Strategizing Together for a Better World: Institutional, Paradox and Practice Theories in Conversation

Journal of Management Inquiry
2024, Vol. 33(2) 115–130
© The Author(s) 2023
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/10564926231210238
journals.sagepub.com/home/jmi
Sage

Rikke Rønholt Albertsen[1], Shahzad (Shaz) Ansari[2], Katrin Heucher[3], Marc Krautzberger[4], Ann Langley[5,6], Pauline Charlotte Reinecke[7], Natalie Slawinski[8] and Eero Vaara[9]

Abstract

In this article, based on a Symposium held at the 2022 Academy of Management Meeting, we present a moderated discussion between established scholars in the field of grand challenges—Shahzad (Shaz) Ansari, Natalie Slawinski, and Eero Vaara—focusing on the role of institutional, paradox, and practice theories in research on grand challenges. Our goal for the symposium was to bring these theoretical perspectives into conversation, reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the lenses, and discuss potential intersections for future research on grand challenges. We present the panelists' prepared remarks as well as the interactive discussion covering four topics: the limitations of existing concepts and theories, materiality, impact, and relations between theory and practice. As part of these four discussion topics, we also present questions and reflections from the audience. We conclude by summarizing insights gleaned from the symposium about critical gaps and avenues for future research.

Keywords

institutional theory, paradox, business and society, process thinking, sustainability

Introduction

Grand challenges[1] such as inequality, climate change, and poverty have become a central topic in management and organization research in recent years. Accelerated by the different crises of this decade including the climate and biodiversity crisis, the collapse of international supply chains, and the energy crisis, grand challenges urgently require solutions that involve multiple stakeholder groups in society. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) March 20, 2023 assessment warns that the 2020s will be perhaps the last chance to keep the global rise in temperature within 1.5°C above preindustrial levels (IPCC, 2023). U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres told the Human Rights Council in February that "Unless humanity kicks its addiction to fossil fuels now, critical climate tipping points will crush the human rights of generations to come. (…) Fossil fuel producers and their financiers must understand one simple truth: Pursuing mega-profits when so many people are losing their lives and rights, now and in the future, is totally unacceptable" (United Nations, 2023). Thus, while it is positive that management and organization scholars have been shifting their research toward grand challenges, there is a need to continue to deepen and expand our research on these topics and provide new insights as well as work collectively on these complex problems.

This interest of organization and management theory (OMT) scholars in contributing to addressing grand challenges and working together for a better world was recently recognized and affirmed by Barbara Gray in her "Call for Activist Scholarship in Organizational Theorizing" published in this journal. We agree with Barbara Gray that we "must

[1]Department of Management, Society and Communication, CBS Sustainability Centre, Copenhagen Business School, Frederiksberg, Denmark
[2]Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
[3]Department of Innovation Management and Strategy, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
[4]University of Edinburgh Business School, Edinburgh, UK
[5]HEC Montréal, Montreal, QC, Canada
[6]University of Warwick, Coventry, UK
[7]Institute for Strategic and International Management, School of Management Sciences and Technology, Hamburg University of Technology, Hamburg, Germany
[8]Gustavson School of Business, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada
[9]Saïd Business School, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

Corresponding Author:
Ann Langley, Department of Management, HEC Montréal, 3000, chemin de la Côte-Ste-Catherine, Montreal, QC H3T 2A7, Canada.
Email: ann.langley@hec.ca

confront the pain that comes from ignoring our interdependence and reframe our attention to our collective plight" (Gray, 2023, p. 184). In this paper, we take a first step toward answering this call by recognizing the interconnectedness between our theories and the communities in which we work. We strive to bridge the conversations, identify overlaps between them, and develop fruitful ways forward. This article is based on a symposium held at the Academy of Management (AOM) Meeting in Seattle in 2022. The purpose of the symposium was to initiate a conversation between the three theoretical lenses of institutional theory, paradox theory, and strategy-as-practice (SAP), and to explore how combining the three lenses might offer fruitful contributions to the complex and interdependent challenges experienced by business organizations, managers and stakeholders (AOM Conference Theme, 2022).

We, the organizers Rikke Albertsen, Katrin Heucher, Marc Krautzberger, and Pauline Reinecke, selected these theories because they each represent "big tent theories" of collective action (practice theory), tensions (paradox theory) and social order (institutional theory) and each offers theoretical contributions across a wide spectrum of management issues related to grand challenges. As researchers are increasingly combining these theoretical perspectives to address emerging topics including grand challenges (e.g., Jarzabkowski et al., 2019, 2022) or new forms of organizing that embrace economic, ecological, and social goals simultaneously (e.g., Gümüsay et al., 2020; Smith & Besharov, 2019), we found it timely to facilitate this conversation to illuminate how future research can make theoretically insightful and practically relevant contributions. We also discussed including other perspectives, which are as important for research on grand challenges. However, we ultimately placed our focus on the chosen lenses because, in our view, these lenses are particularly present in interdisciplinary debates in current research, and we were convinced that this would appeal to a broad audience of established as well as young scholars who will be inspired by our panel.

The Relevance of the Three Lenses in the Context of Societal Challenges

Institutional, paradox, and practice theories provide helpful concepts and insights to advance understanding of strategies for managing grand challenges: In institutional theory, one key concept is the notion of institutional logics defined as "socially constructed, historical pattern of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality" (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 804). An institutional logics perspective helps us reflect on taken-for-granted premises in society and to see how they are being challenged by the climate crisis. For instance, creating new patterns that follow a logic of climate change may contradict the current market logic that has been dominant for centuries (Schüßler et al., 2023). Reflecting on such taken-for-granted premises in society can help us decipher the struggles and complexities of developing strategies to address grand challenges (see, e.g., Ansari et al., 2013; Gümüsay et al., 2020).

The notion of paradoxes, often defined as "persistent contradictions between interdependent elements" (Schad et al., 2016, p. 5) provides a specific view on persistent contradictions or tensions associated with economic, social, and ecological issues (Van der Byl et al., 2020). Inspired by the idea that contradictions and inconsistencies are not necessarily faults or problems but can be opportunities for learning, transformation, and creative solutions, paradox research provides insights into approaches to managing grand challenges by accounting for their paradoxical complexity (Smith et al., 2017).

The concept of practice offers a fine-grained view on how practices or action patterns are reproduced through concrete social and linguistic actions without reducing actions to individual agency (Whittington, 1996). This concept helps researchers to develop a deep understanding of how strategies in response to grand challenges are enacted in context in order to account for their social embeddedness (Hengst et al., 2020).

The application of these three theories to grand challenges research (Besharov et al., 2019) led us (the organizers) to assume that the selected lenses might be combined fruitfully. Prior research beyond the theme of grand challenges and sustainability has demonstrated that combinations of selected lenses can enable scholars to develop insightful theories (Kokshagina et al., 2023; Krautzberger et al., 2021; Putnam et al., 2016).

Inspired by these reflections on the literature, we brought together three scholars who have been particularly influential in shaping how we conduct research on grand challenges using institutional, practice, and paradox theory in our field: Shahzad (Shaz) Ansari, Natalie Slawinski, and Eero Vaara. We invited Ann Langley to moderate the session because of her expertise in engaging with these theories in her multiple roles as co-editor of the journal *Strategic Organization* and as a member of the editorial review board of the *Academy of Management Journal* (AMJ). Table 1 provides an overview of the three key participants and some of their contributions to the literature on grand challenges.

We have written this paper to accompany the symposium and make it accessible beyond the AOM Annual Meeting. Based on transcripts from the symposium and the panelists' presentation materials, we have integrated the panelists' prepared remarks and interactive discussion into two sections: an introduction by each scholar to her or his own approach to theorizing grand challenges, including their personal reflections on comparing and contrasting the three theories; and answers to questions posed by the moderator and the audience during the symposium. We conclude by summarizing insights gleaned from the symposium about the potentials of combining institutional, practice, and paradox theory to

Table 1. Overview of the Participants and Selected Contributions on Grand Challenges.

	Shahzad (Shaz) Ansari	Ann Langley	Natalie Slawinski	Eero Vaara
Biography	Shahzad (Shaz) Ansari is a Professor of Strategy and Innovation at Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, an Honorary Professor at UCL, UK, and a Visiting Faculty at Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University.	Ann Langley is an Emerita Professor at HEC Montréal and a Distinguished Research Environment Professor at the University of Warwick.	Natalie Slawinski is Professor of Sustainability and Strategy, Director of the Centre for Social and Sustainable Innovation at the Gustavson School of Business, University of Victoria, and Adjunct Professor at the Faculty of Business, Memorial University.	Eero Vaara is a Professor of Organizations and Impact at Saïd Business School University of Oxford and a Visiting Distinguished Professor at Aalto University.
Key Works	Purdy, J., Ansari, S., & Gray, B. (2019). Are logics enough? Framing as an alternative tool for understanding institutional meaning making. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *28*(4), 409–419. Gray, B., Purdy, J., & Ansari, S. (2015). From interactions to institutions: Microprocesses of framing and mechanisms for the structuring of institutional fields. *Academy of Management Review*, *40*(1), 115–143. Ansari, S. M., Wijen, F., & Gray, B. (2013). Averting the "tragedy of the commons": An institutional perspective on the construction and governance of transnational commons. *Organization Science*, *24*(4), 1014–1040. Vermeulen, P. Ansari, S., & Lounsbury, M. (2016). Understanding "failed" markets: Conflicting logics and dissonance in attempts to price the priceless child. Article in *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. May 2016. Castro, A., & Ansari, S. (2017). Contextual "readiness" for institutional work. a study of the fight against corruption in Brazil. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *26*(4), 351–365.	Klag, M., & Langley, A. (2023). When everything interacts with everything else: Intervening in messes. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *37*(1), 37–54. Bansal, P., Reinecke, J., Suddaby, R., & Langley, A. (2022). Temporal work: The strategic organization of time. *Strategic Organization*, *20*(1), 6–19. Langley, A. (2021). What is "this" a case of? Generative theorizing for disruptive times, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *30*(3), 251–258. Kouamé, S., & Langley, A. (2018). Relating microprocesses to macro-outcomes in qualitative strategy process and practice research, *Strategic Management Journal*, *39*(3), 559–581. Lewis, M., Smith, W., Jarzabkowski, P., & Langley, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Oxford handbook of organizational paradox: Approaches to plurality, tensions and contradictions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Vaara, E., & Langley, A. (2021). Communicative perspectives on strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*, *19*(4), 541–552.	Slawinski, N., & Bansal, P. (2015). Short on time: Intertemporal tensions in business sustainability. *Organization Science*, *26*(2), 531–549. Slawinski, N., Winsor, B., Mazutis, D., Schouten, J. W., & Smith, W. K. (2021). Managing the paradoxes of place to foster regeneration. *Organization & Environment*, *34*(4), 595–618. Carmine, S., Andriopoulos, C., Gotsi, M., Härtel, C. E. J., Keller, J., Krzeminska, A., Mafico, N., Pradies, C., Raza, H., Raza-Ullah, T., Schrage, S. Sharma, G., Slawinski, N., Stadtler, L., Tunarosa, A., Winther-Hansen, C., & Keller, J. (2021). A paradox approach to organizational tensions during the pandemic crisis. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *30*(2), 138–153. Van der Byl, C., Slawinski, N., & Hahn, T. (2020). Responsible management of sustainability tensions: A paradoxical approach to grand challenges. In Laasch, O., Jamali, D., Freeman, E., & Suddaby, E. (Eds.), *The research handbook of responsible management* (pp. 438–452). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.	Vaara, E., & Fritsch, L. (2022). Strategy as language and communication: Theoretical and methodological advances and avenues for the future in strategy process and practice research. *Strategic Management Journal*, *43*(6), 1170–1181. Kohtamäki, M., Whittington, R., Vaara, E., & Rabetino, R. (2022). Making connections: Harnessing the diversity of strategy-as-practice research. International *Journal of Management Reviews*, *24*(2), 210–232. Vaara, E., & Lamberg, J.-A. (2016). Taking historical embeddedness seriously: Three approaches to advance strategy process and practice research. *Academy of Management Review*, *41*, 633–657. Vaara, E., & Durand, R. (2012). How to make strategy research connect with broader issues that matter? *Strategic Organization*, *10*(3), 248–255. Golsorkhi, D., Rouleau, L., Seidl, D., & Vaara, E. (2015). *Cambridge handbook of strategy as practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

overcome limitations of different lenses, such as infusing materiality in the symbolic sphere of institutional theory. In this context, we also highlight types of materiality (e.g., emissions, waste, viruses) that may influence grand challenges, and need to be incorporated into our theorizing. We hope that the ideas developed during this conversation will spur future research at the intersection of institutional, practice, and paradox theories on the topic of grand challenges.

Introduction of Practice Theory, Paradox Theory, and Institutional Theory

Practice Theory: Eero Vaara

I'm really pleased to have this opportunity to talk about practice-based perspectives, and my intention is to zoom in on SAP research. While doing so, I also want to emphasize that institutional theory and paradox approaches are very fruitful perspectives that can be combined with practice-based approaches. I am going to start by highlighting a few critical aspects about SAP research. In particular, I will focus on the strengths and weaknesses in terms of where we are with SAP research, with a reference to a recent review essay (Kohtamäki et al., 2022). So I'm going to do a very simplistic presentation of some of the pros and cons from this angle. As to the strengths: First, looking back to what SAP research has been and how it's been developing, we've come a long way in terms of increasing theoretical sophistication in drawing from and applying different practice theories, of which we each have our favorites. This is very different from when SAP started, and I think SAP is now a really vibrant area per se and one that informs us about practice-based perspectives overall. Second, the other point I think is great with SAP is that it has placed practical relevance "high up in its agenda." Many other theories and discussions try to formulate implications or practical pieces of advice in terms of how to succeed in changing the world, but they tend to remain relatively high level or even vague. In contrast, SAP has the advantage of a detailed focus on the concrete practices of decision-making and actions. That is a great strength in terms of practical relevance. Third—and unlike what it was in the beginning and what some other people have said—there is a fair bit of a critical stream of thinking in SAP, addressing issues of inclusion/exclusion, transparency, sustainability or ethics (e.g., Golsorkhi et al., 2015) which is very helpful for research on grand challenges and wicked problems about the environment.

As to the weaknesses, there is not much on interorganizational strategy work as a part of strategizing. There are some scholars moving in this direction, but it is fair to say that most of the research is basically looking at what's happening within an organization. And that is a major limitation in terms of dealing with bigger issues that matter. Because that of course usually requires engagement by a number of stakeholders (see, e.g., Ferraro et al., 2015). Second, there is also a lack of analysis of organizational networks and collective action in general, as well as very little in-depth reflection about collective action and its requirements, which is a limitation in this field of research. And last, I am afraid that we also tend to reproduce this very conventional traditional model of decision-making and action, which is basically what companies were doing 200 years ago.

I don't have any magic solutions but I'm next going to highlight key streams of research and trajectories of work that have emerged and that I see as particularly valuable and promising, especially in view of trying to better understand how we can deal with the bigger issues that matter. Not surprisingly, I'm going to first flag (1) *language and communication*, and then continue with (2) *attention in strategy work*, (3) *strategy work in networks and social movements*, and close with (4) *practice-driven institutional and tension analysis*.

1) *Language and communication in strategy work.* A lot can be gained by going further with analysis of the narratives we share and spread, as well as the various kinds of discourses that often reflect the ideological assumptions that people have about, not only the topics per se, but also about the models of decision-making that we should be applying or implementing. More specifically, dialogue is the key word, and there's also a lot of research on dialogue in other areas that we haven't been tapping into too. Of course, nowadays a lot of this is happening in the environment of social media and relatively new technologies that are developed all the time. Again, I don't think that SAP research has been fully looking into how the world has changed, and how we could change the world with these technologies.

In our joint piece published in Strategic Organization (Vaara & Langley, 2021), we had the opportunity to draw together a number of brilliant pieces of work which take communication seriously in the context of strategic organization. Some of the pieces are more, and some of the pieces are less relevant in terms of our question today. But there's a lot to be gained also from the point of view of very innovative theoretical-methodological perspectives taken. There is another piece in *Strategic Management Journal* (SMJ) where I also had the opportunity to look at what is published in SMJ (Vaara & Fritsch, 2022) including several exciting pieces of work that could be interesting for people who want to dig deeper into the role of communication to better understand strategizing in today's world.

2) *Attention in strategy work.* The second stream of research I want to highlight is *attention in strategy work*. There's a lot of work on attention in applied psychology but also

more and more in institutional and organization research, including some pieces linking strategy and attention together (Ocasio et al., 2018). We could gain a lot if we applied attention-based perspectives not only to understand what's going on inside particular organizations but also looking at attention across organizations. I think there are emerging concepts such as strategizing networks that could be helpful precisely in order to understand how we can together make the world a better place. This leads me to my next agenda point.

3) *Strategy work in networks and social movements.* There is a great deal of research on networks and social movements. Unfortunately, SAP has been lagging behind in terms of benefiting from these traditions. However, *open strategy* has emerged as an exciting new topic area. Open strategy is defined as "dynamic bundle of practices that affords internal and external actors' greater strategic transparency and/or inclusion" (Hautz et al., 2017, pp. 298–299). This is a particularly promising angle to understand how to deal with these questions that go beyond particular companies or organizations. I encourage those doing open strategy research to broaden the scope beyond individual organizations to networks of organizations.
4) *Practice-driven institutional and tension analysis.* I want to finish off by saying that I naturally think that practice-based perspectives can be and should be combined with institutional analysis. Some talk about practice-driven institutionalism which is similar to practice-based analysis. Connecting a detailed analysis of practices with broader issues of institutional change would help us a great deal to better understand the processes and mechanisms of change, and to comprehend how particular practices, especially practices of decision-making and strategizing enable or impede change. Finally, paradoxical tensions are also very closely related to a practice-based angle when analyzing tensions and struggles and how to deal with them.

Paradox Theory: Natalie Slawinski

I am delighted to talk about paradox as an important lens for strategizing for a better world. Of course, we are all familiar with the sustainable development goals (SDGs) which were launched by the United Nations in 2015. We know that they are meant to give us some very tangible goals and targets to work toward to achieve a more sustainable world by 2030, but we also know that we're woefully behind and not on target for achieving those goals. The pandemic has slowed us down even more toward achieving those goals. What is important here is to note that whatever we call them, whether we call them grand challenges or sustainability issues, these are uniformly characterized as complex and interconnected. These issues are not separate from each other, they are very complex and uncertain. We don't know what the consequences are even if we do act on them, and we don't know how our actions to address them will unfold. They are wicked: when we find solutions often those solutions cause new problems. For example, with climate change, we install wind turbines to reduce our carbon emissions, and those kill birds and create health problems. So these are not easy issues to tackle, and they're rife with tensions.

So that is the important point that I'm really going to focus on today: how these issues are full of tensions and paradoxes, and why a paradox lens is an important theory with which to examine these issues. We also need to understand how we can apply different strategies as individuals, as organizations, and as institutions, to navigate these challenges and get to a more sustainable world. So I will be promoting paradox theory because I do think it's an important lens that provides fruitful opportunities to be combined with institutional and practice lenses.

I will start by highlighting the work of Wendy Smith and Marianne Lewis (Lewis & Smith, 2022; Smith & Lewis, 2011). In a nutshell, paradox theory provides insights into the nature and the management of tensions and paradoxes, defined as "contradictory yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time" (Lewis & Smith, 2022; Smith & Lewis, 2011, p. 382). One of the important points is that contradictory elements are interrelated; we may perceive them as being separate, but they are in some ways interrelated. And they don't go away; they persist even as we try to solve them. So even as we try to address climate change, with its inherent tensions, by for example installing a wind turbine, further tensions emerge out of that, and so they don't go away easily, and they do persist over time. Within the dynamic equilibrium model, tensions can be latent, and they can be salient (see Smith & Lewis, 2011). There are factors that render tensions salient, including environmental factors such as plurality, change and scarcity, and also actors' paradoxical cognition. Once they are made salient, they can be addressed, and there are different ways to address paradoxical tensions including accepting, embracing and working through the tensions (Lewis et al., 2017).

There are, however, a number of barriers to embracing paradoxes, including individual-level factors such as emotional anxiety and defensiveness, and organizational factors such as inertia. A common reaction people may have to paradoxes is to feel defensive about them. When we bring opposites together and try to pull them together, it may be uncomfortable. It may create some defensiveness, some anxiety, and as a result, people, organizations, or institutions may ignore them or treat them as an either-or choice. However, paradox theory argues that when we pull these poles together, when we juxtapose opposites and engage with, and work through paradoxes, we can get to more

sustainable solutions. That said, we can also take a critical perspective and argue that trying to embrace paradoxes is not always going to lead to better or more creative outcomes. There are dark sides as well that we need to study.

So, I want to talk about tensions within societal challenges or sustainability challenges with regards to (1) *temporal tensions*, (2) *tensions between local needs and global pressures*, (3) *tensions between competition and collaboration*, and close with forms of organizing designed to address societal issues that face (4) *tensions between social and financial demands*.

1) *Addressing poverty and climate change surface temporal tensions.* There have been a number of studies over the years that have looked at some of these tensions around temporality, such as short term versus long term or clock time versus process time. Here, I am thinking about the work by Juliane Reinecke and Shaz Ansari looking at fair trade organizations to address poverty (Reinecke & Ansari, 2015). In my own research with Tima Bansal (Slawinski & Bansal, 2015), we looked at oil and gas companies, how they address climate change, and how that surfaces temporal tensions. We reveal how some organizations engage with those tensions in a more paradoxical way, which we called "temporal ambidexterity," and how others choose to keep them as separate and take a very kind of linear approach to those tensions.
2) *Regional inequality reveals tensions between local needs and global pressures.* If you look at regional inequality as a societal challenge, I'm thinking here of the work of Suntae Kim and Anna Kim where they looked at Detroit and efforts to revitalize it (Kim & Kim, 2022). In my own work with colleagues, including Wendy Smith, on Fogo Island, we reveal tensions that arise when a social enterprise is trying to revitalize a community that was hit hard by the collapse of the cod fishery (Slawinski et al., 2021). Those tensions arise between local needs and global pressures and social enterprises can address those place-based paradoxes using various practices that spur better outcomes for the organization and the community.
3) *Collaborating for the goals surfaces tensions between competition and collaboration.* Speaking of interorganizational relations and networks, as Eero was just talking about, it's important to think about those arrangements as surfacing all kinds of tensions, including between competition and collaboration. We may like to think that cross-sector collaborations prioritize collaboration, but actually they face competitive pressures, competitive behaviors, territorialism, etc. How do we navigate that tension between competition and cooperation to get to more effective interorganizational networks and relationships, to address these societal issues that do require interorganizational approaches? Some papers have begun to address this coopetition paradox in the context of interorganizational arrangements (Bowen et al., 2018; Stadtler & Van Wassenhove, 2016).
4) *Many forms of organizing that address societal issues face a tension between social and financial demands.* As a final example, there has been quite a lot of research on hybrid organizing, social enterprises, and community entrepreneurship and how those forms of organizing to address societal issues often face a tension between social and economic demands, needs, and pressures (Battilana & Lee, 2014; Smith & Besharov, 2019). Paradox theory allows us to examine how hybrid organizations work through these tensions to arrive at more productive outcomes.

Coming back to the topic of this panel and what future research can do to address the paradoxes within societal challenges, some studies have examined how to navigate paradoxes in service of transformation and in service of system-level change, which of course we need to get to if we're going to address these big messy wicked societal challenges. There has been quite a bit of research already on paradox and sustainability, for example, by Tobias Hahn and colleagues (Hahn et al., 2014, 2015), by Katrin Heucher and colleagues on SDGs and paradox (Williams et al., 2021) and by me with my co-author Connie Van der Byl on sustainability paradoxes (Van der Byl & Slawinski, 2015). These are growing areas of research. I would say that we can't talk about strategizing for a better world without talking about how to address the paradoxes and tensions that exist within these societal issues. While there has been a significant amount of research directed at how to respond to these paradoxes, meaning how to manage and navigate them, there is a need to unpack the more micro approaches or responses—including the role of cognition (Miron-Spektor et al., 2018; Smith & Tushman, 2005) and emotions (Lewis, 2000; Pradies, 2023; Vince & Broussine, 1996)—as well as the structures that can be employed within organizations and within interorganizational networks in order to address these paradoxes at a macro level (Andriopoulos & Lewis, 2009; Smith, 2014). Another area of future research are the practices and processes that can be embraced to address paradoxes since they are very much dynamic. Ann Langley's work on process studies is really important for understanding how to address paradoxes (Farjoun et al., 2018) and how different strategies can address the dynamism of these paradoxes (e.g., Clegg et al., 2022).

To finish up, I want to thank the organizers, because if it weren't for this session, I don't know if I would have dug so deeply into how to combine these different theories. And now I'm seeing all kinds of possibilities in my own research for how to bring in more of a practice and/or institutional lens together with paradox theory: Thinking about the intersectionality between paradox and practice lenses, discourse and dialogue come up immediately because as Eero was saying, the SAP lens revolves around this idea of dialogue,

discourse, and communications. Paradoxes emerge through discourse and dialogue as well (see, e.g., Putnam et al., 2016; Vaara & Langley, 2021), so there's a real opportunity to combine those lenses to address tensions and paradoxes within sustainability issues. Both also deal with dynamic models (Jarzabkowski, 2004; Whittington, 2006) as well as interorganizational approaches (Jarzabkowski et al., 2022), and I will echo what was said earlier, that SAP lends itself really well to practical implications, which I would say is absolutely also the case with paradox theory.

Paradox and institutional theories have already been combined in many ways, especially around this idea of institutional logics, which of course overlaps with paradoxical tensions (see, e.g., Besharov & Smith, 2014). Shaz has written about commons logic versus the markets logic (Ansari et al., 2013). When you look at these different logics they are often in tension with one another and so, here there's another opportunity for paradox theory to help us understand their interrelationships, how those logics collide, how they can be better navigated (Hoffman, 2011; Slawinski et al., 2017). Ultimately paradox theory in combination with institutional theory can help us understand how to shift logics toward more of a commons logic that helps us get to a better world.

Institutional Theory: Shahzad (Shaz) Ansari

I was asked to talk about institutional theory and reflect on some of the work I did on institutional theory and grand challenges (e.g., Ansari et al., 2011, 2013; Wijen & Ansari, 2007). While I've also been critical of the theory more recently, I still see a lot more promise. The point of those papers was to extend the conversations, and there's of course a lot of stuff that still needs to be done. You mentioned paradoxical tensions, you mentioned the bottom-up emergence of logics, these are just a few of the many avenues for future research. I will revisit some of the work that I did with Barbara Gray. Especially, I will talk about one paper which is on "Averting the tragedy of the commons" (Ansari et al., 2013), and how a commons logic emerged and took hold in the field of climate change, both drawing from and extending institutional theory more broadly.

I would also like to point you to a special issue that Eero did on connecting the micro with the macro in AMR and I contributed to that by developing theory on the link between interactions (interactional framing) and institutions (Gray et al., 2015). There are a lot of different perspectives in trying to connect more micro views with institutional theory through the lens of interactional framing and other micro theories such as identity or decision-making to examine "institutions at the coalface" (Barley, 2008; Powell & Colyvas, 2008). These approaches try to be bi-directional and connect the micro with the macro, or top-down perspectives with bottom-up perspectives.

Generally, institutional theory has its strengths in understanding the symbolic and discursive construction of meaning in creating, maintaining, and changing institutions. Therefore, institutional theory is a useful foil to study climate change, not just as a physical phenomenon but also as a socially constructed and contested terrain subject to competing cultural and social definitions and narratives. This enables us to study the conflicting institutional demands from different stakeholders that generate conflicting logics within organizations and across fields. As such, institutional theory contributes to our understanding on how divergent perspectives among dissenting actors can be reconciled for collective endeavors (a commons problem), and how grand challenges are understood and addressed as a shared responsibility, a common plight where fates are interconnected, rather than by labeling them as someone else's problem or by finger pointing at culpable others.

On the downside, the weakness of institutional theory is the scant attention accorded to materiality at the expense of illuminating the symbolic and the discursive underpinnings of institutions. Theoretical work, for example, has defined material practices as organizational structures known through symbolic processes (Thornton et al., 2012). Materiality, in a broader understanding, encompasses the physical setting or material circumstances in which organizing (e.g., for grand challenges) takes place; and the material artifacts and technologies that people have at their disposal (e.g., Cornelissen et al., 2014). Scholars have criticized various studies for reducing materiality to social understandings and social processes (see, e.g., Boxenbaum et al., 2015; Leonardi & Barley, 2008; Orlikowski & Scott, 2008). In the context of grand challenges, the materiality of the environment in particular tends to be still neglected.

In our work on the commons logic in institutional theory (Ansari et al., 2013), the question that puzzled me and my co-authors is: Where do field-level logics come from? We usually talk about logics as being out there to be leveraged or freely mixed and matched, but what is the bottom-up or the micro-processes through which any logic emerges and stabilizes? I often have these arguments with Willy Ocasio, Pat Thornton, and others about why we do not have for example a green or a human development logic yet? Does the community logic necessarily subsume these other possible wannabe logics? And I got some good answers from them in terms of how long the "big seven" institutions of family, religion, capitalism, markets, etc. have been around for, but why not the green as an eighth one that arguably has also been around well before the environmental movement?

So we started our work by asking: What is a commons logic? Well, put very simply: Only a few decades ago, we used to think of the atmosphere as a dump that we could endlessly pollute with no repercussions. Where we used to be more concerned was smoke pollutants, something that was visible to everyone. The whole idea of greenhouse gas was

not really on people's radar, because it was invisible. This began to change with the Brundtland report in the seventies warning us about greenhouse gasses. So there was simply a lack of awareness that we depend on the atmosphere and that our actions affect the atmosphere. In that sense, the idea of commons logic was simply to now treat the atmosphere as a degradable or vulnerable commons affected by human activities.

Here is where we are trying to differentiate, building on the foundational work of Elinor Ostrom on the commons. However, the view that there is a commons that exists is arguably an essentialist one. In contrast, we argue that "commons" is a way of thinking about something that we recognize as vulnerable in order to acknowledge our interdependencies—for example, global health, global finance, or global security can also be thought as a commons. While we're not saying that there *is* a commons logic in these issues, we propose that there *can* be a commons logic that emerges as a bottom-up logic, which is different from an essentialist perception of commons being out there and recognized as such. For instance, we do not treat finance as a commons, but if we did, we could potentially reduce financial arbitrage, tax avoidance, and other financial misconduct.

We developed this idea looking at the Kyoto Protocol and how different people shifted their radically different positions about an issue that mattered to everyone. For example, Greenpeace used to hate market mechanisms. But they came around to agreeing to a market measure (e.g., carbon trading) because they felt that "well the train has left the station" and that they needed to be on it to remain relevant in addressing climate change. The interesting thing was that emissions trading started at one company, British Petroleum (BP) and then got diffused to the EU level, and even globally. We call this "catalytic amplification": Something that started inside an oil company, ironically, later on, became a widely institutionalized mechanism of emissions trading. Although it remains polemic and there are still controversies around the "gaming" of carbon trading, it has become a major market mechanism.

The three criteria of a commons logic we identified are (1) *key issue stakeholders need to construct an issue as a collective problem in which they see their fates as correlated and interconnected*, (2) *key stakeholders need to acknowledge their complicity in creating the commons problem rather than blame others*, and (3) *key stakeholders need to reach an agreement about how to collectively remedy the problem*. These criteria are applicable to various societal challenges, be it the climate change crisis or the pandemic. For example, during the pandemic, we repeatedly exhorted: "We are not safe until everyone is safe." We called for an acknowledgment of a societal problem as one where we recognize our common destiny, our interconnected fate, and our interdependencies. For the climate change crisis, we still need to perceive our own behavior as both a source of the problem and a potential solution to the problem. It is not just about blaming the energy companies or the mining companies for the climate change crisis but also recognizing our collective complicity—the enemy is not just others but "us" as well, for example, with our own consumption patterns, as illustrated by cartoonist Walt Kelly's character Pogo, who asserted, "We have met the enemy and he is us." We need to acknowledge that we and our lifestyles are part of that very system in which those companies thrive and are sustained. It's important to recognize our interconnectedness in that particular space, about how the atmosphere is blind to human-made national boundaries or borders when it comes to emissions. A holistic approach will be a key consideration in reaching an agreement about how to collectively remedy the problem, which clearly hasn't happened in the case of climate change where we still lack universal collective action, despite ominous developments in shifting weather patterns, and increase in climate refugees. Therefore, in our work, we looked at the conflicts of interest to understand how you get people with very polarized views to come on board and reach a workable agreement that makes us go forward. Obviously, it doesn't help to simply tell them "you're wrong" and "we're right or now you should slow down economic development because it harms the environment." You don't get people to agree on something they are strongly against through finger-pointing and accusations. You rather need to reach an agreement on how to collectively remedy the issue, which if neglected will simply be catastrophic and suicidal for everyone.

These three conditions of a commons logic apply to grand challenges and beyond: Wikipedia, the internet, and other forms of sharing information have diffused as a commons knowledge logic around the world. I know, Wikipedia is not always accurate, there are issues of unverified entries, but the idea that knowledge is jointly produced and consumed by people, by contributors, is an example of a commons model that has emerged. Last, there are interesting examples of a global financial commons. A really nice paper by Goldin and Vogel (2010), for example, argues that the reason why it's so hard to contain tax avoidance and evasion, black market, or illicit money is because we lack this commons logic in global finance. We have these issues that people can use arbitrage, move their money, open offshore accounts, exploit tax havens, etc. and there is a lack of that common standard. Some of the issues that we can't resolve in the financial realm is because of this fragmentation and lack of a commons approach. Think about toxic assets, systemic risks, and illegal financial flows. The Interpol that tries to have a commons logic in security doesn't mean the police all over the world effectively cooperates but that's because the logic hasn't stabilized. It would be so much more efficient if security was shared to the degree, it would solve or even prevent problems globally rather than again looking at them very locally or nationally. The most recent example of course is global health. I think there's probably

not a better time to talk about a need for a commons approach. It doesn't help to just get vaccinated in the developed world and just let Africa somehow manage the crisis on its own.

Barbara Gray was mentioning this morning in her distinguished speech and the respective article published out of it in this journal that we have to think beyond the self and get to "we-thinking" which is a commons approach (Gray, 2023). Even in the strategy area, they're calling for a more eco-centric rather than an ego-centric approach. I'm doing some work on platforms and ecosystems where we develop an approach on mutualism or "lift all boats" approach as against a "winner takes all" approach (Khanagha et al., 2022). Such an eco-centric approach is much more about this collective value rather than these very narrowly focused approaches about how do I maximize value as an individual firm, exploit everybody else, etc. We believe that this idea of a commons logic, how it emerges, gains traction, picks up momentum, and diffuses in different ways (Ansari et al., 2010) is an exciting area for both research and practice to collectively tackle the grand challenges that we confront.

Practice Theory, Paradox Theory, and Institutional Theory in Conversation

Limitations of Concepts and Theories

Ann: "Grand challenges" is an important topic. There are so many ways to look at them. Three different ways of looking at grand challenges or wicked problems were introduced, and there are others. So I'm going to invite our panelists to react to the first question I have, which is: What is missing with the theories you are proposing?

Shaz: I think what's missing in institutional theory is the role of materiality. For example, actor–network theory (ANT) does a better job at that than institutional theory. ANT is characterized by a broader understanding of an actor as someone or something who acts, attributes or is attributed agency by others, giving agency to both, humans and non-humans (Callon, 1990; Latour, 1996, 2005). From an ANT perspective, grand challenges could more fruitfully be studied as a social praxis entangled in material formations of humans (e.g., key stakeholders) and non-humans (e.g., the atmosphere). The symbolic and discursive focus of institutional theory acknowledges but elides over the material dimension. People have also argued about the limited attention to power barring a few exceptions (Gray et al., 2022; Martí & Fernandez, 2013; Munir, 2015).

Natalie: What's missing in paradox theory as it relates to grand challenges is that I don't think it has engaged enough with theories of sustainability that go beyond just how organizations address sustainability tensions. So I think sustainability has to be broader than just thinking about it from an organizational lens. I think we need to engage with theories from the natural sciences and also take more of a systems view.

Eero: Maybe I could add one thing. I'm thinking about practice theories which I think have offered means to address agency or the micro part, leading to a lot of great research for instance in strategy-as-practice focusing on the micro level. However, we haven't been so successful with the more macro or structure part.

Marc: Based on Natalie's comment, I think also what might be important is that we make a lot of normative assumptions about how we should manage societal challenges. So we may not only engage with theories from natural science but also from ethics. If we apply paradox theory and assume that tensions among sustainability goals are persistent and we might not solve these grand societal problems like climate change, we need to think about how we can live with them from an ethical perspective.

Shaz: I agree, as Wendy's (Wendy Smith) work has shown it's not like you need to solve this issue in a definitive way. It's rather about a mindset, about thinking bold and living with those tensions. It's not like eliminating them, even if you get a commons logic for that matter.

Tim (Hargrave): One thing that worries me about paradox theory is that we don't always ground research in the phenomenon. We tend to think about the public versus private paradox, or stakeholders and shareholders, or long term and short term. That's not exactly the lived experience of the people. I'm wondering if a practice-based approach can be the connection here. A practice-based approach could help the paradox folks ground the phenomenon for the research on paradox challenges.

Eero: From the practice side, I think you nailed it. I think that's what I'm struggling to say: that here's a big risk that we as scholars are imposing our frameworks. To me that's an argument *for* the practice perspective.

Natalie: I would add that this raises another kind of gap or opportunity to advance paradox theory, or maybe it's more of a way to avoid pitfalls if you're working on paradox and you are trying to publish in this space. I think it's important to really show that you're actually talking about the phenomenon of paradoxes. If you think your informants have the lived experience of working through and navigating paradoxes, you have to work hard to show that. Otherwise it looks like you're imposing your theoretical lens of paradox theory onto your informants. It's really important to be very careful when you are theorizing, especially if you are doing inductive work and you are looking at the lived experience of your participants. Are they really experiencing temporal tensions and paradoxes? Or are we imposing that on them? Are we just theorizing it and looking for it, or is it really their lived experience? Being rigorous and making sure that you really are seeing paradox in the data and that you engage very deeply with the data before imposing a paradox lens on it too quickly is important.

Wendy (Smith): Tim, I love that question and I think you're asking a phenomenological, theoretical, and methodological question. Natalie is speaking to the methodological pieces, so if you were studying tensions, to what extent are you seeing discourse and the way that people are talking about paradox and to what extent are you, as Natalie is saying, imposing paradox. When I look around this room and think about some of the really interesting research that people are working on, I think that empirically and phenomenologically some of the research in which people are exploring discourses of paradox, I think there's a lot more to do around that. Work that really looks at how people are using the language or the ideas of paradox, and the word paradox. Natalie and I have been doing this research on Fogo Island, and the language of paradox comes out. So I think there's an interesting empirical question about *when* do people use this language? This is where practice becomes incredibly powerful as a tool to inform this conversation: When do they use this language, how do they use this language, and *what impact* does it have on their organizing and their ability to collaborate and to navigate these tensions? Natalie's work on long term/short term with Tima Bansal (Slawinski & Bansal, 2015) is an interesting piece here that was very much about the language and the mindsets that people were using to impact how they actually organized around climate change in these oil companies. So I think there's an interesting empirical point and I do think that's a place of continued work going forward.

Participant 1 (name unknown): When thinking about what is missing in the theory, you're proposing that something *is* missing in your theory. My question is what has *not* been explained in other theories that they need SAP to explain? What can they learn from practice theory?

Eero: I think that's a very important and fundamental question that goes even beyond this discussion of today. I do believe that there is also a great opportunity to contribute to these other trajectories of work like social movements because in some ways social movements have not so much considered what's going on in terms of more formal or informal practices or strategy making. So that's my easy answer to your great question.

Participant 2 (name unknown): To take up from where Eero left. SAP scholars would have to look at what's changing the practice, or what's evolving the practice, what's affecting the practice. And if we limit our attention only to the cognitive or only to the conscious, there will be a limitation because really all phenomena are quite significantly impacted by unconscious processes. We could cover this ground of how the unconscious processes are affecting the evolution of SAP.

Eero: Let me just say that that's a great idea. I don't claim to be an expert in that but I think that that's clearly a limitation.

Materiality

Ann: I would really like us to think more about materiality. Grand challenges themselves are often concerned with the planet, which is material. How can we integrate considerations of materiality more into our efforts to address or intervene in those kinds of issues? I would like you to say something about how materiality fits with your theories. I notice that you are all discussing various kinds of communicative or cognitive approaches, whether expressed as framing, discourse, or a paradox mindset. Can we get outside that and start to talk about materiality?

Natalie: Jennifer Brenton and I conducted research on a series of dialogues that we run in rural Newfoundland and Labrador where we engage with place and the materiality of the place in order to break down barriers to participation, so that participants will find more common ground with each other (Brenton & Slawinski, 2023). And the way that we do that is through organizing experiential activities like doing squid paintings and physically touching squid, touching things that are of that place in rural coastal Newfoundland in order to spark conversations and collaboration and get them really thinking. The thinking that they're doing and the collaborating that participants engage in is in part enabled by the materiality of the place and deliberately engaging with that place, including with its traditions and culture and the natural environment. For example, participants experience traditional food by smelling and tasting it; they listen to the music; and walk in nature. Those experiences of engaging with the materiality of the place break down some of the barriers that exist when you bring different sectors together, different actors together to collaborate and work together.

Eero: I'm just thinking about SAP research and I think there's a lot that we have learned about materiality in the first place, so I think it's a really great example in this one sense that people have been studying different tools in strategizing or the ways in which space has an impact on decision making. And this is one type. But I am getting at this other type of materiality, when I am thinking about the bigger issues at play in this panel today. The big stakes that we have with climate change, for instance, or the points made about money. And I think it's that kind of materiality, that is safe to say, SAP has not really been addressing. Or it is part of the empirical context at times, but we have not really been getting into it.

Shaz: I would concur, I mean Institutional Theory has not seriously taken on materiality. A theory is not good at everything nor needs to be. It is more about meaning, symbols—the core of Institutional Theory more broadly, of framing research more broadly. But I point to an interesting paper that is forthcoming in AMJ by Maxim Voronov and colleagues (Voronov et al., 2023). They take up the notion of authenticity and how our understanding of the entities is shaped not just by what you say and claim, by history and tradition, but also how things smell, the space, the place, the whole feelings that you get by that experience itself. And they try to unpack authenticity with the notion of materiality, taking it beyond just a discursive meaning. For example, if I go to an authentic restaurant in

Seattle, is that just based on reviews or is that you need to go there and smell and see something, get the feeling it's authentic or not. Authenticity can be an interesting take on researching grand challenges as well.

Natalie: I just wanted to say one other thing about this materiality question, because Jonathan Schad and Tima Bansal had a really interesting paradox paper which brings in systems theory. And the point of that paper is that when you're dealing with issues like the planet and climate change, the paradox you're running across is not just socially constructed (Schad & Bansal, 2018). It is real. The Planet is fighting back. I think that is an interesting way of thinking about materiality and sustainability challenges.

Impact

Rikke: I have a question for Natalie and it's about when we use paradox theory in the specific context of sustainability. I wonder if it requires that we rethink how we evaluate success or how we evaluate outcomes? I remember being turned on to Paradox theory because I read that the paradox approach will allow more *substantial business contributions to sustainable development* (Hahn et al., 2018). But most paradox research actually looks at outcomes at the organizational level, meaning, that you might quite successfully manage a paradox within your organization without actually contributing to sustainability. Therefore my question is, if you have been thinking about that, or have struggled with how we translate paradox theory to the specific context of sustainability? Because of the material nature of sustainability issues.

Natalie: Paula Jarzabkowski and her co-authors have a piece that looks at this idea of societal outcomes and engaging with paradox and looks at them as knotted (Jarzabkowski et al., 2022). I think the point is, whether using a paradox lens or any other lens—I'll speak now as a sustainability scholar: Anytime you're looking at impacts beyond the organization at a societal level, you are walking on really thin ice because it's hard to measure, to understand, to make sense of what does that even look like. The scales are enormous, the complexities are incredibly difficult to work with: So it's not just a question for paradox scholars. I think your question is actually a broader one, it's a question for anyone who does research on systemic level issues and system-level change (Gewatscht et al., 2021). And then we need to think about how different theories allow us or don't allow us to engage at that level. Eero is the one presenting research with "impact" in the title, so maybe I should pass it over.

Eero: I am in total agreement. I think, that what I'm getting out of this discussion is the realization that it's not only about impact but it's this deconstruction of impact, that we should be doing first. Because otherwise it might just lead us to the same kinds of things that we have been criticizing in terms of reproduction of thinking, about the causal logics and blame games, and other things that have been mentioned here.

Shaz: Some of you might have seen this article about a month ago in *The Economist* (2022). It's incredibly critical for a journal like *The Economist*. And the simple point they're making is that you need to look at the paradoxical tensions that sometimes arise between the E, S, and the G (Environmental, Social, Governance). For example, Tesla gets high marks for "environment" because well you have electric cars that save emissions. That is great, but they get rather poor marks for "governance." Or you might have some energy company scoring very high on "governance" and not on "environment," but they may still get a higher score than Tesla. And what the *Economist* article is proposing is to bring it down to a simple measure, something that can be judged and evaluated more objectively, which is emissions. Make each company known for its emissions! And that would be a *material* measure, I would argue. I would say that's really good stuff for academics to read, especially those who are working in the sustainability space of how they unpack the problem with the ESG reporting.

Theory and Practice

Participant 3 (name unknown): In terms of just the practicality of writing papers, we receive advice like "Choose which conversation you want to join." But how do you join a conversation when you have three theories? Is it even practical to write a paper that is bridging three major theories of organization? Or is this where you have a primary theory and then maybe some secondary ones?

Shaz: Well, they say two is good, three is a crowd, right?

Eero: I'm interested in all kinds of phenomena and questions, and I can combine things, but when I'm then working on a particular paper, there has to be a specific focus.

Natalie: The focus is clearly important! And that doesn't necessarily mean you have to exclude other theories; it's just about how you frame it. And which conversation you're entering.

Shaz: If you think about practice theory, think about the institutional perspective they have this thing called *inhabited institutions*. Tim Hallett and colleagues worked on this notion of inhabited institutions which comes closer to what practice does (see, e.g., Hallett, 2010; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Hallett et al., 2009). Not quite as micro, but you have to see that they're different conversations, sometimes different vocabularies. We are talking about similar things, but the conversations tend to differ, because of the audience, the group of scholars that are working with that particular area. So you have to be mindful of that.

Ann: I think your question is very interesting, because in a sense, it reveals the big difference between academics and practitioners. The academic has to make a contribution to theory and so we tend to just focus on one theory and maybe a little bit of another. But the practitioner just wants to know what to do! And they need to know that there are tensions, they need to know that there are frames, that there are practices. They need to

know all this stuff and they are not going to say: Just take one theory. It is a completely different world.

Shaz: There was an interesting comment from an executive MBA student who said: Business schools are designed along teaching you accounting and finance and strategy and marketing and business model classes. But building on Ann's point: could we flip this around so that you solve a problem, and the problem is the thing you need to address. So what can you get from finance, from accounting, from strategy, from marketing? All those things to address that problem. That would flip the model completely. Instead of the silos we have in terms of the different subjects we teach. We are solving problems that do not have these boundaries. It would probably take a little work changing the curriculum! But this was their idea about how we are teaching them.

Wendy (Smith): I just want to say congratulations to you guys for organizing this symposium because this is a great conversation. I think this question of how do you do interdisciplinary research is really provocative and part of the answer is where do you do it? When do you do it right? First of all what struck me is there has been a lot of thinking about the interconnections between practice, paradox and institutional theory. There has been a lot written around interdependence. You were mentioning Paula Jarzabkowski's work. But for those of you that are new to this conversation I would say look at Rebecca Bednarek, look at Jane Lee, and look at Eric Knight's and look at Ann Langley's work. There has been a lot in the intersections. And Tim Hargrave, look at your work. So much of the dialectics work looks at a practice-based approach to paradox. So, we are building on a lot there. I don't bemoan that you have to find a theoretical home in our academic papers, because what I see is the value of being able to offer some contributions that are more focused in academia, and then have the opportunity to be able to offer to the practitioner a different modality, a different channel, a different way in which you can say those things that are more interdisciplinary. I was going to say, I don't know about you guys, but my MBA students, my executive students do not read AMJ, and they're not interested in that. The question is where can we then build the argument that's more interdisciplinary for that community? There are different channels to do that, and in order to be able to effectively do that, we need the insights that are more atomistic and focused in our research. I think there's a relationship between those. So, I feel hopeful.

Participant 3: With all the issues we seem to have a pretty common understanding about what is better. But we also have to keep in mind the danger that the better can also become the worst if you just transform what is better to different meanings. So my question would be how would you say you can integrate that and make sure that it has a foundation in your theorizing?

Eero: I think it reminds us again about the importance of reflecting upon what we mean by these things. The same as with impact. I'm also thinking about what Marc said about ethics. We have philosophical discussions, but sometimes we tend to forget that there are other people who have thought about such issues from various perspectives. That could add to our tool kit.

Natalie: While we're sitting here, debating all of this, the planet is literally on fire. So I think a lot about what Shaz just said, that maybe we should just look at emissions. Maybe we should simplify this to be that climate change is happening, we need to reduce our emissions, climate scientists are telling us what the problem is and how to address it, and here we are, as social scientists, able to actually study behavioral change and how we get people to adopt different behaviors, and how to act on climate change. What would it look like if we all just focused on this very existential material problem, which is climate change? A problem that we actually have solutions for. There is agreement if you read the IPCC report. I mean, of course, there are disagreements between IPCC scientists, but they can more or less achieve a consensus around the main thrust of the problem and some of the main ways to get to solutions. So, could we focus our efforts more on solving those issues where there is less debate about the nature of the problem and how we address it to get to a more sustainable world?

Pauline: I think what has become very clear in the last 90 minutes is: we are far beyond a clear separation of theories, and the combination of theories is pervasive in our research. I think it was a great session to stimulate further research not only at the intersection of institutional, practical, and paradoxical theory on grand challenges, but even beyond. We have addressed gaps in our current research on grand challenges that result from the limitations that the theories currently impose on the phenomenon: For example, we discussed the need to address *new kinds of materialities* and our interdependencies with them—for example, we talked about the planet, the atmosphere, the virus, the fires and other materializations of grand challenges like the climate change crisis, and how they resonate or do not resonate with our organizations, institutions, and even temporal, spatial, or ethical understandings. We further discussed *new kinds of organizations*—for example, we mentioned hybrid organizations as well as networks, interorganizational collaboration or social movements, and how they require new structures, practices, and tensions such as collaboration and competition. Last, we also talked about *new kinds of outcomes*—for example, we discussed the need for new definitions of impact, organizational, social, and ecological outcomes that extend or even replace current outcomes measures that do not sufficiently address the specifics of global, interconnected and wicked problems, because, among other things, they focus too much on the individual organization and not on the big picture—or the commons problems we face.

Thank you to the panelists for sharing thoughts, ideas, and experiences, thank you to Ann for the great moderation, thank you to the audience for a lively conversation, and

thank you to my lovely co-organizers for an always joyful and energizing collaboration.

Conclusion

As organizers of this AOM panel, we were very pleased with the lively discussion, the different perspectives on the theories and their applicability to research on grand challenges, and the insights we generated together for future research. To summarize some points of this conversation: We discussed the role of *materiality* that we need more and new types of materiality in our theories to bring the planet back in. For example, Shaz mentioned ANT. Maybe we can learn from ANT, and other theories that have a different account of materiality, how to give materiality a broader space in our theorizing. Even in those theories, such as SAP, that have recently made a lot of effort in accounting for materiality, the very materialities that determine the grand challenges, such as emissions, waste, or biodiversity, can be incorporated more in our theorizing. "The planet fighting back" is a metaphor that we hope to inspire and guide future work on grand challenges, and which invites us to expand the context in which we study tensions and paradoxes beyond the constructed reality of organizations.

Furthermore, all panelists emphasized the strong need for more research on the *interorganizational level*, reflecting that grand challenges require a broad engagement by a number of stakeholders. In this context, we touched upon agency of actors, whether organized within the boundaries of a single-organization or in broader networks or ecosystems, how they get to adopt a commons logic or shared responsibility for societal problems, what tensions arise, and what practices are underlying such networks of organizations.

Concerning *limitations of concepts and theories*, we reflected on work that has already been published at the intersection of different theories, such as institutional and practice theory, or paradox and institutional theory. Combinations are fruitful in overcoming limitations of different lenses, such as too strong a focus on the symbolic and the discursive in institutional theory by integrating tensions, practice, or even an ethics lens, as suggested by Marc, to understand how thinking bold and living with those tensions that do not go away actually takes place. Similarly, we discussed how combining lenses may help us to avoid imposing our frameworks onto the phenomena. For example, integrating a practice-based approach could help inductively tease out tensions or institutionalized logics related to grand challenges.

And finally, we talked about the different *audiences in theory and practice* that we address as researchers and the responsibility we have to them: First, our primary audience is researchers, who we address when we develop new theories to advance the academic field. This audience includes interdisciplinary researchers, especially when the work is more experimental or practice-based. A second audience is the students we teach in business schools. We can help them address grand challenges by equipping them with practices, a both/and paradoxical mindset, and commons thinking. And finally, practitioners and society more broadly are also important audiences. With more time at our disposal, it would have been fruitful to also explore the intersection of poverty and climate change, the implications of regional inequality and other potential externalities of climate action. These are research areas that beg for interdisciplinary attention. Importantly, researchers and practitioners can inform each other's thinking, and partner together, in the change and rethinking necessary to address the daunting grand challenges our world faces. We can all do our part in advancing theory and practice, while strategizing together for a better world.

Author note

Authors are listed alphabetically.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Pauline Charlotte Reinecke was supported by the Joachim Hertz Foundation (fellowship for Interdisciplinary Science).

ORCID iDs

Marc Krautzberger https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6957-7700
Ann Langley https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3666-328X
Pauline Charlotte Reinecke https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8105-5980

Note

1. The AMJ research forum 2016 identified "Grand Challenges" as "formulations of global problems that can be plausibly addressed through coordinated and collaborative effort" (George et al., 2016, p. 1880). The solutions to grand challenges have expanded from primarily being discussed as the purview of governments, to now also being seen as the responsibility of private sector organizations. Increasingly the term is being used interchangeably with "societal challenges" and "wicked problems" to denote "complex problems with no easy solutions, which transcend national borders and affect future generations" (Cuervo-Cazurra et al., 2022). In this paper we adopt this broader understanding of "grand challenges."

References

Academy of Management (AOM) Conference Theme. (2022, August 5–9). Creating a better world together [Paper

presentation]. 82nd Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Seattle, WA, United States.

Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M. W. (2009). Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organization Science*, *20*(4), 696-717. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0406

Ansari, S., Fiss, P., & Zajac, E. (2010). Made to fit: How practices vary as they diffuse. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(1), 67-92. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.35.1.zok67

Ansari, S., Gray, B., & Wijen, F. (2011). Fiddling while the ice melts? How organizational scholars can take a more active role in the climate change debate. *Strategic Organization*, *9*(1), 70-76. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127010395525

Ansari, S., Wijen, F., & Gray, B. (2013). Constructing a climate change logic: An institutional perspective on the "tragedy of the commons". *Organization Science*, *24*(4), 1014-1040. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0799

Barley, S. R. (2008). Coalface institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 491-518). Sage Publications.

Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing—Insights from the study of social enterprises. *Academy of Management Annals*, *8*(1), 397-441. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2014.893615

Besharov, M., Smith, W., & Darabi, T. (2019). A framework for sustaining hybridity in social enterprises: Combining differentiating and integrating. In G. George, T. Baker, P. Tracey, & H. Joshi (Eds.), *Handbook of inclusive innovation* (pp. 394-413). Edward Elgar.

Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, *39*(3), 364-381. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0431

Bowen, F. E., Bansal, P., & Slawinski, N. (2018). Scale matters: The scale of environmental issues in corporate collective actions. *Strategic Management Journal*, *39*(5), 1411-1436. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2764

Boxenbaum, E., Jones, C., Meyer, R., & Svejenova, S. (2015). Call for papers: Special issue of organization studies the material and visual turn in organization theory: Objectifying and (re) acting to novel ideas. *Organization Studies*, *36*(1), 133-138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840614550150

Brenton, J., & Slawinski, N. (2023). Collaborating for community regeneration: Facilitating partnerships in, through, and for place. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *18*(4), 815-834. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05365-5

Callon, M. (1990). Techno-economic networks and irreversibility. *The Sociological Review*, *38*(1), 132-161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1990.tb03351.x

Clegg, S., Cunha, M. P., & Berti, M. (2022). Research movements and theorizing dynamics in management and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, *47*(3), 382-401. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0466

Cornelissen, J. P., Mantere, S., & Vaara, E. (2014). The contraction of meaning: The combined effect of communication, emotions, and materiality on sensemaking in the Stockwell shooting. *Journal of Management Studies*, *51*(5), 699-736. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12073

Cuervo-Cazurra, A., George, G., Santangelo, G. D., Tihanyi, L., Ma, X., & Senbet, L. (2022). Multinationals' solutions to grand challenges. Call for Papers for a Special Issue of Journal of International Business Studies. Retrieved July 13, 2023, from https://resource-cms.springernature.com/springer-cms/rest/v1/content/23399332/data/v1

Farjoun, M., Smith, W., Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (Eds.). (2018). *Dualities, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizational life*. Oxford University Press.

Ferraro, F., Etzion, D., & Gehman, J. (2015). Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: Robust action revisited. *Organization Studies*, *36*(3), 363-390. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840614563742

George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(6), 1880-1895. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.4007

Goldin, I., & Vogel, T. (2010). Global governance and systemic risk in the 21st century: Lessons from the financial crisis. *Global Policy*, *1*(1), 4-15. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-5899.2009.00011.x

Golsorkhi, D., Rouleau, L., Seidl, D., & Vaara, E. (Eds.) . (2015). *Cambridge handbook of strategy as practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Gray, B. (2023). A call for activist scholarship in organizational theorizing. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *32*(3), 179-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/10564926231169160

Gray, B., Purdy, J., & Ansari, S. (2015). From interactions to institutions: Microprocesses of framing and mechanisms for the structuring of institutional fields. *Academy of Management Review*, *40*(1), 115-143. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0299

Gray, B., Purdy, J., & Ansari, S. (2022). Confronting power asymmetries in partnerships to address grand challenges. *Organization Theory*, *3*(2), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877221098765

Grewatsch, S., Kennedy, S., & Bansal, P. (2021). Tackling wicked problems in strategic management with systems thinking. *Strategic Organization*, *21*(3), 721–732. https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270211038635

Gümüsay, A. A., Claus, L., & Amis, J. (2020). Engaging with grand challenges: An institutional logics perspective. *Organization Theory*, *1*(3), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787720960487

Hahn, T., Figge, F., Pinkse, J., & Preuss, L. (2018). A paradox perspective on corporate sustainability: Descriptive, instrumental, and normative aspects. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *148*(2), 235-248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3587-2

Hahn, T., Pinkse, J., Preuss, L., & Figge, F. (2015). Tensions in corporate sustainability: Towards an integrative framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *127*(2), 297-316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2047-5

Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2014). Cognitive frames in corporate sustainability: Managerial sensemaking with paradoxical and business case frames. *Academy of Management Review*, *39*(4), 463-487. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0341

Hallett, T. (2010). The myth incarnate: Recoupling processes, turmoil, and inhabited institutions in an urban elementary

school. *American Sociological Review*, *75*(1), 52-74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122409357044

Hallett, T., Shulman, D., & Fine, G. A. (2009). Peopling organizations: The promise of classic symbolic interactionism for an inhabited institutionalism. In P. Adler (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of sociology and organization studies: Classical foundations* (pp. 486-509). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199535231.001.0001

Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. J. (2006). How institutions form: Loose coupling as mechanism in Gouldner's patterns of industrial bureaucracy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *49*(7), 908-924. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764205285171

Hautz, J., Seidl, D., & Whittington, R. (2017). Open strategy: Dimensions, dilemmas, dynamics. *Long Range Planning*, *50*(3), 298-309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2016.12.001

Hengst, I. A., Jarzabkowski, P., Hoegl, M., & Muethel, M. (2020). Toward a process theory of making sustainability strategies legitimate in action. *Academy of Management Journal*, *63*(1), 246-271. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0960

Hoffman, A. J. (2011). Talking past each other? Cultural framing of skeptical and convinced logics in the climate change debate. *Organization & Environment*, *24*(1), 3-33. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026611404336

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2023). Synthesis report of the IPCC sixth assessment report. Retrieved July 13, 2023, from https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_SYR_LongerReport.pdf

Jarzabkowski, P. (2004). Strategy as practice: Recursiveness, adaptation, and practices-in-use. *Organization Studies*, *25*(4), 529-560. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840604040675

Jarzabkowski, P., Bednarek, R., Chalkias, K., & Cacciatori, E. (2019). Exploring inter-organizational paradoxes: Methodological lessons from a study of a grand challenge. *Strategic Organization*, *17*(1), 120-132. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127018805345

Jarzabkowski, P., Bednarek, R., Chalkias, K., & Cacciatori, E. (2022). Enabling rapid financial response to disasters: Knotting and reknotting multiple paradoxes in interorganizational systems. *Academy of Management Journal*, *65*(5), 1477-1506. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2019.0745

Khanagha, S., Ansari, S., Paroutis, S., & Oviedo, L. (2022). Mutualism and the dynamics of new platform creation: A study of Cisco and fog computing. *Strategic Management Journal*, *43*(3), 476-506. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3147

Kim, S., & Kim, A. (2022). Going viral or growing like an oak tree? Towards sustainable local development through entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *65*(5), 1709-1746. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2018.0041

Kohtamäki, M., Whittington, R., Vaara, E., & Rabetino, R. (2022). Making connections: Harnessing the diversity of strategy-as-practice research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *24*(2), 210-232. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12274

Kokshagina, O., Reinecke, P. C., & Karanasios, S. (2023). To regulate or not to regulate: Unravelling institutional tussles around the regulation of algorithmic control of digital platforms. *Journal of Information Technology*, *38*(2), 160-179. https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962221114408

Krautzberger, M., Fohim, E., Cooren, F., & Schumacher, T. (2021). The communicative constitution of institutional change in expression games. *Strategic Organization*, *19*(4), 667-692. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127020959253

Latour, B. (1996). On actor-network theory: A few clarifications. *Soziale Welt*, *47*(4), 369-381. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40878163

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford University Press.

Leonardi, P. M., & Barley, S. R. (2008). Materiality and change: Challenges to building better theory about technology and organizing. *Information and Organization*, *18*(3), 159-176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2008.03.001

Lewis, M., Smith, W., Jarzabkowski, P., & Langley, A. (Eds.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of organizational paradox: Approaches to plurality, tensions and contradictions*. Oxford University Press.

Lewis, M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), 760-776. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707712

Lewis, M. W., & Smith, W. K. (2022). Reflections on the 2021 AMR Decade Award: Navigating paradox is paradoxical. *Academy of Management Review*, *47*(4), 528-548. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2022.0251

Martí, I., & Fernandez, P. (2013). The institutional work of oppression and resistance. *Organization Studies*, *34*(8), 1195-1223. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613492078

Miron-Spektor, E., Ingram, A., Keller, J., Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2018). Microfoundations of organizational paradox: The problem is how we think about the problem. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0594

Munir, K. A. (2015). A loss of power in institutional theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *24*(2), 90-92. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492614545302

Ocasio, W., Laamanen, T., & Vaara, E. (2018). Communication and attention dynamics: An attention-based view of strategic change. *Strategic Management Journal*, *39*(1), 155-167. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2702

Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2008). Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1), 433-474. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211644

Powell, W. W., & Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Microfoundations of institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 276-298). Sage Publications.

Pradies, C. (2023). With head and heart: How emotions shape paradox navigation in veterinary work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *66*(2), 521-552. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2019.0633

Putnam, L. L., Fairhurst, G. T., & Banghart, S. (2016). Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach. *Academy of Management Annals*, *10*(1), 65-171. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1162421

Reinecke, J., & Ansari, S. (2015). When times collide: Temporal brokerage at the intersection of markets and developments. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(2), 618-648. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.1004

Schad, J., & Bansal, P. (2018). Seeing the forest and the trees: How a systems perspective informs paradox research. *Journal of*

Management Studies, *55*(8), 1490-1506. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12398

Schad, J., Lewis, M. W., Raisch, S., & Smith, W. K. (2016). Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, *10*(1), 5-64. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1162422

Schüßler, E. S., Lohmeyer, N., & Ashwin, S. (2023). "We can't compete on human rights": Creating market-protected spaces to institutionalize the emerging logic of responsible management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *66*(4), 1071–1101. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.1614

Slawinski, N., & Bansal, P. (2015). Short on time: Intertemporal tensions in business sustainability. *Organization Science*, *26*(2), 531-549. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0960

Slawinski, N., Pinkse, J., Busch, T., & Banerjee, S. B. (2017). The role of short-termism and uncertainty avoidance in organizational inaction on climate change: A multi-level framework. *Business & Society*, *56*(2), 253-282. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315576136

Slawinski, N., Winsor, B., Mazutis, D., Schouten, J. W., & Smith, W. K. (2021). Managing the paradoxes of place to foster regeneration. *Organization & Environment*, *34*(4), 595-618. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026619837131

Smith, W. K. (2014). Dynamic decision making: A model of senior leaders managing strategic paradoxes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(6), 1592-1623. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0932

Smith, W. K., & Besharov, M. L. (2019). Bowing before dual gods: How structured flexibility sustains organizational hybridity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *64*(1), 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217750826

Smith, W. K., Jarzabkowski, P., Lewis, M. W., & Langley, A. (Eds.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of organizational paradox*. Oxford University Press.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(2), 381-403. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0223

Smith, W. K., & Tushman, M. L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. *Organization Science*, *16*(5), 522-536. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0134

Stadtler, L., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2016). Coopetition as a paradox: Integrative approaches in a multi-company, cross-sector partnership. *Organization Studies*, *37*(5), 655-685. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840615622066

The Economist. (2022). ESG should be boiled down to one simple measure: Emissions. Retrieved July 13, 2023, from https://www.economist.com/leaders/2022/07/21/esg-should-be-boiled-down-to-one-simple-measure-emissions

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(3), 801-843. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/210361

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford University Press.

United Nations. (2023). UN Secretary-General's remarks to the 52nd session of the Human Rights Council. Retrieved July 13, 2023, from https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/speeches/2023-02-27/un-secretary-generals-remarks-the-52nd-session-of-the-human-rights-council

Vaara, E., & Fritsch, L. (2022). Strategy as language and communication: Theoretical and methodological advances and avenues for the future in strategy process and practice research. *Strategic Management Journal*, *43*(6), 1170-1181. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3360

Vaara, E., & Langley, A. (2021). Communicative perspectives on strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*, *19*(4), 541-552. https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270211055777

Van der Byl, C., Slawinski, N., & Hahn, T. (2020). Responsible management of sustainability tensions: A paradoxical approach to grand challenges. In O. Laasch, R. Suddaby, R. Edward Freemadn, & D. Jamali (Eds.), *Research handbook of responsible management* (pp. 438-452). Edward Elgar.

Van der Byl, C. A., & Slawinski, N. (2015). Embracing tensions in corporate sustainability: A review of research from win-wins and trade-offs to paradoxes and beyond. *Organization & Environment*, *28*(1), 54-79. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575047

Vince, R., & Broussine, M. (1996). Paradox, defense and attachment: Accessing and working with emotions and relations underlying organizational change. *Organization Studies*, *17*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069601700101

Voronov, M., Foster, W. M., Patriotta, G., & Weber, K. (2023). Distilling authenticity: Materiality and narratives in Canadian distilleries' authenticity work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *66*(5), 1438–1468. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.0017

Whittington, R. (1996). Strategy as practice. *Long Range Planning*, *29*(5), 731-735. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(96)00068-4

Whittington, R. (2006). Completing the practice turn in strategy research. *Organization Studies*, *27*(5), 613-634. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606064101

Wijen, F., & Ansari, S. (2007). Overcoming inaction through collective institutional entrepreneurship: Insights from regime theory. *Organization Studies*, *28*(7), 1079-1100. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607078115

Williams, A., Heucher, K., & Whiteman, G. (2021). Planetary emergency and paradox. In R. Bednarek, M. P. E. Cunha, J. Schad, & W. K. Smith (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary dialogues on organizational paradox: Learning from Belief and Science, Part A (research in the sociology of organizations)* (Vol. 73a, pp. 151-170). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X2021000073a012