

Influential Article Review - Competitive Demand Assessment in Companies: A Structural Comparison

Ed Jones

Stella Wood

Mandy Shaw

This paper examines management. We present insights from a highly influential paper. Here are the highlights from this paper: Organizational scholars have shown increasing interest in the ways in which managers enact and respond to competing demands and the tensions they prompt as constitutive elements of their organizations. There is now a proliferation of conceptualizations of such competing demands that can be somewhat confusing. We will enhance conceptual clarity by identifying seven constitutive empirical characteristics of competing demands: these consist of the existence of dyadic relations, contradiction, interrelatedness, complementarity, compatibility, simultaneity, and the existence of push-pull forces. We construct a comparative classification of competing demands using these characteristics as our distinguishing features. The result is a more nuanced understanding of how managers approach competing demands that can help scholars to minimize arbitrariness, interpret results, and compare contributions in the area in a much-needed step toward understanding and designing organizations. For our overseas readers, we then present the insights from this paper in Spanish, French, Portuguese, and German.

Keywords: Competing demands, Organizational contradictions, Organizational design, Organizational tensions, Paradox theory

SUMMARY

- We sought to increase conceptual clarity by identifying relevant features in different ways of conceptualizing and responding to competing demands. Doing so complements those previous studies providing isolated definitions without systematically juxtaposing their similarities and differences. For instance, increased conceptual clarity demonstrates that treating competing demands as either a duality or a paradox requires particular substantive features. In this case, conceptual confusion among the terms might hinder the development of theory, since it affects what Clegg calls «representing» the tension: what is paradoxical in reality might be conceptualized as something else depending on the features employed.
- Conceptual clarity contributes to the body of scholarship by explaining how competing demands and their associated tensions can be interpreted. Chen argues that unless a field achieves conceptual clarity, research will be limited; it may even culminate in what has been termed conceptual «malaise» Putnam et al. . Moreover, conceptual clarity makes the connection between responses

and specific problematics clearer and hence enables the field to grow by focusing on developing creative ways of dealing with these different tensions using a consistent and shared vocabulary, thus reducing definitional equivocality.

- Conceptual clarity can also explain gaps between conceptualization in theory and the context of practice. With enhanced clarity, the gap between conceptual and practical treatments narrows, allowing practitioners to recognize the consequences of shifts in their practical consciousness when iterating between dilemma and paradox or between dilemma and duality, for instance. Understanding of both practical and theoretical situations is enhanced through the appreciation of multiple approaches for dealing with competing demands. Hence, envisaging multiple conceptualizations and implications liberates both researchers and designers of organizations from self-imposed conceptual captivity. Using the conceptualization provided, organization researchers as well as designers will be able to recognize different tensions and their implications. Clear delineation and understanding of occasions of contradiction, interrelatedness, or complementarity aids both theoretical and practical recognition of the diversity of problems encountered. Organizations need to express a requisite variety in their repertoire of responses that are at least as nuanced as the problems they face. In other words, one can examine transitions or iterations among different ways of categorizing competing demands and how these take place, as well as the reasons behind the different treatments see Chen .
- Escaping from conceptual blinkers also means researchers and practitioners can see that different ways of framing and dealing with competing demands might be operating at the same time.
- Implications for organization action and design. If organization actors frame competing demands as a dilemma, these demands will be approached in terms of their «either/or» quality . If we take the example of strategy, it could mean that exploitation might be prioritized over exploration in what Miles and Snow call a defender strategy. In this case, there is a risk of not being able to change quickly, which makes a firm vulnerable in the long term. Similarly, if exploration is prioritized over exploitation, the firm might exhaust its resources . From a structural point of view, this would mean prioritizing an organic structure at the expense of one that is more mechanistic , something that was evident in Oticon when it adopted the design of a «spaghetti organization» . Oticon gradually abandoned this design to adopt matrix organizing . In the Oticon case, engaging with «the precarious nature of extremes» meant that too much organic structure led to chaos and randomness . Organization design needs to be heedful of the potential for polarization and its associated risks.
- As discussed above, framing of competing demands as trade-offs implies seeking a balance in which more of one implies less of the other. For organization design, how such balance is achieved and the nature of the balance is of high importance. For example, is the balance one that allows a minimal, sufficient, or full-strength presence of both demands? For example, with respect to coordination and control systems, the challenge of organization design entails making decision on flexibility and control and centralization and decentralization . In attempts to balance organization design, compromise might be sought, despite that this can sometimes be a bland halfway or mediocre split . The implication of compromise is that it might provide short-lived relief but it might also reduce or neutralize tension . From an organization design viewpoint, in the case of either a perceived dilemma or a trade-off, the assumption is that the problem is to be solved, respectively, by choosing one alternative or balancing—in a form of error-correction—the two alternatives.
- Framing competing demands as dialectics implies separation of these demands in time and space . For example, organization designers deal with issues of efficiency and effectiveness. If seen as dialectics, the issue that poses a challenge would be whether these demands are assigned to different units or divisions in an organization. Separation might imply an organization design in which these demands are met sequentially where one demand is met followed by the other in a process of ambidextrous sequentiality that deals first with the matter considered on the one hand followed by the matter considered in terms of the other hand.

HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL ARTICLE

We used the following article as a basis of our evaluation:

Gaim, M., Wählin, N., e Cunha, M. P., & Clegg, S. (2018). Analyzing competing demands in organizations: a systematic comparison. *Journal of Organization Design*, 7(1), 1–16.

This is the link to the publisher's website:

<https://jorgdesign.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41469-018-0030-9>

INTRODUCTION

Being subject to competing demands is a pervasive and inherent feature of managerial life (Beech et al. 2004; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013; Lewis and Kelemen 2002). Competing demands occur when management, depending on the use of limited resources or attention, requires more to be done than available resources suggest it is possible to do. Where competing demands are deemed to be of comparable importance for managers and decision-makers, tensions arise over resource allocation and prioritization (see Andriopoulos and Lewis 2010; DeFillippi et al. 2007; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013). For competing demands to be sensed as contradictory, it is not sufficient that demands be competing as there must also be managerial “perceptions of [their] opposing and interwoven elements” (Lewis 2000, p. 397). How they are dealt with depends on “how much time, energy, and effort go into one demand versus the other” (Putnam et al. 2014, p. 416). The struggle to meet competing demands has spurred many dichotomous abstractions in organization studies that require balancing such as exploration and exploitation (March 1991), efficiency and flexibility (Adler et al. 1999), empowerment (power to) and power over (Clegg et al. 2006), the management of order and chaos (Eisenhardt and Brown 1998), efficiency and flexibility (Adler et al. 1999), and managing evolutionary and revolutionary change (Tushman and O’Reilly 1996). For organization members, attending to both demands simultaneously does not necessarily mean engaging both demands to their full strength or with equal vigor (Burton et al. 2015; Clegg et al. 2002) or situating them in a new relationship as a novel approach (Putnam et al. 2016). There are subtle differences between conceptualizations of competing demands when they are addressed separately or engaged simultaneously (see Chen 2017). Managers perceiving tensions between competing demands may be torn between two poles of action when they attempt to attend to both demands at the same time (Carroll 2012). The risk is that one side of the competing demands requires the most immediate attention; an organization exclusively dedicated to exploration of new frontiers, for example, will expire in relatively short order if it fails to manage exploitation of what it already knows well. Similarly, an organization that creates value through exploitation will exhaust its stocks of knowledge in due course, as it is “outflanked” (Clegg 1989) by more exploratory rivals (see Martin 2004). Achieving both poles simultaneously is the managerial ideal promised by ambidextrous designs that enable organizations to accommodate competing demands in order to gain higher performance (Bøe-Lillegraven 2014; O’Reilly and Tushman 2013), despite the ideal being difficult to achieve, costly to maintain, and unstable in action (Burton et al. 2015; Gibson and Birkinshaw 2004).

In reviews of the recent literature, the effects of competing poles have been conceptualized as dilemmas, trade-offs, dualities, dialectics, and paradoxes, to mention only a few of the treatments of the theme (Achtenhagen and Melin 2003; Ashforth et al. 2014; Smith and Lewis 2011). These conceptualizations of competing demands, while becoming more detailed and varied, are also increasingly inconsistent (Denis et al. 2007; Fairhurst et al. 2016; Pache and Santos 2010). In this paper, we increase conceptual clarity by identifying core features and then constructing a system for comparative classification and outline how different conceptualizations result in different understandings and design options.

The paper is structured as follows. We start by discussing the prevalence of competing demands in organizations, and their associated effects in different contexts and at different levels, stressing the need for conceptual clarity. Next, we discuss the most prominent theoretical conceptualizations. Using key

references, we present the salient features and show how these can be used to re-conceptualize the contradictory effects of competing demands. Distilling these features provides a more nuanced conceptualization of the effects of competing demands and the resulting tensions. In concluding, we discuss the implications of having provided increased conceptual clarity, along with the theoretical and practical implications for organizational design.

CONCLUSION

The paper started from the premise that the conceptual confusion regarding the problematization and treatment of competing demands that exists in the management and organization literature was inimical to further theory building and conceptual clarification. Instead of conceptual clarity there was a conceptual malaise. Based on an extensive literature review of key sources, we identified seven distinctive features that reveal underlying assumptions regarding problematization and treatment. Using these features, we have reconceptualized five common approaches to illustrate similarity and distinctiveness. By juxtaposing approaches, we complement previous definitions and make the assumptions behind each much clearer.

Problematization is important. Seeing a competing demand as a dilemma when it might best be seen as a paradox not only makes the existing design of an organization that makes such a mis-categorization seem inadequate but it can also derail an organization. Depending on how events are problematized (Deroy and Clegg 2011), especially in situations where elite problematizations are able to assert their domination over all interpretive repertoires, certain consequences tend to follow. Interpretive repertoires are narrowed, forgotten, or vetoed where they do not align with those of the elites. Smart organizations, rather than be subordinated to singular problematizations of possible competing demands and the implications for action that might follow, can use the categorical distinctions that have been developed here to organize a reflexive conversation about the nature of the problems they face. Problems never announce themselves as such; they must be problematized and their problematization depends on being able to read the signs correctly. Our schema presented herein should provide direction to the semiotics of problematizing and responding to competing demands.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1
VARIOUS TYPES OF COMPETING DEMANDS IN ORGANIZATIONS

Competing demand	Definition	Implications for organizational design	Representative work
Dilemma	An either/or situation where one alternative is preferred relative to the other.	Designers need to know how to select and be aware of potential for polarization and rigidity. Choice of one pole, for example, A, leads to failure to engage in action that supports the other pole, for example, B.	(Achtenhagen and Melin 2003 ; Janssens and Steyaert 1999 ; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013 ; Westenholtz 1993)
Trade-off	A gradual exchange between two demands where more of one means less of the other.	Designers need to be aware that the relief that comes as a result of a compromise is short-lived and it might reduce or neutralize the energy of the tension. In addition, the compromise might mute opposition although it might resurface later.	(Achtenhagen and Melin 2003 ; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013)
Dialectic	A pattern that always begins with a thesis, followed by an antithesis, which is then resolved by their synthesis.	Designers need to be aware of the separation that dialectics imply as it might delay learning of the intersection and the opportunity to thrive through the tension. This also might marginalize the less powerful pole.	(Jarzabkowski et al. 2013 ; Putnam et al. 2016 ; Smith and Lewis 2011 ; Westenholtz 1993)
Duality	The twofold nature of an object of study without separation; they are seemingly opposite but are interdependent and complementary.	This implies that the designer's focus is on complementarity and reducing power difference. This might also imply neutralizing the opposition in the long term.	(Farjoun 2010 ; Janssens and Steyaert 1999 ; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013 ; Smith and Lewis 2011)
Paradox	Contradictory, yet interrelated elements exist simultaneously and the tension persists over time.	This implies that designer's aim for accommodating tensions. For the designer that means critically examining assumptions about tensions and developing a complicated range of understanding tensions and new organizational practices to accommodate them.	(Janssens and Steyaert 1999 ; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013 ; Quinn and Cameron 1988 ; Smith and Lewis 2011)

TABLE 2

FEATURES OF COMPETING DEMANDS

Features	Description
Existence of a dyad	There are two demands that are competing because they need separate attention or they give a different prescription for action.
Contradiction	Competing demands are oppositional, and thus, engaging them both seems irrational.
Compatibility	Competing demands can function together and do not necessarily negate each other.
Interrelatedness	Competing demands have a bidirectional relationship where one interpenetrates the other.
Complementarity	Competing demands reinforce one another.
Simultaneity	Competing demands can function together at the same time at their full strength.
Push-pull	Competing demands are in a tug-of-war in opposite directions, which can either be permanent or temporary.

TABLE 3
A RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF COMPETING DEMANDS

Various types of competing demands	Features of competing demands						
	Existence of dyad	Contradiction	Interrelatedness	Complementarity	Compatibility	Simultaneity	Push-pull
Dilemmas	√	x	x	x	x	x	x
Trade-offs	√	√	x	x	√	x	√
Dialectics	√	√	√	x	x	x	√/x
Dualities	√	x	√	√	√	√	√/x
Paradoxes	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

REFERENCES

- Achtenhagen L, Melin L (2003) Managing the homogeneity-heterogeneity duality. In: Pettigrew A, Whittington R, Melin L, Sanchez-Runde CJ, Van den Bosch F, Ruigrok W, Numagami T (eds) *Innovative forms of organizing*. SAGE, London, pp 301–327
- Adler PS, Goldoftas B, Levine DI (1999) Flexibility versus efficiency? A case study of model changeovers in the Toyota production system. *Organ Sci* 10(1):43–68
- Alonso R, Dessein W, Matouschek N (2008) When does coordination require centralization? *Am Econ Rev* 98(1):145–179
- Andriopoulos C, Lewis MW (2009a) Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organ Sci* 20(4):696–717
- Andriopoulos C, Lewis MW (2009b) Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organ Sci* 20(4):696–717
- Andriopoulos C, Lewis MW (2010) *Managing innovation paradoxes: ambidexterity lessons from leading product design com*
- Ashby WR (1956) *An introduction to cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall, London
- Ashforth BE, Reingen PH (2014) Functions of dysfunction. *Adm Sci Q* 59(3):474–516
- Ashforth BE, Rogers KM, Pratt MG, Pradies C (2014). Ambivalence in organizations: a multilevel approach. *Organ Sci* 25(5):1453–1478
- Bartunek JM (1988) The dynamics of personal and organizational reframing. In: Quinn R, Cameron K (eds) *Paradox and transformation: towards a theory of change in organization and management*. Ballinger, Cambridge, MA, pp 137–162
- Beech N, Burns H, Caestecker LD, MacIntosh R, MacLean D (2004) Paradox as invitation to act in problematic change situations. *Human Relations* 57(10):1313–1332
- Birkinshaw J, Gibson C (2004) Building ambidexterity into an organization. *MIT Sloan Manag Rev* 45(4):47–55

- Bøe-Lillegraven T (2014) Untangling the ambidexterity dilemma through big data analytics. *Journal of Organisation Design* 3(3):27–37
- Boumgarden P, Nickerson J, Zenger TR (2012) Sailing into the wind: exploring the relationships among ambidexterity, vacillation, and organizational performance. *Strateg Manag J* 33(6):587–610
- Burns T, Stalker GM (1961) *The management of innovation*. Tavistock, London
- Burton RM, Obel B, Håkonsson DD (2015) *Organizational design: a step-by-step approach* (third ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Cameron KS (1986) Effectiveness as paradox: consensus and conflict in conceptions of organizational effectiveness. *Manag Sci* 32(5):539–553
- Cameron KS, Quinn RE (1988) *Organizational paradox and transformation*. Ballinger, Cambridge, MA
- Carlson EJ, Poole MS, Lambert NJ, Lammers JC (2017) A study of organizational responses to dilemmas in interorganizational emergency management. *Commun Res* 44(2):287–315
- Carroll TN (2012) Designing organizations for exploration and exploitation. *J Organ Des* 1(2):64–68
- Chen MJ (2008) Reconceptualizing the competition–cooperation relationship: a transparadox perspective. *J Manag Inq* 17(4):288–304
- Chen Y (2017) Dynamic ambidexterity: how innovators manage exploration and exploitation. *Bus Horiz* 60(3):385–394
- Clegg S (2002) General introduction. In: Clegg S (ed) *Management and organization paradoxes*. John Benjamins, Philadelphia, PA, pp 1–10
- Clegg S, Cunha JV, Cunha MP (2002) Management paradoxes: a relational view. *Hum Relat* 55(5):483–503
- Clegg SR (1989) *Frameworks of power*. Sage, London
- Clegg SR, Courpasson D, Phillips N (2006) *Power and organizations*. Sage, London
- Cohen MD, March JG, Olsen JP (1972) A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Adm Sci Q* 17(1):1–25
- Cunha JV, Clegg S, Cunha MP (2002) Management, paradox, and permanent dialectics. In: Clegg S (ed) *Management and organization paradoxes*. John Benjamins, Philadelphia, PA, pp 11–40
- Cunha M, Putnam LL (2017) Paradox theory and the paradox of success. *Strategic organization* 1-12 (in press)
- Cunha MP, Clegg S (2018). Persistence in paradox. In Farjoun M, Smith WK, Langley A & Tsoukas H (Eds.) *Perspectives on process organization studies: Dualities, dialectics and paradoxes in organizational life* (vol.8). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (in press).
- DeFillippi R, Grabher G, Jones C (2007) Introduction to paradoxes of creativity: managerial and organizational challenges in the cultural economy. *J Organ Behav* 28(5):511–521
- Denis JL, Langley A, Rouleau L (2007) Strategizing in pluralistic contexts: rethinking theoretical frames. *Hum Relat* 60(1):179–215
- Deroy X, Clegg S (2011) When events interact with business ethics. *Organization* 18(5):637–653
- Eisenhardt KM (2000) Paradox, spirals, ambivalence: the new language of change and pluralism. *Acad Manag Rev* 25(4):703–705
- Eisenhardt KM, Brown SL (1998) Competing on the edge: strategy as structured chaos. *Long Range Plan* 31(5):786–789
- Fairhurst GT, Smith WK, Banghart SG, Lewis MW, Putnam LL, Raisch S, Schad J (2016) Diverging and converging: integrative insights on a paradox meta-perspective. *Acad Manag Ann* 10(1):173–182
- Farjoun M (2010) Beyond dualism: stability and change as a duality. *Acad Manag Rev* 35(2):202–225
- Foss NJ (2003) Selective intervention and internal hybrids: interpreting and learning from the rise and decline of the Oticon spaghetti organization. *Organ Sci* 14(3):331–349
- Gaim M (2017a). On the emergence and management of paradoxical tensions: The case of architectural firms. *Eur Manag J* 1–22 (in press)
- Gaim M (2017b). Paradox as the new normal: essays on framing, managing and sustaining organizational tensions. Dissertation, Umeå University

- Gaim M, Wåhlin N (2016) In search of a creative space: a conceptual framework of synthesizing paradoxical tensions. *Scand J Manag* 32(1):33–44
- Gibson CB, Birkinshaw J (2004) The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *Acad Manag J* 47(2):209–226
- Gould RM (1994) Revolution at Oticon A/S: the spaghetti organization. In: Dutta S, Manzoni J-F (eds) *Process re-engineering, organizational change and performance improvement*. McGraw-Hill, London, pp 1–16
- Hargrave TJ, Van de Ven AH (2017) Integrating dialectical and paradox perspectives on managing contradictions in organizations. *Organ Stud* 38(3–4):319–339
- Harvey S (2014) Creative synthesis: exploring the process of extraordinary group creativity. *Acad Manag Rev* 39(3):324–343
- Janssens M, Steyaert C (1999) The world in two and a third way out? The concept of duality in organization theory and practice. *Scand J Manag* 15(2):121–139
- Jarzabkowski P, Lê JK, Van de Ven AH (2013) Responding to competing strategic demands: how organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve. *Strateg Organ* 11(3):245–280
- Jay J (2013) Navigating paradox as a mechanism of change and innovation in hybrid organizations. *Acad Manag J* 56(1):137
- Johansson F (2004) *The medici effect*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA
- Kamoche K, Cunha MP (2001) Minimal structures: from jazz improvisation to product innovation. *Organ Stud* 22(5):733–764
- Lewis M (2000) Exploring paradox: toward a more comprehensive guide. *Acad Manag Rev* 25(4):760–776
- Lewis MW, Kelemen ML (2002) Multiparadigm inquiry: exploring organizational pluralism and paradox. *Hum Relat* 55(2):251–275
- Li PP (2016) Global implications of the indigenous epistemological system from the east: how to apply Yin-Yang balancing to paradox management. *Cross Cult Strateg Manag* 23(1):42–77
- Luscher LS, Lewis MW (2008) Organizational change and managerial sensemaking: working through paradox. *Acad Manag J* 51(2):221–240
- March JG (1991) Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organ Sci* 26(3):327–342
- Martin R (2007) *The opposable mind: how successful leaders win through integrative thinking*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA
- Martin, R. (2004). *The design of business*. Rotman Management, Business Design
- Miles RE, Snow CC (1978) *Organizational strategy, structure, and process*. McGraw-Hill, New York
- Nielsen RP (1996) Varieties of dialectic change processes. *J Manag Inq* 5(3):276–292
- O'Reilly C, Tushman M (2013) Organizational ambidexterity: past, present and future. *Acad Manag Perspect* 27(4):324–338
- Pache AC, Santos F (2010) When worlds collide: the internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. *Acad Manag Rev* 35(3):455–476
- Poole MS, Van de Ven AH (1989) Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *Acad Manag Rev* 14(4):562–578
- Porter ME, Kramer MR (2006) Strategy and society: the link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harv Bus Rev* 84(12):78
- Putnam LL, Fairhurst GT, Banghart S (2016) Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: a constitutive approach. *Acad Manag Ann* 10(1):65–171
- Putnam LL, Myers KK, Gailliard BM (2014) Examining the tensions in workplace flexibility and exploring options for new directions. *Human Relations* 67(4):413–440
- Quinn RE, Cameron KS (1988) Organizational paradox and transformation paradox and transformation. toward a theory of change in organization and management. Ballinger, Cambridge, MA, pp 1–19
- Raisch S, Birkinshaw J (2008) Organizational ambidexterity: antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. *J Manag* 34(3):375–409

- Schad J, Lewis M, Raisch S, Smith W (2016) Paradoxical research in management science: looking backward to move forward. *Acad Manag Ann* 10(1):5–64
- Smith K, Berg D (1987) *Paradoxes of group life*. Jossey—Bass, San Francisco
- Smith W (2014) Dynamic decision making: a model of senior leaders managing strategic paradoxes. *Acad Manag J* 57(6):1592–1623
- Smith W, Gonin M, Besharov M (2013) Managing social- business tensions: a review and research agenda for social enterprise. *Bus Ethics Q* 23(3):407–442
- Smith W, Lewis M (2011) Towards a theory of paradox: a dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Acad Manag Rev* 36(2):381–403
- Tushman M, O'Reilly C (1996) Ambidextrous organizations: managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. *Calif Manag Rev* 38(4):8–20
- Tushman M, Smith WK, Wood RC, Westerman G, O'Reilly C (2010) Organizational designs and innovation streams. *Ind Corp Chang* 19(5):1331–1366
- Westenholz A (1993) Paradoxical thinking and change in the frames of reference. *Organ Stud* 14(1):37–58

TRANSLATED VERSION: SPANISH

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSION TRADUCIDA: ESPAÑOL

A continuación se muestra una traducción aproximada de las ideas presentadas anteriormente. Esto se hizo para dar una comprensión general de las ideas presentadas en el documento. Por favor, disculpe cualquier error gramatical y no responsabilite a los autores originales de estos errores.

INTRODUCCIÓN

Estar sujeto a demandas competitivas es una característica generalizada e inherente de la vida gerencial (Beech et al. 2004; 2013; Lewis y Kelemen 2002). Las demandas competitivas se producen cuando la administración, dependiendo del uso de recursos limitados o de atención, requiere más que hacer de lo que los recursos disponibles sugieren que es posible hacer. Cuando se considera que las demandas competidoras son de importancia comparable para los gerentes y los responsables de la toma de decisiones, surgen tensiones por encima de la asignación y priorización de recursos (véanse Andriopoulos y Lewis 2010; 2007; 2013). Para que las demandas competidoras se perciban como contradictorias, no basta con que las demandas compitan, ya que también deben haber "percepciones de [sus] elementos opuestos e entrelazados" (Lewis 2000, p. 397). La forma en que se tratan depende de "cuánto tiempo, energía y esfuerzo entran en una demanda frente a la otra" (Putnam et al. 2014, p. 416). La lucha para satisfacer las demandas competitivas ha estimulado muchas abstracciones dicotómicas en estudios de organización que requieren equilibrios como la exploración y la explotación (marzo de 1991), la eficiencia y la flexibilidad (Adler et al. 1999), empoderamiento (poder a) y poder (Clegg et al. 2006), gestión del orden y el caos (Eisenhardt y Brown 1998), eficiencia y flexibilidad (Adler et al. 1999), y gestión de cambios evolutivos y revolucionarios (Tushman y O'Reilly 1996). Para los miembros de la organización, atender ambas demandas simultáneamente no significa necesariamente involucrar ambas demandas a su plena fuerza o con el mismo vigor (Burton et al. 2015; 2002) o situarlos en una nueva relación como un enfoque novedoso (Putnam et al. 2016). Existen diferencias sutiles entre las conceptualizaciones de las demandas competidoras cuando se abordan por separado o se contratan simultáneamente (véase Chen 2017). Los gerentes que perciban tensiones entre las demandas competidoras pueden estar divididos entre dos polos de acción cuando intentan atender ambas demandas al mismo tiempo (Carroll 2012). El riesgo es que un lado de las demandas competidoras requiere la atención más inmediata; una organización dedicada

exclusivamente a la exploración de nuevas fronteras, por ejemplo, expirará en un orden relativamente corto si no logra gestionar la explotación de lo que ya conoce bien. Del mismo modo, una organización que crea valor a través de la explotación agotará sus existencias de conocimientos a su debido tiempo, ya que está "desenfada" (Clegg 1989) por rivales más exploratorios (véase Martin 2004). Lograr ambos polos simultáneamente es el ideal de gestión prometido por diseños ambidiestros que permiten a las organizaciones dar cabida a las demandas de la competencia con el fin de obtener un mayor rendimiento (Bée-Lillegraven 2014; O'Reilly y Tushman 2013), a pesar de que el ideal es difícil de lograr, costoso de mantener e inestable en acción (Burton et al. 2015; Gibson y Birkinshaw 2004).

En las reseñas de la literatura reciente, los efectos de los polos competidores se han conceptualizado como dilemas, compensaciones, dualidades, dialécticas y paradojas, por mencionar sólo algunos de los tratamientos del tema (Achtenhagen y Melin 2003; 2014; Smith y Lewis 2011). Estas conceptualizaciones de las demandas competidoras, aunque cada vez más detalladas y variadas, también son cada vez más incoherentes (Denis et al. 2007; Fairhurst et al. 2016; Pache y Santos 2010). En este artículo, aumentamos la claridad conceptual identificando las características principales y luego construyendo un sistema de clasificación comparativa y delineamos cómo diferentes conceptualizaciones resultan en diferentes entendimientos y opciones de diseño.

El documento se estructura de la siguiente manera. Comenzamos discutiendo la prevalencia de las demandas competidoras en las organizaciones, y sus efectos asociados en diferentes contextos y en diferentes niveles, enfatizando la necesidad de claridad conceptual. A continuación, analizamos las conceptualizaciones teóricas más destacadas. Utilizando referencias clave, presentamos las características destacadas y mostramos cómo se pueden utilizar para volver a conceptualizar los efectos contradictorios de las demandas que compiten. La destilación de estas características proporciona una conceptualización más matizada de los efectos de las demandas de la competencia y las tensiones resultantes. Para concluir, analizamos las implicaciones de haber proporcionado una mayor claridad conceptual, junto con las implicaciones teóricas y prácticas para el diseño organizacional.

CONCLUSIÓN

El documento partía de la premisa de que la confusión conceptual con respecto a la problemática y el tratamiento de las demandas competidoras que existe en la literatura de gestión y organización era inactiva a la construcción de la teoría y la clarificación conceptual. En lugar de claridad conceptual hubo un malestar conceptual. Basándonos en una extensa revisión bibliográfica de fuentes clave, identificamos siete características distintivas que revelan suposiciones subyacentes con respecto a la problemática y el tratamiento. Usando estas características, hemos reconceptualizado cinco enfoques comunes para ilustrar la similitud y el carácter distintivo. Al juxtaponer enfoques, complementamos las definiciones anteriores y hacemos que las suposiciones detrás de cada uno sea mucho más claras.

La problemática es importante. Ver una demanda competidora como un dilema cuando podría ser vista mejor como una paradoja no sólo hace que el diseño existente de una organización que hace que una categorización errónea parezca inadecuada, sino que también puede descarrilar una organización. Dependiendo de cómo se problematizan los eventos (Deroy y Clegg 2011), especialmente en situaciones donde las problemáticas de élite son capaces de afirmar su dominio sobre todos los repertorios interpretativos, ciertas consecuencias tienden a seguir. Los repertorios interpretativos se estrechan, olvidan o venan cuando no se alinean con los de las élites. Las organizaciones inteligentes, en lugar de estar subordinadas a problemas singulares de posibles demandas competitivas y las implicaciones para la acción que podrían seguir, pueden utilizar las distinciones categóricas que se han desarrollado aquí para organizar una conversación reflexiva sobre la naturaleza de los problemas a los que se enfrentan. Los problemas nunca se anuncian a sí mismos como tales; deben ser problemáticas y su problematización depende de ser capaz de leer los signos correctamente. Nuestro esquema presentado aquí debe proporcionar orientación a la semiótica de problematizar y responder a las demandas de la competencia.

TRANSLATED VERSION: FRENCH

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSION TRADUITE: FRANÇAIS

Voici une traduction approximative des idées présentées ci-dessus. Cela a été fait pour donner une compréhension générale des idées présentées dans le document. Veuillez excuser toutes les erreurs grammaticales et ne pas tenir les auteurs originaux responsables de ces erreurs.

INTRODUCTION

Le fait d'être assujéti à des demandes concurrentes est une caractéristique omniprésente et inhérente de la vie de gestion (Beech et coll., 2004; Jarzabkowski et coll. 2013; Lewis et Kelemen, 2002). Des demandes concurrentes se produisent lorsque la gestion, selon l'utilisation de ressources limitées ou d'attention, exige plus à faire que les ressources disponibles ne le suggèrent. Lorsque les demandes concurrentes sont jugées d'une importance comparable pour les gestionnaires et les décideurs, des tensions surgissent au sujet de l'allocation et de la priorisation des ressources (voir Andriopoulos et Lewis 2010; defillippi et coll. 2007; Jarzabkowski et coll. 2013). Pour que les demandes concurrentes soient qualifiées de contradictoires, il ne suffit pas que les demandes soient concurrentes, car il doit également y avoir des « perceptions managériales de [leurs] éléments opposés et entrelacés » (Lewis, 2000, p. 397). La façon dont ils sont traités dépend de « combien de temps, d'énergie et d'efforts entrent dans une demande par rapport à l'autre » (Putnam et coll. 2014, p. 416). La lutte pour répondre à des demandes concurrentes a stimulé de nombreuses abstractions dichotomiques dans les études organisationnelles qui nécessitent un équilibre comme l'exploration et l'exploitation (mars 1991), l'efficacité et la flexibilité (Adler et al. 1999), l'autonomisation (pouvoir) et le pouvoir sur (Clegg et al., 2006), la gestion de l'ordre et du chaos (Eisenhardt et Brown, 1998), l'efficacité et la flexibilité (Adler et al., 1999) et la gestion du changement évolutif et révolutionnaire (Tushman et O'Reilly, 1996). Pour les membres de l'organisation, s'occuper simultanément des deux demandes ne signifie pas nécessairement engager les deux demandes à leur pleine force ou avec la même vigueur (Burton et coll., 2015; Clegg et coll. 2002) ou les situer dans une nouvelle relation comme une approche nouvelle (Putnam et al., 2016). Il existe des différences subtiles entre les conceptualisations de demandes concurrentes lorsqu'elles sont traitées séparément ou engagées simultanément (voir Chen 2017). Les gestionnaires percevant les tensions entre les demandes concurrentes peuvent être déchirés entre deux pôles d'action lorsqu'ils tentent de répondre aux deux demandes en même temps (Carroll 2012). Le risque est qu'un côté des demandes concurrentes nécessite l'attention la plus immédiate; une organisation exclusivement dédiée à l'exploration de nouvelles frontières, par exemple, expirera relativement peu si elle ne parvient pas à gérer l'exploitation de ce qu'elle connaît déjà bien. De même, une organisation qui crée de la valeur par l'exploitation épuisera ses stocks de connaissances en temps voulu, car elle est « débordée » (Clegg, 1989) par des rivaux plus exploratoires (voir Martin, 2004). Atteindre les deux pôles simultanément est l'idéal managérial promis par les conceptions ambidextres qui permettent aux organisations de répondre à des demandes concurrentes afin d'obtenir des performances plus élevées (Bøe-Lillegraven 2014; O'Reilly et Tushman 2013), bien que l'idéal soit difficile à réaliser, coûteux à entretenir et instable dans l'action (Burton et coll. 2015; Gibson et Birkinshaw, 2004).

Dans les revues de la littérature récente, les effets des pôles concurrents ont été conceptualisés comme dilemmes, compromis, dualités, dialectiques et paradoxes, pour ne citer que quelques-uns des traitements du thème (Achtenhagen et Melin 2003; Ashforth et coll. 2014; Smith et Lewis 2011). Ces conceptualisations des demandes concurrentes, bien qu'elles soient de plus en plus détaillées et variées, sont également de plus en plus incohérentes (Denis et coll., 2007; Fairhurst et coll. 2016; Pache et Santos 2010). Dans cet article, nous augmentons la clarté conceptuelle en identifiant les caractéristiques de base,

puis en construisant un système de classification comparative et en décrivant comment les différentes conceptualisations donnent lieu à des compréhensions et des options de conception différentes.

Le document est structuré comme suit. Nous commençons par discuter de la prévalence des demandes concurrentes dans les organisations, et de leurs effets associés dans différents contextes et à différents niveaux, en soulignant la nécessité d'une clarté conceptuelle. Ensuite, nous discutons des conceptualisations théoriques les plus importantes. À l'aide de références clés, nous présentons les caractéristiques saillantes et montrons comment celles-ci peuvent être utilisées pour re-conceptualiser les effets contradictoires des demandes concurrentes. La distillation de ces caractéristiques offre une conceptualisation plus nuancée des effets des demandes concurrentes et des tensions qui en résultent. En conclusion, nous discutons des implications d'avoir fourni une clarté conceptuelle accrue, ainsi que des implications théoriques et pratiques pour la conception organisationnelle.

CONCLUSION

L'article partait du principe que la confusion conceptuelle concernant la problématique et le traitement des demandes concurrentes qui existent dans la documentation sur la gestion et l'organisation était contraire à la construction de la théorie et à la clarification conceptuelle. Au lieu de clarté conceptuelle, il y avait un malaise conceptuel. Sur la base d'un examen approfondi de la littérature des sources clés, nous avons identifié sept dispositifs distinctifs qui révèlent des hypothèses sous-jacentes concernant la problématique et le traitement. À l'aide de ces caractéristiques, nous avons reconceptualisé cinq approches communes pour illustrer la similitude et le caractère distinctif. En juxtaposant des approches, nous complétons les définitions précédentes et nous rendons les hypothèses derrière chacune beaucoup plus claires.

La problématique est importante. Considérer une demande concurrente comme un dilemme alors qu'elle pourrait être considérée comme un paradoxe rend non seulement la conception existante d'une organisation qui rend une telle mauvaise catégorisation sembler inadéquate, mais elle peut aussi faire dérailler une organisation. Selon la façon dont les événements sont problématiques (Deroy et Clegg 2011), en particulier dans les situations où les problématiques d'élite sont en mesure d'affirmer leur domination sur tous les répertoires d'interprétation, certaines conséquences ont tendance à suivre. Les répertoires d'interprétation sont rétrécis, oubliés ou mis leur veto là où ils ne s'alignent pas avec ceux des élites. Les organisations intelligentes, plutôt que d'être subordonnées à des problématiques singulières de demandes concurrentes possibles et aux implications pour l'action qui pourraient suivre, peuvent utiliser les distinctions catégoriques qui ont été développées ici pour organiser une conversation réflexive sur la nature des problèmes auxquels elles sont confrontées. Les problèmes ne s'annoncent jamais comme tels; ils doivent être problématiques et leur probtatisation dépend de la capacité de lire les signes correctement. Notre schéma présenté ici devrait fournir une direction à la sémiotique de la problématique et de répondre à des demandes concurrentes.

TRANSLATED VERSION: GERMAN

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

ÜBERSETZTE VERSION: DEUTSCH

Hier ist eine ungefähre Übersetzung der oben vorgestellten Ideen. Dies wurde getan, um ein allgemeines Verständnis der in dem Dokument vorgestellten Ideen zu vermitteln. Bitte entschuldigen Sie

alle grammatikalischen Fehler und machen Sie die ursprünglichen Autoren nicht für diese Fehler verantwortlich.

EINLEITUNG

Konkurrierenden Anforderungen unterworfen zu sein, ist ein allgegenwärtiges und inhärentes Merkmal des Managementlebens (Beech et al. 2004; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013; Lewis und Kelemen 2002). Konkurrierende Anforderungen treten auf, wenn die Verwaltung, abhängig von der Verwendung begrenzter Ressourcen oder Aufmerksamkeit, mehr erfordert, als die verfügbaren Ressourcen vermuten lassen. Wenn konkurrierende Forderungen als vergleichbar wichtig für Manager und Entscheidungsträger angesehen werden, entstehen Spannungen bei der Ressourcenallokation und Priorisierung (siehe Andriopoulos und Lewis 2010; defillippi et al. 2007; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013). Damit konkurrierende Forderungen als widersprüchlich wahrgenommen werden können, reicht es nicht aus, dass Forderungen konkurrieren, da es auch Management-"Wahrnehmungen [ihrer] gegensätzlichen und verwobenen Elemente" geben muss (Lewis 2000, S. 397). Wie mit ihnen umgegangen wird, hängt davon ab, "wie viel Zeit, Energie und Aufwand in eine Nachfrage im Vergleich zur anderen fließen" (Putnam et al. 2014, S. 416). Der Kampf um konkurrierende Anforderungen hat viele dichotome Abstraktionen in Organisationsstudien angespornt, die eine Ausgewogenheit wie Exploration und Ausbeutung (März 1991), Effizienz und Flexibilität erfordern (Adler et al. 1999), Empowerment (Power to) und Power over (Clegg et al. 2006), Verwaltung von Ordnung und Chaos (Eisenhardt und Brown 1998), Effizienz und Flexibilität (Adler et al. 1999) und Bewältigung des evolutionären und revolutionären Wandels (Tushman und O'Reilly 1996). Für die Mitglieder der Organisation bedeutet die gleichzeitige Beachtung beider Forderungen nicht notwendigerweise, dass sie beide Forderungen mit voller Kraft oder mit gleicher Kraft erfüllen (Burton et al. 2015; Clegg et al. 2002) oder sie als neuartigen Ansatz in eine neue Beziehung zu setzen (Putnam et al. 2016). Es gibt subtile Unterschiede zwischen Konzeptualisierungen konkurrierender Forderungen, wenn sie separat behandelt oder gleichzeitig eingesetzt werden (siehe Chen 2017). Manager, die Spannungen zwischen konkurrierenden Forderungen wahrnehmen, können zwischen zwei Handlungssteinen hin- und hergerissen werden, wenn sie versuchen, beide Forderungen gleichzeitig zu erfüllen (Carroll 2012). Das Risiko besteht darin, dass eine Seite der konkurrierenden Forderungen die unmittelbarste Aufmerksamkeit erfordert; Eine Organisation, die sich beispielsweise ausschließlich der Erforschung neuer Grenzen widmet, läuft in relativ kurzer Zeit aus, wenn sie es nicht schafft, das, was sie bereits weiß, auszunutzen. In ähnlicher Weise wird eine Organisation, die durch Ausbeutung Wert schafft, ihre Wissensbestände zu gegebener Zeit ausschöpfen, da sie von eher explorativen Rivalen "überflügelt" wird (Clegg 1989). Beide Pole gleichzeitig zu erreichen, ist das Managementideal, das von ambidextrous Designs versprochen wird, die es Organisationen ermöglichen, konkurrierenden Anforderungen gerecht zu werden, um höhere Leistungen zu erzielen (b'e-Lillegraven 2014; O'Reilly und Tushman 2013), obwohl das Ideal schwer zu erreichen, teuer zu halten und instabil in Aktion (Burton et al. 2015; Gibson und Birkinshaw 2004).

In Rezensionen der jüngsten Literatur wurden die Auswirkungen konkurrierender Pole als Dilemmata, Kompromisse, Dualitäten, Dialektik und Paradoxien konzipiert, um nur einige der Behandlungen des Themas zu erwähnen (Achtenhagen und Melin 2003; Ashforth et al. 2014; Smith und Lewis 2011). Diese Konzeptualisierungen konkurrierender Anforderungen werden zwar detaillierter und vielfältiger, aber auch zunehmend inkonsistent (Denis et al. 2007; Fairhurst et al. 2016; Pache und Santos 2010). In diesem Beitrag erhöhen wir die konzeptionelle Klarheit, indem wir Kernmerkmale identifizieren und dann ein System für die vergleichende Klassifizierung erstellen und skizzieren, wie unterschiedliche Konzeptualisierungen zu unterschiedlichen Verständnissen und Gestaltungsoptionen führen.

Das Papier ist wie folgt aufgebaut. Zunächst diskutieren wir die Prävalenz konkurrierender Anforderungen in Organisationen und die damit verbundenen Auswirkungen in verschiedenen Kontexten und auf verschiedenen Ebenen und betonen die Notwendigkeit konzeptioneller Klarheit. Als nächstes besprechen wir die prominentesten theoretischen Konzeptualisierungen. Anhand von Schlüsselreferenzen stellen wir die herausragenden Merkmale vor und zeigen, wie diese genutzt werden können, um die widersprüchlichen Effekte konkurrierender Anforderungen neu zu konzipieren. Die Destillation dieser

Merkmale bietet eine differenziertere Konzeptualisierung der Auswirkungen konkurrierender Anforderungen und der daraus resultierenden Spannungen. Abschließend besprechen wir die Implikationen, die sich daraus machen, dass wir für mehr konzeptionelle Klarheit gesorgt haben, sowie die theoretischen und praktischen Implikationen für die Organisationsgestaltung.

SCHLUSSFOLGERUNG

Das Papier ging von der Prämisse aus, dass die konzeptionelle Verwirrung über die Problematisierung und Behandlung konkurrierender Anforderungen, die in der Management- und Organisationsliteratur besteht, der weiteren Theoriebildung und konzeptionellen Klärung nicht zuzumuten sei. Statt konzeptioneller Klarheit gab es eine konzeptionelle Malaise. Basierend auf einer ausführlichen Literaturrecherche zu schlüsselwichtigsten Quellen identifizierten wir sieben Unterscheidungsmerkmale, die zugrunde liegende Annahmen in Bezug auf Problematisierung und Behandlung aufdecken. Anhand dieser Features haben wir fünf gemeinsame Ansätze neu konzipiert, um Ähnlichkeit und Unterscheidungskraft zu veranschaulichen. Indem wir Ansätze gegenüberstellen, ergänzen wir frühere Definitionen und machen die Annahmen hinter jedem viel klarer.

Problematisierung ist wichtig. Eine konkurrierende Nachfrage als Dilemma zu sehen, wenn sie am besten als Paradox ontachtet angesehen werden könnte, lässt nicht nur das bestehende Design einer Organisation, die eine solche Fehl kategorisierung unzulänglich erscheinen lässt, sondern kann auch eine Organisation entgleisen lassen. Je nachdem, wie Ereignisse problematisiert werden (Deroy und Clegg 2011), vor allem in Situationen, in denen Elite-Problematisierungen in der Lage sind, ihre Vorherrschaft über alle interpretativen Repertoires zu behaupten, folgen gewisse Konsequenzen. Interpretierenwerden-Repertoires werden eingeengt, vergessen oder ein Veto eingelegt, wenn sie nicht mit denen der Eliten übereinstimmen. Intelligente Organisationen können die hier entwickelten kategorischen Unterscheidungen nutzen, um ein reflexives Gespräch über die Art der Probleme zu organisieren, mit denen sie konfrontiert sind, anstatt sich den einzelnen Problematisierungen möglicher konkurrierender Forderungen und den möglichen Auswirkungen auf die folgenden Maßnahmen unterzuordnen. Probleme geben sich nie als solche an; sie müssen problematisiert werden und ihre Problematisierung hängt davon ab, dass sie die Zeichen richtig lesen können. Unser hier vorgestelltes Schema sollte der Semiotik der Problematisierung und Reaktion auf konkurrierende Anforderungen eine Richtung geben.

TRANSLATED VERSION: PORTUGUESE

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSÃO TRADUZIDA: PORTUGUÊS

Aqui está uma tradução aproximada das ideias acima apresentadas. Isto foi feito para dar uma compreensão geral das ideias apresentadas no documento. Por favor, desculpe todos os erros gramaticais e não responsabilize os autores originais responsáveis por estes erros.

INTRODUÇÃO

Estar sujeito a exigências concorrentes é uma característica abrangente e inerente à vida de gestão (Beech et al. 2004; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013; Lewis e Kelemen 2002). As exigências concorrentes ocorrem quando a gestão, dependendo da utilização de recursos limitados ou atenção, requer mais a ser feito do que os recursos disponíveis sugerem que é possível fazer. Nos casos em que as exigências concorrentes são

consideradas de importância comparável para os gestores e decisores, surgem tensões sobre a atribuição e priorização de recursos (ver Andriopoulos e Lewis 2010; defillippi et al. 2007; Jarzabkowski et al. 2013). Para que as exigências concorrentes sejam consideradas contraditórias, não basta que as exigências sejam concorrentes, pois deve também haver "percepções de gestão dos [seus] elementos opostos e entrelaçados" (Lewis 2000, p. 397). A forma como são tratados depende "de quanto tempo, energia e esforço vão para uma procura em relação à outra" (Putnam et al. 2014, p. 416). A luta para satisfazer as exigências concorrentes tem impulsionado muitas abstrações dicotômicas em estudos de organização que requerem equilíbrio como exploração e exploração (março de 1991), eficiência e flexibilidade (Adler et al. 1999), capacitação (poder para) e poder sobre (Clegg et al. 2006), gestão da ordem e do caos (Eisenhardt e Brown 1998), eficiência e flexibilidade (Adler et al. 1999), e gestão da mudança evolutiva e revolucionária (Tushman e O'Reilly 1996). Para os membros da organização, atender a ambas as exigências simultaneamente não significa necessariamente envolver ambas as exigências na sua força máxima ou com igual vigor (Burton et al. 2015; Clegg et al. 2002) ou situando-os numa nova relação como uma nova abordagem (Putnam et al. 2016). Existem diferenças subtis entre conceptualizações de exigências concorrentes quando são abordadas separadamente ou envolvidas simultaneamente (ver Chen 2017). Os gestores que percebem as tensões entre as exigências concorrentes podem ser divididos entre dois polos de ação quando tentam atender a ambas as exigências ao mesmo tempo (Carroll 2012). O risco é que um dos lados das exigências concorrentes exija a atenção mais imediata; uma organização exclusivamente dedicada à exploração de novas fronteiras, por exemplo, expirará em ordem relativamente curta se não conseguir gerir a exploração do que já sabe bem. Da mesma forma, uma organização que cria valor através da exploração esgotará as suas reservas de conhecimento no devido tempo, uma vez que é "flanqueada" (Clegg 1989) por rivais mais exploratórios (ver Martin 2004). Alcançar ambos os polos simultaneamente é o ideal de gestão prometido pelos projetos ambidextrous que permitem às organizações acomodar exigências concorrentes de forma a obter um maior desempenho (Bøe-Lillegraven 2014; O'Reilly e Tushman 2013), apesar do ideal ser difícil de alcançar, dispendioso de manter, e instável em ação (Burton et al. 2015; Gibson e Birkinshaw 2004).

Nas revisões da literatura recente, os efeitos dos polos concorrentes foram conceptualizados como dilemas, trocas, dualidades, dialéticas e paradoxos, para mencionar apenas alguns dos tratamentos do tema (Achtenhagen e Melin 2003; Ashforth et al. 2014; Smith e Lewis 2011). Estas conceptualizações das exigências concorrentes, ao mesmo tempo que se tornam mais pormenorizadas e variadas, são também cada vez mais inconsistentes (Denis et al. 2007; Fairhurst et al. 2016; Pache e Santos 2010). Neste trabalho, aumentamos a clareza conceptual identificando as características fundamentais e, em seguida, construindo um sistema de classificação comparativa e delineando como diferentes conceptualizações resultam em diferentes entendimentos e opções de design.

O papel é estruturado da seguinte forma. Começamos por discutir a prevalência das exigências concorrentes nas organizações, e os seus efeitos associados em diferentes contextos e a diferentes níveis, salientando a necessidade de clareza conceptual. Em seguida, discutimos as mais proeminentes conceptualizações teóricas. Utilizando referências-chave, apresentamos as características salientes e mostramos como estas podem ser usadas para re-conceber os efeitos contraditórios das exigências concorrentes. A destilação destas características proporciona uma conceptualização mais matizada dos efeitos das exigências concorrentes e das tensões resultantes. Na conclusão, discutimos as implicações de ter proporcionado uma maior clareza conceptual, juntamente com as implicações teóricas e práticas para o design organizacional.

CONCLUSÃO

O documento partiu da premissa de que a confusão conceptual em relação à problemática e tratamento das exigências concorrentes que existem na literatura de gestão e organização foi inimiga de mais teorias e esclarecimentos conceptuais. Em vez de clareza conceptual, houve um mal-estar conceptual. Com base numa extensa revisão literária de fontes-chave, identificámos sete características distintas que revelam

pressupostos subjacentes à problemática e ao tratamento. Utilizando estas características, reconceptualizámos cinco abordagens comuns para ilustrar a semelhança e a distinção. Ao justtaping abordagens, complementamos as definições anteriores e tornamos os pressupostos por trás de cada um muito mais claro.

A problemática é importante. Ver uma procura concorrente como um dilema quando pode ser melhor visto como um paradoxo não só faz com que o design existente de uma organização que faz com que tal má categorização pareça inadequado, mas também pode descarrilar uma organização. Dependendo de como os eventos são problemáticos (Deroy e Clegg 2011), especialmente em situações em que as problematizações de elite são capazes de afirmar o seu domínio sobre todos os repertórios interpretativos, certas consequências tendem a seguir-se. Os repertórios interpretativos são limitados, esquecidos ou vetados onde não se alinham com os das elites. As organizações inteligentes, em vez de estarem subordinadas a problematizações singulares de possíveis exigências concorrentes e às implicações para a ação que se seguirão, podem usar as distinções categóricas que aqui foram desenvolvidas para organizar uma conversa reflexiva sobre a natureza dos problemas que enfrentam. Os problemas nunca se anunciam como tal; devem ser problemáticos e a sua problematização depende de ser capaz de ler corretamente os sinais. O nosso esquema aqui apresentado deve dar orientação à semiótica da problemática e resposta às exigências concorrentes.