Appendix A. Responses from Round 1 Open-ended Questions of the Delphi Survey (Red words indicate similar issues)

Summary of Delphi responses—Team members (N=17)	**Summary of Delphi responses—Authors (N=16)**
1. Challenges to include and discuss in the Position Paper:	**1. Challenges to include and discuss in the Report:**
a) Lack of insightful, forward-looking, and relevant knowledge for a larger audience, such as educated public and practitioners; lack of connectedness with local business community, organizational and economics issues; theory and practice gap is stronger than ever, purpose is not to serve. (6) b) Rewarding number of papers in A-journals, a criterion that produces narrow, quick, flashy but insignificant research, instead of quality of reward or a collective body of work. (3) c) Journals' emphasis on theory and method but not relevance of knowledge for the business world. d) Research quality is in question due to publication pressure, questionable research practices (researchers doing whatever it takes to get published). This threatens intellectual integrity, and impairs the accumulation of knowledge and integrity of science. (4) e) Journals tend to be disciplinary focus to emphasis on theory and less interest on inter-disciplinary and problem-focused research. (2) f) Journals' focus on economic outcomes important for for-profit firms, the MNCs of the West, which are declining in number and rise of alternative forms of organizations, including BOT and emerging economies. We need to solve problems of the world, not only a subset of corporations. Mission of business school – current focus is on the development of firms, but need to become a positive contributor to the development of society, to create and shape our future. (2)	a) The persistent research-practice gap—research not relevant for practice, does not reach appropriate audience. (6) b) Pressure and conformism on A-journals that trump content (asking important, complex, messy questions), publish at all costs, fosters homogeneity, singular mindset, stifles innovation, incentivizes questionable practices. (7) c) Over-emphasis on theory leading to highly specialized unintelligible framing of our research. Crafting the perfect article through complicated statistical methods, bias against negative findings. (7) d) Questionable research practices to maximize publication success (including authorship collusion) and study trivial problems but do not necessarily advance or even produce wrongful knowledge. (6) e) Favor disciplinary silos over multidisciplinary work. (2) f) Too much focus on economic performance of large firms of the Anglo-Saxon world (MNCs); need more balance with social outcomes important to society. g) No accountability to discover truth, to engage the community, and to improve human condition through research. (2) h) Division of academics between those who publish in the right journals versus those who do not; suppresses passion and intrinsic motivation of young scholars (reduce academic freedom). (2) i) No place for non-main stream topics e.g., exploratory and inductive research due to the emphasis on theory in top (or even non-top) journals. j) Questionable practices by journals and publishers to increase

h) Administrative goal (ranking) of the school is interfering with the intellectual autonomy of scientists. i) We do not value non-main stream topics e.g., process knowledge, tools or concepts to support decision making as academic outputs. j) Journals are competing in questionable ways (e.g., manipulate citations to inflate impact factor), undermining the credibility of science. k) How technology is changing the opportunities for peer review and publication of our work. l) Selection and socialization of scientists ignore the moral standards, trained as research technicians and not noble social-minded scientists.	and open public's access to research. (3) l) Journals favor a positivist and functionalist perspective, fostering a focus on small issues. m) Random, capricious, narrow, control in the review and publication process, lack reliability and validity in reviews. (2)
2. Key potential change leaders (groups):	**2. Key potential change leaders (groups):**
a) Deans, associate deans of research, department heads (4) b) University leaders c) Senior faculty, top researchers, leading scholars (6) and Tenure and promotion committees (2 d) Journal editors (5), review boards e) Leadership of professional associations (4), especially owners of leading journals f) Ranking agencies (2) g) Accreditation bodies; they influence what business schools focus on. (3) h) Business and government leaders i) Government and private funding sources (2) j) Non-business public, critical of the research that is self-serving and not serving public interest k) Students, alumni—relevant and useful research prepares them better to understand and contribute to societal issues. l) Publishers m) Professors of practice (to disseminate and frame problem-focused research	a) Deans and department chairs (11) b) University leaders as policy makers (3) c) Senior faculty as scholars and promotion committees (8) d) Journal editors (9) "editors united can change the field overnight" e) Professional associations e.g., AoM, SMS, SIOP, MBA Roundtable (7) f) Ranking agencies e.g. Thompson Reuters, Financial Times g) Accreditation bodies e.g., AACSB, EFMD (4) h) Business leaders i) Granting agencies or sources, private donors (3) j) Journal publishers—profit motive
3. Potential solutions or actions for each group:	**3. Potential solutions or actions for each group:**
a) Journal editors i. Publish special issues on important topics that is of relevance	a) Journal editors i. Encourage innovative research with relevant for and impact on

to society, interdisciplinary e.g., grand challenges. (3) ii. Change review criteria to include important, relevant message, to consider both technical quality and importance of issues. (4) iii. Bring editors together (e.g., in professional conferences) to discuss impact of research on practice and society. iv. Appoint open-minded editors, associate editors, and reviewers; come to agreement on big questions and how they might be addressed. (2) b) Deans, associate deans of research, department chairs i. Change P&T criteria and promote people based on broad, significant contributions, focus of annual reports, summer support, etc. (4) ii. Schools to develop areas of excellence and encourage faculty to work in these areas to accumulate knowledge on important issues. iii. Reward papers with direct implication for practice, regulation or other relevant issues. iv. Change PhD training to include examples of new scholarship. (2) v. Include relevance of research in school development strategy and cultivate culture of responsible research with institutional arrangement. vi. Recommend professors of practice to connect with industry and policy. vii. Create postdoc models for white papers and industry briefs. c) Professional associations—promote relevant research agenda. (2) d) Accreditation bodies, ranking and funding agencies i. Evaluate institutions based on 5-10 most significant contributions, using combined criteria of academic quality and broader relevance. (2) ii. Strengthen academic and business connections. iii. Encourage cross-disciplinary research (e.g., medicine,	practice and develop associated standards. (3) ii. Reign in reviewers socialized within the current system, create standards to prevent authoritarian and unreasonable reviews, consider the 2-stage review process (e.g., Kepes & McDaniel, 2013). iii. Get 15-20 leading editors in each field to create a binding revolution (and avoid the tragedy of the commons). iv. Publish replications, negative findings, non-significant results, or effect size over significance, etc. (4) Develop standards for data accessibility, transparency, and replication. v. Need metrics other than impact factor to judge the journals, to recognize both rigor and relevance. vi. Encourage multi-disciplinary, challenge-led research. b) Deans, departments heads i. Stop simply counting of publications in reviews; change criteria in promotion and hiring. (2) ii. Develop vision and strategy to encourage and reward faculty research that makes a difference. (2) iii. Reward risky, path-breaking research. iv. Improve PhD training on questionable research practices and beyond hypothetico-deductive model. (2) v. Convene diverse stakeholders to discuss socially responsible research, accountability and social impact. vi. Create better measures of impact in evaluating individuals, departments, and schools. Develop quality alternatives to A publications (e.g., books, chapters, conference papers, etc.) (4) vii. Enforce ethical research practices. viii. Abolish journal lists (they distort and degrade scholarly activities). c) Professional associations i. Set guidance, sanctions, standards. ii. Serve as change agents. d) Abolish journal rankings. e) Businesses to partner with researchers.

engineering). iv. Change the ranking methodology and criteria to focus on relevance of research. (4) e) Business and government leaders—they are the subject of our research and should influence what we do. We need external stakeholder evaluation of the relevance and usefulness of BS research. (2) f) Top and like-minded researchers—seek their involvement to promote the position paper and the grand challenges (identifying them and promoting them). g) Non-business public—op-ed pieces in Sunday Times business sections; Malcolm Gladwell-like book; get influential people on board (e.g., James Surowiecki, Adrian Woolridge, etc.).	f) Senior faculty to set examples. g) Media—to disseminate this report. h) System-wide change focusing on "how research can win rather than players within the system win".
4. Grand Challenges that business school research should address:	**4. Grand Challenges that business school research should address:**
a) Poverty alleviation and economic integration; make all countries wealthy would make the world a much better place. (5) b) Environment, climate and sustainability issues, green management. (4) c) Managerial ethics; we keep failing it e.g., recent Volkswagen scandal. (3), interface of finance and ethics. d) Social sustainability—Improve health by improving systems and processes; inclusive organization/culture to provide engaging and fulfilling work, social inclusion. (3) e) Technological breakthroughs i. Communication and information ii. Business models, institutions iii. Effects on inequality, labor market imbalance, regulation change, etc. (2) iv. Internet-based business model innovation. v. Implications for financial regulations. f) Purpose of business firms (e.g., to achieve triple bottom line). (2) g) New employment relationships: a. Nature of relationship between individuals and business organizations. b. New organizational forms, nature of work, expectations,	a) Income inequality, poverty—how corporations are contributing to the problem and what to do to reduce it, how to create wealth more broadly. (7) b) Environment, climate, ecological diversity, and sustainability issues (5) c) Managerial ethics, agency problem, managerialism. (4) d) Social sustainability, inclusiveness. (3) e) AI and technological influence on work and organizations, changing nature of work, digital economy. (6) f) Purpose of business firms i. Role of MNCs or large corporations, global communities. (3) ii. Impact of global firms (MNCS) on societies (global community). (2) iii. Systemic impact of organizations; long-term consequences of their products and services. g) New employment relationships: i. Generation gap caused by technological and economic

employment contracts, incentive systems. c. Wellbeing of employees and society. (2) h) Natural resource scarcity, restructuring energy system to one based on renewable and decentralized energy source. (2) i) Provision of healthy food to support healthy lifestyle, job stress and burnout. j) Redirect capital flows from speculative to constructive purposes. k) Digitization of democratized innovation activities; allow some countries to jump over several decades of innovation; will digitalization bring equality or bigger division? l) Some challenges may transcend disciplines e.g., innovation, sustainability, new business models, income inequality. Others may be discipline specific e.g., sustainable design, service strategies and consumer wellbeing. m) Structure of society across for-profit organizations, public entities, NGS. n) Cross-functional and inter-disciplinary research. o) Other topics: Cross-sector research for social change e.g., UN's sustainable development goals; Big data and social change; Aging workforce, religion and bias in the workplace. p) Encourage faculty to ask meaningful questions from the heart and to make sure their work is useful to society. q) Annual update of grand challenges; similar to the Annual Global Risk Report of WEF.	developments. ii. Leadership (2) for sustainable performance. iii. Managing multi-cultural workforce, diversity and different types of work relationships (less loyalty by younger workers, contractors and staff on demand. UBER (4) h) Alternatives to capitalism i) Corporate democracy j) More reflexive long-term organizations k) Religion and business l) Fostering innovation at system and individual levels m) Discrimination and bullying in organizations n) Better selection tools and data considerations o) Develop meaningful workplace p) Impact of machine learning in education; when computers can be better teachers than humans—how does that impact what and how we teach? q) How do we communicate and connect with people from different thought worlds, and when we prefer to communicate with like-minded people? How do we encourage dialog instead of "we-against-them" conversations? r) Less complex research models, main effects are robust.
5. Additional comments or suggestions for this project	**5. Additional comments or suggestions for this project**
1. The problem is important but difficult, with no easy solutions. 2. The project is really important and really challenging; believe the vision of the project and effort are worthwhile. 3. This is a profoundly influential project that should be widely disseminated and discussed. 4. I am enthusiastic about this project; need a process/structure to get the endorsement and engagement of others. 5. Great initiative. 6. This is an ambitious project and with it success.	1. The relationship between research and practice is a highly complex matter. 2. Refrain from promoting the view that social science research can solve the problems of the world. 3. An important project; good luck with it. (2) 4. Excellent goal and organization. 5. This is important work. 6. Some more guidelines would be helpful; could write 10 pages per question.

Appendix B: Ranked Responses to Structured Questions in Round 2 of the Delphi Survey (Top 12 responses highlighted in yellow)

Question 1: What are the most important issues in business school research that our report or position paper must address? For each main theme and the issues within each theme, please consider your personal opinion on the relative importance of this idea for discussion in the report or position paper concerning business school research.							
	Most important = a top priority for discussion Quite important = discuss if there is space Less important = exclusion would not affect the big picture						
#	**Theme/Issue**	**Most important**	**Quite important**	**Less important**	**No. of Response**	**Average Value**	**Rank**
1	**1,1 Research does not produce relevant knowledge for business practice and societal improvement.**	20	6		26	1.23	1
8	1.2.a Rewarding the number of papers in A journals distorts incentives towards a narrow focus and excludes many important papers that are published in lesser-ranked journals.	17	7	2	26	1.42	2
2	1.1.a Lack of insightful, forward-looking and relevant knowledge for a larger audience beyond the academic community.	16	10	1	27	1.44	3
7	**1,2 Star journal obsession and consequences**	**15**	**11**	**1**	**27**	**1.48**	**4**
18	1.3.c An over-emphasis on theory leads authors to frame their research in highly specialized, unintelligible framing, the crafting of complicated analysis, and a bias against negative findings.	17	5	4	26	1.50	5
17	1.3.b Journals favor disciplinary silos, focuses on theory and are less interested in inter-disciplinary and problem-focused research.	14	9	3	26	1.58	6
9	1.2.b Pressure to publish in A journals that trumps content (important, complex, difficult questions), produces homogenization and stifles innovation.	14	9	4	27	1.63	7

4	1.1.c Current mission of business schools is on development of firms, but not on the development of society, to create and shape our future.	12	10	4	26	1.69	8
3	1.1.b No accountability to discover truth, to engage the community, and to improve human condition through research.	10	12	4	26	1.77	9
19	1.3.d We do not value non-mainstream topics e.g., exploratory, inductive, process knowledge, or decision tools.	9	14	3	26	1.77	10
23	1.4.a In selecting and socializing students, we ignore moral standards and train them to be research technicians and not social-minded scientists accountable to society.	10	12	4	26	1.77	11
24	1.4.b Graduate training does not encourage scholars (faculty and doctoral students) to ask meaningful questions from the heart.	11	11	5	27	1.78	12
6	1.1.e We do not value research with direct implications for practice (as much as we value research with implications for theory).	9	13	4	26	1.81	13
10	1.2.c Publication pressure threatens intellectual integrity, impairs the accumulation of knowledge and integrity of science.	9	11	5	25	1.84	14
13	1.2.f Questionable practices by journals to increase citations, undermining the credibility of science.	8	13	4	25	1.84	15
14	1.2.g Division of academics into those who publish in the right journals and those who do not; suppresses passion and intrinsic motivation of young scholars.	11	7	7	25	1.84	16
21	1.3.f Journals' current focus is on economic outcomes of for-profit firms and MNCs, which are declining in number; with rise of emerging economies, we need to solve problems of the world, not of a subset of corporations.	10	10	6	26	1.85	17
11	1.2.d Administrative goal (ranking) of the school interferes with the intellectual autonomy of scientists.	7	14	4	25	1.88	18

22	**1,4 Doctoral training on techniques not on ethics and science for society**	**6**	**17**	**3**	**26**	**1.88**	**19**
26	1.5.a Current publication models (book binding and typesetting) are antiquated and overpriced in a digital world. The future lies with flexible ways of publishing and open access to research.	10	9	7	26	1.88	20
15	**1,3 Tight research focus of journals on discipline, theory, and analysis**	**8**	**11**	**7**	**26**	**1.96**	**21**
27	1.5.b Technology is changing the opportunities and models of peer review and publishing of our work.	3	20	3	26	2.00	22
5	1.1.d We focus on empirical data from the past, not knowledge about the future, or social outcomes important to society.	7	11	8	26	2.04	23
12	1.2.e Random, capricious, narrow and excessive control in the review and publication process.	5	14	6	25	2.04	24
25	**1,5 Technology changes reviewing and publishing models**	**5**	**13**	**8**	**26**	**2.12**	**25**
20	1.3.e Narrow focus and theory emphasis stifle the ability of new journals (on non-main-stream and new topics) to succeed.	5	12	9	26	2.15	26
16	1.3.a Journals favor a positivist and functionalist perspective, fostering a focus on small issues.	5	11	9	25	2.16	27

Are there any other issues about business school research that should be considered in a report?
This should be enough ...
Current research models and incentives do not encourage research that engages practitioners in co-creation. Underdeveloped platforms that connect scholars to people and problems beyond academe. Faculty cultures that do not appreciate breadth of academic and professional preparation for research and teaching activities.
Several of these items are double barreled or otherwise problematic. I don't think items such as "Research does not produce relevant knowledge for business practice and societal improvement" will provide meaningful results. Clearly, "business practice" and "societal improvement" are very different. Why are they asked in one question? (***Please see the end of this document for a response to this comment)
I cannot think of any. Good list.

Textbooks very often lag behind the current issue, problems and practices of all our stakeholders. They often describe organizational structures that are not found frequently in a technologically enabled world.
Writers talk about VUCA environments yet they rarely discuss the skills needed nowadays e.g. flexibility, resilience, agility, adaptability.
I often think of Don Hambrick's paper. What if the Academy really Mattered—our tenure, incentive and reward systems encourage the template of very narrow, often arid and trivial research. Impactful, path-breaking papers are most often found in lesser, eclectic and risk-taking journals.

Masters (MBA) students are implicitly (e.g. by cases) taught that academic research in business is useless. If they—like masters students in MOST disciplines—learned something about research and how to learn from it, the problems would be a lot less than they are. I'm sure that the systematic dismissal of research in MBA courses makes the academic-practitioner relationship much worse than it should be.

The dimension of criteria of Accreditations to measure the socially responsible researches should be mentioned more.

No, but your use of the term "positivist" in 1.3.a is incorrect. Our journals have never been positivist. Perhaps reconsider your language here?

Question 2: Who are the most important change agents? What are their best strategies or actions to re-orient business school research? For each item below, first indicate the relative importance of the change agent. Then, indicate the relative importance of each strategy or action that this group can take.

#	Strategy/Action	Most important	Quite important	Less important	No. of Response	Average Value	Rank
2	2.1.a Change promotion and tenure criteria from counting publications to valuing broad and significant contributions.	23	4		27	1.15	1
11	**2,2 Journal editors and professional associations**	**19**	**7**		**26**	**1.27**	**2**
1	2,1 Administration: deans, associate deans, department heads, etc.	18	8	1	27	1.37	3
4	2.1.c Develop better measures for impact in evaluating individuals, departments, and schools.	17	8	1	26	1.38	4
5	2.1.d Reward risky, path-breaking research that contributes to practice and society.	16	10		26	1.38	5
12	2.2.a Encourage innovative research that has relevance for and impact on practice.	16	10		26	1.38	6

21	**2,3 Senior scholars—top researchers, promotion and tenure committees**	**17**	**8**	**1**	**26**	**1.38**	**7**
16	2.2.e Publish special issues on important topics, grand challenges, and encourage inter-disciplinary approaches.	15	11		26	1.42	8
22	2.3.a Identify senior scholars and seek their involvement to promote changes in research.	14	12		26	1.46	9
23	2.3.b Encourage senior scholars to act as examples.	15	11	1	27	1.48	10
3	2.1.b Develop vision and strategy to encourage faculty to work on research that would make a difference.	14	11	1	26	1.50	11
20	2.2.i Promote relevant research, set standards and serve as change agents.	16	7	3	26	1.50	12
19	2.2.h Develop metrics other than impact factor (citations) to recognize both the rigor and relevance of published research.	15	10	2	27	1.52	13
15	2.2.d Bring leading editors together to discuss the impact of research on society, agree on big questions, and create a binding resolution (to avoid tragedy of the commons).	13	11	2	26	1.58	14
13	2.2.b Publish replications, negative findings, non-significant results, or report effect size, not just significance.	11	14	1	26	1.62	15
14	2.2.c Develop standards for data accessibility and transparency.	11	14	1	26	1.62	16
17	2.2.f Change review criteria to consider both technical quality and important issues relevant to business and society.	13	10	3	26	1.62	17
6	2.1.e Enforce ethical research practices.	12	11	3	26	1.65	18
26	2.4.b Encourage cross-disciplinary research, similar to that in medicine and engineering schools.	12	11	3	26	1.65	19
7	2.1.f Improve PhD training to include research ethics and examples of new scholarship.	9	17	1	27	1.70	20
36	2.6.c Invite media to disseminate the report from this	13	7	6	26	1.73	21

	Delphi study.						
35	2.6.b Write op-ed pieces in influential newspapers, publish Gladwell-like books, and value these publications.	10	12	4	26	1.77	22
24	**2,4 Assessment group—AACSB, EFMD, ranking publishers, etc.**	**8**	**14**	**4**	**26**	**1.85**	**23**
27	2.4.c Strengthen academic and business connections.	8	14	4	26	1.85	24
28	2.4.d Change the ranking methodology and criteria to focus on relevance of research.	11	8	7	26	1.85	25
9	2.1.h Convene diverse stakeholders to discuss responsible research, accountability and social impact	8	13	5	26	1.88	26
25	2.4.a Evaluate institutions based on five to ten most significant research contributions, using combined criteria of academic quality and broad relevance.	9	11	6	26	1.88	27
18	2.2.g Create standards of reviewing to prevent authoritarian and unreasonable reviews.	8	12	6	26	1.92	28
31	2.5.a Encourage collaborative research between practitioners and academics.	8	13	5	26	1.88	28
29	2.4.e Abolish the use of journal ranking (citations) as indicator of journal quality.	9	10	7	26	1.92	30
10	2.1.i Abolish journal lists in schools because they distort and degrade scholarly activities.	9	9	8	26	1.96	31
30	**2,5 Business leaders, alumni, funding agencies**	**7**	**12**	**7**	**26**	**2.00**	**32**
8	2.1.g Consider postdoc positions for white papers and industry briefs, and use of professors of practice to connect to industry.	5	13	8	26	2.12	33
34	2.6.a Encourage system-wide change with focus on “how research can win rather than on how players within the system win”.	6	11	9	26	2.12	34
32	2.5.b Involve business and government in the evaluation of the relevance of business school research.	3	11	12	26	2.35	35
33	**2,6 Other groups e.g., public, media**	**1**	**14**	**11**	**26**	**2.38**	**36**

Are there any other groups or solutions that are not mentioned in the above but should be considered?							
The government agencies' role should also be mentioned.							
Read the recent REF from the UK and how they are evaluating impact.							
Institutional leaders that can enable business schools to set policies that may not conform to university policies. Professional societies (e.g., SHRM, AICPA, CFA, etc.) that can assist in leveraging research to benefit members. Edtech companies that can enable new ways to track utility and impact of research products, such as software, pedagogical tools, etc.							
I cannot think of any. Very complete and thorough list.							
Again, many of the items on this page are double barreled or otherwise problematic. Who designed these questions? (***Please see the end of this document for a response to this comment.)							
Question 3. What are the grand challenges that responsible business school research should address? To what extent do you agree that each idea below is an important grand challenge for business school research to address?							
#	**Grand Challenge Ideas**	**Totally Agree**	**Agree**	**Do not Agree**	**No. of Responses**	**Average (N=27)**	**N=27 Rank**
1	3,1 Poverty, income inequality, economic integration, increase wealth for all.	22	2	2	26	1.23	1
2	3,2 Natural sustainability, environment, climate, ecology, natural resources.	20	5	1	26	1.27	2
6	3,6 Impact of firms on society beyond shareholders.	19	8		27	1.30	3
11	3,7 Changing nature of work and workforce.	18	8	1	27	1.37	4
5	3,5 Social sustainability, health systems, inclusive organizations, job stress, burnout.	16	10		26	1.38	5
10	3.6.d Achieving triple bottom line.	16	10	1	27	1.44	6
4	3,4 Finance and ethics, direct capital toward constructive purposes.	15	10	1	26	1.46	7
7	3.6.a Purpose of business firms.	13	11	2	26	1.58	8
15	3,8 Influence of technology on work and the firm.	12	13	1	26	1.58	9
8	3.6.b Impact of global MNCs.	12	12	2	26	1.62	10

21	3,9 Topics on nature of firms e.g., alternative to capitalism, religion and business, alternative forms of corporate governance, reflexive organizations.	12	11	3	26	1.65	11
23	3,11 Topics on research methods e.g., use of big data, cross-functional and cross-disciplinary research, less complex models, main effects are robust, better selection tools and data consideration.	13	9	4	26	1.65	12
13	3.7.b Managing multi-cultural workforce	12	12	3	27	1.67	13
9	3.6.c Long-term consequences of products and services	10	14	2	26	1.69	14
3	3,3 Managerialism, agency problem	10	13	3	26	1.73	15
18	3.8.c Digitization of work	8	16	2	26	1.77	16
16	3.8.a Information systems and business processes	18	14	4	26	1.85	17
20	3.8.e Machine learning and work of humans	9	12	5	26	1.85	18
12	3.7.a Technology-induced generation gap	9	11	6	26	1.88	19
14	3.7.c Different forms of employment relationship	6	17	3	26	1.88	20
22	3,10 Topics on social issues e.g., cross-sector social change, communication across cultures, discrimination	6	17	3	26	1.88	21
17	3.8.b Technology-related business models	6	16	4	26	1.92	22
19	3.8.d Technology and new forms of regulations	3	18	5	26	2.08	23

Are there any other grand challenges not mentioned above but should be considered?

Globalization and cultural diversity, dual criteria of ethics.

There are a number of grand challenges that we might consider that focus more on consumers, consumption, and society, e.g.:
Influence of technology on consumption and consumers
Digitization of products and services and their impact on productivity, employees and consumers
Collaborative product and service design
Innovative models of value co-creation across the firm, customers, and society
Creating shared value among the firm, customers, shareholders, and employees
Sustainable product/service design
Integrated, multi-channel customer experiences
Transformation of organizations to enhance employee and customer well-being

Creating robust, valid, and trustworthy research may be the “grandest” challenge, regardless of the topic.

Question 4. Are there any other issues, questions, suggestions or solutions about business school research that you would like to offer?
Providing examples of schools that are "doing it right" would be very useful. Many Deans would like to do this, but do not know HOW to do it. We need to provide them with practical tools, examples, and applications that they can easily and practically implement.
Impact of changing business school business models, as well as the higher education ecosystem, on research expectations and systems. Create more opportunities for data sets and research subjects in practice.
The principle that business schools should consider local community engagement with equal weight as global reputation. Identifying and addressing issues that matter at home could also have importance to other communities.
Not at this time.
Questions that have to be addressed: - How do we create/design a scientific process in the social sciences/business schools that encourages the generation of actionable, replicable, robust, valid, and trustworthy research? - How do we encourage our journals to publish such research? - How do we encourage deans and other administrators to reward such research? - How do we get practitioners to read such research and follow trustworthy conclusions?
In addition to the focus on research, faculty has important roles as catalysts for change and innovation. AACSB's new vision highlights this role for business schools in creating global prosperity. The traditional model is that faculty teach and do research; the new model adds more focus on creating impact, innovation, and engagement. We should highlight efforts to disseminate research ideas through the media, social networks and other channels.
I think you covered quite well the main problems in part 1 of this questionnaire.
We really need to break this incestuous, closed loop that Donald Hambrick so eloquently described in his presidential address of research being defined by academia, produced by scholars for other scholars and being evaluated by academia. This is neither effective nor responsible and it is going to blow into our face sooner or later.
Bottom of Pyramid related research encouragement. Global-local business development.
Understanding how some countries, like China, have been so successful in many dimensions.

Question 5. What do we currently do in our research that is good and that we should highlight and be sure to retain?
Highlight some papers as good research; maybe institute a prize.
Rigor and high level of ambition. We do not want business schools and universities to turn into B-class consultancy firms.
We are getting better at communicating about interesting aspects of our research to the public, including practice.
Systematic and theory driven logic and causal hypotheses tests are useful in developing a larger view of the world. The challenge is in pursuing problems that matter to society than only for sake of theory.
Peer review of research. Strong incentives to produce quality research (need to change the criteria for "quality"). Problem-based research—it does exist in pockets and across all our disciplines so we should highlight those areas/journals, etc. Managerial/societal implications are present in many journals and domains—we need to point these out and benchmark/emphasize. Cross-disciplinary conferences, domains, and research teams—they do exist and we should point these out.
High quality, professionalism, integrity
A number of journals have decided to expand their scope in including different forms of research. This acceptance of eclecticism should be recognized and actively promoted.
Research that informs optimal regulation of firms and markets.
We need to address societal issues and the public good…something we have been neglecting completely. We should not give up evidence based research and insights. And we do not have to give up research to improve business and management, but it needs to reflect always to what an extent business actions and success help or hinders the solution of societal problems and the public good.
Highly motivated junior faculty who would respond diligently to incentives. Extrinsic reward (promotion and tenure) is working well. But scientific work should be driven primarily by intrinsic motivation. We need to strengthen intrinsic motivation through freeing faculty to pursue important problems, create knowledge that can change practice, and improve society.

***Note on comments about items with multiple ideas: We agree that it would have been worthwhile to make sure that each item has only one idea. In the interest of keeping the survey to a reasonable length, we made the judgment of grouping some ideas within a single item. We tried to only put in the same item where only those ideas seem to belong to a general high-level idea. Even though the result of the Delphi is not to inform policy, but to inform some general trends, we should interpret the responses to these items with some caution.