Oxford Bibliographies
Your Best Research Starts Here

Organizational Paradox

Simone Carmine, **Wendy K. Smith**

Introduction

Organizational paradox offers a theory of the nature and management of competing demands. Historically, the dominant paradigm in organizational theory depicted competing demands as trade-offs or dilemmas that could be resolved by choosing one option. In the late 1960s, scholars such as Joan Woodward, Paul Lawrence, and Jay Lorsch introduced contingency theory, suggesting that individuals resolve these tensions by taking the context and environment into account. Paradox theory offers an alternative approach, suggesting that these tensions cannot be resolved. By depicting competing demands as tensions that are not only contradictory, but also interdependent and persistent, paradox theory argues that actors need to accept, engage, and navigate tensions rather than resolve them. Foundational work on paradox in organizations emerged starting in the late 1970s and 1980s. This work drew from rich insights across a variety of disciplines, including Eastern philosophy (Taoism, Confucianism), Western philosophies (Hegel, Heraclitus), psychodynamics (Jung, Adler, Frankel), psychology (Schneider, Watzlawick), political science (Marx, Engel), communications and sociology (Taylor, Bateson), and negotiations and conflict resolution (Follett). More recent work has advanced foundational building blocks toward a theory of paradox. Underlying the theory of paradox is ontologies of dualism—two opposing elements that together form an integrated unity—and dynamism— ongoing change. Scholars have defined paradox as tensions that are contradictory, interdependent, and persistent, noting their dynamic, everchanging, cyclical nature. Some scholars describe the origins of paradox as inherent within systems, while others highlight their social construction through cognition, dialogue, and rationality. Still others explore the relationship between the inherent and socially constructed nature of tensions, depicting tensions as latent within a system, becoming salient through social construction and external conditions. Moreover, some scholars focus more on understanding the poles of paradox, while others depict the ongoing dynamic interaction and evolution. As paradox theory continues to grow and expand, scholars have also added complexity to our understanding, emphasizing paradoxes as nested across levels and as knotted and interwoven across various tensions, while also taking into account the power dynamics, uncertainty, plurality, and scarcity of systems within which paradoxes emerge. This article identifies scholarship that depicts these varied approaches and ideas, providing the foundations of paradox theory for scholars new to this field and in-depth analysis for those seeking to expand their understanding. Section 1 offers foundational work. Section 2 introduces early scholarship that launched the field. Section 3 includes work describing foundational building blocks toward a theory of paradox. Section 4 highlights research that recognizes the nested nature of paradox and describes how this theory has been applied across different levels. Section 5 includes papers that address the meta-theoretical and multi-paradigmatic aspect of paradox theory, noting how these ideas have been applied across phenomena and across theoretical lenses. Section 6 describes papers that draw on the varied methodological traditions associated with paradox. Finally, section 7 identifies several handbooks and special issues that offer an introduction to or integration of paradox theory.

The Pillars of the Paradox: Foundational Papers

The early foundational work in organizational paradox dates back to the late 1970s and 1980s, and it established paradox as a core lens through which to understand organizational phenomena. These different insights emerged out of multiple traditions. One of the earliest pieces, Benson 1977 draws on the work of Hegel, Marx, and Engels to introduce the idea of dialectics in organizations. Discussion continues to this day about the distinctions and synergies between dialectical and paradoxical perspectives (see, e.g., Hargrave and van de Ven 2017, cited under Different Traditions and Influences). Putnam 1986, a foundational work, draws its roots from communication and sociology from writers such as Taylor, Bateson, and Watzlewick, while the core insight of Smith and Berg 1987 grew out of work on psychodynamics from scholars such as Jung, Adler, Frankel, and Freud. In 2000, Marianne Lewis wrote her AMR paper, "Exploring

Paradox: Toward a More Comprehensive Guide" (Lewis 2000), which brings together these traditions and has inspired the next generation of those examining paradox. In doing so, she won AMR's best paper of the year award.

Benson, J. Kenneth. "Organizations: A Dialectical View." *Administrative Science Quarterly* **22.1 (1977): 1–21.**

Benson draws heavily on insights from Marx and Engels, providing a dialectical perspective of organizations in which contradictions morph and change over time into new integrations. This piece constitutes an early introduction to thinking about organizational systems as embodiments of oppositional tensions. Benson suggests that understanding these tensions depends on four basic principles: social construction, totality, contradiction, and praxis.

Cameron, Kim S. "Effectiveness as Paradox: Consensus and Conflict in Conceptions of Organizational Effectiveness." *Management Science* **32.5 (1986): 539–553.**

Cameron reviews the areas of consensus and conflicts in the literature on effectiveness and in doing so describes the inherently paradoxical nature of effectiveness in organizations. He argues that to be effective an organization must own attributes that are simultaneously contradictory, even mutually exclusive.

Clegg, Stewart R., ed. *Management and Organization Paradoxes.* **Advances in Organization Studies 9. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002.**

Scholars debate the source of paradox as socially constructed and symbolic or inherent and material. Clegg organizes this edited volume to address this paradox of paradoxes. The first section addresses "representing paradoxes," highlighting the role of symbols and discourse to create paradoxes. The second section focuses on "materializing paradoxes," describing paradox within various organizational phenomena.

Clegg, Stewart R., João Vieira da Cunha, and Miguel Pina e Cunha. "Management Paradoxes: A Relational View." *Human Relations* **55.5 (2002): 483–503.**

The authors offer a relational view of paradox. They discern four regularities from the literature: first, the simultaneous presence of opposites is the everyday experience in management; second, a relationship is often found between the opposing poles (synthesis); third, this synthesis emerges when the relationship's structural side is kept at a minimal level, and the relationship is mutually reinforcing; finally, this relationship is local, it cannot be designed but emerges from situated practice.

Lewis, Marianne. W. "Exploring Paradox: Toward a More Comprehensive Guide." *Academy of Management Review* **25.4 (2000): 760–776.**

This article advances foundational ideas of organizational paradox. Lewis defines paradox as "contradictory yet interrelated elements— elements that seem logical in isolation but absurd and irrational when appearing simultaneously" (p. 760). She develops a framework that starts with tensions (self-referential loops, mixed messages, and system contradictions), identifies defense mechanisms that lead to reinforcing cycles, and explores management strategies to tap into the power of paradox. She further categorizes paradoxes of learning, organizing, and belonging.

Poole, Marshall S., and Andrew H. van de Ven. "Using Paradox to Build Management and Organization Theories." *Academy of Management Review* **14.4 (1989): 562–578.**

The authors explore how paradox thinking can be used to improve our approaches to theorizing. They describe paradoxes as "social paradoxes" that exist in the real world, subject to temporal and spatial constraints, and they propose four strategies for addressing social paradoxes: opposition, accepting the contradiction and using it; spatial separation, defining clear levels of analysis; temporal separation, taking time into account; and synthesis, adopting new term to overcome paradoxes. They illustrate each of these four approaches by

exploring the paradoxical tension between structure and agency.

Putnam, Linda L. "Contradictions and Paradoxes in Organizations." In *Organization-Communication: Emerging Perspectives*. Edited by Lee Thayer, 151–167. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1986.

Putnam draws on theories of discourse, communication, and group relations to introduce a categorization of three types of paradoxes: contradictory messages in which words conflict with actions or in roles; paradoxes or double binds, which highlights self-referential interactions due to the dynamics between actors; and system contradictions in which the tensions are embedded within the organizational structures.

Quinn, Robert E., and Kim S. Cameron, eds. *Paradox and Transformation: Toward a Theory of Change in Organization and Management*. Cambridge MA: Ballinger, 1988.

This edited volume includes essays from luminaries in organizational theory offering insights about how paradox can inform and is informed by strategic thinking, organizational change, communication, and group dynamics. These now classic essays provide foundational insights for applying paradox theory to organizational phenomena.

Smith, Kenwyn K., and David N. Berg. *Paradoxes of Group Life: Understanding Conflict, Paralysis, and Movement in Group Dynamics*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Smith and Berg define paradox as "a statement or set of statements that are self-referential and contradictory and trigger a vicious cycle" (p. 12). They trace the roots of paradoxical thought drawing heavily on psychoanalysis, and they highlight twelve paradoxes within groups and merge them in three different categories: paradoxes of belonging, paradoxes of engaging, and paradoxes of speaking. This text offers an early approach to exploring paradox within organizational phenomena.

Paradox Theory: Conceptual Papers

As insights expanded on paradox thinking, scholars advanced foundational building blocks of a theory—definitions, underlying assumptions, and boundaries. Smith and Lewis 2011 (cited under Defining Paradox) integrates research on organizational paradox over the previous twenty years to propose these foundations. The authors define paradox as "contradictory, yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time" (p. 382), and they offer a theory of how paradoxical tensions exist as latent tension in systems to become salient through social construction or through conditions of change, scarcity, and plurality. They further argue that tensions exist in a dynamic interactive state that they describe as a dynamic equilibrium. These foundational insights opened up room for robust and valuable dialogue and debate about the definition of paradox, its relationship to other concepts (such as dialectics, dualities, dichotomies, irony, etc.), the nature of paradox as inherent and socially constructed, and the potential to manage paradox or not to manage it. These debates are evident in the juxtaposition of two papers in the journal *Academy of Management Annals* (Schad, et al. 2016 and Putnam, et al. 2016, both cited under Defining Paradox). Rich additions to paradox theory emerge as people continue to draw on varied traditions and advance new frameworks. These varied insights are included below.

Defining Paradox

This subsection groups the foundational works that define core concepts of paradox theory. Smith and Lewis 2011 defines paradox as "contradictory, yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time" (p. 382) and categorizes organizational tension in learning, performing, organizing, and belonging. In 2014 they also extended the field in defining paradox as a metatheory that offers insights across various phenomena and theories, while offering a methodological approach for theorizing. In 2016, *Academy of Management Annals* published two manuscripts back to back. Putnam, et al. 2016 defines a constitutive approach to organizational paradox, and Schad, et al. 2016 reviews twenty-five years of paradox research to organize key concepts and outcomes and underline future research lines. Another milestone in the developing of the field is *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox* (Smith, et al. 2017), which introduces and offers theoretical and practical tools to scholars willing to do research on organizational paradoxes. Finally,

Farjoun, et al. 2018 is another important volume that compares the most used perspectives to address competing demands: duality, dialectic, and paradox.

Fairhurst, Gail T., Wendy K. Smith, Scott G. Banghart, et al. "Diverging and Converging: Integrative Insights on a Paradox Meta-perspective." *Academy of Management Annals* **10.1 (2016): 173–182.**

In this work, the authors discuss the similarities and differences between Putnam, et al. 2016 and Schad, et al. 2016, and they note across the literature the understudied role of process, power, and multiple paradox tensions that are in relation to one another.

Farjoun, Moshe, Wendy Smith, Ann Langley, and Haridimos Tsoukas, eds. *Dualities, Dialectics, and Paradoxes in Organizational Life.* **Perspectives on Process Organizational Studies 8. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.**

This paper introduces the eighth volume in the Perspectives on Process Organizational Studies series, offering a comparison among duality, dialectic, and paradox approaches to competing demands.

Lewis, Marianne W., and Wendy K. Smith. "Paradox as a Metatheoretical Perspective: Sharpening the Focus and Widening the Scope." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* **50.2 (2014): 127–149.**

Lewis and Smith describe paradox as a metatheory, comparing this theory to contingency theory. Paradox theory offers insights that apply across theories and phenomena and can be used for theorizing. Whereas contingency theory addresses competing demands by exploring conditions for choosing one option, paradox theory asks how to accommodate both options simultaneously. As a metatheory, paradox can offer a strategy for theorizing, an approach to address it and its challenges, and it can provide a theoretical framework for exploring tensions.

Putnam, Linda L., Gail T. Fairhurst, and Scott Banghart. "Contradictions, Dialectics, and Paradoxes in Organizations: A Constitutive Approach." *Academy of Management Annals* **10.1 (2016): 65–171.**

The authors define a constitutive approach to the study of organizational paradox that includes five core elements: discourse, developmental actions, sociohistorical conditions, presence in multiples, and praxis. They draw on five streams of research that can inform this approach, including process-based systems, structuration, critical, postmodern, and relational dialectics. Investigating these dimensions, they define constructs, connect research to process outcomes, and underline alternative ways of confronting organizational paradoxes.

Schad, Jonathan, Marianne W. Lewis, Sebastian Raisch, and Wendy K. Smith. "Paradox Research in Management Science: Looking Back to Move Forward." *Academy of Management Annals* **10.1 (2016): 5–64.**

The authors surveyed management research to identify 256 articles about paradox. Based on these articles, they define paradox as "a persistent contradiction between interdependent elements" (p. 10). They find that paradox scholars have paid more attention to identifying types of paradoxes, exploring collective approaches, and highlighting key outcomes, yet they have paid less attention to relationships within paradoxes, individual approaches, and unpacking processual dynamics.

Smith, Wendy K., and Marianne W. Lewis. "Toward a Theory of Paradox: A Dynamic Equilibrium Model of Organizing." *Academy of Management Review* **36.2 (2011): 381–403.**

Smith and Lewis survey research on paradox across twenty years (1989–2008). They define paradox as "contradictory, yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time" (p. 382); and they categorize paradox as learning, performing, organizing, and belonging. They argue that paradoxes are latent and become salient through environmental conditions (plurality, change, and scarcity) or through social construction. They propose a dynamic equilibrium model: consistency can trigger vicious cycles, but a consistently inconsistent approach to accommodate both poles can enable virtuous cycles.

Smith, Wendy K., Paula Jarzabkowski, Marianne W. Lewis, and Ann Langley. "Introduction: The Paradoxes of Paradox." In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox*. Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Paula Jarzabkowski, Marianne W. Lewis, and Ann Langley, 1–25. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

This paper offers an introduction to the thirty chapters of *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox*, summarizing the diversity and richness of papers treating paradoxical tensions within paradox literature.

Different Traditions and Influences

Paradox theory draws on and is related to various other theoretical lenses that all adopt ontologies of duality (two elements that act in unity) and dynamism (elements in constant motion). Benson 1977 adopts a dialectic approach that has roots in Hegelian thinking and the work of informed philosophers such as Marx. This perspective has been adopted in empirical studies (e.g., Farjoun 2002) and developed in conceptual work (Langley and Sloan 2011). Hargrave and van de Ven 2017 integrates a dialectal and paradox perspective in the management of tensions. Other approaches, such as plurality (Jarzabkowski and Fenton 2006) and duality (Smith and Graetz 2006, Keller and Sadler-Smith 2019), further advance these ideas.

Benson, J. Kenneth. "Organizations: A Dialectical View." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22.1 (1977): 1–21.

Drawing on a Marxist perspective, Benson develops a dialectic approach to organizational theory. A dialectic perspective is focused on the processes that produce and maintain organizational arrangements. Four basic principles shape the study: social construction, totality, contradiction, and praxis.

Farjoun, Moshe. "The Dialectics of Institutional Development in Emerging and Turbulent Fields: The History of Pricing Conventions in the On-Line Database Industry." *Academy of Management Journal* 45.5 (2002): 848–874.

This study investigates institutional developments in emerging and turbulent fields. Farjoun proposes a dialectic process model that highlights how institutionalization generates and supports inherent tensions in organizations, and these tensions are sources of an internal continuous dialectical process. The dialectic process model contributes to institutional theory by underlining the content and path dependent structure of institutional development, while offering insights into the processual and dialectical nature of tensions.

Hargrave, Timothy J., and Andrew H. van de Ven. "Integrating Dialectical and Paradox Perspectives on Managing Contradictions in Organizations." *Organization Studies* 38.3–4 (2017): 319–339.

This paper offers a typology and process model able to integrate dialectical and paradox perspectives in the management of organizational tensions. A paradox approach involves accepting tensions, not solving them but using synergies to manage them. A dialectical approach transforms opposing poles through conflict. The proposed model adopts both perspectives and highlights how assimilation and adjustment are able to combine the two and suggesting that power between the poles is crucial in shaping actors' approaches.

Jarzabkowski, Paula, Rebecca Bednarek, and Jane Lê. "Studying Paradox as Process and Practice: Identifying and Following Moments of Salience and Latency." In *Dualities, Dialectics, and Paradoxes in Organization Life*. Edited by Moshe Farjoun, Wendy Smith, Ann Langley, and Haridomos Tsoukas, 175–194. Perspectives on Process Organization Studies 8. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

The authors develop a methodological approach to study salient and latent paradoxes. The authors assume that paradoxes and responses are socially constructed by actors in daily activities and practices, and that latency or saliency of paradoxes depends on these activities and practices. The authors identify three processes and practice-based indicators, namely, language, emotion, and action, to study the salient paradoxes, while the study of daily practices offers indicators of latent paradox.

Jarzabkowski, Paula, and Evelyn Fenton. "Strategizing and Organizing in Pluralistic Contexts." *Long Range Planning* **39.6 (2006): 631–648.**

The authors use the concept of pluralism in order to highlight how organizing and strategizing can assume different forms and how these variations impact on managerial practice. Internal and external stakeholders have different and competing goals and interests, which creates pluralistic contexts. These varied stakeholder interests lead to multiple organizing processes, strategic goals, and objectives.

Keller, Josh, and Eugene Sadler-Smith. "Paradoxes and Dual Processes: A Review and Synthesis." *International Journal of Management Reviews* **21.2 (2019): 162–184.**

This conceptual paper integrates theories on decision making with theories on the micro-foundations of paradox. Keller and Sadler-Smith argue that intuition and analysis are inherently paradoxical. At the same time, because intuition and analysis are fundamental to the decision-making process, they are nested within other paradoxes. Understanding these underlying tensions associated with thinking helps us to understand how we think about paradoxes.

Langley, Ann, and Pamela Sloan. "Organizational Change and Dialectic Processes." In *The Routledge Companion to Organizational Change.* **Edited by David M. Boje, Bernard Burnes, and John Hassard, 261–275. London: Routledge, 2011.**

Langley and Sloan note how dialectics inherently draws on both a pluralistic ontology that recognizes the multiple conflicting approaches embedded in phenomena and a processual ontology that explores the ongoing dynamic evolution of phenomena. They describe four different approaches to dialectics: as technique, to enrich managerial approaches; as mantra, a managerial approach for success; as narrative, describing the thesis-antithesis-synthesis in a particular case; and as critique, to demonstrate a process for challenging taken-for-granted assumptions in a system.

Putnam, Linda L. "Unpacking the Dialectic: Alternative Views on the Discourse–Materiality Relationship." *Journal of Management Studies* **52.5 (2015): 706–716.**

This paper is part of a group of studies examining the relationship between materiality and discourse. Putnam investigates the assumptions and characteristics of such relationship in five explanatory frameworks. To preserve the dialectical relationship between the two, she argues for maintaining the tension between them through a constant interaction. Adopting a dialectic approach, she studies in each framework the nature and management of such tensions.

Smith, Aaron, and Fiona Graetz. "Organizing Dualities and Strategizing for Change." *Strategic Change* **15.5 (2006): 231–239.**

This paper examines how a duality approach to organizing informs the process of strategizing for change, in particular accepting both poles of a contradiction and instead of choosing one of the extremes, the authors suggest creating a "constructive tension" between efficiency and innovation. To manage tensions, the dualities approach highlights the need to address tensions both through innovation and through routines to support strategic change.

Paradox Frameworks and Models

Many works on organizational paradox develop frameworks and models to describe the nature and the management of paradoxical tensions inside organizations. Thus, there are models that explore the ontological nature of organizational paradoxes, as inherent in the systems or socially contracted (Hahn and Knight 2019), and the dark side of them, the power dynamics involved in paradoxes (Berti and Simpson 2019). Moreover, there are dynamic frameworks that define the management of organizational paradoxes in governance (Sundaramurthy and Lewis 2003), innovation (Smith and Tushman 2005), decision making (Smith 2014), and learning process (Raisch, et al. 2018).

Berti, Marco, and Ace Simpson. "The Dark Side of Organizational Paradoxes: The Dynamics of Disempowerment." *Academy of Management Review* **(2019): In press.**

Berti and Simpson investigate the organizational pragmatic paradoxes: "contradictory demands received within the context of an intense managerial relationship" (p. 1). The authors show how power relations that limit the capacities of organizations members in responding to tensions (e.g., coercion, manipulation, domination, and subjectification) produce organizational pragmatic paradoxes. They suggest strategies to mitigate pragmatic paradoxes in order to enhance organizational efficacy and emancipation from oppressive social conditions.

Hahn, Tobias, and Eric Knight. "The Ontology of Organizational Paradox: A Quantum Approach." *Academy of Management Review* **(2019): In press.**

Hahn and Knight use the ontological underpinnings of quantum mechanics to address a longstanding question in paradox theory: Whether organizational paradoxes are inherent in systems or socially and discursively constructed? They argue that paradox is both socially constructed and inherent in organizational systems. Latent paradoxes are inherent but indeterminate, and they become salient and determinate only through social and discursive construction. This social construction is context-specific and represents a selective instantiation from the manifold possibilities.

Raisch, Sebastian, Timothy J. Hargrave, and Andrew H. van de Ven. "The Learning Spiral: A Process Perspective on Paradox." *Journal of Management Studies* **55.8 (2018): 1507–1526.**

The authors adopt dialectics theory to investigate the learning processes inside organizations that lead members to develop the capacity to understand and cope with contradictions. The paradox process model presented is characterized by stages of convergence and divergence in a learning spiral. In the convergence phase members move from one pole to the other, learning and refining their worldviews. The divergence phase helps to better comprehend tensions and their management.

Smith, Wendy K. "Dynamic Decision Making: A Model of Senior Leaders Managing Strategic Paradoxes." *Academy of Management Journal* **57.6 (2014): 1592–1623.**

Smith defines strategies paradoxes as "contradictory yet interrelated demands in an organization's goals" (p. 1592). She compares six senior leadership teams navigating exploration and exploitation paradoxes to induce a model of dynamic decision making in which senior leaders navigate tension by (1) recognizing paradox at an overarching level, (2) adopting practices to both differentiate and integrate, and (3) engaging a pattern of micro-decisions that oscillate between exploration and exploitation.

Smith, Wendy K., and Michael L. Tushman. "Managing Strategic Contradictions: A Top Management Model for Managing Innovation Streams." *Organization Science* **16.5 (2005): 522–536.**

Smith and Tushman propose a model of how senior leadership teams can navigate paradoxes – specifically the ongoing organizational tension between exploration and exploitation. They suggest that doing so includes (1) articulating a paradoxical frame—"mental templates in which managers recognize and accept the simultaneous existence of contradictory forces" (p. 526); (2) differentiating—highlighting distinctions between poles; and (3) integrating—seeking synergies across poles.

Sundaramurthy, Chamu, and Marianne Lewis. "Control and Collaboration: Paradoxes of Governance." *Academy of Management Review* **28.3 (2003): 397–415.**

Sundaramurthy and Lewis advance our understanding of vicious and virtuous cycles of paradox. They adopt a paradox perspective to study control and collaboration in corporate governance. Drawing on agency and stewardship theories, the authors define and investigate the tensions between the two poles and underline the role of monitoring and empowerment. Moreover, they articulate the reinforcing cycles that lead organizations to strategic persistence and decline.

Quo Vadis Paradox? Limits and Future Developments

Paradox theory has expanded since the 1990s with expanding insights as well as an awareness of its boundaries and limitations (Cunha and Putnam 2019; Schad, et al. 2019). Moreover, more work is needed to develop the field and overcome the current limits of the literature, including examination of the intersection between institutional theory and paradox perspective (Smith and Tracey 2016), a more in-depth development of a systems perspective (Schad and Bansal 2018), a better understanding the cognitive aspects of organizational paradoxes (Keller and Chen 2017), and the development of accurate and robust methodologies to investigate organizational paradoxes (Fairhurst and Putnam 2019).

Cunha, Miguel Pina E., and Linda L. Putnam. "Paradox Theory and the Paradox of Success." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Dialectics and Strategic Organization*. Edited by Luca Berchicci, Robert David, Glen W. S. Dowell, Paula Jarzabkowski, Ann Langley, and Tim Rowley. *Strategic Organization* 17.1 (2019): 95–106.

Paradox theory has been a growing area of organizations studies; however Cunha and Putnam point to unintended consequences of this success, including conceptual imprecision, paradox as a problem or a tool, the taming of paradox, and the reifying process. The authors present the risks of success as well as strategies to avoid them, including retaining the systemic and embedded nature of paradoxes by situating them within organizations and society, adopting a strong process approach, and studying double or multiple paradoxes.

Fairhurst, Gail T., and Linda L. Putnam. "An Integrative Methodology for Organizational Oppositions: Aligning Grounded Theory and Discourse Analysis." *Organizational Research Methods* 22.4 (2019): 917–940.

Fairhurst and Putnam integrate grounded theory and discursive analysis to produce a new methodology for studying organizational contradictions and tensions. Such integrative methodology support researchers in (1) better defining tensions and contradictions and their management, and (2) better examining their potential power effects and micro organizing dynamics. Moreover, the authors show how to adopt such integrative methodology and its different phases.

Keller, Josh, and Erica W. Chen. "A Road Map of the Paradoxical Mind: Expanding Cognitive Theories on Organizational Paradox." In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox*. Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Paula Jarzabkowski, and Ann Langley, 66–86. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

To understand the underlying cognitive foundation of organizational paradox, scholars can draw on research insights from the cognitive sciences. Specifically, considerable work on categories and frames within the cognitive sciences can help explain what we really mean by "paradoxical framing."

Schad, Jonathan, and Pratima Bansal. "Seeing the Forest and the Trees: How a Systems Perspective Informs Paradox Research." *Journal of Management Studies* 55.8 (2018): 1490–1506.

The authors adopt a systems approach to paradox theory in order to distinguish between epistemology of paradox (actors' perception) and the ontology of paradox (tensions' underlying reality). By investigating and explaining the ontological structure of paradoxes scholars can understand their underlying complexity. The systems perspective is characterized by two research strategies: "zooming out"— seeing new relationships (hierarchy)—and "zooming in"—uncovering the dominant tensions (emergence).

Schad, Jonathan, Marianne W. Lewis, and Wendy K. Smith. "Quo Vadis, Paradox? Centripetal and Centrifugal Forces in Theory Development." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Dialectics and Strategic Organization*. Edited by Luca Berchicci, Robert David, Glen W. S. Dowell, Paula Jarzabkowski, Ann Langley, and Tim Rowley. *Strategic Organization* 17.1 (2019): 107–119.

An increasing number of studies are adopting paradox theory; however, this success could result in a dominant logic. The authors suggest that these risks can be avoided if researchers embrace centripetal forces (efforts to clarify core assumptions) and centrifugal forces (efforts to challenge and advance underlying assumptions). These forces allow theory to both diverge and converge, and they can be by themselves considered as paradoxical.

Smith, Wendy K., and Paul Tracey. "Institutional Complexity and Paradox Theory: Complementarities of Competing Demands." *Strategic Organization* **14.4 (2016): 455–466.**

This paper compares how institutional theory and paradox theory investigate the nature of organizational competing demands and their management. Paradox theory investigates the contradictory, interdependent, and persistent nature of tensions, while institutional theory emphasize contradiction, but not integration and persistence. The authors highlight how the comparison of these two theories and the integration between them can contribute to the theoretical development of the field.

A Matter of Perspectives: Levels of Analysis

Lewis and Smith 2014 (cited under Defining Paradox) describes paradox as a meta-theory that offered insights across levels of analysis, across phenomena, and across theoretical perspectives. This section offers examples of paradox research at the individual, group/organizational, and societal levels as well as scholarship that explores how paradoxes are nested across levels and how these levels interact with one another.

Micro: Individual Level

Paradox research on the individual level of analysis draws on work from psychology and psychoanalysis, exploring how individual cognition and emotions impact our understanding of and reaction to paradoxes. Hahn, et al. 2014 shows the difference between managerial paradoxical and business case frames in coping with sustainability tensions or on the members of organizations. Keller, et al. 2017 and Keller, et al. 2018 investigate how national culture informs different individual experience of paradoxical tensions. Miron-Spektor, et al. 2018 studies the micro-foundations of a paradoxical mindset in organizations. A micro-perspective is also adopted in investigating the micro-practices (Jarzabkowski and Lê 2017) and the role of supporting actors in tensions management (Pradies, et al. 2020). Additional work at the individual level could explore the paradoxical nature of emotions—the ambivalent experience of positive and negative emotions—as well as the tensions between cognition (thinking) and emotions (feeling).

Hahn, Tobias, Lutz Preuss, Jonatan Pinkse, and Frank Figge. "Cognitive Frames in Corporate Sustainability: Managerial Sensemaking with Paradoxical and Business Case Frames." *Academy of Management Review* **39.4 (2014): 463–487.**

This paper offers a theory on how different cognitive frames influence decision makers' sensemaking of paradoxical tensions in corporate sustainability. This work shows how decision makers, holding either a business case frame or a paradoxical frame, differ in scanning, interpreting, and responding to sustainability issues. The authors explain how the two frames lead to differences in the breadth and depth of scanning, differences in issue interpretations, and different types of responses to sustainability issues.

Jarzabkowski, Paula A., and Jane K. Lê. "We Have to Do This *and* That? You Must Be Joking: Constructing and Responding to Paradox through Humor." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change*. Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey. *Organization Studies* **38.3–4 (2017): 433–462.**

Jarzabkowski and Lê adopt a practice approach to paradox, investigating how micro-practices influence creations of and responses to tensions. They draw on an ethnographic study that showed incidences of humor, joking, and laughter. These incidents of humor make salient, draw attention to, and make communicable employees' experience of paradox. Humor was integral in constructing two response paths: (1) entrenching a response, and (2) shifting a response.

Keller, Joshua, Erica W. Chen, and Angela K. Y. Leung. "How National Culture Influences Individuals' Subjective Experience with Paradoxical Tensions." *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management* **25.3 (2018): 443–467.**

Keller, Chen and Leung contribute to the discussion about cultural influences on individual experiences with tensions. The authors conducted laboratory studies that compared the subjective experience of Americans and Chinese across multiple types of tensions. Chinese people had a lower level of experienced tension compared to Americans for performing tensions but not belonging tensions. The differences between performing and belonging tensions for Chinese were attributed to harmony concerns.

Keller, Joshua, Jeffrey Loewenstein, and Jin Yan. "Culture, Conditions and Paradoxical Frames." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change.* **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey.** *Organization Studies* **38.3–4 (2017): 539–560.**

This paper explores how national culture influences individuals' response to paradoxical tensions. Keller and Loewenstein present several laboratory studies that compare American and Chinese people's framing of cooperation and competition and the behavioral outcome of their framing. They found that Chinese subjects were more likely than Americans to frame situations as both cooperative and competitive (i.e., paradoxical framing) when the situations had overlapping features of cooperation and competition (e.g., outperforming and out-helping scenarios).

Miron-Spektor, Ella, Amy Ingram, Joshua Keller, Wendy K. Smith, and Marianne W. Lewis. "Microfoundations of Organizational Paradox: The Problem Is How We Think about the Problem." *Academy of Management Journal* **61.1 (2018): 26–45.**

Miron-Spektor and colleagues explore the micro-foundations of paradox by understanding the individual experience of paradox. They developed and validated a paradox mindset scale. Their research finds that that (1) resource scarcity is associated with employees experiencing tensions, and (2) increased experience with tensions and a paradox mindset is associated with increased creativity, innovation, and performance.

Pradies, Camille, Andrew Tunarosa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Julie Courtois. "From Vicious to Virtuous Paradox Dynamics: The Social-Symbolic Work of Supporting Actors." *Organization Studies* **(2020): In press.**

The authors use action research in studying a multinational company that finds the role of supporting actors (i.e., HR professionals) in shifting the responses to paradoxical tensions from vicious to virtuous cycle. Supporting actors are member of the organization, but they are not inside the paradoxical tensions, and, therefore, they can help in breaking dysfunctional dynamics and supporting the shift and the implementation of virtuous dynamics in the organization.

Meso: Organizational Level

Much of the work on paradox theory to date focuses on organization-level tensions. Studies have explored how paradoxes inform competitive advantage (Heracleous and Wirtz 2014), foster regeneration (Slawinski, et al. 2019), change or improvement processes (Cunha, et al. 2019; Aoki 2020), etc. Moreover, studies at the meso-level investigate organizational logics (Haffar and Searcy 2019) and defensive response to paradoxical tensions (Pinkse, et al. 2019). Scholars have also explored how senior leaders address strategic paradoxes in their organizations (Knight and Paroutis 2017; Smith 2014 [cited under Paradox Frameworks and Models]) through leadership cognition (Smith and Besharov 2019 [cited under Hybridity and Institutional Theory]; Zhang, et al. 2015 [cited under Leadership]), discourse (Fairhurst and Sheep 2020 [cited under Identity]), practices (Smith 2014; Jarzabkowski and Lê 2017 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]) as well as materiality and symbolic features (Knight and Paroutis 2017; Aoki 2020).

Aoki, Katsuki. "The Roles of Material Artifacts in Managing the Learning-Performance Paradox: The Kaizen Case." *Academy of Management Journal* **63.4 (2020): 1266–1299.**

Aoki investigates how material artifacts affect responses to the learning-performance paradox. The study explores such response during

the implementation of the Kaizen approach (continuous improvement) in Chinese manufacturing firms. Material artifacts generate social interaction that supports frontline employees to concentrate on both performance and learning. In one case the interplay of material artifacts results in competing understating of the two poles. In comparison, in a second case there was an understanding resulting in acceptance of the learning-performance paradox.

Cunha, Miguel P., Pedro Neves, Stewart R. Clegg, Sandra Costa, and Arménio Rego. "Paradoxes of Organizational Change in a Merger Context." *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal* **14.3 (2019): 217–240.**

In this paper, the authors describe transcendence in the reorganization of the Portuguese national health-care system. An initial positive vision of transcendence turned negative and resulted in a vicious circle of mistrust and cynicism. The study highlights the reproduction of vicious circles as a consequence of paradox.

Fairhurst, Gail T., and Mathew L. Sheep. "Rethinking Order and Disorder: Accounting for Disequilibrium in Knotted Systems of Paradoxical Tensions." In *Dis/organization as Communication: Studying Tensions, Ambiguities and Disordering.* **Edited by Consuelo Vásquez and Timothy Kuhn, 80–98. London: Routledge, 2019.**

Fairhurst and Sheep distinguish between the concepts of dynamic equilibrium and disequilibrium and propose mechanisms by which these concepts are constructed in the organizational actors' discourse. These ideas advance paradox theory by accounting for (boundary) conditions of disequilibrium and disorder.

Haffar, Merriam, and Cory Searcy. "How Organizational Logics Shape Trade-Off Decision-Making in Sustainability." *Long Range Planning* **52.6 (2019): In press.**

Haffar and Searcy investigate the logics that companies adopt to address sustainability tensions, which impact many companies. They found that firms using a market-led perspective look at a narrow range of stakeholder concerns. By contrast, companies with a holistic perspective consider a wider range of stakeholders and showed more integration in their logics.

Heracleous, Loizos, and Jochen Wirtz. "Singapore Airlines: Achieving Sustainable Advantage through Mastering Paradox." In *Special Issue: Paradox in Context: Advances in Theory and Practice.* **Edited by Claudy Jules and Darren Good.** *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* **50.2 (2014): 150–170.**

Singapore Airlines has become a top performing company due to its ability to transcend organizational paradoxes. The authors draw on data from this organization to identify four paradoxes: cost-effective service and excellence, decentralized and centralized innovation, followers and leaders in service development, and standardization and personalization in customer services. The organizational capacity to adopt an approach to transcend conflicting poles results in sustainable competitive advantage for Singapore Airlines.

Knight, Eric, and Sotirios Paroutis. "Becoming Salient: The TMT Leader's Role in Shaping the Interpretive Context of Paradoxical Tensions." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change.* **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey.** *Organization Studies* **38.3–4 (2017): 403–432.**

Knight and Paroutis examine the relationship between top management team leaders and lower-level managers in working together to balance paradoxical demands at the organizational level. The paper highlights the importance of an "interpretive context" in enabling the balancing of these demands across organizational levels.

Pinkse, Jonatan, Tobias Hahn, and Frank Figge. "Supersized Tensions and Slim Responses? The Discursive Construction of Strategic Tensions around Social Issues." *Academy of Management Discoveries* **5.3 (2019): 314–340.**

This study analyzes the discursive responses of food companies to social-business tensions about obesity. To protect their core business such companies adopt an accepting-defensive approach to address tensions, including two discursive defensive mechanisms

that involve the choice of discursive tactics and construction of tensions.

Slawinski, Natalie, Blair Winsor, Daina Mazutis, John W. Schouten, and Wendy K. Smith. "Managing the Paradoxes of Place to Foster Regeneration." *Organization & Environment* **(2019): 1–24.**

This study is the result of a six-year inductive research examination of Shorefast, a social enterprise bringing economic opportunities to rebuild the community of Fogo Island, Newfoundland. The authors propose an empirically grounded model, showing how managing paradoxical place-base tensions enables the regeneration of place.

Macro: Intra-organizational or Societal Level

As our environments become more complex, we continually investigate the paradoxical nature of society and the grand challenges they face. Research at the societal level has explored paradoxes in collaborations in business organizations and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (Sharma and Bansal 2017) and corporate collective responses (Bowen, et al. 2018), and it has offered methodological insights into studying intra-organizational paradoxes (Jarzabkowski, et al. 2019).

Bowen, Frances E., Pratima Bansal, and Natalie Slawinski. "Scale Matters: The Scale of Environmental Issues in corporate collective actions." *Strategic Management Journal* **39.5 (2018): 1411–1436.**

Bowen, Bansal, and Slawinski inductively study how a consortium of twelve oil sands companies collectively respond to environmental concerns. They identified a set of rules that influences the nature of the relationships within the members as either collaborative or competitive. These organizing rules influence the collective response to smaller scale problems (i.e., tailings ponds and water) as well as to larger scale ones (i.e., greenhouse gas emissions).

Jarzabkowski, Paula, Rebecca Bednarek, Konstantinos Chalkias, and Eugenia Cacciatori. "Exploring Inter-organizational Paradoxes: Methodological Lessons from a Study of a Grand Challenge." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Dialectics and Strategic Organization.* **Edited by Luca Berchicci, Robert David, Glen W. S. Dowell, Paula Jarzabkowski, Ann Langley, and Tim Rowley.** *Strategic Organization* **17.1 (2019): 120–132.**

These authors develop a methodological framework to investigate the interorganizational dimensions of paradoxes. The study examines the insurance protection gap, a grand challenge that arises of economic loss from large-scale disaster that can result in economic and social hardship for the affected communities. The study identified three analytical methods to examine interorganizational paradoxes: zooming in and out, tracking problematization, and tracking boundaries and boundary organizations.

Sharma, Garima, and Pratima Bansal. "Partners for Good: How Business and NGOs Engage the Commercial–Social Paradox." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change.* **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey.** *Organization Studies* **38.3–4 (2017): 341–364.**

The authors investigate why collaborations across sectors succeed or fail by examining five projects in India where NGOs, employing disadvantaged people, produce goods for business companies. Adopting a paradox perspective, this study shows how projects succeed when businesses and NGOs engage the commercial-social paradox and when the two parties use categorical fluidity, including malleable boundaries, interdependent interests, appreciating differences, iterative problem solving, and accommodating needs. Collaborations failed where businesses and NGOs imposed categorical imperatives.

Nested: Paradoxes across Levels

Due to the complexity of organizational phenomena, paradoxes are often are nested across different levels. The following studies show how paradoxes can be employed to investigate at different organizational levels. Jarzabkowski, et al. 2013 develops a process model of

tensions across levels. Keller, et al. 2020 examines the micro-level responses to paradox and how tensions from different levels influence one another.

Jarzabkowski, Paula, Jane K. Lê, and Andrew H. Van de Ven. "Responding to Competing Strategic Demands: How Organizing, Belonging, and Performing Paradoxes Coevolve." *Strategic Organization* **11.3 (2013): 245–280.**

The authors present a process model of managerial responses to coexisting paradoxical tensions. The paper draws on a longitudinal real-time study of a telecommunications firm's responses to address the organizing paradox between market and regulatory demands. The authors demonstrate the effect on managerial belonging and performing paradoxes. Managers adopted defensive and active responses; this shift modifies paradoxes over time. The proposed model describes paradoxical relationships, the cumulative impact of responses, and their processes.

Keller, Joshua, Sze-Sze Wong, and Shyhnan Liou. "How Social Networks Facilitate Collective Responses to Organizational Paradoxes." *Human Relations* **73.3 (2020): 401–428.**

Keller, Wong, and Liou investigate how micro-level responses to paradox aggregate to the organizational level. They study how scientists and engineers at a research institute respond to tensions from combining basic science and applied engineering activities. They found that diversity in instrumental networks contributed to the formation of a unified response among both types of employees, whereas a lack of diversity in expressive networks contributed to the formation of two polarized responses.

Paradoxical Phenomena and Theories

As a metatheory, scholars have drawn on various theories and phenomena to inform paradox insights, while also using paradox as a lens to inform these theories and phenomena. This section highlights scholars and scholarship that link paradox to a variety of theories and lenses. While extensive, this list is not exhaustive and much opportunity remains for continued scholarship connecting paradox with new theories and phenomena.

Change

Organizational changes and transformations has been one of the earliest topics adopting a paradox lens, beginning with works such as Quinn and Cameron 1988, an edited handbook, as well as Poole and van de Ven 1989 (cited under the Pillars of the Paradox: Foundational Papers). Vince and Broussine 1996 and Huy 2002 investigate the role of emotions in transformations processes, while Lüscher and Lewis 2008 recognizes the roles of sensemaking to inform how leaders respond to change.

Huy, Quy N. "Emotional Balancing of Organizational Continuity and Radical Change: The Contribution of Middle Managers." *Administrative Science Quarterly* **47.1 (2002): 31–69.**

This paper explores alternative emotion-management patterns in work groups for middle managers, including either emotionally committing to personally championed change projects or attending to recipients' emotions. Scarce emotional commitment to change negatively impacts organizations and leads to inertia. Strong commitment to change, accompanied by little attention to the emotions of the recipients, generates chaos. Performing both patterns creates emotional equilibrium that support adaptation to enable quality in customer service and the emergence of new knowledge and skills.

Lüscher, Lotte S., and Marianne W. Lewis. "Organizational Change and Managerial Sensemaking: Working through Paradox." *Academy of Management Journal* **51.2 (2008): 221–240.**

Lüscher and Lewis use action research to explore how middle managers respond to organizational change at the Lego Company in Denmark. The authors identify paradoxes of performing, belonging, and organizing, that are inherent in change processes. Using the

lens of paradox, the authors helped middle managers cope with these tensions by recognizing their unsolvable nature and assisting them in moving from feeling stuck to finding a "workable certainty" to move forward.

Quinn, Robert E., and Kim S. Cameron. *Paradox and Transformation: Toward a Theory of Change in Organization and Management.* **Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1988.**

Quinn and Cameron compile one of the earliest compendiums of paradox theory in organizational studies. This book includes chapters exploring the paradoxical nature of change. In doing so, they advance a paradoxical approach to organizational theory.

Vince, Russ, and Michael Broussine. "Paradox, Defense and Attachment: Accessing and Working with Emotions and Relations Underlying Organizational Change." *Organization Studies* **17.1 (1996): 1–21.**

Vince and Broussine draw on insights from a change effort in the UK National Health Service to highlight the underlying emotional and psychodynamic defensive response to change, including repression, regression, projection, reaction formation, and denial. They define a four-stage process to working with paradoxical emotions in organizations: working with complexity and uncertainty in the change process, reviewing the boundary between organizational groups, relatedness to understand members' feelings and responses, and capacity to work through an issue.

Coopetition

In 1997, Adam Brandenburger and Barry Nalebuff coined the term *coopetition* to recognize how organizations need to simultaneously engage in both competition and cooperation in partnerships. Raza-Ullah, et al. 2014 describes this relationship as paradoxical. Gnyawali, et al. 2016 further advances theoretical insights about the conditions, paradoxical tensions, and performance implications of cooperation and competition tensions. Empirical studies investigate the moderation effects of coopetition capabilities on the experience of these tensions (Bengtsson, et al. 2016; Raza-Ullah 2020), the influence of cultural elements (Chen 2008 and Keller, et al. 2017 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]), the employees responses to coopetition tensions (Stadtler and van Wassenhove 2016), and the micro-foundations of coopetition capabilities (Bengtsson, et al. 2020).

Bengtsson, Maria, Tatbeeq Raza-Ullah, and Manish K. Srivastava. "Looking Different vs. Thinking Differently: Impact of TMT Diversity on Coopetition Capability." **In** *Special Issue: Coopetition Strategies.* **Edited by Wojciech Czakon, Manish K. Srivastava, Frédéric Le Roy, and Devi Gnyawali.** *Long Range Planning* **53.1 (2020): Article 101857.**

This paper unpacks the micro-foundations of managing the paradox of coopetition. It provides novel insights, both theoretically and empirically, into how surface-level TMT diversity (e.g., age, gender, and nationality) contributes negatively, while deep-level TMT diversity (e.g., knowledge and experience) contributes positively to the development of coopetition capability.

Bengtsson, Maria, Tatbeeq Raza-Ullah, and Vladimir Vanyushyn. "The Coopetition Paradox and Tension: The Moderating Role of Coopetition Capability." *Industrial Marketing Management* **53 (2016): 19–30.**

Using a paradox lens, the authors empirically demonstrate the dual role of coopetition capability in moderating the effect of coopetition paradox on managers' experience of interorganizational tension and reducing the development of intra-organizational tension.

Chen, Ming-jer. "Reconceptualizing the Competition–Cooperation Relationship: A Transparadox Perspective." *Journal of Management Inquiry* **17.4 (2008): 288–304.**

This conceptual paper highlights how East Asians and Westerners have a different perspective on the relationship between cooperation and competition paradox, noting the role of an Eastern "middle way" approach.

Gnyawali, Deri R., Ravi Madhavan, Jinyu He, and Maria Bengtsson. "The Competition–Cooperation Paradox in Inter-firm Relationships: A Conceptual Framework." *Industrial Marketing Management* **53 (2016): 7–18.**

The authors develop a conceptual framework in order to explain key paradoxical conditions, paradoxical tensions, and performance implications of tensions in interfirm relationships that simultaneously involve cooperation and competition. Moreover, they highlight some crucial skills, which can support comprehension of paradox and the response to it.

Raza-Ullah, Tatbeeq. "Experiencing the Paradox of Coopetition: A Moderated Mediation Framework Explaining the Paradoxical Tension–Performance Relationship." In *Special Issue: Coopetition Strategies.* **Edited by Wojciech Czakon, Manish K. Srivastava, Frédéric Le Roy, and Devi Gnyawali.** *Long Range Planning* **53.1 (2020): Article 101863.**

This paper empirically examines how and why experiencing the paradox of coopetition impacts alliance performance. Emotional ambivalence (feeling torn between conflicting emotions) is a main mechanism through which such experiences can hurt performance, but firms that are able to balance competing demands of coopetition can reduce the negative effect of emotional ambivalence on alliance performance.

Raza-Ullah, Tatbeeq, Maria Bengtsson, and Sören Kock. "The Coopetition Paradox and Tension in Coopetition at Multiple Levels." *Industrial Marketing Management* **43.2 (2014): 189–198.**

This paper conceptualizes coopetition as an interorganizational paradox that involves tensions that foster emotional ambivalence at multiple levels—individual, organizational, and interorganizational levels.

Stadtler, Lea, and Luk N. van Wassenhove. "Coopetition as a Paradox: Integrative Approaches in a Multi-company, Cross-Sector Partnership." *Organization Studies* **37.5 (2016): 655–685.**

The authors investigate a cross-sector partnership in order to shed light on employees' responses to address coopetition tensions. Employees' understating of their identity and actions can be shaped by the juxtaposition of competitive and collaborative logics. This juxtaposition helps them in coping with tensions by adopting integrating behaviors that use the two perspectives and demarcating behaviors that engage one pole of the tension without eliminate the other.

Creativity

Creativity brings to the surface a number of paradoxes. Miron-Spektor, et al. 2011a recognizes that creativity involves the paradoxical tension between novelty and usefulness. Andriopoulos 2003 identifies six paradoxes involved in managing creativity in creative firms. Gotsi, et al. 2010 investigates the tensions experienced by creative workers. In addition, as Miron-Spektor, et al. 2011b notes, adopting a paradoxical frame to understand paradoxes can lead to new creative ideas.

Andriopoulos, Constantine. "Six Paradoxes in Managing Creativity: An Embracing Act." *Long Range Planning* **36.4 (2003): 375–388.**

This article investigates the management of organizational creativity in order to detect its practical tensions, mixed messages, and contradictions. The authors study three successful creative organizations to shed light on how they engage paradoxes related to creativity. Drawing from such cases they identify six key paradoxes in managing organizational creativity. Moreover, this study highlights how understanding the interdependency of the opposing poles involved in paradoxes, rather than considering them as separated, positively impacts the possibility of successfully managing them.

Gotsi, Manto, Constantine Andriopoulos, Marianne W. Lewis, and Amy E. Ingram. "Managing Creatives: Paradoxical Approaches to Identity Regulation." *Human Relations* **63.6 (2010): 781–805.**

This paper investigates the tensions that creative workers experience. Creatives aspire to advance their innovative energies; however, daily activities and demands lead to a business-like identity, related to company performance. Using a comparative case study, the authors show the positive consequences in managing such identity tensions. Results reveal differentiation and integration strategies. Differentiation, by separating roles in precise time and space, supports different identities. On the other hand, integration fosters the development of a synergistic meta-identity, namely, "practical artists."

Miron-Spektor, Ella, and Miriam Erez. "Looking at Creativity through a Paradox Lens." In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox*. **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Paula Jarzabkowski, and Ann Langley, 434–451. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.**

This chapter examines the paradoxical nature of creativity and proposes strategies to manage the paradox. The authors developed a framework that defines paradoxical creativity results, processes, and identities. They investigate the paradox of creativity from several viewpoints and suggest that creativity processes lead individuals to experience paradoxical thoughts, processes, goals, identities, and perspectives.

Miron-Spektor, Ella, Miriam Erez, and Eitan Naveh. "The Effect of Conformist and Attentive-to-Detail Members on Team Innovation: Reconciling the Innovation Paradox." *Academy of Management Journal* **54.4 (2011a): 740–760.**

This paper investigates the members of innovation teams using data on forty-one teams in an research and development company. The authors shows how the presence of creative and conformist members on a team improves team radical innovation. Creative members increase conflict and inhibit the team's adherence to a standard. In contrast, conformists engage in limited task conflict, and conformists and attentive-to-detail members improve the ability of teams to respect the standards.

Miron-Spektor, Ella, Francesca Gino, and Linda Argote. "Paradoxical Frames and Creative Sparks: Enhancing Individual Creativity through Conflict and Integration." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **116.2 (2011b): 229–240.**

This article suggests that using paradoxical frames—individual mindsets that accept and navigate tensions—fosters creativity. The authors conducted four laboratory studies proposing to participants different creativity tasks and creating conditions to enhance paradox mindset. Results suggest that individuals who assumed paradoxical frames were more creative with respect to the others. The authors underline how such positive impacts of a paradoxical mindset on creativity is fostered by the paradoxical relationship between task elements.

Facing Paradoxes

Responding to paradoxes is another important stream in literature that examines how individuals or organizations face and respond to paradoxical tensions, in a virtuous (see Pradies, et al. 2020 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]) or vicious way (Gaim, et al. 2019). Addressing paradoxical tensions can involve segmenting, bridging, and demarcating mechanisms (Smets, et al. 2015), rhetorical practices (Bednarek, et al. 2017), joking (see Jarzabkowski and Lê 2017 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]), irony (Gylfe, et al. 2019), etc. Moreover, a paradox mindset can help in managing tensions (Calabretta, et al. 2017 and Sleesman 2019). Bednarek, et al. 2019 and Panayiotou, et al. 2019 are two empirical papers that represent a clear example of how investigating organizational response to paradoxical tensions.

Bednarek, Rebecca, Konstantinos Chalkias, and Paula Jarzabkowski. "Managing Risk as a Duality of Harm and Benefit: A Study of Organizational Risk Objects in the Global Insurance Industry." *British Journal of Management* **(2019): In press.**

This study investigates the tensions involving harms and benefits in risk management systems. The authors study thirty-five insurers and their risk-transfer processes. Daily risk management practices of centralizing, calculating, and diversifying influence the organizations' constructions of risk, while abstracting and localizing sensemaking processes help prioritize harm or benefit.

Bednarek, Rebecca, Sotirios Paroutis, and John Sillince. "Transcendence through Rhetorical Practices: Responding to Paradox in the Science Sector." *Organization Studies* **38.1 (2017): 77–101.**

This paper investigates transcendence: "the ability to view both poles of the paradox as necessary and complementary." The authors analyze the rhetorical practices in three science organizations. They highlight how transcendence is constituted by four rhetorical practices (ordering, aspiring, signifying, and embodying). Moreover, they show how such practices are balanced in addressing paradox. They underline that transcendence balances focus (paradoxical content/context), time (stability/change), and distance (maintaining/reducing).

Calabretta, Giulia, Gerda Gemser, and Nachoem M. Wijnberg. "The Interplay between Intuition and Rationality in Strategic Decision Making: A Paradox Perspective." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change.* **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey.** *Organization Studies* **38.3–4 (2017): 365–401.**

The paper presents a three-step process for managing the intuition–rationality tension in adopting a paradox mindset. The first step consists of creating the conditions to develop a paradox perspective: acceptance of contradictions of intuition and rationality in strategic paradoxical decision making. The second phase is the integration of intuitive and rational practices in decision-making processes. In the third phase, organizations insert the results of a paradoxical approach into their organizational context.

Gaim, Medhanie, Stewart Clegg, and Miguel Pina e Cunha. "Managing Impressions Rather Than Emissions: Volkswagen and the False Mastery of Paradox." *Organization Studies* **(2019): Online First.**

The authors investigate the Volkswagen case to study how leaders manage paradox through impression management instead of through real actions. Examining the emissions scandal, this paper highlights how Volkswagen addressed the emission problems discursively but not substantively. This leads to not really transcending the paradox, and the illusion of embracing it can produce dysfunctional behaviors. The paper suggests that organizations not be overconfident in embracing paradoxes successfully.

Gylfe, Philip, Henrika Franck, and Eero Vaara. "Living with Paradox through Irony." In *Special Issue: The Role of Paradox Theory in Decision Making and Management Research.* **Edited by David A. Waldman, Linda L. Putnam, Ella Miron-Spektor, and Donald S. Siegel.** *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **155 (2019): 68–82.**

This paper investigates, through an ethnographic study of the Finnish public service broadcaster, how individuals use irony to deal with paradoxes. The authors show how tensions are co-built using irony in three different ways: inversive, subversive, and dramatic. They present a model that explains the possible use of irony and how to move from one phase to another. Irony works through management strategies called "connecting," namely, individuals in organizations give voice to, energize, and embrace opposing elements.

Panayiotou, Alexia, Linda L. Putnam, and George Kassinis. "Generating Tensions: A Multilevel, Process Analysis of Organizational Change." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Dialectics and Strategic Organization.* **Edited by Luca Berchicci, Robert David, Glen W. S. Dowell, Paula Jarzabkowski, Ann Langley, and Tim Rowley.** *Strategic Organization* **17.1 (2019): 8–37.**

This study investigates an Internet start-up that transformed the music industry. The authors study the tensions emerging in the company's development and responses to these contradictions. They propose a process model that explains how unintended consequences of the decisions generate change and how tensions and responses are crucial in this change process and can be seen as indicators of possible future challenges.

Sleesman, Dustin J. "Pushing through the Tension While Stuck in the Mud: Paradox Mindset and Escalation of Commitment." In *Special Issue: The Role of Paradox Theory in Decision Making and Management Research.* **Edited by David A. Waldman, Linda L. Putnam, Ella Miron-Spektor, and Donald S. Siegel.** *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **155**

(2019): 83–96.

This paper demonstrates how people with a paradox mindset (accepting and navigating tensions) will be more optimistic about responding to contradictory situations in a successful way. The author conducts four experiments to show how a paradox mindset positively impacts individual optimism and persistence in a failing course. This effect is largely weakened in situations where an alternative direction is relevant.

Smets, Michael, Paula Jarzabkowski, Gary T. Burke, and Paul Spee. "Reinsurance Trading in Lloyd's of London: Balancing Conflicting-yet-Complementary Logics in Practice." *Academy of Management Journal* **58.3 (2015): 932–970.**

This paper contributes to institutional complexity studies in three ways. First, shifting the focus from structural and static organizational responses to institutional complexity, the authors find that segmenting, bridging, and demarcating are the mechanisms through which members manage competing logics. Second, the authors propose a theoretical model that integrates such mechanisms in showing how individuals can find an equilibrium between logics and how they can benefit from it. Third, the paper shows how institutional complexity can be institutionalized and integrated into daily activities.

Human Resource

The human resource (HR) management field unpacks the paradoxes experienced by organizations' actors in human resource practices and offers insights about how to respond. Keegan, et al. 2019 introduces a framework for understanding paradoxical tensions in human resources. Cunha, et al. 2020 links HR management of paradoxes to strategic agility. Guerci and Carollo 2016 highlights the paradoxical tensions generated in green HR management practices. Moreover, paradox theory can contribute to gender dynamics inside organizations (Putnam and Ashcraft 2017).

Cunha, Miguel Pina e, Emanuel Gomes, Kamel Mellahi, Anne S. Miner, and Arménio Rego. "Strategic Agility through Improvisational Capabilities: Implications for a Paradox-Sensitive HRM." *Human Resource Management Review* **30.1 (2020): 100695.**

This paper investigates strategic agility. Strategic agility addresses challenges raised by strategic consistency and rapid change. The authors highlight how improvisational capabilities can support strategic agility. They propose six human resource management (HRM) action typologies that can improve effective improvisation and can shape the actions of a paradoxical HRM system.

Guerci, Marco, and Luca Carollo. "A Paradox View on Green Human Resource Management: Insights from the Italian Context." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* **27.2 (2016): 212–238.**

This paper investigates paradoxes in green HR management practices. The authors study six Italian companies with a clear environmental strategy and they find eight paradoxes related to human resource management experienced by organizations. Moreover, they analyze each paradox, showing and describing the tension and its impact on human resource management systems.

Keegan, Anne, Julia Brandl, and Ina Aust. "Handling Tensions in Human Resource Management: Insights from Paradox Theory." *German Journal of Human Resource Management* **33.2 (2019): 79–95.**

In this article, the authors identify core tensions embedded in human resource management, and they identify approaches that HR practitioners can use to address these tensions.

Putnam, Linda L., and Karen L. Ashcraft. "Gender and Organizational Paradox." In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox.* **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Paula Jarzabkowski, and Ann Langley, 333–352. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.**

In this chapter the authors investigate gender dynamics that reveal and produce paradox in organizations, and they analyze how gender

and organizations studies have considered paradox. This chapter presents work on gender and organizations in two chief but different perspectives: modern feminism and postmodern feminism.

Hybridity and Institutional Theory

Hybrid organizations involve multiple, competing logics simultaneously characterized by inherent contradictions and tensions. Paradox theory offers a useful lens to investigate hybridity. To address inherent tensions inside hybrid organizations, "spaces of negotiation" can play a crucial role (Battilana, et al. 2015), or dynamic capabilities can support their management (Vallaster, et al. 2019). Moreover, different roles can inform how members deal with such tensions (Ashforth and Reingen 2014). Navigating contradictions and paradoxes can enable leaders in hybrid organizations to find innovative solutions (Jay 2013) or structured flexibility can help to maintain over time their hybrid nature (Smith and Besharov 2019). However, members of hybrid organizations also do not always experience paradoxical tensions as they may frame them in a different way (Child 2019).

Ashforth, Blake E., and Peter H. Reingen. "Functions of Dysfunction: Managing the Dynamics of an Organizational Duality in a Natural Food Cooperative." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 59.3 (2014): 474–516.

This paper explores the tensions between mission and market in a natural food cooperative. Drawing on psychodynamic insights, the authors note how members of the cooperative split into two distinct groups—idealist and pragmatists—while projecting the other on the other side. The authors highlight how different roles in the groups informed how they navigate the tensions. Continual rituals of rupture and repair, which created dysfunctionality at the group level, provoked functionality at the organizational level.

Battilana, Julie, Metin Sengul, Anne-Claire Pache, and Jacob Model. "Harnessing Productive Tensions in Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Work Integration Social Enterprises." *Academy of Management Journal* 58.6 (2015): 1658–1685.

The authors study work integration social enterprises in investigating factors that impact hybrid organizations' social performance. They show how social imprinting and economic productivity foster social performance. However, social imprinting is paradoxical not only because it supports social performance, but also because it negatively impacts economic productivity and has a weak indirect impact on social performance. They underline how "spaces of negotiation"—places of discussion about trade-offs between members—allow members of hybrid organizations to manage such paradoxes.

Child, Curtis. "Whence Paradox? Framing Away the Potential Challenges of Doing Well by Doing Good in Social Enterprise Organizations." *Organization Studies* (2019): In press.

Child argues that members of social enterprises do not necessarily experience paradoxes in their work because they frame away possible paradoxical elements. The author identifies three frames: looking at the big picture, engaging with potentially paradoxical, and making favorable comparisons. Moreover, these results highlight the crucial insights into how actors frame (or frame away) possible contradictions rather than adopting responses to tensions.

Jay, Jason. "Navigating Paradox as a Mechanism of Change and Innovation in Hybrid Organizations." *Academy of Management Journal* 56.1 (2013): 137–159.

The author investigates how combinations of institutional logics in hybrid organizations foster their ability to find innovative solutions to complex problems. Institution complexity results in experiencing unintended consequences that can weaken their efforts. The author propose a process model of managing these tensions: how actors frame success impacts organizational logic. Outcomes can be interpreted using different logics or in finding a synthesis among them. Innovation capacity relies partially on these sensemaking processes.

Smith, Wendy K., and Marya L. Besharov. "Bowing before Dual Gods: How Structured Flexibility Sustains Organizational

Hybridity." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 64.1 (2019): 1–44.

Smith and Besharov explore ten years of data at Digital Divide Data, a social enterprise in Southeast Asia, and they propose a model that shows how hybrid organizations maintain their nature over time, due to structured flexibility and integrating stable structures and adaptive processes. Two stable structures—paradoxical frames (considering tensions as interrelated and contradictory) and guardrails (organizational structures, roles, and relationships that bound each aspect of the tensions)—are able to support the adaptation of meanings and practice over time, maintaining the opposite poles.

Vallaster, Christine, François Maon, Adam Lindgreen, and Joëlle Vanhamme. "Serving Multiple Masters: The Role of Micro-foundations of Dynamic Capabilities in Addressing Tensions in For-Profit Hybrid Organizations." *Organization Studies* (2019): In press.

This paper investigates the tensions inherent in hybrid organizations and the capacity of members to cope with such challenges. In this study, the authors show the role of individual and collective practices in managing the tensions inherent in for-profit hybrids and how they influence the success of hybrids. The authors identify four dynamic capabilities—sensing, seizing, transforming, and liaising—and their micro-foundations.

Identity

Paradoxical tensions emerge in the individual identity of members of organizations. Studies highlight the paradoxes of identity work (Sheep, et al. 2017; Sheep 2020) and point to the integration of individual and societal identities (Kreiner, et al. 2006, Fairhurst and Sheep 2020).

Fairhurst, Gail T., and Mathew L. Sheep. "If You Have to Say You Are, You Aren't." In *The Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organizations*. Edited by Andrew D. Brown, 424–441. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

The paper adopts a paradox approach to identity to address the contradictions of a post-truth era. The authors investigate how paradoxical tensions inform individual and collective identities. If the discourse reveals a great interrelation between paradoxical tensions then that can lead to more self-referential action that is paradoxical in their nature. They study the discourse of Donald J. Trump to show these paradoxical construction of identity.

Kreiner, Glen E., Elaine C. Hollensbe, and Mathew L. Sheep. "Where Is the 'Me' among the 'We'? Identity Work and the Search for Optimal Balance." *Academy of Management Journal* 49.5 (2006): 1031–1057.

The authors conducted both surveys and interviews with Episcopal priests to understand how they navigate tensions between personal and social identities. They identify numerous identity work strategies through which individuals differentiate and integrate personal and social identities, reducing demands and tensions.

Sheep, Mathew L. "Paradoxes in the Pursuit of Positive Identities." In *The Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organizations*. Edited by Andrew D. Brown, 618–636. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

This chapter explores the paradoxical tensional in positive identity work, highlighting current perspectives, criticisms, and ways forward in research. Individuals engage in identity work to create positive identities in pursuit of life, energy, viability, well-being, and growth. However, it is often a complex process that involves tensions persisting over time and resulting from the past and/or from a current crisis or a future threat.

Sheep, Mathew L., Glen E. Kreiner, and Gail T. Fairhurst. "'I Am . . . I Said': Individual Identity and Paradox." In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox*. Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Paula Jarzabkowski, and Ann Langley, 452–471. Oxford:

Oxford University Press, 2017.

This chapter reviews research on identity work that adopts a paradox perspective. Two main topics emerge: first, the identity work is characterized by four primary paradoxes: (1) paradoxes of entity, (2) paradoxes of conformity, (3) paradoxes of temporality, and (4) paradoxes of elasticity. The second element involves interpreting identity in a post-structuralist manner (the identity and the identity work fully involves language, communication, and discourse) to show how these four paradoxes are interrelated.

Innovation and Ambidexterity

Ambidexterity involves the organizational capabilities and cultures that enable organizations to explore and exploit simultaneously. Andriopoulos and Lewis 2009 and Andriopoulos and Lewis 2010 investigate design firms to demonstrate that addressing exploration and exploitation simultaneously involves practices that both differentiate the tensions as well as seek to integrate them. Farjoun 2010 offers a perspective on the duality of stability and change to transcend their paradoxical nature. Other contributions to paradox theory consider the role of leaders in managing paradoxes in innovations and change processes (see Smith 2014 [cited under Paradox Frameworks and Models] and Knight and Paroutis 2017 [cited under Meso: Organizational Level]).

Andriopoulos, Constantine, and Marianne W. Lewis. "Exploitation-Exploration Tensions and Organizational Ambidexterity: Managing Paradoxes of Innovation." *Organization Science* **20.4 (2009): 696–717.**

In this paper, the authors propose a paradoxical framework to study exploitation and exploration tensions and their management. They highlight paradoxes nested in innovation: strategic intent (profit breakthroughs), customer orientation (tight-loose coupling), and personal drivers (discipline and passion). They propose that integration and differentiation actions support the management of such interrelated paradoxes and foster the virtuous cycles of ambidexterity. The responsibility of coping with paradoxes is shared across all organizational levels, and it involves both differentiating and integrating.

Andriopoulos, Constantine, and Marianne W. Lewis. "Managing innovation Paradoxes: Ambidexterity Lessons from Leading Product Design Companies." *Long Range Planning* **43.1 (2010): 104–122.**

The authors show the power of paradox in ambidexterity using three cases. First, paradoxes can fuel, as well as frustrate, innovation. Second, innovation paradoxes benefit from paradoxical management—integration, both/and thinking, and temporal and spatial separation. Third, paradoxes can lead to a specific managerial response, but contextual differences are possible. The companies investigated reveal common trends; however, integration and splitting practices are related to company size and, for this reason, they can be different.

Farjoun, Moshe "Beyond Dualism: Stability and Change as a Duality." *Academy of Management Review* **35.2 (2010): 202–225.**

Balancing stability, reliability, and exploitation with change, innovation, and exploration can foster company success. Usually such elements are presented and understood as opposite and impossible to reconcile. Farjoun describes a duality view as an alternative approach that depicts stability and change as not only competing, but also interrelated. This work offers a perspective that can overcome the classical opposition and transcend the paradoxical nature of stability and change.

Leadership

Leaders play a crucial role in managing paradoxical tensions (Fairhurst, et al. 2002; Smith, et al. 2010). Leaders can adopt a paradoxical approach, developing a both/and mindset, to address competing demands, goals, and logics (Lavine 2014; Lewis, et al. 2014; Smith, et al. 2016). Paradox theory can offer insights also into leaders' discourses (Deye and Fairhurst 2019). Moreover, the special issues on decision making and paradox published in *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* has extended the studies on leadership adopting a paradox approach: Kearney, et al. 2019 highlights that paradoxical leaders are able to pursue visions and this fosters performance by followers. Pearce, et al. 2019 defines four types of leadership in dealing with multiple paradoxes. Zhang and Han

2019 investigates antecedents and consequences of paradoxical leadership behaviors, while Zhang, et al. 2015 introduces a measure of paradox leadership behaviors.

Deye, Joseph M., and Gail T. Fairhurst. "Dialectical Tensions in the Narrative Discourse of Donald J. Trump and Pope Francis." *Leadership* **15.2 (2019): 152–178.**

Using qualitative methods, the authors examine the discourses of Pope Francis and President Donald J. Trump in investigating the dialectical tensions and management strategies that their narratives show. The authors highlight dialectical tensions as: truth–post truth, popular–elite, and unity–disunity. The response and management of such tensions differs between the two leaders. Trump adopts a more unilateral fashion than Francis.

Fairhurst, Gail T., François Cooren, and Daniel J. Cahill. "Discursiveness, Contradiction, and Unintended Consequences in Successive Downsizings." *Management Communication Quarterly* **15.4 (2002): 501–540.**

This paper investigates how contradictory demands lead companies to perform in varied ways. The authors study three successive downsizings of an organization and they investigate the various contradictions regarding missions, values, job expectations, and resources experienced internally. To examine such contradictions, the authors implement a contradiction-centered view of organizations. The results highlight that managing these tensions produces both contradictory solutions and unintended consequences.

Kearney, Eric, Meir Shemla, Daan van Knippenberg, and Florian A. Scholz. "A Paradox Perspective on the Interactive Effects of Visionary and Empowering Leadership." In *Special Issue: The Role of Paradox Theory in Decision Making and Management Research*. **Edited by David A. Waldman, Linda L. Putnam, Ella Miron-Spektor, and Donald S. Siegel.** *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **155 (2019): 20–30.**

This paper presents and tests a model about the impact of visionary and empowering leadership on follower performance. The authors demonstrate that visionary and empowering leadership has an indirect positive interactive effect on individual follower performance through goal clarity. When leaders adopt a both/and approach on vision and empowerment they can foster follower performance.

Lavine, Marc. "Paradoxical Leadership and the Competing Values Framework." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* **50.2 (2014): 189–205.**

Lavine investigates the relationship between leadership and paradox and the usefulness of the competing values framework. A paradoxical perspective of leadership—greater cognitive complexity and leader flexibility—can be fostered by a competing values framework. Moreover, awareness, exploration, and interpretation represent important dimensions in carrying out research on paradoxical leadership.

Lewis, Marianne W., Constantine Andriopoulos, and Wendy K. Smith. "Paradoxical Leadership to Enable Strategic Agility." *California Management Review* **56.3 (2014): 58–77.**

This paper explores strategic agility and competing demands. Paradoxical leadership is crucial in addressing such competing demands, and the capacity to develop creative and integrative policies can support flexible and fast decision making. The authors identify five paradoxical leadership practices that foster strategic agility: value paradoxes as a vital ingredient of high performance, proactively identify and raise tensions, avoid traps of anxiety and defensiveness, consistently communicate a both/and vision, and separate efforts to focus on both sides of a paradox.

Pearce, Craig L., Christine L. Wassenaar, Yair Berson, and Rivka Tuval-Mashiach. "Toward a Theory of Meta-paradoxical Leadership." In *Special Issue: The Role of Paradox Theory in Decision Making and Management Research*. **Edited by David A. Waldman, Linda L. Putnam, Ella Miron-Spektor, and Donald S. Siegel.** *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*

155 (2019): 31–41.

This paper examines how leaders simultaneously handle multiple paradoxes. The study highlights four types of leadership: formal, situational, shared, and paradoxical. Leaders who integrate formal and shared leadership in the long and short term can be more effective in coping with organizational paradox.

Smith, Wendy K., Andy Binns, and Michael L. Tushman. "Complex Business Models: Managing Strategic Paradoxes Simultaneously." *Long Range Planning* 43.2–3 (2010): 448–461.

This work is focused on the complex business models that organizations need to implement in order to adopt paradoxical strategies. Leadership plays a crucial role in managing such complex business models. Leaders need to make dynamic decisions, create commitment to both the general visions and the specific objectives of the agenda, learn actively at multiple levels, and address conflicts. To implement these approaches, senior teams could organize as a leader-centric team, in which where tensions are held by the leader, and team-centric teams, in which tensions are held by the whole team.

Smith, Wendy K., Marianne W. Lewis, and Michael L. Tushman. "'Both/And' Leadership." *Harvard Business Review* 94.5 (2016): 62–70.

The authors argue that organizational success depends on simultaneously addressing conflicting demands, not choosing between them. Leaders need to become comfortable with multiple truths and inconsistencies, assume that resources are abundant rather than scarce, and embrace change instead of seeking stability. Organizations reach a state of dynamic equilibrium, wherein paradoxes do not impede progress—they spur it. To do so, they need to separate and connect opposing forces.

Zhang, Yan, and Yu-Lan Han. "Paradoxical Leader Behavior in Long-Term Corporate Development: Antecedents and Consequences." In *Special Issue: The Role of Paradox Theory in Decision Making and Management Research*. Edited by David A. Waldman, Linda L. Putnam, Ella Miron-Spektor, and Donald S. Siegel. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 155 (2019): 42–54.

The authors describe the behavior of paradoxical leaders in long-term corporate development (PLB-CD), a new conceptual perspective on leadership. They argue that leaders adopt a paradox perspective in order to address competing demands in the process of (1) preserving short-term efficiency and long-term development, (2) maintaining stability and flexibility, (3) focusing on shareholders and stakeholder, and (4) conforming to and shaping collective. They define a measure for PLB-CD and find that long-term perspective is positive related to paradoxical leadership.

Zhang, Yan, David A. Waldman, Yu-Lan Han, and Xiaobei Li. "Paradoxical Leader Behaviors in People Management: Antecedents and Consequences." *Academy of Management Journal* 58.2 (2015): 538–566.

Drawing on two studies of Chinese leaders, Zhang and colleagues develop a paradoxical leaders scale, which includes five dimensions (1) combining self-centeredness with other-centeredness; (2) maintaining both distance and closeness; (3) treating subordinates uniformly, while allowing individualization; (4) enforcing work requirements, while allowing flexibility; and (5) maintaining decision control, while allowing autonomy. They find that leaders adopt these behaviors more when they engage in holistic thinking and have integrative complexity, and that these behaviors are associated with increased proficiency, adaptivity, and proactivity among subordinates.

Power

Power is an important aspect in paradox dynamics and it has emerged as a research topic in recent years. Wenzel, et al. 2019 shows how power produces paradoxical tensions, and Berti and Simpson 2019 focuses on organizational pragmatic paradoxes, where power conditions weak actors response to paradoxical tensions.

Berti, Marco, and Ace Simpson. "The dark side of organizational paradoxes: The Dynamics of Disempowerment." *Academy of Management Review* **(2019): In press.**

This article focuses on pragmatic paradoxes in organizations: "contradictory demands received within the context of an intense managerial relationship." The authors propose a model of the relationship between organizational pragmatic paradoxes and power. Restriction of members' actions reduce the potential to manage such paradoxes. Dimensions of organizational power make pragmatic paradoxes salient. The authors identify actions that help to reduce the effect of such power dynamics.

Huq, Jo-Louise, Trish Reay, and Samia Chreim. "Protecting the Paradox of Interprofessional Collaboration." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change***. Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey.** *Organization Studies* **38.3–4 (2017): 513–538.**

This paper investigates collective decision-making processes in studying interprofessional collaborations to shed light on how professionals address paradoxical tensions. The research reveals a shift from a vicious cycle to a virtuous one, which the authors describe as "protecting the paradox." Three strategies are identified in this process: (1) pursuing simultaneously both poles, (2) strengthening the weaker pole, and (3) looking beyond the paradox by concentrating on outcomes. This work shows how managers and professionals can collaborate to protect paradoxes and reduce the detrimental impact of power relations.

Wenzel, Matthias, Jochen Koch, Joep P. Cornelissen, Wasko Rothmann, and N. Natalie Senf. "How Organizational Actors Live Out Paradoxical Tensions through Power Relations: The Case of a Youth Prison." In *Special Issue: The Role of Paradox Theory in Decision Making and Management Research***. Edited by David A. Waldman, Linda L. Putnam, Ella Miron-Spektor, and Donald S. Siegel.** *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **155 (2019): 55–67.**

The authors study the experience of paradoxes in power relationships, investigating data from a juvenile prison. They propose a model that define conceptually (1) individual actions to cope with paradox, building positions of control and resistance; (2) collective actions that implement such power positions, and (3) the macro-level consequences of these processes. They show how power conflicts at the micro-level produce paradoxical tensions.

Social Responsibility

Social responsibility involves competing demands, goals, and interests between an organization's social mission and business purpose. Margolis and Walsh 2003 describes the conflicts between people and profits, offering a broad overview of the literature on such relationships. Different works offer insights on the management of social-business tensions (Smith, et al. 2013; Longoni, et al. 2019). Moreover, paradox theory has been used to review the literature on corporate social responsibility (CSR) and Maon, et al. (2019) finds that belonging and performing tensions lead stakeholders to negative responses to CSR.

Longoni, Annachiara, Davide Luzzini, Madeleine Pullman, and Martin Habiague. "Business for Society Is Society's Business: Tension Management in a Migrant Integration Supply Chain." *Journal of Supply Chain Management* **55.4 (2019): 3–33.**

This work investigates the tensions between different institutional logics in a social mission-driven firm and in its supply chain. Adopting institutional theory and paradox theory, the authors examine seven relationships between the social enterprise and its stakeholder in the supply chain. To manage the existing tensions, they highlight the role of relationship management mechanisms—relationship governance, power, and trust. Moreover, they underline three specific tensions management approaches: complementarity, acceptance, and accommodation.

Maon, François, Joëlle Vanhamme, Kenneth De Roeck, Adam Lindgreen, and Valérie Swaen. "The Dark Side of Stakeholder Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: Tensions and Micro-level Undesirable Outcomes." *International Journal of Management Reviews* **21.2 (2019): 209–230.**

This paper reviews the literature on corporate social responsibility, focusing on its micro-level impacts. The authors offer an integrative

framework to identify the undesirable relational outcomes of CSR on stakeholders inside and outside the organizations. Using a paradox approach, the authors show that belonging and performing tensions lead stakeholders to negative responses to CSR. Moreover, such undesirable relational outcomes of CSR are driven by contextual and personal influences.

Margolis, Joshua D., and James Walsh. "Misery Loves Company: Rethinking Social Initiatives by Business." *Administrative Science Quarterly* **48.2 (2003): 268–305.**

Margolis and Walsh offer a comprehensive overview of the relationship between corporate social performance and financial performance. The authors draw on ninety-five different studies that offer researchers and practitioners a wide picture of the existing literature on such relationships.

Smith, Wendy K., Michael Gonin, and Marya L. Besharov. "Managing Social-Business Tensions: A Review and Research Agenda for Social Enterprise." *Business Ethics Quarterly* **23.3 (2013): 407–442.**

Smith, Gonin, and Besharov offer a systematic analysis of tensions between social missions and business ventures. First, adopting the Smith and Lewis framework on paradoxical tensions typologies (performing, learning, belonging, organizing), the authors categorize tensions that can arise between social mission and business. Then, they examine how four different conceptual approaches (institutional theory, paradox theory, stakeholder theory, organizational identity) can help in understanding such tensions. Finally, they argue that examining social-business tensions can contribute to the development of traditional organizational theories.

Sustainability

Sustainability scholars adopt paradox theory to explore the tensions among social, business, and environmental issues. Hahn, et al. 2015 and Hahn, et al. 2018 advance work on how a paradox perspective can inform literature on corporate sustainability, encouraging scholars to explore insights into the roles of cognitive frames in sustainability (Sharma and Jaiswal 2018; see also Hahn, et al. 2014 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]), the role of strategic agility to manage sustainability paradoxes (Ivory and Brooks 2018), the role of guardrails to develop paradoxical thinking in sustainability (Soderstrom and Heinze 2019), and the defensive responses of firms to paradoxes (Iivonen 2018). Gao and Bansal 2013 investigates the difference between instrumental and integrative logics and their effect on sustainability performance. Van der Byl and Slawinski 2015 reviews the literature to detect how sustainability tensions have been studied more broadly.

Gao, Jijun, and Pratisma Bansal. "Instrumental and Integrative Logics in Business Sustainability." *Journal of Business Ethics* **112.2 (2013): 241–255.**

This paper describes instrumental and integrative logics in business sustainability. An instrumental perspective considers social and environmental issues as a means to achieve better financial performance. On the other hand, an integrative perspective leads to integration of financial performance and social and environmental commitment in organizations. The authors empirically test if the two perspectives are present in organizations; using a sample of 738 firms over thirteen years, they find the presence of integrative logic in corporations.

Hahn, Tobias, Frank Figge, Jonatan Pinkse, and Lutz Preuss. "A Paradox Perspective on Corporate Sustainability: Descriptive, Instrumental, and Normative Aspects." In *Special Issue: Thematic Symposium: Paradoxes in Corporate Sustainability; Managing Tensions between Social, Economic, and Environmental Issues.* **Edited by Tobias Hahn, Frank, Fisse, Jonatan Pinkse, and Lutz Preuss.** *Journal of Business Ethics* **148.2 (2018): 235–248.**

This paper introduces a special issue on paradox in corporate sustainability. The paper serves as the conceptual foundation of a paradox perspective on corporate sustainability, defining its limits and core elements. The authors offer a definition of the paradox perspective on corporate sustainability and a framework to delineate its descriptive, instrumental, and normative aspects. This framework clarifies the paradox perspective's contents and its implications for research and practice.

Hahn, Tobias, Jonatan Pinkse, Lutz Preuss, and Frank Figge. "Tensions in Corporate Sustainability: Towards an Integrative Framework." *Journal of Business Ethics* **127.2 (2015): 297–316.**

In this paper, the authors offer a framework of tensions in sustainability that highlights the dimensions of change, level, and context. They also discuss different response strategies to address tensions in corporate sustainability: acceptance, separation, and synthesis. Firms need to accept tensions in corporate sustainability and pursue different aspects simultaneously. The framework argues that tensions in sustainability occur between different levels, in change processes, and within a temporal and spatial context.

Hahn, Tobias, Jonatan Pinkse, Lutz Preuss, and Frank Figge. "Ambidexterity for Corporate Social Performance." *Organization Studies* **37.2 (2016): 213–235.**

In this conceptual paper the authors propose that ambidexterity can be a crucial determinant for corporate social performance. Indeed, pursing both instrumental and moral-driven actions, organizations can achieve higher social results. They propose two mechanisms that inform this process – balanced ambidexterity and combined ambidexterity. The balance dimension increases the scope of corporate social performance through a compensation between instrumental and moral actions. The combined dimension increases the scale of social results because instrumental and moral actions supplement each other.

Iivonen, Kirsti. "Defensive Responses to Strategic Sustainability Paradoxes: Have Your Coke and Drink It Too!" In *Special Issue: Thematic Symposium: Paradoxes in Corporate Sustainability; Managing Tensions between Social, Economic, and Environmental Issues***. Edited by Tobias Hahn, Frank, Fisse, Jonatan Pinkse, and Lutz Preuss.** *Journal of Business Ethics* **148.2 (2018): 309–327.**

The author addresses societal obesity conflicts with core business demands of some food and beverage companies. The author adopts a discursive approach to show how organizational leaders address such challenges but do not directly work through the paradox. The company projects the tensions outside the organization to the society, and this process for projection is defined as a defensive mechanism.

Ivory, Sarah B., and Simon B. Brooks. "Managing Corporate Sustainability with a Paradoxical Lens: Lessons from Strategic Agility." In *Special Issue: Thematic Symposium: Paradoxes in Corporate Sustainability; Managing Tensions between Social, Economic, and Environmental Issues***. Edited by Tobias Hahn, Frank, Fisse, Jonatan Pinkse, and Lutz Preuss.** *Journal of Business Ethics* **148.2 (2018): 347–361.**

Ivory and Brooks investigate paradoxical acceptance and resolution in organizations. The authors argue that strategic agility helps organizations in dealing with paradoxes. Strategic agility is characterized by three organizational meta-capabilities: strategic sensitivity, collective commitment, and resource fluidity. Agile organizations are able to achieve a wide acceptance of paradox through strategic sensitivity and collective commitment. Moreover, they can implement paradoxical resolution through collective commitment and resource fluidity.

Sharma, Garima, and Anand K. Jaiswal. "Unsustainability of Sustainability: Cognitive Frames and Tensions in the Bottom of the Pyramid Projects." In *Special Issue: Thematic Symposium: Paradoxes in Corporate Sustainability; Managing Tensions between Social, Economic, and Environmental Issues***. Edited by Tobias Hahn, Frank, Fisse, Jonatan Pinkse, and Lutz Preuss.** *Journal of Business Ethics* **148.2 (2018): 291–307.**

This paper investigates how organizational leaders understand tensions at the bottom of the pyramid to offer a dynamic model of cognitive frames in sustainability. The authors identify different perspectives adopted by actors across time and space in organizations: paradoxical, business case, and business. The decision-making horizon plays a crucial role in driving the shift from one frame to another. The paradoxical and business perspectives reveal tensions across organizational levels, which were mitigated by adopting long-term decision-making perspectives.

Soderstrom, Sara B., and Kathryn L. Heinze. "From Paradoxical Thinking to Practicing Sustainable Business: The Role of a Business Collective Organization in Supporting Entrepreneurs." *Organization & Environment* **(2019): In press.**

This work studies the role of a business collective organization in supporting entrepreneurs to move from paradoxical thinking to realize a sustainable business. Soderstrom and Heinze demonstrate that opposing goals of sustainability challenge individuals; however, business collective organizations can support their work through coordinating mechanisms. Collective organizations offer guardrails that help to co-create common resources that support members in reducing cognitive and practical barriers of sustainable entrepreneurship.

---

van der Byl, Connie A., and Natalie Slawinski. "Embracing Tensions in Corporate Sustainability: A Review of Research from Win-Wins and Trade-Offs to Paradoxes and Beyond." *Organization & Environment* **28.1 (2015): 54–79.**

The authors review the literature on sustainability tensions. Four general approaches emerged: win-win, trade-off, integrative, and paradox. The win-win approach involves reconciling social or environmental elements with economic ones. The trade-off approach includes choosing between opposing goals. An integrative approach depends on exploring synergies among social, environmental, and economic aspects. A paradox approach involves considering tensions as an opportunity and looking at sustainability in a complex way in order to create innovative responses to tensions.

Temporality

Temporal aspects can generate tensions and contradictions, involving short-term and long-term perspectives and goals simultaneously. Slawinski and Bansal 2012 and Slawinski and Bansal 2015 investigate how firms and leaders are able to manage temporal challenges on climate change. Reinecke and Ansari 2015 develops the concept of "ambitemporality" to describe the organizational capacity to integrate competing temporal perspectives.

Reinecke, Juliane, and Shaz Ansari. "When Times Collide: Temporal Brokerage at the Intersection of Markets and Developments." *Academy of Management Journal* **58.2 (2015): 618–648.**

Reinecke and Ansari investigate the role of Western time perspective. They find that the clock-time orientation that is adaptive to markets seeking efficiency and control are less adaptive for human development work that is more focused on emergent, complex, and indeterminant processes. They examine the Fairtrade case, where these different temporal structures emerge and create tensions. The results show how contestation, temporal reflexivity, interpretive shifts, and mutual appreciation of interdependencies drive Fairtrade in integrating competing temporal structures. They propose the concept of "ambitemporality," namely, the organizational capacity to integrate opposing temporal orientations.

Slawinski, Natalie, and Pratima Bansal. "A Matter of Time: The Temporal Perspectives of Organizational Responses to Climate Change." *Organization Studies* **33.11 (2012): 1537–1563.**

Slawinski and Bansal study time perspectives adopted by company leaders as they address environmental challenges such as climate change. They examine the climate change strategies of five oil and gas firms and they propose a model to explain how time perspectives inform organizational responses to climate change. The model define two types of strategies that firms adopt to address these challenges, and they identify two different temporal perspectives: focused and integrated.

Slawinski, Natalie, and Pratima Bansal. "Short on Time: Intertemporal Tensions in Business Sustainability." *Organization Science* **26.2 (2015): 531–549.**

Slawinski and Bansal investigate how leaders adopt different perspectives (long term or short term) to understand issues of environmental sustainability in business. The authors study the organizational responses to climate change and show how by juxtaposing short-term and long-term perspectives, companies also create tension between business and society. Thus, such companies are able to look at climate change in all its complexity and recognize the necessity of integrated, multidimensional solutions.

Knotted Paradoxes

While scholars often isolate and explore a particular paradox, multiple paradoxes often exist simultaneously and interact with one another (see Jarzabkowski, et al. 2013 [cited under Nested: Paradoxes across Levels]). Sheep, et al. 2017 describes these as paradoxes as being knotted with one another.

Sheep, Mathew L., Gail T. Fairhurst, and Shalini Khazanchi. "Knots in the Discourse of Innovation: Investigating Multiple Tensions in a Reacquired Spin-Off." In *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change.* **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey.** *Organization Studies* **38.3–4 (2017): 463–488.**

The authors adopt a discourse approach to investigate paradoxical tensions of innovation. They propose the concept of paradoxical "knots" defined as "discursive formulations in which members construct tensions." Such knotted tensions can influence one another, reducing or intensifying their consequences, and these can produce a very different impact on innovative action.

Methods of Studying Paradox

Paradox scholarship draws on a variety of methods. An accumulation of work focused on qualitative methods to unpack the nonlinear, absurd nature of paradox and induce new insights, including case studies (see Smith 2014 [cited under Paradox Frameworks and Models], Smith and Besharov 2019 [cited under Hybridity and Institutional Theory]), action research (see Lüscher and Lewis 2008 [cited under Change]; Pradies, et al. 2020 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]), or ethnographies (see Ashforth and Reingen 2014 [cited under Hybridity and Institutional Theory]). More recently, scholars have begun to use more quantitative methods, such as experiments (see Miron-Spektor, et al. 2011b [cited under Creativity]; Keller, et al. 2017 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]) and survey (see Miron-Spektor, et al. 2011a [cited under Creativity]; Miron-Spektor, et al. 2018 [cited under Micro: Individual Level]) to better develop the field through robust empirical studies on larger samples. Andriopoulos and Gotsi 2017 (cited under Unpacking Methods) offers an overview to help scholars looking to adopt methods to study paradox.

Unpacking Methods

Lewis and Grimes 1999 explores the use of multiple paradigms to support theory building. Andriopoulos and Gotsi 2017 investigates the different methodologies to study paradoxes and their challenges.

Andriopoulos, Costas, and Manto Gotsi. "Methods of Paradox." In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox.* **Edited by Wendy K. Smith, Marianne W. Lewis, Paula Jarzabkowski, and Ann Langley, 513–527. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.**

Andriopoulos and Gotsi investigate methodologies to study paradox. The authors propose six strategies to help researchers in addressing methodological challenges in paradox research: (1) making empirically clear the contradictory, interrelated, simultaneous, and persistent nature of paradoxical tensions; (2) developing reliable and flexible protocols to detect paradox; (3) adopting a multilevel approach; (4) practicing reflexivity; (5) staying close to the context; and (6) leveraging multi-modality.

Lewis, Marianne W., and Andrew I. Grimes. "Metatriangulation: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms." *Academy of Management Review* **24.4 (1999): 672–690.**

Lewis and Grimes explore how adopting multiple paradigms draws on various different perspectives to enrich theory building. They identify a process by which authors can engage in more multi-paradigm research, which includes addressing issues as they select a research topic, collecting and analyzing data, theorizing, and evaluating the resulting theory using multiple paradigms.

Special Issues and Handbooks: Issues on Paradox

During the last decade, scholars have edited handbooks and special issues that help advance the field of organizational paradox. A number of recent compilations of paradox scholarship are cited in this section. Jules and Good 2014 offers insights to advance paradox literature in theory and practice. Smith, et al. 2017 focuses on paradox in innovation and change. Hahn, et al. 2018 sets the core dimensions and boundaries of the emerging field of research in paradox perspective on corporate sustainability. Waldman, et al. 2019 investigates the role of individual and teams in managing paradoxical tensions. Berchicci, et al. 2019 includes articles debating theoretical and empirical developments in the literature on paradox. Finally, Lindgreen and Maon 2019 includes a review of different streams of literature in the management of the organizational paradoxes field. Two handbooks offer an overview of work in recent years in research on the organizational paradox. Farjoun, et al. 2018 reflects on dialectics, paradoxes, and dualities in organizations. Smith, et al. 2017 organizes the literature from different theoretical and empirical perspectives to help scholars in conducting research on paradox.

Berchicci, Luca, Robert David, Glen W. S. Dowell, Paula Jarzabkowski, Ann Langley, and Tim Rowley, eds. *Special Issue: Paradox, Dialectics and Strategic Organization*. *Strategic Organization* 17.1 (2019).

This special issue create a forum to debate and enrich paradox theory. Pina e Cunha and Putnam reflect on the risks of paradox theory success, warning of converging on a set of ideas too quickly. Schad, et al. underline possible theoretical developments. Jarzabkowski, et al. show how to adopt paradox theory to investigate grand challenges. Farjoun invites scholars to consider the dialectic perspective to overcome the static notion of paradox. Then the forum is enriched by three articles using both paradox and dialectics.

Farjoun, Moshe, Wendy Smith, Ann Langley, and Haridimos Tsoukas, eds. *Dualities, Dialectics, and Paradoxes in Organizational Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

This volume examines dialectics, paradoxes and dualities in organizations, and how tensions foster creative responses The chapters offer insights into how the development of paradox theory helps in better understanding organizational contradictions, and how tensions support processes of transformation in organizations. The authors introduce and compare dialectics, paradox, and dualities perspectives.

Hahn, Tobias, Frank, Fisse, Jonatan Pinkse, and Lutz Preuss, eds. *Special Issue: Thematic Symposium: Paradoxes in Corporate Sustainability; Managing Tensions between Social, Economic, and Environmental Issues*. *Journal of Business Ethics* 148.2 (2018).

This special issue introduces and formalizes the use of paradox theory in corporate sustainability studies (Hahn, et al.). It presents a series of studies adopting a paradox approach to investigate corporate sustainably tensions with a descriptive or instrumental aim. Descriptive articles investigate how organizations or decision makers cope with paradoxical tension in sustainability. Instrumental work is focused on the interconnection between sustainability tension and its outcomes.

Jules, Claudy, and Darren Good, eds. *Special Issue: Paradox in Context: Advances in Theory and Practice*. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 50.2 (2014).

This special issue aims at developing paradox literature both in theory and in practice. Smith and Lewis deal with paradox as meta-theory, Heracleous and Wirtz provide an empirical case study on sustaining competitive advantage through paradox perspective (see Heracleous and Wirtz 2014 [cited under Meso: Organizational Level]), Fredberg treats the practices of CEOs to manage paradoxes, Levine studies the paradox perspective to create leaders, and Johnson gives a description of practices on how paradox has been used by the organization development community in polarity management.

Lindgreen, Adam, and François Maon, eds. *Special Issue: Organisation and Management Paradoxes*. *International Journal of*

Management Reviews **21.2 (2019).**

This special issue includes six papers that offer insights on paradox literature drawing on different managerial and organizational phenomena and analytical and theoretical perspectives. De Keyser, et al. review the literature to explicate how scholars have adopted the construct of paradox. Keller and Sadler-Smith review paradox and dual processes literature to synthetize relevant aspects. Pinto links paradox and stakeholder theory. Maon, et al. investigate adverse stakeholder reactions to CSR in relation to tensions. Niesten, Ioana Stefan, and Pelz focus on specific paradoxes of organizational life.

Smith, Wendy K., Miriam Erez, Sirkka Jarvenpaa, Marianne W. Lewis, and Paul Tracey, eds. *Special Issue: Paradox, Tensions and Dualities of Innovation and Change.* *Organizational Studies* **38.3–4 (2017).**

This special issue sheds light on the nature and management of tensions in innovation and change processes. The selected articles examine tensions in senior leadership decision making, cross-sector collaborations, interprofessional collaborations, employee identification, and mergers and acquisitions.

Smith, Wendy K., Marianne W. Lewis, Paula Jarzabkowski, and Ann Langley, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox.* **Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.**

This book offers theoretical and empirical insights to conduct research on organizational paradoxes. Authors of the chapters use different theoretical perspectives and empirical approaches in organizing thirty years of research in the field and offer tools to develop organizational paradox studies.

Waldman, David A., Linda L. Putnam, Ella Miron-Spektor, and Donald S. Siegel, eds. *Special Issue: The Role of Paradox Theory in Decision Making and Management Research.* *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **155 (2019).**

This special issue aims at shedding light on the paradoxes of individual and teams. It includes articles that treat this level of analysis regarding paradox in leadership, conflict, decision making, power, and individual coping.

back to top

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

You are browsing courtesy of: OUP–USA Mirror