitioners. I co-founded it along with Don Green and Jake Bowers in 2017.

---

<sup>2</sup> I am not implying that researchers can only be involved with “relevant” rather than “rigorous” research (Gulati 2007). Instead, my goal was simply to ensure that the matches were framed around social problems in which practitioners and researchers have a shared interest.

<sup>3</sup> Most of this research does not explicitly examine people who differ in professional experience, yet relevant literature reviews often discuss results in terms of any salient diverse attribute (e.g. Galinsky et al. 2015).

<sup>4</sup> Of those 24, there were 4 misconnects where the practitioner and researcher never spoke and 2 cases in which they did speak but neither responded to my follow-up assessing the conversation. The 94% figures thus refer to 17 of 18 conversations.