

**Responsible Research in Business and Management**  
Delphi Study Summary Report  
November 1, 2016

*1. Introduction: Responsible Business School Research*

Consistent isomorphic pressures like rankings, ratings, league tables and institutional recruitment, promotional and auditing mechanisms have helped create the craving amongst academics for the publication of articles in top ranked journals (Wilson & McKiernan, 2011). Many scholars (e.g., McKiernan, 2009; Pfeffer, 2009; Tsui, 2015; Walsh, 2011)<sup>1</sup> have noted the continued problematique of this type of specialist article that, despite its undoubted skill in technical theory building and conceptual analysis, remains light on useful knowledge exchange. Consequently, few practicing managers read the work of business school scholars. Put bluntly, the work has been accused of being “irrelevant”.

In the face of such a serious accusation, a group of multidisciplinary business academics (BA) with support from the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD) and the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), joined virtually to address this problem. Their ambition was to stop the publication juggernaut and make a “turn of relevance” (TOR) in business school research.

As part of this TOR ambition, a Delphi study was conducted to tease out the key issues as perceived by “experts”. Two samples were chosen—one group of business academics who are members of the Community for Responsible Research in Business and Management (the Community) and the other group are authors who have published works about the topic under investigation.<sup>2</sup>

In this report, we first provide a brief discussion of the Delphi method and then report the process and results of the Delphi study conducted by the Community.

*2. The Delphi Method*

Named after the oracle at “Delphi”, the Delphi method or technique<sup>3</sup> was developed by the Rand Corporation in 1957 and is used in research studies to engage with expert opinions on an individual basis. It has been used, *inter alia*, in healthcare studies (Guyzys et al., 2015; McKenna, 1994; Thangaratinam & Redman, 2005); transportation studies (Robinson, 1991; Saito & Sinha, 1991); education (Styliandes & Pashiardis, 2007); tourism (Garrod & Fyall, 2004), as well as specialty domains like human resource management (Tsui, 1987) or information systems (Okali & Pawlowski, 2004). In particular, given its roots in technological forecasting, it has been a valuable asset in futures studies (see, for instance, Czinkota & Ronkainen, 1997; Helmer, 1967). Herein, it is used for the evaluation of risk when complexity is high such as structural interventions, where probabilistic modeling techniques struggle because the nature of the contextual forces may have changed markedly.

---

<sup>1</sup> Many papers have been published since the early 1990s discussing the problems in business school research. A partial bibliography of over 60 papers is available from Anne Tsui ([atsui@nd.edu](mailto:atsui@nd.edu)).

<sup>2</sup> A bias is inherent in these samples. Most of the senior scholars and academic authors lean toward a critique of the current publication trend in business and management research and, by and large, would claim to support the irrelevance argument.

<sup>3</sup> There are many definitions of Delphi method/technique/process/approach – see Mullen (2003).

Experts could be asked about the key drivers of future change and about future events and when they might happen. Often, Delphi is used in parallel with, and supportive of, other future orientated techniques like scenario planning.

### *2.1. Delphi Philosophy and Method<sup>4</sup>*

Delphi is based on the Hegelian ‘dialectical inquiry’ approach, which consists of ‘thesis’, where an opinion is formed on a complex topic; ‘anti-thesis’, where a counter opinion is offered and ‘synthesis’, where a new thesis is established through consensus. Essentially, but not exclusively, it is a consensus seeking process, which taps expert opinions for the purposes of idea generation for understanding and improvement, problem solving and forecasting.

The Delphi process consists of the formation of panels of experts (50 plus in big projects) who are surveyed on the topic of interest. Usually, experts are dispersed geographically and this allows for a broad cross-cultural mix. They operate individually and anonymously, thus allowing for ‘softer’ voices to express themselves, to eliminate factors that can contaminate meetings such as hidden agendas, dominant personalities, status differences, and to negate the influence of ‘group think’.

The project professionals design a set of questions to elicit the opinions and counter opinions of panel members. Their answers are assessed using content analysis and, often, a coding technique customized to the project. This analysis forms the basis for the design of a further round of questions and this can continue through a ‘continuous loop’ system until the experts converge on a common output.

Two Delphi approaches are used actively in modern futures work—the basic ‘paper and pencil’ approach and the ‘broadband digital conference version’; although, hybrid techniques using software like ‘Survey Monkey’ are widely used.

Whichever data collection approach is used, the Delphi process is consistent across them. Normally, this consists of a flowchart of activity that includes:

1. Definition and scope of research topic.
2. Identify a moderator for the process. The role requires a firm hand from an experienced individual who is familiar with the topic.
3. Identify ‘experts’ for the panel and brief them thoroughly on the project’s objective and scope.
4. Design a set of easily understood and answerable questions that interrogate the topic. Send these to the panel members and treat all responses as anonymous. The moderator supervises this Round One activity.
5. Maintaining the breadth of responses, analyze the variety of responses using metrics to score or rank the answers.
6. Show the analysis (non attributed) to the experts and obtain feedback, giving them an opportunity to change their views.
7. Further analysis can follow, the questions reformulated (or even new ones added) and then the process is repeated for Round Two, in the hope of achieving consensus.

---

<sup>4</sup> This section draws upon McKiernan, P., ‘Delphi Technique’ in Clegg, S.R., and Bailey, J.R., (2008), *International Encyclopedia of Organisation Studies*, Sage Publications Inc.

8. The cycle can be repeated to achieve as much consensus or depth of knowledge as required.

## 2.2. Critique of the Delphi Method

Although it can lead to rapid consensus amongst participants, the Delphi method has been criticized on a number of levels (Helmer & Rescher, 1959; Linstone & Turoff, 1975). First, as Mullen (2003) notes, positivists argue (e.g., Sackman, 1975) that Delphi fails to follow respected scientific principles such as psychometric validity. However, defenders point out that Delphi, by providing high-level and indispensable judgmental information, can operate well in conditions when formal Operational Research techniques suffer. Indeed, as a method of last resort, it is used when no other technique can cope with the complexity involved. Because Delphi bridges the gap between qualitative and quantitative techniques, its integrity is open to much debate.

Positivist critics have railed about: a) *the concept of an 'expert'*, especially where non-conventional experts might be required such as in policy studies. Hence, Cantrill, Sibbald, and Buetow (1996) suggest broadening the sample to include any individual with relevant knowledge of the topic and/or ranking an individual's knowledge of the topic beforehand (Linstone, 1978); b) *the optimum size of the Delphi panel*, especially in the search for sample representativeness and statistical significance—samples as low as 7 (Linstone, *op cit*) to 300-500 have been recommended (Wild & Torgeson, 2000); although as Mullen (*op cit*) contends, size is only an issue if Delphi is confused with conventional quantitative techniques; c) *the focus on consensus*, when some projects need to garner all the differing views from parts of society—as in policy studies where consensus may neither be achieved nor desired (Walker & Self, 1996); d) *poorly designed questionnaires*; e) *the validity of scoring methods*; f) *anonymity of respondents*, especially where this could limit the extent of exploratory thinking (Bowles, 1999) and accountability (Sackman, *op cit*).

Whatever the scientific critique of Delphi, Mullen (*op cit*) concludes that good research practice from both qualitative and quantitative studies should be exercised to offset any potential problems. Then, it has proven an invaluable technique in practice, when a topic is highly charged e.g., in politics or education, or when actions may have serious and enduring outcomes such as thermo-nuclear warfare. Okali and Pawlowski (*op cit*) make a strong case for its use in theory building, particularly in generating key variables and relationships in the early stages, in assessing construct validity and, especially, if panel experts are asked for justification for their reasoning. Given Delphi's versatility, it ought to be possible to customize a good design to suit any form of project.

## 3. The Delphi Study of Responsible Business School Research

### 3.1. Task Force and Objective

The purpose of this Delphi study was to obtain a list of key problematic issues facing business and management research and potential solutions, prioritized by their perceived relative importance. We used the Delphi as a calibration exercise rather than as a conclusive platform for our enquiry. Our purpose was not to seek a consensus on a set of problems or solutions, but to identify a broad set of both, first through an open-ended format and then a rating scale on a set of statements to tease out those with majority views.

Four members of the Community representing the disciplines of Finance, Marketing, Strategy and Management comprised the Delphi Study Task Force. This group designed and oversaw the Delphi study, which consisted of two rounds. Round One obtained opinions on a set of open-ended questions. Round Two assessed a set of ideas or suggestions obtained from round one in a structured format. Since the Delphi study did not seek consensus on a set of ideas for decision-making, one round of structured responses was deemed sufficient. An experienced member of the Delphi Task Force was appointed as the ‘monitor’ to oversee the Delphi process.

### 3.2. Delphi Study Participants

Twenty business academic (BA) members of the Community from different disciplines, excluding the ‘monitor’, were invited to participate in the Delphi study. In addition, 35 papers on problems of business schools were identified and the first and second authors (A) were approached as potential participants. The initial sample consisted of 20 BAs and 27 As (excluding a few authors who were also members of the Community).<sup>5</sup>

For the author sample, an email invitation was sent stating that: “...*the purpose of the Delphi is to seek input from opinion leaders to produce a report<sup>6</sup> that articulates the major problems that confront business school research and identifies powerful solutions. We will disseminate the report widely to encourage debate and discussion among important stakeholders.*”

The process was explained further:

*“We need your kindness and help in completing four questions in our short Delphi study. We will run two rounds of the Delphi and your total commitment will be less than an hour. In return, we will share a draft version of the report with you before it goes public. Of course, your individual response will be confidential. The report will contain only aggregate data.”*

A total of 18 authors responded positively to this invitation (67% response rate). These responses were treated as anonymous, though members of the BA group were aware of the overall membership of their group; members of the A group were anonymous within their own group and between the two groups.

### 3.3. Delphi Round One

Round One took place during November and December 2015. Two members of the Task Force drafted the questions for Round One while the other two members edited and refined the questions. The finalized questions are contained in Table 1 below. The same questions were posed to the A group without the examples in brackets. This design was chosen to test any variation in the responses between the two samples.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Business Academic participants are from the Community for Responsible Research in Business and Management, a group of 24 scholars from five business disciplines (accounting, finance, management, marketing, operations) at 23 universities in ten countries. The Author participants are senior scholars in management, accounting and operations from 25 universities in five countries.

<sup>6</sup> The report is the White Paper by the Community for Responsible Research in Business and Management.

Table 1: Round One Delphi Open-ended Questions

1. What challenges around business school research should the report or the position paper include and discuss? (e.g., relevance, research quality, research purpose, journal publication criteria, promotion criteria, instrumentality rationality, etc.)
2. Which groups should the position paper identify as key potential change levers? (e.g., senior faculty, deans, associate dean of research, recruiting committees, journal editors, promotion committees, accreditation bodies, ranking agencies, granting agencies, influential executives and businesses, etc.)
3. What potential solutions or actions do you suggest (for each group)? (e.g., journal review criteria, evaluation criteria to include quality and importance of idea in addition to number of papers, doctoral training to include purpose of science and responsibility of scientists, change promotion and recruiting criteria, etc.)
4. Over the next 20 years, what are the grand challenges in organizations that business school research should address (e.g., income inequality, poverty alleviation, managerial ethics, job stress, virtual firms, etc.)?

### *3.3.1. Round One Delphi Open-ended Questions*

The questions were inserted into the ‘Qualtrics’ software by an administrator at the sponsor organization (EFMD) and sent out to the samples of BAs and As. Three reminder letters were sent to stimulate the response rate. In addition, the task force kept close checks on response quality and response timing by frequent analysis of the interim replies. In total, 17 responses were received from the sample of BAs (85%) and 16 responses from the sample of As (89%).

For the analysis of the open-ended responses, two members of the task force conducted the initial analysis and coding, while the other pair checked, changed and verified that work.

### *3.3.2. Round One Results*

There were some interesting differences but mainly similarities in the replies from the two groups. Since the purpose of the open-ended questions is to pool the opinions of the experts, all the responses were allowed to fall into the set for consideration during the second round. Appendix A contains the total responses of all the Delphi participants to each of the four questions. Presented next are the responses that are similar between the BA and the A groups, for each of the four questions.

Question 1 inquired about the main challenges for business school research.

- a. There is a disconnect between academic theory and real-world practice.
- b. Desire or necessity to publish in A-ranked journals stems creativity, causes conformity, which leads to insignificant research.
- c. Over-emphasis on academic theory makes academic research highly specialized and non-accessible to the larger public.
- d. Due to high pressure to produce publications, questionable research practices that threaten intellectual integrity and do not contribute to advancing the field emerge.
- e. Not enough interdisciplinary research.

- f. Research focus has been zeroed in on economic performance of large firms in the western world. Other societal challenges and problems need to be researched as well.
- g. Need to conduct research that is meaningful and can improve human condition, instead of just studying the past.
- h. Administrative goals (rankings, publications) interfere with academic integrity and intellectual autonomy.
- i. Innovative and exploratory research (non-main stream topics) is not valued, due to over-emphasis on theory.
- j. Questionable practices by journals or publishers such as manipulation of citations to inflate impact factor.
- k. How technological development can increase accessibility to papers.

Question 2 asked about the main agents of change.

Influential agents ranged amongst university administrators (including Deans), journal editors, senior scholars, accreditation and ranking agencies, funding bodies, business leaders and journal publishers.

Question 3 inquired about potential solutions or actions that the Delphi participant would suggest for each change agent.

- a. Journal editors:
  - i. Publish important topics and innovative research of relevance to society and practice.
  - ii. Change review criteria to include both relevance and technical quality, and to create professional review standards.
  - iii. Come together to discuss and agree on publishing research with impact on practice and society.
- b. Deans, associate deans of research, and department heads
  - i. Change promotion and tenure criteria, summer support, and annual reports from counting to significant contribution in ideas and with impact.
  - ii. Develop a vision and strategy to focus on research that makes a difference and accumulate knowledge on important issues.
  - iii. Reward papers with impact and with risky and path-breaking research.
  - iv. Change PhD training to focus on both impactful and ethical research practices.

Question 4 sought grand challenges that business school research should address.

- a. How business can contribute to poverty alleviation, economic integration, and wealth creation for all people.
- b. Natural environment, climate and sustainability issues.
- c. Social environment, social sustainability, e.g., inclusiveness issues.
- d. Managerial ethics.
- e. Influence of technology on business, work, and organizations.
- f. Reconsider the purpose and long-term impact of business firms in society.
- g. New employment relationships in changing economies, technologies, and multi-culturalism.

#### *3.4. Delphi Round Two Structured Survey*

Based upon the responses of Round One, the Delphi task force developed themes and identified items within each theme for each question. A simple rating system was developed for Round Two. For each item, the respondents were asked to select one of three possible choices: Most Important, Less Important, or Not Important (for Questions 1 and 2) or Totally Agree, Agree, or Do Not Agree (for Question 3). The questions about change agents and possible actions were combined into one question, hence this Round Two contained three structured questions with the list of items developed from the responses during round one. The original wording of the responses was retained as much as possible and edited only when it was absolutely necessary to improve clarity. In addition, to check for Type 1 and Type 2 errors in the round one responses, participants were given an opportunity to: a) emphasize what was valuable about business school research (Question 4), and b) add any other issues/themes that were important, but had not been included so far (Question 5).

To ensure the quality and readability of the structured survey, two leading scholars (one previous editor of and another previous associate editor of two leading management journals) pre-tested the online survey. Their suggestions improved the wording of the items.

Round Two was carried out during February and March 2016. Only those who completed the round one survey (17 BAs and 16 authors) were invited to participate in the round two survey.<sup>7</sup> Since the purpose of round two was to develop a list with a priority ranking (based on the importance or agreement responses) across both samples, members of the two samples completed the same survey. Three reminders sent to improve the response rate. The same checks and balances that operated in round one were applied to response quality and timing. Twenty-seven of the 33 invited completed the round two survey, with a response rate of 81%.

### *3.4.1. Round Two Results*

The results for Round Two are contained in Appendix B. The items in Appendix B are ranked by the degree of importance or agreement with the question presented. The top five most important issues under each main question for both groups are as follows:

Question 1. What are the most important issues in business school research that our report or position paper must address?

1. Research does not produce relevant knowledge for business practice and societal improvement.
2. 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.
3. Lack of insightful, forward-looking and relevant knowledge for a larger audience beyond the academic community.
4. Star journal obsession and consequences.
5. 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.

Question 2. Who are the most important change agents and what actions can they take?

1. Change promotion and tenure criteria from counting publications to valuing broad and

---

<sup>7</sup> Two authors who did not participate in Round One were invited to participate in Round Two by mistake. They completed the Round Two survey and we had to exclude their responses in this final report.

- significant contributions.
2. Journal editors and professional associations.
  3. Administration: deans, associate deans, department heads, etc.
  4. Develop better measures for impact in evaluating individuals, departments, and schools.
  5. Reward risky, path-breaking research that contributes to practice and society.

Question 3. What are the grand challenges that responsible business school research should address?

1. Poverty, income inequality, economic integration, increase wealth for all.
2. Natural sustainability, environment, climate, ecology, natural resources.
3. Impact of firms on society beyond shareholders.
4. Changing nature of work and workforce.
5. Social sustainability, health systems, inclusive organizations, job stress, burnout.

The additional questions for Type 1 and Type 2 errors (Questions 4 and 5) provided considerable supportive detail for these main issues.

#### *4. Conclusion*

As expected, the Delphi results indicate the strength of feeling amongst senior scholars about the general malaise of academic research and publishing in business schools. This report provides clarity on the nature of the problem facing business school research, incorporates the views voiced by both business academics in the Community for Responsible Research in Business and Management and authors who have written papers on this problem. The Delphi results also suggest or implicate a series of remedial propositions. They provided some clarity on the causes and remedies that the profession could adopt to rectify it. The full results and main summary were handed to the scholar members in the Community to include in the formal project report, i.e., the white paper. The white paper will be distributed widely, discussed at major conferences, underpin journal special issues, and help guide Deans and other key stakeholders in their quest for a more productive and impactful research agenda. It marks a small yet crucial part of the debate, and hopefully the much needed progress in the relevance of business school research.

#### *SPECIAL THANKS*

The Delphi Task Force would like to thank all participants for their valuable time and for their helpful and creative responses to the survey. We also thank the two pre-test scholars for their valuable input in improving the Round Two structured survey.

Delphi Task Force Members:

Franklin Allen, Professor of Finance and Economics, Imperial College, UK  
Peter McKiernan, Professor of Management, The University of Strathclyde, Scotland  
David Reibstein, William Stewart Woodside Professor of Marketing, Wharton School, USA  
Anne S. Tsui, Adjunct Distinguished Professor, University of Notre Dame, USA and  
Distinguished Professor, Peking University and Fudan University, China

## Bibliography

- Bowles, N. (1999). The Delphi technique. *Nursing Standard*, 13(45), 32-36.
- Cantrill, J. A., Sibbald, B., & Buetow, S. (1996). The Delphi and nominal group techniques in health services research. *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice*, 4(2), 67-74.
- Czinkota, M. R., & Ronkainen, I. A. (1997). International business and trade in the next decade: Report from a Delphi study. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(4), 827-844.
- Garrod, B., & Fyall, A. (2004). Revisiting Delphi: The Delphi technique in tourism research. In Ritchie, B.W., Burns, P., & Palmer, C. (Eds.), *Tourism research methods: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 85-98). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- Guyzs, D., Dickson-Swift, V., Kenny, A., & Threlkeld, G. (2015). Gadamerian philosophical hermeneutics as a useful methodological framework for the Delphi technique. *International Journal of Qualitative Stud Health Well-being*, v10, 26291. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v10.26291>
- Helmer, O. (1967). *Analysis of the future: The Delphi method*. (No. RAND-P-3558). Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.
- Helmer, O., & Rescher, N. (1959). On the epistemology of the inexact sciences. *Management Science*, 5(June), 25-52.
- Linstone, H. (1978). The Delphi technique. In Fowles, R. B. (Ed.), *Handbook of futures research* (pp. 271-300). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Linstone, H., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Addison-Wesley.
- McKenna, H. P. (1994). The Delphi technique: A worthwhile research approach for nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19, 1221-1225.
- McKiernan, P. (2008). Delphi technique. In S.R. Clegg & J.R. Bailey, *International Encyclopedia of Organisation Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McKiernan, P. (2009). The irrelevance of management research: Nature of the problem and some European hope: A reply to Pfeffer. *European Management Review*, 6(3), 149-155.
- Mullen, P. (2003). Delphi: Myths and reality. *Journal of Health Organisation and Management*, 17(1), 37-52.
- Okali, C., & Pawlowski, S.D. (2004). The Delphi method as a research tool: An example, design considerations and applications. *Information and Management*, 42, 15-29.
- Pfeffer, J. (2009). Renaissance and renewal in management studies: Relevance regained. *European Management Review*, 6(3), 141-148.
- Robinson, J. B. L. (1991). Delphi methodology for economic impact assessment. *Journal of Transport Engineering*, 117(3), 335-349.
- Sackman, H. (1975). Summary evaluation of Delphi. *Policy Analysis*, 1(4), 693-718.
- Saito, M., & Sinha, K. C. (1991). Delphi study on bridge condition rating and effects of improvements. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 117(3), 320-324.

- Styliandes, M., & Pashiardis, P. (2007). The future of our schools: An example of the Delphi technique in action and the case of Cyprus. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(5), 384-406.
- Thangaratinam, S., & Redman, C. W. E. (2005). The Delphi technique. *The Obstetrician and Gynaecologist*, 7, 120-125.
- Tsui, A. S. (1987). Defining the activities and effectiveness of the human resource department: A multiple constituency approach. *Human Resource Management*, 26, 35-69.
- Tsui, A. S. (2015). *Reconnecting with the business world*. Brussels: Global Focus, EFMD, 09(01), 36-39.
- Walsh, J. P. (2011). Presidential address: Embracing the sacred in our secular scholarly world. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 215-234.
- Wilson, D., & McKiernan, P. (2011). Global mimicry: Putting strategic choice back on the business school agenda. *British Journal of Management*, 22(3), 457-469.
- Walker, A. M., & Self, J. (1996). The Delphi method: A useful tool for the allied health researcher. *British Journal of Health and Rehabilitation*, 3(12), 677-680.
- Wild, C., & Torgeson, H. (2000). Foresight in medicine: Lessons from three European Delphi studies. *European Journal of Public Health*, 10(2), 114-119.

**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)
<p><b>1. Challenges to include and discuss in the Position Paper:</b></p>	<p><b>1. Challenges to include and discuss in the Report:</b></p>
<p>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; <b>theory and practice gap</b> is stronger than ever, purpose is not to serve. (6)</p> <p>b) Rewarding number of papers in <b>A-journals</b>, a criterion that produces narrow, quick, flashy but insignificant research, instead of quality of reward or a collective body of work. (3)</p> <p>c) Journals’ <b>emphasis on theory and method</b> but not relevance of knowledge for the business world.</p> <p>d) Research quality is in question due to publication pressure, <b>questionable research practices</b> (researchers doing whatever it takes to get published). This threatens intellectual integrity, and impairs the accumulation of knowledge and integrity of science. (4)</p> <p>e) Journals tend to be <b>disciplinary focus</b> to emphasis on theory and less interest on inter-disciplinary and problem-focused research. (2)</p> <p>f) Journals’ focus on <b>economic outcomes</b> 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)</p>	<p>a) The persistent <b>research-practice gap</b>—research not relevant for practice, does not reach appropriate audience. (6)</p> <p>b) Pressure and conformism on <b>A-journals</b> that trump content (asking important, complex, messy questions), publish at all costs, fosters homogeneity, singular mindset, stifles innovation, incentivizes questionable practices. (7)</p> <p>c) <b>Over-emphasis on theory</b> leading to highly specialized unintelligible framing of our research. Crafting the perfect article through complicated statistical <b>methods</b>, bias against negative findings. (7)</p> <p>d) <b>Questionable research practices</b> to maximize publication success (including authorship collusion) and study trivial problems but do not necessarily advance or even produce wrongful knowledge. (6)</p> <p>e) Favor <b>disciplinary silos</b> over multidisciplinary work. (2)</p> <p>f) Too much focus on <b>economic performance</b> of large firms of the Anglo-Saxon world (MNCs); need more balance with social outcomes important to society.</p> <p>g) No accountability to <b>discover truth</b>, to engage the community, and to <b>improve human condition</b> through research. (2)</p> <p>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 <b>academic freedom</b>). (2)</p> <p>i) No place for <b>non-main stream topics</b> e.g., exploratory and inductive research due to the emphasis on theory in top (or even non-top) journals.</p> <p>j) Questionable practices by journals and publishers to increase</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h) Administrative goal (ranking) of the school is interfering with the <b>intellectual autonomy</b> of scientists.</li> <li>i) We do not value <b>non-main stream topics</b> e.g., process knowledge, tools or concepts to support decision making as academic outputs.</li> <li>j) Journals are competing in questionable ways (e.g., <b>manipulate citations</b> to inflate impact factor), undermining the credibility of science.</li> <li>k) How <b>technology</b> is changing the opportunities for peer review and publication of our work.</li> <li>l) Selection and socialization of scientists ignore the moral standards, trained as research technicians and not noble social-minded scientists.</li> </ul>	<p>and open public's access to research. (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>l) Journals favor a positivist and functionalist perspective, fostering a focus on small issues.</li> <li>m) Random, capricious, narrow, control in the review and publication process, lack reliability and validity in reviews. (2)</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Key potential change leaders (groups):</b></p>	<p><b>2. Key potential change leaders (groups):</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Deans, associate deans of research, department heads (4)</li> <li>b) University leaders</li> <li>c) Senior faculty, top researchers, leading scholars (6) and Tenure and promotion committees (2)</li> <li>d) Journal editors (5), review boards</li> <li>e) Leadership of professional associations (4), especially owners of leading journals</li> <li>f) Ranking agencies (2)</li> <li>g) Accreditation bodies; they influence what business schools focus on. (3)</li> <li>h) Business and government leaders</li> <li>i) Government and private funding sources (2)</li> <li>j) Non-business public, critical of the research that is self-serving and not serving public interest</li> <li>k) Students, alumni—relevant and useful research prepares them better to understand and contribute to societal issues.</li> <li>l) Publishers</li> <li>m) Professors of practice (to disseminate and frame problem-focused research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Deans and department chairs (11)</li> <li>b) University leaders as policy makers (3)</li> <li>c) Senior faculty as scholars and promotion committees (8)</li> <li>d) Journal editors (9) “editors united can change the field overnight”</li> <li>e) Professional associations e.g., AoM, SMS, SIOP, MBA Roundtable (7)</li> <li>f) Ranking agencies e.g. Thompson Reuters, Financial Times</li> <li>g) Accreditation bodies e.g., AACSB, EFMD (4)</li> <li>h) Business leaders</li> <li>i) Granting agencies or sources, private donors (3)</li> <li>j) Journal publishers—profit motive</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Potential solutions or actions for each group:</b></p>	<p><b>3. Potential solutions or actions for each group:</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Journal editors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Publish special issues on <b>important topics that is of relevance</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Journal editors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Encourage <b>innovative research with relevant for and impact on</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. <b>to society</b>, interdisciplinary e.g., grand challenges. (3)</li> <li>Change <b>review criteria</b> to include important, relevant message, to consider both technical quality and importance of issues. (4)</li> <li>iii. <b>Bring editors together (e.g., in professional conferences) to discuss impact of research on practice and society.</b></li> <li>iv. Appoint open-minded editors, associate editors, and reviewers; come to agreement on big questions and how they might be addressed. (2)</li> </ul> <p>b) Deans, associate deans of research, department chairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Change P&amp;T criteria and promote people based on broad, significant contributions, focus of annual reports, summer support, etc.</b> (4)</li> <li>ii. Schools to develop areas of excellence and <b>encourage faculty to work in these areas to accumulate knowledge on important issues.</b></li> <li>iii. <b>Reward papers with direct implication for practice, regulation or other relevant issues.</b></li> <li>iv. Change <b>PhD training</b> to include examples of new scholarship. (2)</li> <li>v. Include relevance of research in school development strategy and cultivate culture of responsible research with institutional arrangement.</li> <li>vi. Recommend professors of practice to connect with industry and policy.</li> <li>vii. Create postdoc models for white papers and industry briefs.</li> </ul> <p>c) Professional associations—promote relevant research agenda. (2)</p> <p>d) Accreditation bodies, ranking and funding agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Evaluate institutions based on 5-10 most significant contributions, using combined criteria of academic quality and broader relevance. (2)</li> <li>ii. Strengthen academic and business connections.</li> <li>iii. Encourage cross-disciplinary research (e.g., medicine,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>practice</b> and develop associated standards. (3)</li> <li>ii. Reign in <b>reviewers</b> socialized within the current system, create standards to prevent authoritarian and unreasonable reviews, consider the 2-stage review process (e.g., Kepes &amp; McDaniel, 2013).</li> <li>iii. <b>Get 15-20 leading editors in each field to create a binding revolution (and avoid the tragedy of the commons).</b></li> <li>iv. Publish replications, negative findings, non-significant results, or effect size over significance, etc. (4) Develop standards for data accessibility, transparency, and replication.</li> <li>v. Need metrics other than impact factor to judge the journals, to recognize both rigor and relevance.</li> <li>vi. Encourage multi-disciplinary, challenge-led research.</li> </ul> <p>b) Deans, departments heads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Stop simply counting of publications in reviews; change criteria in promotion and hiring.</b> (2)</li> <li>ii. Develop vision and strategy <b>to encourage and reward faculty research that makes a difference.</b> (2)</li> <li>iii. <b>Reward risky, path-breaking research.</b></li> <li>iv. Improve <b>PhD training</b> on questionable research practices and beyond hypothetico-deductive model. (2)</li> <li>v. Convene diverse stakeholders to discuss socially responsible research, accountability and social impact.</li> <li>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)</li> <li>vii. Enforce ethical research practices.</li> <li>viii. Abolish journal lists (they distort and degrade scholarly activities).</li> </ul> <p>c) Professional associations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Set guidance, sanctions, standards.</li> <li>ii. Serve as change agents.</li> </ul> <p>d) Abolish journal rankings.</p> <p>e) Businesses to partner with researchers.</p>
---	--

<p>engineering).</p> <p>iv. Change the ranking methodology and criteria to focus on relevance of research. (4)</p> <p>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)</p> <p>f) Top and like-minded researchers—seek their involvement to promote the position paper and the grand challenges (identifying them and promoting them).</p> <p>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.).</p>	<p>f) Senior faculty to set examples.</p> <p>g) Media—to disseminate this report.</p> <p>h) System-wide change focusing on “how research can win rather than players within the system win”.</p>
<p><b>4. Grand Challenges that business school research should address:</b></p>	<p><b>4. Grand Challenges that business school research should address:</b></p>
<p>a) <b>Poverty</b> alleviation and economic integration; make all countries wealthy would make the world a much better place. (5)</p> <p>b) <b>Environment</b>, climate and sustainability issues, green management. (4)</p> <p>c) Managerial <b>ethics</b>; we keep failing it e.g., recent Volkswagen scandal. (3), interface of finance and ethics.</p> <p>d) <b>Social sustainability</b>—Improve health by improving systems and processes; inclusive organization/culture to provide engaging and fulfilling work, social inclusion. (3)</p> <p>e) <b>Technological</b> breakthroughs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Communication and information</li> <li>ii. Business models, institutions</li> <li>iii. Effects on inequality, labor market imbalance, regulation change, etc. (2)</li> <li>iv. Internet-based business model innovation.</li> <li>v. Implications for financial regulations.</li> </ol> <p>f) <b>Purpose of business firms</b> (e.g., to achieve triple bottom line). (2)</p> <p>g) <b>New employment relationships:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nature of relationship between individuals and business organizations.</li> <li>b. New organizational forms, nature of work, expectations,</li> </ol>	<p>a) Income inequality, <b>poverty</b>—how corporations are contributing to the problem and what to do to reduce it, how to create wealth more broadly. (7)</p> <p>b) <b>Environment</b>, climate, ecological diversity, and sustainability issues (5)</p> <p>c) Managerial <b>ethics</b>, agency problem, managerialism. (4)</p> <p>d) <b>Social sustainability</b>, inclusiveness. (3)</p> <p>e) AI and <b>technological</b> influence on work and organizations, changing nature of work, digital economy. (6)</p> <p>f) <b>Purpose of business firms</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Role of MNCs or large corporations, global communities. (3)</li> <li>ii. Impact of global firms (MNCS) on societies (global community). (2)</li> <li>iii. Systemic impact of organizations; long-term consequences of their products and services.</li> </ol> <p>g) <b>New employment relationships:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Generation gap caused by technological and economic</li> </ol>

<p>employment contracts, incentive systems.</p> <p>c. Wellbeing of employees and society. (2)</p> <p>h) Natural resource scarcity, restructuring energy system to one based on renewable and decentralized energy source. (2)</p> <p>i) Provision of healthy food to support healthy lifestyle, job stress and burnout.</p> <p>j) Redirect capital flows from speculative to constructive purposes.</p> <p>k) Digitization of democratized innovation activities; allow some countries to jump over several decades of innovation; will digitalization bring equality or bigger division?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>m) Structure of society across for-profit organizations, public entities, NGS.</p> <p>n) Cross-functional and inter-disciplinary research.</p> <p>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> <p>p) Encourage faculty to ask meaningful questions from the heart and to make sure their work is useful to society.</p> <p>q) Annual update of grand challenges; similar to the Annual Global Risk Report of WEF.</p>	<p>developments.</p> <p>ii. Leadership (2) for sustainable performance.</p> <p>iii. Managing multi-cultural workforce, diversity and different types of work relationships (less loyalty by younger workers, contractors and staff on demand. UBER (4)</p> <p>h) Alternatives to capitalism</p> <p>i) Corporate democracy</p> <p>j) More reflexive long-term organizations</p> <p>k) Religion and business</p> <p>l) Fostering innovation at system and individual levels</p> <p>m) Discrimination and bullying in organizations</p> <p>n) Better selection tools and data considerations</p> <p>o) Develop meaningful workplace</p> <p>p) Impact of machine learning in education; when computers can be better teachers than humans—how does that impact what and how we teach?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>r) Less complex research models, main effects are robust.</p>
<p><b>5. Additional comments or suggestions for this project</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The problem is important but difficult, with no easy solutions.</li> <li>2. The project is really important and really challenging; believe the vision of the project and effort are worthwhile.</li> <li>3. This is a profoundly influential project that should be widely disseminated and discussed.</li> <li>4. I am enthusiastic about this project; need a process/structure to get the endorsement and engagement of others.</li> <li>5. Great initiative.</li> <li>6. This is an ambitious project and with it success.</li> </ol>	<p><b>5. Additional comments or suggestions for this project</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The relationship between research and practice is a highly complex matter.</li> <li>2. Refrain from promoting the view that social science research can solve the problems of the world.</li> <li>3. An important project; good luck with it. (2)</li> <li>4. Excellent goal and organization.</li> <li>5. This is important work.</li> <li>6. Some more guidelines would be helpful; could write 10 pages per question.</li> </ol>

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

<p><b>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.</b></p>							
<p>Most important = a top priority for discussion                      Quite important = discuss if there is space                      Less important = exclusion would not affect the big picture</p>							
#	Theme/Issue	Most important	Quite important	Less important	No. of Response	Average Value	Rank
1	<b>1,1 Research does not produce relevant knowledge for business practice and societal improvement.</b>	20	6		26	1.23	<b>1</b>
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	<b>2</b>
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	<b>3</b>
7	<b>1,2 Star journal obsession and consequences</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1.48</b>	<b>4</b>
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	<b>5</b>
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	<b>6</b>
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	<b>7</b>

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	<b>1,4 Doctoral training on techniques not on ethics and science for society</b>	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	<b>1,3 Tight research focus of journals on discipline, theory, and analysis</b>	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	<b>1,5 Technology changes reviewing and publishing models</b>	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
<b>Are there any other issues about business school research that should be considered in a report?</b>							
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	<b>2,2 Journal editors and professional associations</b>	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	<b>2,3 Senior scholars—top researchers, promotion and tenure committees</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>7</b>
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
<b>24</b>	<b>2,4 Assessment group—AACSB, EFMD, ranking publishers, etc.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>23</b>
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
<b>30</b>	<b>2,5 Business leaders, alumni, funding agencies</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>32</b>
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
<b>33</b>	<b>2,6 Other groups e.g., public, media</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>36</b>

#	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
<b>Are there any other grand challenges not mentioned above but should be considered?</b>							
Globalization and cultural diversity, dual criteria of ethics.							
<p>There are a number of grand challenges that we might consider that focus more on consumers, consumption, and society, e.g.:</p> <p>Influence of technology on consumption and consumers</p> <p>Digitization of products and services and their impact on productivity, employees and consumers</p> <p>Collaborative product and service design</p> <p>Innovative models of value co-creation across the firm, customers, and society</p> <p>Creating shared value among the firm, customers, shareholders, and employees</p> <p>Sustainable product/service design</p> <p>Integrated, multi-channel customer experiences</p> <p>Transformation of organizations to enhance employee and customer well-being</p>							
Creating robust, valid, and trustworthy research may be the “grandest” challenge, regardless of the topic.							

<b>Question 4. Are there any other issues, questions, suggestions or solutions about business school research that you would like to offer?</b>
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.
<p>Questions that have to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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?</li> <li>- How do we encourage our journals to publish such research?</li> <li>- How do we encourage deans and other administrators to reward such research?</li> <li>- How do we get practitioners to read such research and follow trustworthy conclusions?</li> </ul>
<p>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.</p> <p>The traditional model is that faculty teach and do research; the new model adds more focus on creating impact, innovation, and engagement.</p> <p>We should highlight efforts to disseminate research ideas through the media, social networks and other channels.</p>
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.

<b>Question 5. What do we currently do in our research that is good and that we should highlight and be sure to retain?</b>
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.