



Essay

Paradox theory and the paradox of success

Strategic Organization
2019, Vol. 17(1) 95–106
© The Author(s) 2017
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/1476127017739536
journals.sagepub.com/home/soq



Miguel Pina e Cunha

Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

Linda L Putnam

University of California, USA

Abstract

The study of paradox in strategy and organization studies has grown rapidly over the last 25 years. Paradox, as contradictory yet interrelated opposites that exist simultaneously and persist over time, can be qualified as a successful area of study. Yet success, however sweet, may come at a price, namely, premature convergence on theoretical concepts, overconfidence in dominant explanations, and institutionalizing labels that protect dominant logics. We discuss the risk of paradox theory being vulnerable to the paradox of success and focus on ways to avoid narrowness in theory building.

Keywords

institutionalization, paradox, paradox of success, paradox theory, premature, process

Introduction

We should never underestimate the power of foundational works in shaping the course of subsequent developments in a social arena! Theories as well as social systems are subject to imprinting and path dependent processes. (Scott, 2008: 428)

Imprinting and path-dependent processes cited in the quotation above may stem, in part, from a phenomenon known as “the paradox of success.” This paradox, also called *the Icarus paradox* or the *paradox of performance*, refers to ways that past successes contribute to the persistence of a given path of action through focusing on the same strategies (Audia et al., 2000; Pinsonneault and Rivard, 1998). Success, as Miller (1990) explains, leads to a path of convergence which diminishes awareness of important forces of divergence. In other words, as organizational members converge on a path of action, “strong performance promotes a defensive mindset that may lead

Corresponding author:

Miguel Pina e Cunha, Nova School of Business and Economics, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Campus de Campolide, Lisboa 1099-032, Portugal.
Email: mpc@novasbe.pt

to dysfunctional outcomes” (Amason and Mooney, 2008: 407). The paradox of success, while reaping the benefits of convergence may result in worldviews that simplify and desensitize members to divergent environmental demands (Elsass, 1993). Thus, the same practices that lead organizations to becoming successful often simultaneously push them to a downfall (Elsass, 1993). The ways in which this paradox develops, as evidenced in laboratory and field settings, include premature convergence on theoretical concepts, overconfidence in dominant explanations, and relying on institutionalized labels that protect dominant logics.

This type of paradox is problematic because it leads to an organizational architecture that breeds narrowness and complacency (Miller, 1993). In effect, this syndrome spurs its own vicious cycles through a drive for consistency and homogeneity that surface when actors are not aware of the interrelated and persistent nature of contradictions in their environments (Lewis, 2000; Smith and Lewis, 2011).

In applying this work, we question whether paradox theory could become trapped by its own successes. Paradox theory refers to a particular approach to oppositions which sets forth “a dynamic equilibrium model of organizing [that] depicts how cyclical responses to paradoxical tensions enable sustainability and [potentially produces] ... peak performance in the present that enables success in the future” (Smith and Lewis, 2011: 381). As an organizational concept, paradox is defined as, “contradictory yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time” (Smith and Lewis, 2011: 382). As documented by Schad et al. (2016), the study of paradox and related concepts (e.g. tensions, contradictions, and dialectics) in organizational studies has grown rapidly over the last 25 years. This view is reinforced by Putnam et al. (2016) who identified over 850 publications that focused on organizational paradox, contradiction, and dialectics in disciplinary and interdisciplinary outlets. This growth is clearly evident in the strategic management literature as scholars have brought paradox theory into the study of innovation processes (Andriopoulos and Lewis, 2009; Atuahene-Gima, 2005), top management teams (Carmeli and Halevi, 2009), CEO strategies (Fredberg, 2014), and strategy work (Dameron and Torset, 2014). To what degree does this growth represent success? What features of a success syndrome might surface in paradox studies?

To address these questions, we examine several factors that might point to the paradox of success and discuss possible unintended effects of what some scholars have called “the premature institutionalization” of paradox theory (Farjoun, 2017). In theory development, efforts at consolidation are normal as research accumulates (e.g. Scott, 1987) and some consensus on key concepts is advantageous, but this practice could also introduce narrowness and an unquestioned acceptance of existing knowledge. In this essay, we examine three symptoms of the paradox of success as it applies to paradox theory, namely, premature convergence on theoretical dimensions, overconfidence in dominant explanations, and institutionalized labels that protect dominant logics. Then we explore four ramifications or unintended effects of this success: (1) conceptual imprecision, (2) paradox as a problem or a tool, (3) the taming of paradox, and (4) reifying process. The final section of this essay focuses on suggestions for moving forward in theory building, namely, retaining systemic embeddedness, developing strong process views, and exploring nested and knotted paradoxes.

Why should we be concerned about the paradox of success or the institutionalization of paradox theory? These trends are problematic for several reasons. First, following this path leads to reducing the inherent complexity of paradox, especially the tendency to exclude or severely diminish theoretical imagination from alternative perspectives. Second, these trends push practical application in a particular direction that overrides reflection-in-action as the basis for responding to contradiction. Third, these trends raise questions tied to strategic management, such as how to define and measure proficiency in responding to contradictory, interrelated, and persistent paradoxes? Is this proficiency determined at the strategic level and how does it close off or open up options for

organizing? In general, we see the goal of paradox theory in strategic management and organizational studies as keeping research vibrant and polyphonic rather than narrow it through converging on theoretical premises.

Although this essay refers to the work of Lewis (2000) and Smith and Lewis (2011), our concerns center on the community of scholars who embrace specific features of paradox theory as a mantra or as orthodox assumptions for reviewing manuscripts and developing paradox theory. In particular, we focus on the translation of this theory into research and a growing trend to institutionalize concepts and explanation. This essay, then, is not against the work of Smith and Lewis (2011); in fact, we hold great respect and admiration for their contributions in promoting research on paradox. Rather, it aims to extend paradox theory in ways that will keep the field vibrant and polyphonic. To continue to thrive, research programs need to receive routine feedback about their development from within or outside the scholarly community (Tsoukas and Papoulias, 1996). With this goal in mind, we approach this essay from within the community of paradox scholars.

Symptoms of the paradox of success

One indicator of the success of any theory is publications—the standard measure of scholarly success. As previously noted, the number of articles on paradox in management and organizational studies has increased significantly in the past 25 years (Schad et al., 2016). The theme has attracted special issues of highly prestigious journals (see Jules and Good, 2014; see Smith et al., 2017). These references also show how paradox research appears in practice, particularly ones aimed at managers and organizational leaders (Smith et al., 2016). In academic circles, scholars have developed a track or subtheme in the Standing Working Group on Organizational Studies (EGOS). Moreover, we see scholars readily adopting theoretical premises and concepts without contestation or translation—a practice that points to routines involved in institutionalizing established knowledge (Scott, 2008).

Based on the rapid growth of this topic, three symptoms suggest that paradox theory may become vulnerable to the paradox of success. The first one, premature convergence on dimensions and concepts, refers to reaffirming theoretical stances while inadvertently dismissing divergent views. For example, scholars generally agree that *both-and* approaches to managing paradoxes foster creativity, enable virtuous cycles, and produce successful outcomes over time. Although a number of studies support the benefits of embracing both-and approaches (Heracleous and Wirtz, 2014; Smith and Tushman, 2005), two consequences fall out of prematurely converging on this recommendation. First, scholars cast *either-or* responses as inadequate for and detrimental to meeting the challenges of complex environments (Chen, 2002; Smith et al., 2010). Hence, they urge leaders to consistently communicate a both-and vision (Lewis et al., 2014) and to avoid the “tyranny of the OR” (i.e. either-or thinking; Collins and Porras, 1994: 43). For Collins and Porras (1994), visionary companies are distinctly yin and yang, “at the same time, all the time” (p. 45). In effect, either-or approaches, which encompass a complex array of responses to paradox, become aggregated, treated as ineffective, and labeled a *tyranny*.

Rather than prematurely converging on both-and approaches, scholars might treat responses to competing demands as *repertoires* that organizations and their members use to deal with multiple types of contradictions that develop over time. In some cases, effective responses to contradictory demands entail a combination of either-or, both-and, and more-than approaches (Putnam et al., 2016). Thus, scholars may need to avoid equating both-and approaches with embracing opposites. Instead, some research contends that an array of either-or and both-and approaches, including source splitting, vacillating between poles, reflexive learning, reframing, and humor, are pivotal strategies for engaging opposites (Berglund and Werr, 2000; Iedema et al., 2004).

Second, when scholars emphasize the both-and side of paradox (Smith et al., 2016), complementarity gains an advantage over contradiction. As Hargrave and Van de Ven (2017) point out, both-and approaches adopt a bias for synergy, collaboration, and joint actions. The focus on synergy over trade-offs may seem attractive, but it risks emptying paradox of its emergent, surprising, and often uncontrollable effects. As some theorists claim, paradox is for “chaos-thrivers” (Fraher et al., 2017) and entails both trade-offs and synergy (Li, 2016). In effect, even though scholars differ as to whether both-and approaches can be sustained over time or end up developing into either-or alternatives (Putnam, 2015), researchers tend to converge in their views that these approaches are singularly effective in helping organizational members manage paradoxes (Clarke, 1998). As a contrast, Davis and Eisenhardt’s (2011) study of innovation reveals that alternating decision control through rotating leadership produces more innovation than does the use of balance and consensual leadership, as types of both-and strategies.

Prematurely converging on theoretical beliefs is closely related to a second symptom of the paradox of success, overconfidence in dominant explanations. This symptom refers to accepting prominent features of a theory as established knowledge, irrespective of its fit with the research context or the complexity of phenomena. For example, a number of organizational scholars have readily adopted the four types of paradoxes—learning, belonging, organizing, and performing—as a research paradigm (Jarzabkowski et al., 2013; Luscher and Lewis, 2008; Luscher et al., 2006). Learning paradoxes focus on tensions between the old and the new while belonging ones center on organizational identities, for example, individual versus collective identities. Organizing paradoxes refer to tensions that arise through competing designs and processes, such as rigid alignment versus flexibility, and performing paradoxes deal with internal and external demands between goals and performance (Schad et al., 2016).

These four types of paradoxes grew out of Lewis’ (2000) and Smith and Lewis’ (2011) exemplary studies in which they classified tensions. Our concern is that researchers are using them as a typology or a full-scale road map for the paradox landscape rather than as building blocks for generating and classifying tensions. In particular, scholars often treat them as a fully developed a priori category system (Luscher and Lewis, 2008; Smith et al., 2013) or as explanatory interpretations for research findings (Luscher et al., 2006) without questioning or problematizing the four types. In addition to relying on the four types as a pre-existent category system, scholars treat them as synthesizing existing knowledge about tensions in organizational restructuring “that occur at different levels of analysis” (Jarzabkowski et al., 2013, p. 247), as types of paradoxes that managers cope with over a long time (Sandoff and Widell, 2015: 307), and as a point of departure for leaders to recognize the existence of a paradox and how to deal with it in strategic decision-making (Peterlin et al., 2015: 285)—ways that sustainability concerns can be addressed through paradox theory (Hahn et al., 2017: 3).

Two shortcomings—exclusion and isolation—can result from readily adopting an a priori category system. Exclusion refers to ignoring other types of paradoxes that do not fit neatly into the four-part classification system. For example, corporate social responsibility paradoxes (Campbell, 2006), the connectivity paradox (Leonardi et al., 2010; Stohl, 2011), and paradoxes of meritocracy (Castilla and Benard, 2010)—each represent a complex array of competing demands that cross organizational levels and/or combine one or more of the four types of paradoxes in unique ways. Thus, researchers who readily adopt the four types of paradoxes need to be open to other kinds of tensions that might emerge from the data itself. In effect, this framework should not be treated as a comprehensive or an exhaustive set of organizational paradoxes. The second potential shortcoming, isolation, focuses on the practice of breaking the four types of paradoxes into distinct categories and then putting them back together in the discussion section at the end of an article, without empirically examining their interrelationships (Luscher and Lewis, 2008; see Jarzabkowski et al., 2013, as an exception to this critique).

The third symptom, institutionalizing labels that protect dominant logics, focuses on theoretical concepts and dominant assumptions that may need further exploration. In particular, the *dynamic equilibrium model* that is prevalent in paradox theory seems to protect the dominant logic of *order* in managing contradictions (Smith and Lewis, 2011). The logic of order focuses on ways to restore the status quo and reinstate predictability (Cooper, 1986). In contrast, the concept of *disorder* embraces a logic of difference that treats disequilibrium as a source of organizing in the midst of opposites. That is, the instability that surfaces from multiple, competing meanings gives rise to new directions of organizing, ones that often depart from equilibrium and balance (Clegg et al., 2005; Vásquez et al., 2015). Clearly, both the dynamic equilibrium model (order) and logics of difference (disorder) are theoretical assumptions that need to be tested. Hence, scholars need to embrace both views in paradox theory and examine them in the interplay between order and disorder, as Vásquez et al. (2015) did in their study of tensions in three project teams.

In general, we see three symptoms in which paradox theory appears ripe for experiencing the paradox of success. Specifically, scholars may have prematurely converged on “both-and” approaches as the most effective ways to manage contradictions, as opposed to examining a repertoire of different types of responses. Overconfidence in dominant explanations refers to unquestioned acceptance of existing knowledge. The ready adoption of the four types of paradoxes as a typology for classifying organizational tensions exemplifies this overconfidence. Finally, we see labels such as *dynamic equilibrium* or *balance* as protecting the dominant logic of order at the cost of examining how the interplay of order and disorder drive paradoxical practices.

Unintended effects

These symptoms may also trigger unintended effects that can hinder the development of paradox theory. Specifically, we examine four unintended effects—conceptual imprecision, paradox as a problem or a tool, the taming of paradox, and reifying process. Each has ramifications for future research directions.

Conceptual imprecision

As noted in recent reviews, paradox theory lacks definitional coherence (Putnam et al., 2016; Schad et al., 2016; Smith and Lewis, 2011). Specifically, researchers who invoke the term *paradox* often refer to a variety of organizational phenomena, including puzzling and contradictory situations, conflicts, and difficult choices as well as the simultaneous persistence of opposites (Atuahene-Gima, 2005; Tse, 2013). Thus, the conceptual frontiers of paradox are shaky, depending on the goal of the researcher who employs the construct. Even after 25 years of research, “paradox” is often applied in ways that parallel close yet distinct concepts, for example, contradictions, dualisms, dialectics, and tensions. Such conceptual looseness turns the construct into a cauldron in which different concepts boil together, in a savory yet often confounding stew. These constructs are often difficult to distinguish because “paradox” has become the umbrella concept that encompasses the conceptual map for all organizational tensions and contradictions. Umbrella concepts, used to encompass a diverse set of phenomena, may collapse over time or transform through validity challenges, as exemplified in the way that *organizational performance* has become a substitute for the umbrella term, *organizational effectiveness* (Hirsch and Levin, 1999). To push theory development forward, this conceptual imprecision needs to be addressed. Recent definitions by Smith and Lewis (2011) that emphasize the three building blocks of paradox—contradiction, interdependence, and persistence—provide a starting point to help scholars develop a precise and shared position regarding the essential features of paradox.

Paradox as a problem and as a tool

A second unintended effect is a growing tendency to treat paradox as a problem to be solved or a tool for intervention. Even though many scholars contend that paradoxes persist over time and are “impervious to resolution” (Schad et al., 2016; Smith and Lewis, 2011), researchers and practitioners sometimes operate as if paradoxes are problems that require solutions (e.g. Fredberg, 2014; Tse, 2013). By treating them as problems, contradictions surface as potentially harmful or leading to negative organizational outcomes.

When scholars treat paradoxes as “things” to be solved or controlled, they ignore the instability and duality embedded in them (Farjoun, 2010). In this way, paradox loses its processual edge and its dynamic, time-sensitive, and path-dependent properties.

Treating paradox as a problem is also linked to its role as a tool (Gaim, 2017) or an intervention that enhances organizational proficiency (The Price Waterhouse Change Integration Team, 1996; see Takeuchi et al. (2008) for a study of Toyota’s successes in managing paradoxes). Yet, we know less about how to assess proficiency in managing contradictory, interdependent, and inherently persistent processes. Rather than treating paradox as a problem or a tool, we believe that scholars should examine how organizational actors respond in paradoxical situations (Putnam, 2015). Responses refer to actions and reactions that arise as part of the contextually embedded, ongoing processes of organizing when actors make decisions to move forward amid contradictions. Responding, however, differs from controlling or resolving contradictions; rather, it centers on how tensions emerge, evolve, and transform in the midst of organizational events. Using the typologies of either-or, both-and, and more-than approaches (Putnam et al., 2016), researchers can track ongoing responses in complex paradoxical situations. Tracking could also reveal how patterns of responses open up meanings that preserve the dynamic interplay of opposites over time.

Clearly, paradox theory has practical implications, but we believe that these applications are best addressed through reflection-in-action, in the tradition of Argyris (1994) and Schon (1983), rather than through generating lists of “best paradoxical practices.” By removing paradoxes from their “natural state,” as often occurs when practitioners recommend best practices, interventions simplify the vast complexity of paradoxical processes. As researchers suggest, paradoxes are local, embedded, and sensitive to time and history, and, therefore, aligned with particular circumstances (Barge et al., 2008; Huxham and Beech, 2003; Luschner and Lewis, 2008). Scholars need to capture these circumstances in developing practical recommendations for responding to paradoxes.

The taming of paradox

A third unintended effect of institutionalizing this work is the taming of paradox. Taming refers to homogenizing or mainstreaming paradox within the organizational literature. Instead of homogenizing this work, scholars should treat paradoxes as conceptually puzzling because they cannot be harnessed or tamed; rather, they are wicked (Rittel and Webber, 1973; Sheep et al., 2017), surprising (Cunha et al., 2012), and uncontrollable (Li, 2016). Thus, we urge scholars to draw on the surprising and wicked nature of paradox rather than ignore or homogenize these features.

The taming of paradox results in two other problematic concerns. First, given paradox’s link to tension, contradiction, and ambiguity, this work is especially fruitful for understanding organizational power and knowledge concerns (Carter, 2013). Yet, the issue of power is a major vacuum in paradox studies (Fairhurst et al., 2016; Schad et al., 2016). The tendency to treat paradox as a technical matter likely contributes to neutralizing power (Kornberger, 2013) by presuming equal

influence between opposing poles (Schad et al., 2016) and ignoring the power dynamics that emerge in living out organizational paradoxes (see, Kan and Perry, 2004 as an exception). Second, developing paradox as an alternative to contingency theory may have inadvertently tamed it by situating this work with rational choice theories. Paradox, however, persists because of its unpredictability and its ability to dis-organize, perturb, and dis-equilibrate. In effect, paradox disrupts the boundary zones of organization, leading scholars to move away from rationality (Cooper, 1986). In the face of disorganization, research on paradox requires a departure from traditional organizational theories to embrace a vision of organizing as “wonderland” (McCabe, 2016). In the taming of paradox, scholars have privileged rational organizational models in theory development and have devoted little attention to the critical role that power plays in contradictory relationships.

Reifying process

The fourth unintended consequence, reifying process, also contributes to the taming of paradox. Even though research on paradox emanates from process thinking, researchers note a dearth of management studies that “explore complex and changing systems” (Schad et al., 2016: 43). Focusing on efforts to manage tensions over time, researchers have examined negative and positive feedback cycles, counter-productive reinforcing cycles, and dynamic equilibrium models. This research, however, adopts a *weak-process perspective* (Langley and Tsoukas, 2017) that treats paradox itself as reified and stable while organizations are changing. Paradox then retains its identity, even though responses to it shift over time. Yet, paradox is often transformed in recursive ways; thus, as noted above, paradox is just as much about dis-equilibrium as it is about equilibrium. In effect, scholars need to focus on “mutating” (Weick, 1979: 47) as a way of examining paradox.

The temporal progression of paradox embedded in organizational activities is a key to grasping the notion of mutating. Process research on paradoxes, however, needs to move beyond sequential stages, time cycles, chronological development, and dramatic episodes to examine everyday routines, connections among episodes, and links between the micro-dynamics of paradoxical interactions and the large scale contradictory organizational events (Jarzabkowski et al., 2013). Depictions of paradox as extraordinary moments in organizational life, for example, dramas (vicious circles), romances (virtuous circles), and sagas (never ending tensions), capture the dynamic episode (Langley, 2016) but at the cost of exploring the cumulative effects of circularity as it unfolds (Tsoukas and Cunha, 2017; Weick, 1979). Focusing on episodic moments condenses the development of paradox in ways that ignore the daily routines in which contradictions unfold. Studying everyday routines, for example, the before and after of episodes, could reveal paradox as process. In effect, scholars need to explore how paradoxes evolve, interact, change, and challenge one another in everyday routines of organizing.

In essence, we see four unintended effects as emerging from the practice of institutionalizing paradox theory. Treating paradox as an umbrella term for interrelated concepts has led to definitional imprecision that masks the subtle and distinct relationships between different constructs. Scholars need to conceptualize the essential characteristics of paradox and develop precise distinctions among related terms. Moreover, the move to make paradox practical for managers has led to casting it as a problem to be solved, an intervention tool, or a set of practices to be controlled. Treating paradox as a problem contributes to neutralizing or taming it. Finally, paradox researchers need to avoid reifying process as well as embracing a *weak process perspective* in which paradox itself remains static while organizational responses are changing over time. Treating paradox as a “thing” and focusing on dramatic organizational episodes, for example, vicious or virtuous cycles, may contribute to the unintended effect of reifying process.

Avoiding the traps of success

How can researchers avoid the trappings of success that lead to convergence and narrowness? How can they rely on existing knowledge while using openness and novelty to engage in theory elaboration? How can we as paradox scholars avoid depleting this construct of its vibrancy, complexity, and breadth (Farjoun, 2017)? In addressing these questions, we suggest three directions: retain systemic embeddedness, develop strong process views, and embrace nested and knotted paradoxes.

First, researchers should retain the systemic and embedded nature of paradoxes by situating them within organizations and society. Specifically, scholars should examine paradoxes as emerging from organizing rather than surfacing as isolated problems to be managed. As a template for doing this work, Benson (1977) advances a sophisticated process explanation for how contradictions emerge within organizational systems through examining the role of contradictions in social totalities. By extension, as organizations work with and through paradoxes, they introduce contradictions that reverberate and feed into other paradoxes, thus destabilizing the totality of the system. Focusing on alignments, dis-alignments, and re-alignments reveals the unfolding of paradoxes. Applying the same logic, scholars could examine the emergence of paradox in complex, intricate institutional ecologies that embrace complexity (Tsoukas, 2005).

A second suggestion is to adopt a strong process approach (Bakken and Hernes, 2006) to investigate the ways that paradoxes emerge in ongoing organizational interactions. *Strong process perspectives* focus on *becoming* or how something comes into existence (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). It embraces *performativity* or the actions and interactions that develop over time in the *experiencing* or the living with paradox (Langley and Tsoukas, 2017). In becoming, paradoxes are constituted in routine organizational activities and events. Thus, scholars need to focus on how paradoxes *become* paradoxes and how actors' lived experiences of enacting and responding to contradictions differ in particular moments in time. In becoming, researchers should explore how paradoxes evolve and how they change the managers who respond to them and the organizations that provide for them.

A third suggestion is to study double paradoxes (Wedeman, 2012) or multiple, bundled sets of tensions (Putnam et al., 2016). Double paradoxes are ones that nest within and unlock other paradoxes. In exploring one paradox, the researcher discovers another one triggered by or nested within it (Kuiper et al., 1997: 171). Scholars also need to focus on the interrelationships of tensions and paradoxes that function as triggers, mitigators, or amplifiers of other paradoxes and that lead to tangled knots (Sheep et al., 2017). Specifically, paradoxes that amplify each other become knotted or interwoven through transforming positive features into negative ones, for example, how the most innovative talented people become the least innovative employees. In contrast, nested paradoxes that mitigate each other transform negatives features into positive ones, for example, failure is necessary for success. The opposite logics that emanate from these nested tensions may account for persistence as well as the elements of surprise in paradoxes. Continual oscillations between opposite poles may create nested paradoxes or "paradoxes of paradoxes" which, over time, become increasingly difficult to disentangle, comprehend, or articulate fruitfully.

Conclusion

The research on paradox has developed into an exciting, vigorous, and vibrant area in strategic management and organization theory. It deals with a central dimension of organizational life that is often ignored. This body of work offers important contributions to the organizational literature, but its recent successes call for reflecting about its future development. Paradox theory suggests that defensiveness and inertia can arise from the ways that organizational actors manage tensions. In effect, research has shown that success can promote a defensive mind-set (Amason and Mooney,

2008) and theory development is not immune to this path dependence (Scott, 2008). We as paradox scholars need to recognize that institutionalizing this theory might drive it to the same vicious cycle pattern that this work guards against.

As Andriopolous et al. (2014) suggest, paradoxical tensions “provoke questions and confusion, encouraging both scholars and practitioners to pause and reflect.” We have followed this advice and used this essay to pause to reflect. Our reflections suggest that paradox theory is at the cross-roads between institutionalizing existing knowledge and exploring new terrains. As paradox-oriented scholars, we see no need to follow an either-or approach. Rather, we can take advantage of the trade-offs and the synergy that result from navigating paradox with existing maps, while treating these maps as incomplete and to a great extent, terra incognita. We have offered some suggestions for future research that we believe will keep the field vibrant and polyphonic rather than becoming another victim of the paradox of success.

Acknowledgements

We appreciate the feedback and insights from Gail Fairhurst, Luca Giustiniano, Nicolas Wiedemann, and Sónia Oliveira.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) 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: Miguel thanks funding by National Funds through FCT (Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia under the project Ref. UID/ECO/00124/2013) and by POR Lisboa under the project LISBOA-01-0145-FEDER-007722.

References

- Amason AC and Mooney AC (2008) The Icarus paradox revisited: How strong performance sows the seeds of dysfunction in future strategic decision-making. *Strategic Organization* 6(4): 407–434
- Andriopoulos C and Lewis MW (2009) Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organization Science* 20(4): 696–717.
- Andriopolous C, Miron-Spektor E, and Smith WK (2014) Call for papers: Paradoxes and unreason: Provoking greater examinations into organizational life. European Group on Organizational Studies Colloquium 2015. Available at: www.egosnet.org
- Argyris C (1994) Good communication that blocks learning. *Harvard Business Review*, July–August, pp. 77–85.
- Atuahene-Gima K (2005) Resolving the capability-rigidity paradox in new product innovation. *Journal of Marketing* 69(4): 61–83.
- Audia PG, Locke EA, and Smith KG (2000) The paradox of success: An archival and a laboratory study of strategic persistence following radical environmental change. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(5): 837–853.
- Bakken T and Hernes T (2006) Organizing is both a verb and a noun: Weick meets Whitehead. *Organization Studies* 27(11): 1599–1616.
- Barge JK, Lee M, Maddux K, et al. (2008) Managing dualities in planned change initiatives. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 36(4): 364–390.
- Benson JK (1977) Organizations: A dialectical view. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22(1): 1–21.
- Berglund J and Werr A (2000) The invincible character of management consulting rhetoric: How one blends incommensurates while keeping them apart. *Organization* 7(4): 633–655.

- Campbell JL (2006) Institutional analysis and the paradox of corporate social responsibility. *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(7): 925–938.
- Carmeli A and Halevi MY (2009) How top management team behavioral integration and behavioral complexity enable organizational ambidexterity: The moderating role of contextual ambidexterity. *Leadership Quarterly* 20(2): 207–218.
- Carter C (2013) The age of strategy: Strategy, organizations and society. *Business History* 55(7): 1047–1057.
- Castilla EJ and Benard S (2010) The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55(4): 543–576.
- Chen MJ (2002) Transcending paradox: The Chinese “middle way” perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 19(2–3): 179–199.
- Clarke M (1998) Can specialists be general managers? Developing paradoxical thinking in middle managers. *Journal of Management Development* 17(3): 191–206.
- Clegg SR, Kornberger M, and Rhodes C (2005) Learning/becoming/organizing. *Organization* 12(2): 147–167.
- Collins J and Porras J (1994) *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. New York: Harper Business.
- Cooper R (1986) Organization/disorganization. *Social Science Information* 25(2): 299–335.
- Cunha MP, Clegg SR, and Rego A (2012) Surprising organization. In: Pitsis T, Simpson A, and Dehlin E (eds) *Handbook of Organizational and Managerial Innovation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 295–316.
- Dameron S and Torset C (2014) The discursive construction of strategists’ subjectivities: Towards a paradox lens on strategy. *Journal of Management Studies* 51(2): 291–319.
- Davis JP and Eisenhardt KM (2011) Rotating leadership and collaborative innovation: Recombination processes in symbiotic relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 56: 159–201.
- Elsass PM (1993) The paradox of success: Too much of a good thing? *Academy of Management Perspectives* 7(3): 84–85.
- Fairhurst GT, Smith WK, Banghart SG, et al. (2016) Diverging and converging: Integrative insights on a paradox meta-perspective. *Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 173–182.
- Farjoun M (2010) Beyond dualism: Stability and change as duality. *Academy of Management Review* 35: 202–225.
- Farjoun M (2017) Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes. In: Langley A and Tsoukas H (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Process Organization Studies*. London: SAGE, pp. 87–109.
- Fraher AL, Branicki J, and Grint K (2017) Mindfulness in action: Discovering how U.S. Navy SEALs build capacity for mindfulness in high-reliability organizations (HROs). *Academy of Management Discoveries*. Epub ahead of print 29 December 2016. DOI: 10.5465/amd.2014.0146.
- Fredberg T (2014) If I say it’s complex, it bloody well will be: CEO strategies for managing paradox. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 50(2): 171–188.
- Gaim M (2017) *Paradox as the new normal: Essays on framing, managing and sustaining organizational tensions*. PhD Thesis, Umea School of Business and Economics, Sweden.
- Hahn T, Figge F, Pinkse J, et al. (2017) A paradox perspective on corporate sustainability: Descriptive, instrumental, and normative aspects. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Epub ahead of print 7 June. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-017-3587-2.
- Hargrave TJ and Van de Ven AH (2017) Integrating dialectical and paradox perspectives on managing contradictions in organizations. *Organization Studies* 38(3–4): 319–339.
- Heracleous L and Wirtz J (2014) Singapore airlines: Achieving sustainable advantage through mastering paradox. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 50(2): 150–170.
- Hirsch PM and Levin DZ (1999) Umbrella advocates versus validity police: A life-cycle model. *Organization Science* 10(2): 199–212.
- Huxham C and Beech N (2003) Contrary prescriptions: Recognizing good practice tensions in management. *Organization Studies* 24(1): 69–93.
- Iedema R, Degeling P, Braithwaite J, et al. (2004) “It’s an interesting conversation I’m hearing”: The doctor as manager. *Organization Studies* 25(1): 15–33.

- Jarzabkowski P, Lê JK and Van de Ven AH (2013) Responding to competing strategic demands: How organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve. *Strategic Organization* 11(3): 245–280.
- Jules C and Good D (2014) Introduction to the special issue on paradox in context: Advances in theory and practice. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 50(2): 123–126.
- Kan MM and Perry KW (2004) Identifying paradox: A grounded theory of leadership in overcoming resistance to change. *Leadership Quarterly* 15(4): 467–491.
- Kornberger M (2013) Clausewitz: On strategy. *Business History* 55(7): 1058–1073.
- Kuiper H, Miller S, Martinez E, et al. (1997) Urban adolescent females' views on the implant and contraceptive decision-making: A double paradox. *Family Planning Perspectives* 29(4): 167–172.
- Langley A (2016) Paradox theory and research. *Presented at the Annual European Group on Organization Studies Colloquium*, Naples, 7–9 July.
- Langley A and Tsoukas H (2017) Introduction: Process thinking, process theorizing and process researching. In: Langley A and Tsoukas H (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Process Organization Studies*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE, pp. 1–25.
- Leonardi PM, Treem JW, and Jackson MH (2010) The connectivity paradox: Using technology to both decrease and increase perceptions of distance in distributed work arrangements. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 38(1): 85–105.
- Lewis MW (2000) Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review* 25(4): 760–776.
- Lewis MW, Andriopoulos C, and Smith WK (2014) Paradoxical leadership to enable strategic agility. *California Management Review* 56(3): 58–77.
- Li PP (2016) Global implications of the indigenous epistemological system from the East: How to apply yin-yang balancing to paradox management. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management* 23(1): 42–77.
- Luscher LS and Lewis MS (2008) Organizational change and managerial sensemaking: Working through paradox. *Academy of Management Journal* 51(2): 221–240.
- Luscher LS, Lewis MW, and Ingram A (2006) The social construction of organizational change paradoxes. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 19(4): 491–502.
- McCabe D (2016) “Curiouser and curiouser!”: Organizations as wonderland—A metaphorical alternative to the rational model. *Human Relations* 69(4): 945–973.
- Miller D (1990) *The Icarus Paradox: How Exceptional Companies Bring about Their Own Downfall*. New York: Harper Business.
- Miller D (1993) The architecture of simplicity. *Academy of Management Review* 18: 116–138.
- Peterlin J, Pearse NJ, and Dimovski V (2015) Strategic decision making for organizational sustainability: The implications of servant leadership and sustainable leadership approaches. *Economic and Business Review for Central and South-eastern Europe* 17(3): 273–290.
- Pinsonneault A and Rivard S (1998) Information technology and the nature of managerial work: From the productivity paradox to the Icarus paradox? *MIS Quarterly* 22(3): 287–311.
- Putnam LL (2015) Moving beyond “both/and” approaches: Alternative strategies for managing paradoxical tensions. *Presented at the annual European Group on Organizational Studies Colloquium*, Athens, 2–4 July.
- Putnam LL, Fairhurst GT, and Banghart S (2016) Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach. *Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 65–171.
- Rittel HWJ and Webber MM (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences* 4: 155–169.
- Sandoff M and Widell G (2015) Translating as response to paradoxes—when implementing HRM strategies in service organisations. *German Journal of Human Resource Management* 29(3–4): 303–321.
- Schad J, Lewis MW, Raisch S, et al. (2016) Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. *Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 5–64.
- Schon DA (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scott WR (1987) The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 32: 493–511.
- Scott WR (2008) Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. *Theory and Society* 37(5): 427–442.
- Sheep ML, Fairhurst GT, and Khazanchi S (2017) Knots in the discourse of innovation: Investigating multiple tensions in a reacquired spin-off. *Organization Studies* 38(3–4): 463–488.

- Smith WK and Lewis MW (2011) Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review* 36(2): 381–403.
- Smith WK and Tushman ML (2005) Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. *Organization Science* 16(5): 522–536.
- Smith WK, Binns A, and Tushman ML (2010) Complex business models: Managing strategic paradoxes simultaneously. *Long Range Planning* 43(2–3): 448–461.
- Smith WK, Erez M, Jarvenpaa S, et al. (2017) Adding complexity to theories of paradox, tensions, and dualities of innovation and change: Introduction to organization studies special issue on paradox, tensions, and dualities of innovation and change. *Organization Studies* 38(3–4): 303–317.
- Smith WK, Gonin M, and Besharov ML (2013) Managing social-business tensions: A review and research agenda for social enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 23(3): 407–442.
- Smith WK, Lewis M, and Tushman M (2016) “Both/and” leadership. *Harvard Business Review* 94(5): 63–70.
- Stohl C (2011) Paradoxes of connectivity: Boundary permeability, technological variability, and organizational durability. *Australian Journal of Communication* 38(2): 123–139.
- Takeuchi H, Osono E, and Shimizu N (2008) The contradictions that drive Toyota’s success. *Harvard Business Review*, June, pp. 96–104.
- The Price Waterhouse Change Integration Team (1996) *The Paradox Principles: How High-Performance Companies Manage Chaos, Complexity, and Contradiction to Achieve Superior Results*. Chicago, IL: Irwin.
- Tse T (2013) Paradox resolution: A means to achieve strategic innovation. *European Management Journal* 31(6): 682–696.
- Tsoukas H (2005) *Complex Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsoukas H and Chia R (2002) On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science* 13(5): 567–582.
- Tsoukas H and Cunha MP (2017) On organizational circularity: Vicious and virtuous circles in organizing. In: Lewis MW, Smith WK, Jarzabkowski P, and Langley A (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Paradox: Approaches to Plurality, Tensions, and Contradictions*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 393–412.
- Tsoukas H and Papoulias DB (1996) Understanding social reforms: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 47(7): 853–863.
- Vásquez C, Schoeneborn D, and Sergi V (2015) Summoning the spirits: Organizational texts and the (dis)ordering properties of communication. *Human Relations* 69(3): 629–659.
- Wedeman A (2012) *Double Paradox, Rapid Growth and Rising Corruption in China*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Weick KE (1979) *The Social Psychology of Organizing*, 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Author biographies

Miguel Pina e Cunha is the Fundação Amélia de Mello Professor of Leadership at Nova School of Business and Economics, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, in Lisbon, Portugal. His research deals with the surprising (paradox, improvisation, serendipity, zemblanity, vicious circles) and the extreme (positive organizing, genocide). He coauthored several books including *The Virtues of Leadership* (Oxford University Press, 2012). Miguel received the 2015 best paper award from the *European Management Review*.

Linda L Putnam is a Distinguished Research Professor and Emerita Professor in the Department of Communication at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Her research focuses on organizational discourse, dialectics and paradoxes, and conflict and negotiation. She is the co-editor of 11 books and a distinguished scholar of the National Communication Association, a fellow of the International Communication Association, and the recipient of life-time achievement awards from the International Association for Conflict Management and *Management Communication Quarterly*.