

Call for Papers

Special Issue on “Reconciling Conflicting Paradigms in Operations and Supply Chain Management” *International Journal of Production Economics*

Summary

In recent years, scholars and practitioners in Operations and Supply Chain Management (OSCM) are increasingly concerned about the conflicting paradigms in operations management and contradictory operational objectives in organizational design. For example, it has been widely criticized that quality management programmes such as ISO 9000 and Six Sigma make organizations less innovative, and there is a conflict in pursuing efficiency and innovativeness. The paradox between organizational exploration and organizational exploitation is of increasing concern to scholars in OSCM and other disciplines. Similarly, there are other possible conflicting objectives in the design of organizational systems. For example, an operational system being more reliable and resilient might require a higher level of redundancy, so it is less lean and efficient. The emphasis on risk management might in turn make firms less decisive and more inert. On the contrary, some researchers also proposed the synergistic and overlapping approaches of these systems, processes, and techniques. Do these conflicts really exist from an operations management point of view? What can OSCM scholars do to mitigate these conflicts? Are there any better organizational designs to deal with the conflicts? This special issue (SI) aims to encourage discussion, conceptual development, analysis, and empirical verification of these issues.

Background

Industrial practitioners often face different and conflicting objectives in their organizational functions, leading to tension in the design of organizational systems (Andropoulos and Lewis, 2009; Benner and Tushman, 2003). In the last decades, the paradoxical tension between exploration and exploitation in the organizational context received increasing attention from the management research community, predominantly from organisational behaviour researchers. In the OSCM domain, such research is limited to the contexts of process management, new product development, and innovation (Ng et al., 2015). Even with growing interest, there is little research examining paradoxes including tension, duality, emerging trade-off, and dilemma in the domain of OSCM. Similarly, there is a lack of research on how operations and supply chain managers deal with operational ambidexterity (Patel et al., 2012) to manage exploitation versus exploration or paradoxical tension.

In addition, with a growing focus on the sustainability, safety, and resilience of firms, there are increasingly potential conflicting objectives in the design of organizational systems (MacCarthy et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2014). For instance, firms' initiatives for environmental and social responsibility might be multi-dimensional, creating conflicting operational requirements from different stakeholders (MacCarthy et al., 2013). Social and environmental research has received much attention in a wide range of literature (e.g., Pagell and Shevchenko, 2014; Linton et al., 2007; Markman and Krause, 2016; Matos and Hall, 2007; Matthews et al., 2016), and many of these studies implicitly assume that the pursuit of economic and operational efficiency is always in line with social and environmental objectives. Yet, it is sometimes not the case in actual practice (see, e.g., Jacob et al., 2010; Lam et al., 2016), particularly when both economic and social objectives are pursued across the entire organization (Yeung et al., 2011).

Research Opportunities

This SI provides an important and timely platform for researchers in various domains to conduct interdisciplinary research to bridge the above research gaps and generate novel insights. We are looking for papers that can create new theories or extend, test, and validate existing theories to explain new problems or phenomena. We also welcome papers that connect theory with practice in a problem-driven environment and provide managerial guidelines on how to make decisions relating to and managing conflicting objectives. In short, this SI aims to address some of the key questions arising from the above development, which include but are not limited to

- What are the emerging conflicting paradigms in the domains of OSCM and Production Economics?
- Do these conflicts really exist from an OSCM point of view?
- What can OSCM scholars do to mitigate these conflicts?
- What are the new forms of organizational design and business model to deal with such conflicts?
- How are organisations dealing with such conflicting objectives?
- What are the different collaboration or incentive mechanisms to deal with such conflicting objectives?

These are all interesting questions for both industry practitioners and academic researchers. The potential topics in the domain of OSCM may include

- Paradoxes including duality, dilemma, and tension
- Managing lean, agile or leagile objectives
- Conflicting objectives in embracing sustainable and resilient OSCM
- Efficiency versus resilience paradoxical tension
- Managing objectives in collaboration, competition, and co-opetition
- Exploration and exploitation tension
- Intertemporal tension
- Short-term versus long-term OSCM objectives
- Organizational ambidexterity issues
- Unanticipated consequences and trade-offs in OSCM
- Game-theoretical models for managing conflicts
- Conflicting objectives as a result of the use of digital technologies such as big data, blockchain, digital manufacturing, in the contexts of industry 4.0 and the sharing economy
- Managing objectives for SMEs, MSMEs, and MNCs
- Synergistic approaches to operations including lean innovation, lean versus resilient, environmental performance versus operations performance, and equity versus efficiency
- Emerging conflicting and synergistic issues associated with the adoption of sustainable production, circular economy, resource efficiency, industrial symbiosis and product-service systems

We encourage the use of multiple theoretical lenses and methodologies. The methodologies may include, but not be limited to, case studies, surveys, use of secondary and archival data, analytical modelling, experiments, and social media analytics. All the submitted papers are required to comply with the theme of the SI within the scope of the *International Journal of Production Economics (IJPE)*.

Publication Schedule (*tentative*)

Manuscript submission deadline: 31 December 2019

Notification of review reports: 29 February 2020

Revised manuscript submission deadline: 31 May 2020

Manuscript Preparation

Authors should conform to the instructions given in the Guide for Authors for *IJPE* when preparing their manuscripts, and should submit their full papers electronically through the journal's online manuscript submission site: <http://ees.elsevier.com/ijpe> by selecting "Special Issue: Reconciling Conflicting Paradigms in Operations and Supply Chain Management" when it prompts to indicate the "Article Type" in the submission. The review process will follow the journal's normal standard and practice.

For further enquiries, please contact any of the SI guest editors.

Guest Editors

Prof. Andy C. L. Yeung [Managing Guest Editor]

Chair Professor of Operations Management

Faculty of Business

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong

E-mail: andy.yeung@polyu.edu.hk

Dr Alok Choudhary

Reader in Supply Chain Management

School of Business and Economics

Loughborough University, Loughborough, United Kingdom

E-mail: a.choudhary@lboro.ac.uk

Dr Di Fan

Senior Lecturer

Research School of Management

The Australian National University

Canberra, Australia

E-mail: di.fan@anu.edu.au

References

- Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M.W. (2009) Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 696-717.
- Benner, M.J., & Tushman, M.L. (2003) Exploitation, exploration, and process management: The productivity dilemma revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 238-256.
- Jacobs, B.W., Singhal, V.R., & Subramanian, R. (2010) An empirical investigation of environmental performance and the market value of the firm. *Journal of Operations Management*, 28(5), 430-441.

- Lam, H.K., Yeung, A.C., Cheng, T.C.E., & Humphreys, P.K. (2016) Corporate environmental initiatives in the Chinese context: Performance implications and contextual factors. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 180, 48-56.
- Linton, J.D., Klassen, R., & Jayaraman, V. (2007) Sustainable supply chains: An introduction. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25(6), 1075-1082.
- MacCarthy, B. L., Lewis, M., Voss, C., & Narasimhan, R. (2013). The same old methodologies? Perspectives on OM research in the post-lean age. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 33(7), 934-956.
- Markman, G.D., & Krause, D. (2016) Theory building surrounding sustainable supply chain management: Assessing what we know, exploring where to go. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 52(2), 3-10.
- Matos, S., & Hall, J. (2007) Integrating sustainable development in the supply chain: The case of life cycle assessment in oil and gas and agricultural biotechnology. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25(6), 1083-1102.
- Matthews, L., Power, D., Touboulic, A., & Marques, L. (2016) Building bridges: Toward alternative theory of sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 52(1), 82-94.
- Ng, S.C., Rungtusanatham, J.M., Zhao, X., & Lee, T.S. (2015) Examining process management via the lens of exploitation and exploration: Reconceptualization and scale development. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 163, 1-15.
- Pagell, M., & Shevchenko, A. (2014) Why research in sustainable supply chain management should have no future. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 50(1), 44-55.
- Patel, P.C., Terjesen, S., & Li, D. (2012) Enhancing effects of manufacturing flexibility through operational absorptive capacity and operational ambidexterity. *Journal of Operations Management*, 30(3), 201-220.
- Wu, T., Wu, Y.C.J., Chen, Y.J., & Goh, M. (2014) Aligning supply chain strategy with corporate environmental strategy: A contingency approach. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 147, 220-229.
- Yeung, A.C., Lo, C.K., & Cheng, T.C.E. (2011) Behind the iron cage: An institutional perspective on ISO 9000 adoption and CEO compensation. *Organization Science*, 22(6), 1600-1612.