



*Citation for published version:*

Grigore, G, Molesworth, M, Miles, C & Glozer, S 2021, '(Un)Resolving digital technology paradoxes through the rhetoric of balance', *Organization*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 186-207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420968196>

*DOI:*

[10.1177/1350508420968196](https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420968196)

*Publication date:*

2021

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

*Publisher Rights*

CC BY-NC

**University of Bath**

**Alternative formats**

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:  
[openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk)

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**(Un)Resolving digital technology paradoxes through the rhetoric of balance**

Journal:	<i>Organization</i>
Manuscript ID	ORG-19-0227.R3
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue: Dark Side of Digitalization
Keywords:	digital technologies, rhetoric, paradox, balance, corporate social responsibility
Abstract:	The organizational benefits of digital technologies are increasingly contrasted with negative societal consequences. Such tensions are contradictory, persistent and interrelated, suggesting paradoxes. Yet, we lack insight into how such apparent paradoxes are constructed and to what effect. This empirical paper draws upon interviews with thirty-nine responsibility managers to unpack how paradoxes are discursively (re)constructed and resolved as a rhetoric of 'balance' that ensures identification with organizational, familial and societal interests. We also reveal how such 'false balance' sustains and legitimizes organizational activity by displacing responsibilities onto distant 'others' through temporal (futurizing), spatial (externalizing) and level (magnifying / individualizing) rhetorical devices. In revealing the process of paradox construction and resolution as 'balance' in the context of digitalization and its unanticipated outcomes, we join conversations into new organizational responsibilities in the digital economy, with implications for theory and practice.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## (Un)Resolving digital technology paradoxes through the rhetoric of balance

### Abstract

*The organizational benefits of digital technologies are increasingly contrasted with negative societal consequences. Such tensions are contradictory, persistent and interrelated, suggesting paradoxes. Yet, we lack insight into how such apparent paradoxes are constructed and to what effect. This empirical paper draws upon interviews with thirty-nine responsibility managers to unpack how paradoxes are discursively (re)constructed and resolved as a rhetoric of 'balance' that ensures identification with organizational, familial and societal interests. We also reveal how such 'false balance' sustains and legitimizes organizational activity by displacing responsibilities onto distant 'others' through temporal (futurizing), spatial (externalizing) and level (magnifying / individualizing) rhetorical devices. In revealing the process of paradox construction and resolution as 'balance' in the context of digitalization and its unanticipated outcomes, we join conversations into new organizational responsibilities in the digital economy, with implications for theory and practice.*

**Keywords:** Paradox, rhetoric, balance, digital technologies, corporate social responsibility

## Introduction

Digitalization presents somewhat of a paradox for corporate social responsibility (CSR). On the one hand, digital technologies enchant CSR agendas, facilitating inclusive and flexible working practices (Johnson, 2015), providing ‘spaces’ within which knowledge of CSR is constructed (Author 4 et al., 2019) and even in offering environmental benefits through ‘smart’ business solutions (Caragiu et al., 2011). Yet these same technologies also engender concerns regarding surveillance, exploitative work contracts, and data use and privacy (Author 1, 2017). This creates a need for engagement with, and abatement of, the darker side of digitalization (Trittin et al., 2019). Yet we know little about exactly *how* the managers tasked with responding to social, environmental and (digi-)ethical issues in organizations, construct and navigate evolving tensions surrounding digitalization, or the subsequent implications for business and society.

It is against this backdrop that this paper draws upon thirty-nine interviews with CSR managers to unpack and examine the rhetorical construction and resolution of the apparent paradoxes of digital technology. We theorize how paradoxes are ‘talked into existence’ building upon the rhetorical turn in organizational studies (Author 3, 2018; Heath, 2011; Meisenbach and McMillan, 2006). Although rhetoric has been utilized in CSR scholarship to reveal how CSR managers organize emerging business-society tensions as paradoxical (Hoffman, 2018; Hoff-Clausen, 2018), studies relating to the digital interface are scant. Indeed, as digitalization creates new challenges for how organizations and societies are organized (Flyverbom et al., 2019), the time is ripe to explore the language use that surrounds the dark side of digital technology.

Our contributions are twofold. First, we offer empirical insight into the processes through which managers *talk into* existence paradoxes related to digital technologies, and then deploy balance as a way of *talking out* of existence the same paradoxes. This process ensures continued

1  
2  
3 identification with organizational, familial and societal interests, revealing the complexity of  
4 reconciling juxtaposed and interwoven views of digital technologies. Yet, contrary to the positive  
5 possibilities of achieving ‘dynamic equilibrium’ or ‘both and more’ approaches within paradox  
6 literature (Smith and Lewis, 2011; Wenzel et al., 2019), we suggest that such paradoxes are not  
7 static entities in search of (re)solution (Pina e Cunha and Putman, 2019), but concurrently  
8 constructed and resolved as responsibility managers make sense of evolving social and ethical  
9 implications of digital technologies for business and society. We thus offer insight into the  
10 paradoxes of digital technologies in CSR contexts (Hoffman, 2018; O’Conner and Ihlen, 2018).

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Secondly, we critically examine the rhetorical *purpose* that paradox and its resolution  
23 serves in organizational contexts (Pina e Cunha, 2020). Constructing the dark side of technology  
24 as a paradox that may be balanced *legitimizes* organizational activity (Erkama and Vaara, 2010;  
25 Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005) by crafting a ‘false balance’. CSR is displaced from the  
26 organization onto distant ‘others’ through three rhetorical strategies spanning: (1) time, by  
27 *futurizing* (projecting a positive vision of the future), (2) space, by *externalizing* (shifting  
28 responsibility outside of the organization to homes, other organizations, or governments), and/or  
29 (3) level, by either *magnifying* or *individualizing* (presenting issues so that they can only be  
30 solved by society, or by individuals and not at the level of the organisation). We thus unveil  
31 micro-level, discursive defence mechanisms (Smith and Lewis, 2011) as CSR managers express  
32 (digital) responsibility within a constraining frame of organizational identification (Hoff-  
33 Clausen, 2018).

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 We start by considering paradox in organizational research, before unpacking rhetoric as  
50 our conceptual frame. We bring these strands of literature together in the context of CSR and  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 digital technology, prior to presenting our methods. We follow with findings and a discussion  
4 that offers implications for theory and practice.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **Organizational Paradoxes**

11  
12 Schad et al. (2016) note the persistence of paradox in ways of thinking about the world. For  
13 example, paradox appears as the ying-yang of interdependent elements in Taoism, as universal  
14 problems that need resolution in the pursuit of truth in ancient Greece, and as rational dialectic in  
15 more recent philosophy. In psychoanalysis, paradox is also present as Jung's shadow and Freud's  
16 defence mechanisms.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 More recently 'paradox studies' have emerged as a useful way to understand the  
25 inevitable tensions and contradictions that emerge in organizational contexts (Schad et al., 2016;  
26 Smith and Lewis, 2011; Putnam et al., 2016; Ihlen and Heath, 2018). Defined as 'contradictory  
27 yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time' (Smith and Lewis,  
28 2011:382), paradox is experienced when elements that might seem logical in isolation, become  
29 irrational, or absurd when juxtaposed. For example, the commercial use of online consumer data  
30 on its own seems reasonable. As does citizens' desire not to be subject to surveillance. Yet when  
31 existing together, they create a paradox of profitability versus privacy.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 For Schad et al. (2016), paradox is therefore an overarching perspective on tensions and  
43 their management. They rearticulate Poole and Van de Ven's (1989) possible responses to  
44 paradox, including: spatial and temporal separation, and synthesis, and, acknowledging Smith  
45 and Lewis (2011), note defence mechanisms associated with paradox, including: splitting,  
46 projecting, and ambivalence. They conclude that paradox is an *inevitable* experience of  
47 conflicting and interwoven logics produced by markets, corporations, communities and family,  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with a known range of possible responses. Consequently, they highlight a move to working with,  
4 rather than resolving paradox, through a productive ‘dynamic equilibrium’ that moves between  
5  
6  
7  
8 opposing sides and requires an ongoing balance. Yet they also observe a lack of research into  
9  
10 *how* individuals experience such productive balancing.

11  
12 To address this gap, Wenzel et al. (2019) consider the ‘both and more’ approaches to  
13  
14 solving paradox by reflecting on the conflicting demands of officers and therapists in a  
15  
16 correctional facility. Resolutions of tensions allow for both sides to achieve a ‘balanced  
17  
18 compromise’ by integrating the other’s position in their role description. The resulting  
19  
20 compromises then reproduce themselves at an individual, collective/organizational, or macro-  
21  
22 level. Again, the literature points to the potential for paradox to lead to productive balance. The  
23  
24 issue of level is also important here, as once ‘talked into existence’, paradox may be experienced  
25  
26 by individuals, exist within organisations, or be present within a whole society, with each level  
27  
28 co-constituting the others.

29  
30  
31  
32  
33 However, Pina e Cunha and Putman (2019:99) suggest that the success of paradox theory  
34  
35 means that it has become conflated with tensions and contradictions such that it is easy to assume  
36  
37 these are always paradoxes, resulting in a prevalence of normative approaches to explain the  
38  
39 existence and resolution tension, contradiction, or paradox. This institutionalization of paradox  
40  
41 theory reduces the theoretical imagination by reifying paradox, with ‘labels such as *dynamic*  
42  
43 *equilibrium* or *balance* [protecting] the dominant logic of order’(p99). Hence scholars might give  
44  
45 more focus to how paradoxes *become* paradoxes.

46  
47  
48  
49 For example, Putnam et al. (2016) argue that paradox develops in organizations through  
50  
51 discourse that becomes a way of dealing with inevitable conflicts and tension. Hoffman (2018)  
52  
53 further suggests that paradoxes are talked into existence when incompatible claims are made, as  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 a way *to deal with* a tension. Using CSR as a context, Hoffman further suggests that industry and  
4 academic discourse also attempts *to eliminate* paradox by *talking it away*, either to recreate the  
5 organizational harmony necessary to maintain corporate legitimacy, or to construct hypocrisy  
6 discourses in the case of critical CSR. However, both approaches merely reproduce the figures of  
7 paradox and its resolutions, preventing alternative theorization, or organizational reflection.  
8  
9

10 We can observe this discursive construction and resolution of paradox in recent research.  
11  
12 For example, in an analysis of the Volkswagen Diesel scandal, Gaim et al. (2020) show how  
13 managers' demands for high-performance engines that met emissions targets generated  
14 'stretched goals' which could not be met (i.e., talked a paradox into existence). This resulted in  
15 organizational dysfunctions as engineers 'embraced paradox' to produce emissions cheat  
16 devices. Such paradox isn't an inevitable 'out there' aspect of organizations, but it is constituted  
17 by managers to *create* a tension to be resolved (by engineers in this case). Gaim et al. (2020) call  
18 for more research on the 'false mastery of paradoxes', yet we might further observe the risk of  
19 normalizing paradox as representing any tension or contradiction, then focussing on balance as a  
20 solution, without fully recognizing how and why paradox is constructed in the first place. As  
21 Wenzel et al. (2019) also highlight, paradox results from power dynamics: the ability of some to  
22 say what takes precedence over what, or even what is equivalent to what. For example, a data  
23 use/privacy tension is a paradox when businesses claim that their right to exploit data is equally  
24 legitimate as users' claims for privacy. So whilst not denying the possibility of inherent paradox  
25 in organizations, or its productive value (Schad et al., 2016), we can also recognize its role in  
26 constructing preferred organizational realities. It is upon this ontological distinction – the  
27 discursive construction of paradox – that our attention now turns to rhetoric.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Organizational Rhetoric

Paradox is tied to rhetoric through its original use in logical and persuasive argumentation in ancient Greek thought and whilst the art of persuasion may have changed, the practice of using words to persuade others – and ourselves – remains a core human trait. Rhetoric may now also be understood as the means by which we construct organizational realities and then protect them by undermining alternative constructions (Keiser, 1997; Hamilton, 2001). Surprisingly, paradox and rhetoric studies remain mostly separate, resulting in little understanding of the *rhetorical* purpose of constituting and (re)solving paradox.

Although rhetoric is popularly associated with public persuasion, in the twentieth century, a ‘new’ rhetoric led to a widening of the field’s concerns and techniques. It was especially influenced by Kenneth Burke’s (1969a, 1969b) position that rhetoric is about creating and maintaining *identifications* between people and groups to create a *terministic screen* – a system of language – through which the world is then understood. For Heath et al. (2018) identification produces tensions between the individual ‘I’ and organizational ‘we’ (or any other group) as humans seek order. This sensitizes us to pronoun use in rhetoric that indicates attempts at identification (or disidentification). For example, Heath et al. (2018) note that processes of identification involve seeking a common ground, uniting against a common ‘other’, and assuming a transcendent ‘we’.

The new rhetoric produced a ‘rhetorical turn’ in organizational studies, strategic, managerial and marketing discourse (Cheney et al., 2004; Meisenbach and Macmillan, 2006; Author 3, 2018; Ihlen and Heath, 2018). Meisenbach and McMillan (2006:89) describe an organizational rhetoric perspective as, ‘focusing on messages created *within and/or on behalf of organizations* that seek to create identifications, solicit cooperation, and/or persuade’ (our

1  
2  
3 emphasis). This contrasts with the broader concerns of organizational discourse scholarship. For  
4  
5 example, although Grant and Hardy (2004:6) define organizational discourse as ‘the structured  
6  
7 collections of texts embodied in the practices of talking and writing [...] that bring  
8  
9 organizationally related objects into being’, organizational rhetoric focuses on the approaches  
10  
11 taken by managers, employees, and other organizational stakeholders to *persuade* themselves,  
12  
13 each other, and the outside world. Hence, rhetoric deals with how organizers ‘use language as a  
14  
15 symbolic means of inducing cooperation’ by creating and maintaining identifications (Burke,  
16  
17 1969a:43). As Nienkamp (2001) also shows, the way that we talk ourselves into accepting and  
18  
19 supporting ideas and positions can be considered fundamentally rhetorical. Rhetoric is therefore  
20  
21 about *relating* to others, in addition to ensuring they identify with us.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 In studies of organizational rhetoric, there is an urge to distinguish between internal and  
28  
29 external rhetoric (Cheney et al., 2004; Heath, 2011) as different layers of persuasive discourse.  
30  
31 Yet, as Heath (2011:416) notes, ‘tensions and choices that exist within an organization are  
32  
33 inseparable from those external to it’, and the relationship between internal and external rhetoric  
34  
35 is often dynamic and highly synergistic. As symbolic work, rhetoric can therefore construct  
36  
37 ‘legitimizing accounts’ of new organizational forms (Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005), with  
38  
39 change (e.g., a ‘jolt’ from digital technology) allowing room for organizational actors to modify  
40  
41 existing logics. Balogun et al. (2014) similarly highlight that rhetoric (metaphor) represents how  
42  
43 speakers construct both themselves, and the legitimization of corporate strategy. Suddaby and  
44  
45 Greenwood (2005) observe various argumentation strategies in legitimizing rhetoric: teleological  
46  
47 (outcome of a breach caused by a grand plan), ontological (what can and cannot exist) and  
48  
49 cosmological (a natural change, evolution). They further note that ‘backstage’ debates about  
50  
51 legitimacy are not well-researched. Erkama and Vaara (2010) place further emphasis on the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 central role of language (rhetoric) in legitimizing activity, adding autopoiesis and cosmos to the  
4 classical ethos, pathos and logos, to explore tensions that emerge in a factory shutdown process.  
5  
6 In particular, they note how self-referential, or autopoietic rhetoric argues for an action based on  
7  
8 a strategy (to improve efficiency), and how cosmos presents change (i.e., globalization and  
9  
10 movements in labour) as inevitable. However, Boyd and Waymer (2011) note a managerial bias  
11  
12 in such studies of organizational rhetoric, calling for more critical approaches.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 In sum, rhetoric-based studies provide insight into how organizational actors deploy  
18  
19 arguments to persuade the self and others about preferred realities, and thus provide a rich  
20  
21 avenue for understanding *how* paradoxes are ‘called into existence’. Our attention now turns to  
22  
23 the (digital) CSR context of our study.  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **CSR and Digital Technologies as a Context for Business-Society Paradox**

29  
30 Organizations are a marketplace for ideas, including social issues (Wickert and De Bakker,  
31  
32 2018) and CSR managers, in particular, attempt to transform abstract ideas into responsibilities  
33  
34 and related tasks through their ‘talk’ (Christensen et al., 2020). Hoffman (2018) further observes  
35  
36 that CSR is a key contemporary site for paradox, and O’Conner and Ihlen (2018) note that  
37  
38 rhetoric is instrumental in the conceptualization, construction and negotiation of CSR between  
39  
40 corporations and stakeholders. The authors further highlight a surprising lack of rhetorical  
41  
42 approaches in CSR research, and a bias towards functionalist approaches to CSR  
43  
44 communication, to the detriment of constitutive views. Hoff-Clausen (2018) further notes that a  
45  
46 rhetorical approach can reveal how CSR managers organize *emerging* business-society tensions  
47  
48 *within* an organization. The organization therefore provides a subject-position from which a  
49  
50 rhetor can speak, but it also constrains what can be said. This suggests an inherent paradox in the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 CSR position of both enabling expressions of responsibility, but constraining them within  
4  
5 organizational identification.  
6

7  
8 Studies on CSR and rhetoric have focussed on how a firm's activity is legitimized. For  
9  
10 example, Castello and Lozano (2011) have argued that CSR creates 'strategic rhetoric' to defend  
11  
12 corporate decisions. In this context, CSR managers are engaged in an *epideictic* rhetorical  
13  
14 enterprise, in that they argue persuasively for the praise of something (organizational activities).  
15  
16 CSR has therefore become a source of security that responds to destabilizing aspects of business-  
17  
18 society relationships, and may be understood as an unrealised source of 'aspirational talk' that  
19  
20 represents firms' desire for social responsibility (Christensen et al., 2013). Drawing upon the  
21  
22 concept of strategic ambiguity, Christensen et al. (2020:11; 2013) show how vague ideals placed  
23  
24 into the future allow for the perception of fulfilments of promises. Strategic ambiguity is  
25  
26 therefore a 'rhetorical resource that may be exploited by different actors to advance their  
27  
28 particular interests' (Christensen et al., 2020:11), i.e., CSR managers create organizational  
29  
30 descriptions that current activities do not yet live up to (a rhetoric-reality paradox). This generate  
31  
32 new 'productive idealizations' that organizations then work to realize (Christensen et al., 2013).  
33  
34 Christensen et al. (2013) also acknowledge that CSR may be inherently paradoxical, whilst  
35  
36 remaining vague and open to multiple interpretations.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 In another study of everyday CSR practice, Carrington et al. (2019) suggest that the focus  
43  
44 on separate units of analysis (i.e., firms, industry or community, regional, societal, global)  
45  
46 obscures the role that individuals have in organizational and societal change through their  
47  
48 'aspirational talk'; an implicit reference to the power of rhetoric in constructing a positive reality.  
49  
50 CSR managers therefore first acknowledge business-society tensions, then make claims about  
51  
52 possible solutions through aspirational talk that will ideally move an organisation towards the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 societal side of the paradox. Similarly, Hoffman (2018) argues that CSR theory and practice  
4  
5 serve to deal with tensions that emerge between business interests and subsequent societal  
6  
7 concerns discursively.  
8  
9

10           However, prior studies have not yet fully revealed how CSR managers come to construct  
11  
12 the reality that they present through discourse, particularly in the context of evolving areas of  
13  
14 *digital* responsibility. Digital technologies continue to change how businesses and societies are  
15  
16 governed and organized, raising new debates about business responsibilities in the digital  
17  
18 economy (Andersen, 2020; Author 1 et al., 2017, 2018; Flyverbom et al., 2019; Lobschat et al.,  
19  
20 2019; Trittin et al., 2019). Many studies celebrate the socio-economic virtues of digitalization,  
21  
22 e.g. in facilitating partnerships across market, civil and state sectors (Author 4, 2018; Author 4 et  
23  
24 al., 2019), as well as boosting productivity (Fleming, 2019). Digital technologies further allow  
25  
26 employees to operate anywhere and at any time, supporting flexible working practices that  
27  
28 benefit marginalized members of society (Johnson, 2015). In addition to the exciting economic  
29  
30 benefits of the ‘4<sup>th</sup> Industrial Revolution’, digital technology also promises environmental  
31  
32 benefits from Smart electric meters to Smart buildings and even whole Smart cities (Caragliu et  
33  
34 al., 2011). Digital technology is therefore presented as a *solution* to previous business-society  
35  
36 tensions located in the CSR domain. This has further resulted in new concepts including ‘virtual  
37  
38 CSR dialogs’ where the Internet allows for businesses and stakeholders to ‘co-create’ and  
39  
40 organize responsible programs (Author 4 et al., 2019), or ‘responsible network societies’  
41  
42 (Castello et al., 2013) revealing how digital media affords opportunities for enhancing business-  
43  
44 society networks.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51           Whilst benefits are widely noted, recent research paints a darker picture (West, 2019),  
52  
53 finding the solution argument wanting. For instance, concerns surrounding social and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 professional isolation (Hislop et al., 2015), mental health illness through ‘technostrain’ and  
4  
5 ‘technoaddiction,’ where users exhibit compulsive use of technologies (Perlow, 2012), have  
6  
7 come to the fore. Additionally, Flyverbom et al. (2019) draw attention to the ethical issues  
8  
9 related to aggressive algorithms for profiling and tracking employees privacy, and Makridakis  
10  
11 (2017) notes potential social and wealth inequalities resulting from AI in the workplace. Putnam  
12  
13 et al. (2016) further note the erosion of work-home and private-public boundaries. Such studies  
14  
15 contrast celebratory discourses with alternative and oppositional political and social narratives  
16  
17 (West, 2019), and these have further raised debates about new business responsibilities in the  
18  
19 digital economy (Author 1 et al., 2017, 2018; Trittin et al., 2019), resulting in novel concepts like  
20  
21 ‘corporate digital responsibility’ (Lobschat et al., 2019; Andersen, 2020).  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Although it may be tempting to attribute the dark side of technology to omnipotent  
27  
28 hardware and code, we might recognize that tensions are a result of both the organization of  
29  
30 technology, and the various positions put forward by different stakeholders as a result of their  
31  
32 sense-making and motivations. Any dark side may in fact be an organizational one. The  
33  
34 presentation of both apparent benefits and potential downsides to digital technology has therefore  
35  
36 resulted in a paradox being talked into existence as an issue for responsible business (c.f.  
37  
38 Hoffman, 2018). Indeed, this may represent something of a *meta-paradox* as the paradox of how  
39  
40 business-society paradox is resolved is that it creates a new paradox.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **Methods**

48  
49 Our aim is to understand how responsibility managers use rhetoric to construct and resolve  
50  
51 apparent paradoxes relating to digital technology, and their purpose in doing so.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Wickert and De Bakker (2018) note the difficulty of *identifying* CSR managers because  
4 titles are so varied. Encountering the same issue, we recruited managers who *describe themselves*  
5 as engaging with aspects of ethics, sustainability, or responsibility. This inevitably expanded the  
6 range of managerial roles included (Table 1), and so we refer to them as ‘responsibility  
7 managers’. As we followed participant recommendations to identify further participants, we  
8 included one public sector professional and two people working for non-profit organizations. All  
9 thirty-nine participants were located in the South of the UK with ages ranging from 26 to 56.  
10 Thirteen were female. Interviews lasted between 50 minutes and 150 minutes and took place in  
11 participants’ offices, or in coffee shops. Interviews were recorded with participants’ permission,  
12 and then transcribed with identifying information removed. Together, our participants have  
13 considerable experience of defining, developing and/or implementing ethics policies, CSR  
14 strategies and communications, and knowledge of how digital technology is transforming their  
15 workplace and lives.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Interviews were unstructured with participants invited to talk about their work and  
34 careers (‘Tell me about your career’, ‘What is it about your work that is important to you?’, etc.),  
35 their experiences of digital technologies, including in their private lives (‘What are your thoughts  
36 on digital technology?’, ‘What technologies do you use?’, etc.), their understanding of the impact  
37 of digital technology (‘How has technology impacted your work?’, ‘How has it changed other  
38 aspects of your life?’, etc.), and at the end of the interviews, their knowledge and use of  
39 organizational policy relating to areas of concerns (‘Are issues relating to digital technology  
40 discussed in your organisation?’, etc.). After 52 hours of data generation between January and  
41 June 2018, we saturated themes, noting recurrent patterns.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Although we recognize that other roles may also speak to the dark side of business  
4 technology use, it is the familiarity with both aspects of business-society tensions, and with  
5 arguing for responsibility, that allows our participants to reveal related rhetorical strategies to us.  
6  
7 They are unlike both Information and Communications Technology (ICT) managers, who may  
8 focus on the development of technology itself, or general managers that may be familiar with the  
9 business technology use, but neither have the remit, or experience to specifically articulate issues  
10 of responsibility. Participants themselves recognized their role as different from those directly  
11 working on technology. For example, Rebecca, a 50-year-old responsibility manager in  
12 telecommunications explains:  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 *There are a lot of technologists in the innovation team. And we know that if you only look*  
27 *at the technology, you tend to bias everything [...] They can be crazy sometimes and see*  
28 *a really, really cool technology, but not really think about the consequences of it. So, my*  
29 *role is to think about some of those consequences.*  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Although such managers may be reluctant to *explicitly* acknowledge their rhetoric, due to  
39 negative connotations of manipulation, it is at the centre of their role (Castello and Lozano,  
40 2011; Hoffman, 2018; Christensen et al., 2020). Interviews themselves can also be considered  
41 ‘rhetorical situations’ (Bitzer, 1968), with interviewers acting as an audience. As Symon  
42 (2008:83) notes, respondents might understand a researcher as a judge of their accounts, and so  
43 present their view so as to avoid alienating them. As rhetoric is centred around identification  
44 (Burke, 1969), a respondent might therefore seek to present a ‘balanced’ view in order to  
45 highlight consubstantiality (common ground) with an academic interviewer thought to value an  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 ‘objective’, nuanced dialectic. A rhetorical approach therefore problematizes the relationship  
4 between researcher and respondent, yet as Laine et al. (2015) observe, although participants  
5  
6 ‘perform’, this must still represent their subjectivity, i.e., they can only draw from the rhetoric  
7  
8 available to them, and within desired identifications. Our participants therefore inevitably reveal  
9  
10 the rhetoric embedded in their role, their other identifications, and their relationship to digital  
11  
12 technology.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 The process of data analysis was iterative and abductive, consistent with studies such as  
18  
19 Erkama and Vaara (2010), Laine et al. (2015), Wickert and De Bakker (2018), or Author 1 et al.  
20  
21 (2020). As Driver (2017) notes, subsequent interpretations are not intended as proof of a finding,  
22  
23 but as plausible explanations that contribute to debate. As Hoffman (2018) further explains, our  
24  
25 arguments are therefore themselves rhetorical, presenting a version of the world where readers  
26  
27 might reconsider both paradox and its resolution in CSR rhetoric.  
28  
29

30  
31 Analysis occurred in two phases. Firstly, two members of the research team compared  
32  
33 interpretations of the data. During this phase, it became apparent that managers would present  
34  
35 positive aspects of digital technology for their organizations, and then - especially when  
36  
37 reflecting on their private lives or society - consider its darker sides, expressing feelings relating  
38  
39 to their personal experiences of digital technology, as well as the arguments around it that they  
40  
41 marshal professionally. Consistent with Nienkamp’s (2009) explanation that external  
42  
43 contingencies produce an internal negotiation between voices, our respondents expressed *self-*  
44  
45 *persuasion* as they introduced metaphors of balance, spontaneously arguing for solutions to their  
46  
47 own contradictions.  
48  
49  
50

51 In the second phase, the focus was on *how* balance is constructed through specific  
52  
53 rhetorical devices. In this stage, we moved between the transcripts and established rhetorical  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ideals, and in doing so, recognized a *complexio oppositorum*, or ‘complex of interrelated  
4 opposites’. We then documented how participants deployed metaphors of spaces, time and level  
5 to convince themselves (and us) that a balance - *argumentum ad temperantiam* - could be  
6 achieved.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

### 14 **Experiences of Paradox in Digital Technologies**

15  
16  
17 When asked about their experiences of technology, participants identified both positive and  
18 negative consequences, presenting contradictions as interwoven elements (a paradox) in need of  
19 resolution. Participants highlighted new technologies as affording efficiency, connectivity,  
20 marketing opportunities, and improved corporate communications, but then, when considering  
21 their own families, or society, and based on recent media reports, the same technologies were  
22 described as intrusive, addictive and damaging. Participants spoke of ‘pros and cons’, ‘trade  
23 offs’, ‘two sides of a coin’, and ‘double-edged sword’ as metaphors for paradox. Such  
24 ambivalence is expressed by Arthur, a 37-year-old director in a consulting firm:  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 *Technology is remarkable [...] In my sustainability communications work, social media*  
39 *has really changed the landscape of how to connect with people. So, there’s much greater*  
40 *opportunity to target in real-time with precision [...] and there are also these terrifying...I*  
41 *think we’re sleepwalking into something quite terrifying [...] You read about how*  
42 *teenagers are at an all-time low in terms of confidence because of self-esteem related to*  
43 *online presence and online bullying [...] So, I’ve got quite strong feelings about that [...]*  
44 *I think I’ve probably been a bit contradictory in this interview, so I’ve gone back and*  
45 *forth on some of my own issues.*  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Arthur's reflection illustrates how he experiences contradictions, presenting a positive thought  
6 about greater business opportunities, against a negative one related to young people. The former  
7 emerges from the *epideictic nature* of the CSR role and his identification with business.  
8  
9 Positively promoting digital technology as a 'remarkable' source of business growth is a  
10 rhetorical performance of his corporate role, presenting what his organization does as useful and  
11 necessary. But this is contra to his negative experiences of technology outside work, and so his  
12 identification with family and society. His resulting reflection portrays a complex of  
13 contradictory feelings. The *metaphor* he chooses – sleepwalking – also depicts digital technology  
14 as overpowering the unconscious human, with the reference to 'we' making this a societal issue  
15 rather than the consequences of corporate action. Arthur then balances this image with his 'quite  
16 strong feelings', returning to his professional role. He has thought about it, considered it, and it is  
17 important to him. Yet this remains on the level of feelings (empathy), rather than action.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Lucas, a 55-year-old CSR manager in the construction industry, also starts by presenting  
34 the positive side of technology, and then expresses worries about recent social media scandals:  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 *I like technology, I get on well with it, I feel I've kept up [...] I am on Facebook, I don't*  
41 *put much on there, occasionally I might put a couple of holiday snaps [...] I think that*  
42 *[the Cambridge Analytics scandal is] probably a turning point for making people aware*  
43 *of how much they put online and what they put online [...] People who've grown up in*  
44 *the last ten years... I think they've grown up in a world of just putting everything online*  
45 *[...] I like some of the benefits of sharing what's going on in your life, but then the reams*  
46 *and reams of rubbish that people put on, yeah, I'm not sure about it.*  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Lucas too expresses ambivalence, weighing the benefits of sharing against the ‘rubbish that  
6 people put on’. By shifting from ‘I’, as an expression of his own ability to speak from  
7 experience, to ‘they’, a separate group that actually has the problem, he presents himself as  
8 outside the problem, as a knowledgeable and objective evaluator of it, but one who remains  
9 ‘unsure’, and so uncommitted to any course of action.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Other respondents also relayed angst related to wellbeing, privacy, security and  
18 surveillance issues, whilst elaborating on the various organizational benefits of digital  
19 communications in facilitating global communication and enabling flexible work. For example,  
20 Harry, a 42-year-old responsibility director in a bank, explains:  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 *People were from [an international headquarter], and not everyone could get to those*  
29 *meetings, so we would use digital technology to try and connect with them..., such that*  
30 *their views are represented [...] I work with technology. I think technology it's done a*  
31 *great job in connecting the world around issues, around keeping people connected [...]*  
32  
33 *There are opportunities for us, particularly when social media and those sorts of*  
34 *technologies are introduced, because we can make quite a lot of noise, but at a very low-*  
35 *cost rate. But you need a genuine understanding of the impact you're going to have, and*  
36 *potentially some of the positive and negative consequences of what you create.*  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 We again witness a professional *epideictic rhetoric* as Harry moves between identifications. He  
50 uses ‘I’ to express his expertise and right to talk on the matter, ‘us’ to describe the organization  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 he identifies with, but then ‘you’ when explaining the paradox that needs to be resolved,  
4  
5 distancing himself and the organization from any immediate action.  
6

7  
8 Participants’ experiences of tensions between societal, family or individual ramifications  
9  
10 of digital technology and business opportunities then prompt them to suggest solutions. For  
11  
12 example, Harry applies an established rhetorical solution, by suggesting that consumers will  
13  
14 reward responsibility:  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 *I think the morals by which a business runs is going to become more important than it*  
20  
21 *maybe has done for the past 20-30 years. Purpose and value are important for*  
22  
23 *consumers. I think there will be a big change in terms of the way technologies will start*  
24  
25 *to be used.*  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 This passage demonstrates the complex rhetorical forces at play. Harry says the ‘morals by  
32  
33 which a business runs’ rather than the ‘morals by which a business *is* run’. The business is  
34  
35 *personified* (granted its own agency), which serves to push the responsibility *away* from  
36  
37 managers, and towards a more abstract emergent entity. There is also a subtle form of elision at  
38  
39 work, as we see that the morality means responding to customers’ expectations. Business will  
40  
41 not, in the end, be led by morality, but by what is ‘important for customers’. In the final  
42  
43 sentence, there is an absence of any clear agency at all. Who will be ‘starting to use’ these  
44  
45 technologies, and when exactly? Any identification has evaporated, and with it a clear index of  
46  
47 responsibility. Such rhetoric again acts to displace organizational responsibility. Harry  
48  
49 reproduces both the definition of markets (an organizational response to consumer demand) and  
50  
51 CSR (the recognition of ‘purpose and value’). Yet neither Harry nor other participants end with  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 concrete resolutions of the paradoxes they themselves identify. Rather, they develop complexity  
4 and ambiguity in both the constitution and resolution of business-society technology paradoxes.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **Temporal Rhetorical Devices: Displacing Responsibility into the Future**

11 An apparent temporal resolution to business-societal paradox of technology is apparent when  
12 participants project solutions into the future. Kate a 54-year-old manager in heavy industry,  
13  
14 explains her organization's enthusiasm for AI:  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 *I think the workplace will look very, very different, and I think that the kind of jobs where*  
22 *many people have traditionally been employed, they won't be in the same way. And there*  
23 *will, I imagine, be a whole load of different industries that we barely know about now*  
24 *that will have come about.*  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Kate notes that human labour will be redundant or reduced as a result of AI – although she resists  
34 using those terms – and therefore acknowledges a negative consequence of the use of automation  
35 by business. Here, the reference is also to 'jobs' and 'industries' in the abstract, to society rather  
36 than the organization where she works. However, her initial doubt is transformed into an *vision*  
37 *of the future* that takes advantage of the vagueness of the prophetic modality to describe the  
38 prospect of a 'whole load of different industries'. Kate's use of the phrasing 'that will have come  
39 about', echoes a biblical 'and it came to pass' and so points to a cosmic order (Suddaby and  
40 Greenwood, 2005; Erkama and Vaara, 2010) where agency is elided in favour of claims to some  
41 natural process. Indeed, Kate later strengthens this position by noting that following earlier  
42 industrial revolutions, new industries always emerged. This sense of inevitable progress is  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 strengthened by *hyperbole* ('very, very', and 'whole load of') that speaks to the power of  
4 technology. Human agency is absent: the workplace will look different, not 'we'll make a  
5 different workplace'.  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 Rebecca also explains what is happening at her firm:

11  
12  
13  
14 *What we're looking at is stripping out the simple stuff, and that's what we've done with a*  
15 *lot of automation [...] The customer service area up till now it's around, well, let's put*  
16 *simple transactions online, let's give customers the [AI] tools that can solve their own*  
17 *problems so that the simple transactional stuff doesn't come through to your contact*  
18 *centre person, because it's a boring job...*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 She goes on to describe an ideal contact centre exchange where workers have meaningful  
29 interactions with customers that AI can't. She is not denying that people will lose their jobs, but  
30 contrasts this with a vision of an enhanced, more human workplace *in the future*. The tasks that  
31 'your contact centre person' (note the displacing 'your' that rejects her own identification with  
32 this role, and makes it everyone's issue) does now are not fit for a human to be doing (i.e.,  
33 nobody should identify with such a role). Technology releases humans from these 'inhuman'  
34 tasks, although Rebecca neglects to acknowledge her organization for creating these alienating  
35 roles in the first place. Instead, she focuses on balancing a paradox of AI versus human jobs  
36 through recourse to classical *rhetorical epideictic* that celebrates how better jobs will come to  
37 exist.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Isabelle, a 34-year-old manager at the UK offices of a global digital advertising platform,  
52 also tells the story of automated administration tasks:  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 *Maybe there's a secretary somewhere losing her job because this room is booked*  
7  
8 *automatically by machine. I'm ok with that [...]* *It's much better that that secretary re-*  
9  
10 *trains and gets another job, or learns how to programme that calendar tool, because no-*  
11 *one will know better the challenges that comes with scheduling than someone who's done*  
12 *scheduling for the last 20-years, so let her help the programmers.*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Jobs will be lost, but enhanced jobs will balance such loss. This holds the tensions in stasis, not  
20 denying redundancy, but again presenting the opportunity for finding one's true value to the  
21 industry, and so better identification. Rebecca's judgement is that programming calendar tools  
22 *will be 'much better'* for the secretary, an evocation of a *future scenario* based on the portrayal of  
23 logic and functionality, that allows her to declare that she is 'OK with that'. This is a  
24 pronouncement of the morality of the situation from someone who knows about these things. If  
25 she is ok with it, then we all should be too.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Digital technology is rhetorically bi-located so that an agonistic complex of opposites – a  
36 *complexio oppositorum* – is constructed, for example AI and jobs are interrelated in an ongoing  
37 tension, both destroying and creating jobs. A function of this rhetoric is that it avoids the need  
38 for immediate action on lost jobs and blurs who is responsible for that action. It also diverts  
39 attention from the initial premise: that corporate efficiency eliminates jobs. Solutions also have  
40 the character of an *argumentum ad temperantiam* (a compromise) that avoids the need to act  
41 now. By constructing the dark side of technology as a business-society paradox than can later be  
42 solved, the issue of organizational legitimacy being based on providing jobs is avoided, whilst  
43 the benefits of efficiency can be celebrated.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### **Spatial Rhetorical Devices: Displacing Responsibility to Somewhere Else**

The rhetorical weight of managing the *complexio oppositorum* also involves constructing interrelated spaces. For example, Daniel a 48-year-old manager of a consultancy considers flexibility versus intrusion on his home space:

*[work] is always bombarding you because everyone knows you have access to those applications [emails and Skype], and those devices are with you all the time, and they expect an immediate response. So, you never can escape it even when you're not at work. But it also gives you great flexibility to be able to work and do other things. Well, you just must come to terms with it really, and being able to put it to one side and leave it there.*

Daniel again presents two sides of an apparent paradox, then deals with this by speaking of putting 'it to one side' and leaving 'it there' such that the solution is a spatial one that may be dealt with by individuals at home, rather than at work. 'You' also makes this everyone's problem and not the organization's concern.

In other accounts, we also note spatial devices used to specifically displace responsibility towards other organizations. For example, Boris, a 40-year-old director in a telecommunications firm, explains:

*A huge amount of [problematic] stuff [...] it's happening on Facebook, or it's happening on Twitter, or the current trend [violent videos] is actually YouTube. And then that gets*

1  
2  
3 *into a really weird area, because is that YouTube's responsibility, is that the police's*  
4 *responsibility, is it the person who makes the phone that you're seeing it on?*  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Boris suggests an absence of established boundaries of accountability such that responsibility can  
11 be diffused. A number of rhetorical figures give insight into Boris's narrative. The heaping up of  
12 unanswered questions is an *accumulatio of aporia* (interrelated contradictions) which serves to  
13 dramatize self-doubt. He states questions but cannot provide an answer, but nor can the receiver,  
14 leaving them to accept the question as if it were a statement of truth. It is YouTube, or the police  
15 that is responsible? Everyone, in fact, except the organization he works for and who benefits  
16 from social media use. Boris also uses *spatial metaphors* – social media platforms are described  
17 as places – and the word 'area' to define the space that the issue's complexity inhabits.  
18  
19

20 This *rhetorical generation of locus* was repeated by other participants. Paul, a 42-year-  
21 old CSR executive who works for an assurance company, says:  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 *If technology is generating new challenges [...], it is the responsibility of the business to*  
29 *help their employees through training or coaching to understand and adapt. Also,*  
30 *suppliers [...]. And it's your responsibility to help other stakeholders to manage the*  
31 *change and to explain to the shareholders through your reporting what you are doing*  
32 *towards adapting to meeting challenges, or why you are adopting new technologies.*  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Paul *personifies* technology, and creates doubt by starting with 'if'. It is technology itself which  
50 generates new challenges, and creates new risks, not the people who make or use it. Technology  
51 is presented as originating in *a space outside business, government and society*. This *others*  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 technology, and therefore brings the rest of us together in our response to it. This represents an  
4  
5 act of societal identification where ‘we are all in it together’. Agency is afforded to business, but  
6  
7 it is in agonistic response to this Other’s intruding presence. Paul also makes use of ‘your’ to  
8  
9 distance himself personally, and present his objective, advisory capacity. In the end, the  
10  
11 organization’s role is educational and communicative, with the stakeholders required to act on  
12  
13 technology somewhere else and under this advice.  
14  
15

16  
17 Harry, a 42-year-old responsibility manager in banking, expresses a similar externalizing:  
18

19  
20  
21 *Social media providers, they have created a platform for younger audiences which they*  
22  
23 *currently don't take responsibility for. So, I think there is emerging research around the*  
24  
25 *impact of social media and technology on mental health in young people. I would love to*  
26  
27 *see technology providers come and play a leading role to tackle this.*  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33 Harry locates the responsibility for digital technology somewhere *away* from himself and his  
34  
35 organization, not identifying with ‘them’, the ones causing harm. This rhetorical externalization  
36  
37 of responsibility means there is no need for him or his organization to take responsibility because  
38  
39 a solution is only in the reach of the social media giants.  
40

41  
42 Participants respond to paradox through a *rhetorical demarcation* that places the negative  
43  
44 unintended consequences of digital technologies away from the organization and into other  
45  
46 spaces, diffusing responsibility between external actors, whilst suggesting that solutions remain  
47  
48 possible. Again, this presents an *argumentum ad temperantiam*, a call for ‘balance’ created by a  
49  
50 range of actors, and that can be achieved when any dark side to technology is identified such that  
51  
52 immediate action by the organization is avoided.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Level Rhetorical Devices: Displacing Responsibility to Individuals or Society

Managers are keen to demonstrate their corporations' own responsible practices where they can, as part of their *epideictic role*. For example, for a few participants, concerns had resulted in some organizational withdrawal from using social media platforms on the grounds of brand safety.

While we do not suggest that organizations never take on responsibility at the organizational-level, we highlight how they may avoid doing so through rhetoric that evade responsibilities.

We have already seen how managers move between levels in their balancing rhetoric. For example, Benjamin makes work-home balance a micro-level/individual issue, whilst Paul suggests that change should be government policy on a macro-level. At times, the issues are too big for organizational responses, hence 'new jobs will come about' through some macro-level restructuring of society. At other times, the issues can only be solved through individual actions. These level movements - magnifying and individualizing problems and solutions - avoid the need for specific organizational/messo-level actions. In particular, individualizing potential solutions provides confirmation that balancing positive outcomes with potential harm is possible.

Edward, a 48-year-old manager who works for a utilities company, explains how his family take responsibility for themselves:

*In terms of social media, I mean, we're [his family] very cautious about how widely we kind of share pictures of, you know, my daughter and things on social media. There are a few pictures, but [...] you worry about, you know, once it's out there where is it going to go and what is it going to be used for. So social media worries me. It's a benefit, but it also is a concern.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Resolving the paradox of technology described here doesn't go beyond *individual* 'caution'  
6 (micro-level). Tensions are kept separate in a relationship that emphasizes personal agency, and  
7  
8 so identification with family, when it comes to responsibility. The unknown 'out there' is also  
9  
10 again constructed as the *locus* of the digital, but the responsibility isn't at the organizational-  
11  
12 level. Characterizing the digital world as an 'out there' helps to construct the family and the  
13  
14 personal (micro-level) as the controllable, valuable 'in here'. The two levels are portrayed in  
15  
16 opposition to each other. Yet they remain held in balance with responsibility ascribed to the  
17  
18 *individual*.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Participants further expressed how they find it hard to disconnect and separate work-  
25  
26 home spaces, and they attempted to construct demarcations in their own mental spaces that allow  
27  
28 home and work to continue to co-exist in tension. In such instances, the rhetorical devices  
29  
30 participants again resort to are *individual solutions* to deal with paradox. Although participants  
31  
32 reflect on regulation to protect employees' rights to disconnect from work-related  
33  
34 communications, they reject this approach in order to protect business interests. Rebecca moves  
35  
36 between potential legislation (macro-level) to protect staff and organizational interests, but  
37  
38 concludes that it's down to her to manage digital technologies (micro-level):  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 *France have done the policy decision, what they've got now is, well, let's just ban*  
46  
47 *companies from permitting employees to access emails outside office hours so that they*  
48  
49 *must disconnect... but again, if you're in a global company, you're not always keeping*  
50  
51 *nine to five hours so that's, the top down approach doesn't always work [...] I changed*  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *the way I did email, so I'm not on email all day, I typically partition certain times of the*  
4  
5 *day to do it [...] So, yeah, just turn off.*  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Perhaps not surprisingly Rebecca doesn't want legislation as an identification because of the way  
11 it challenges her own professional role (if legislation solves the problem there would be no need  
12 for corporate responsibility managers). She cites the inevitability of globalization as an external  
13 macro-force, but suggests *individual solutions*, i.e., her own partitioning of work, so that she  
14 does not engage with emails at certain times. We see once more the *spatial-temporal metaphors*  
15 that participants have recourse to when discussing how to negotiate tensions relating to  
16 technology. Rebecca talks of having to 'partition' time, as well as mentioning receiving emails  
17 'outside' office-hours and being 'on' email and dealing with a 'top-down approach'. The  
18 *personal management* of spatial-temporal boundaries enables the effective balance of these  
19 complex opposites. Such personal management allows tensions to remain in balance, again by  
20 using an *argumentum ad temperantiam*. In the end, both the discourse of business benefits and  
21 that of employees' rights to their own protected time are able to be accepted as an ongoing  
22 balance.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 **Discussion and conclusions**

43  
44 These 'backstage' reflections (Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005) reveal how paradoxes are  
45 constituted as managers experience digital technology through different identifications  
46 (profession, family, society). Participants undertake *self-persuasion* related to these  
47 identifications, creating a reality where businesses-society tensions are complex and inevitable  
48 (*complexio oppositorum*), yet can be resolved. The resulting temporal, spatial and level rhetorical  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 delimitations displace organizational responsibility and legitimize ongoing use of technology  
4  
5 (*argumentum ad temperantiam*). Resolving the dark side of technology therefore represents both  
6  
7 a false equivalence and false compromise. Together these form a ‘balance’ rhetoric between  
8  
9 business interests and societal concerns, that serves as a *terministic screen* (a system of  
10  
11 language) for digital CSR (Figure 1).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 **Paradox in Identifications and the Complexio Oppositorum**

18  
19 Unlike Wenzel et al.’s (2019) study that deals with paradox *within* the organization and *between*  
20  
21 different actors, we reveal the rhetorical *self-persuasion* that ensures continued identifications  
22  
23 with business, family and society, in light of experiences of technology that are conflicting.  
24  
25 Although Meisenbach and McMillan (2006:89) show how identifications are created within  
26  
27 and/or on behalf of organizations, we add that these also involve managers’ identifications with  
28  
29 family and society that are brought *into* the organization. As managers reflect on digital  
30  
31 technologies, they move between these identifications, presenting the contradictions they  
32  
33 constitute as a *complexio oppositorum*, a set of intertwined opposites that contain both positive  
34  
35 and negative aspects of technology. Without creating such a paradox, participants might be  
36  
37 required to concede that organizations operate without concern for society (see Friedman, 1971);  
38  
39 a position that negates their professional CSR role and external identifications. Conversely,  
40  
41 accepting that society (citizens, family members) takes preference over business when  
42  
43 considering digital technology, invites the solution that business use might be restricted; a  
44  
45 position that risks making the CSR manager the ‘outsider within’ the organization (Carrington et  
46  
47 al., 2019), jeopardizing organizational identification. If business and society are instead  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 rhetorically constructed as having opposite but legitimate positions - a paradox to be solved -  
4  
5 identifications can be maintained.  
6

7  
8 The subsequent rhetorical construction of an *argumentum ad temperantiam* (a false  
9  
10 balance), therefore ensures that the premise of the paradox is not examined closely. The  
11  
12 invitation to consider solutions that maintain business activity and moderate societal harm,  
13  
14 allows us to consider *how* to balance business interests with societal problems, not to consider if  
15  
16 these interests should be separate and equal in the first place. Business and societal interests are  
17  
18 therefore kept apart and in tension by a rhetoric that at first seems to argue for the opposite.  
19  
20

21  
22 The focus on rhetoric represents the construction of organizational realities through  
23  
24 identifications, consistent with studies by Suddaby and Greenwood (2005) and Balogun et al.  
25  
26 (2014). As rhetoric is always situated within a context of controversy, we can understand  
27  
28 participants as ‘engaged in thinking’ that expresses a complex range of ‘dilemmatic’ positions  
29  
30 (Billig, 1998:204-206). Not surprisingly, managers reproduce established CSR narratives such as  
31  
32 stakeholder dialogue and education (Castello and Lozano, 2011), or consumer pressure. The  
33  
34 resulting *epideictic rhetoric* of the responsibility managers normalizes ‘balance’ as a response to  
35  
36 tensions or contradictions related to digital technology use, which are themselves presented as  
37  
38 inevitable paradoxes. ‘Balancing’ these enables managers to maintain their position as ‘socially  
39  
40 competent entrepreneurs’ (Holt and Macpherson, 2010), able to navigate competing tensions and  
41  
42 constituencies in their work.  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Different from established ideas that paradox can be managed through the creative and  
48  
49 positive possibilities of ‘dynamic equilibrium’ (Smith and Lewis, 2011), or ‘both and more’  
50  
51 approaches (Wenzel et al., 2019) that may do justice to competing demands in day-to-day work,  
52  
53 our study emphasises how participants first talk into existence paradoxes related to technologies,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 and then deploy the rhetoric of *balance* as a way of talking out of existence the same paradoxes.  
4  
5 Consistent with Hoffman's (2018) approach, we note the purpose of managers creating a paradox  
6  
7 (to displace responsibility), hence we contribute to an understanding of *how* paradox is created  
8  
9 and not just how it is resolved.  
10  
11  
12  
13

### 14 **(Un)Resolving Paradoxes through an Argumentum Ad Temperantiam**

15  
16  
17 If we were to summarise the rhetoric of managers, it would be: *As a responsibility manager, I*  
18  
19 *recognize that we (society) must balance the complex benefits of digital technology (for business)*  
20  
21 *against its emerging but uncertain dark side (for society) that we can now observe (and which I*  
22  
23 *myself experience). As a responsibility manager, I can affirm that this will be achieved in the*  
24  
25 *future by those organizations best placed to do so ('them' and not the corporate 'us'), or by*  
26  
27 *individuals themselves (not the corporate 'us'), or at a society level ('we' and not the corporate*  
28  
29 *'us').* Pronoun use reveals the complex shifts in identification, and their relation to specific  
30  
31 rhetorical constructions: a professional and personal 'I'; an organizational 'us' (which is  
32  
33 contrasted with external organisational 'them'), and; a transcendental, societal 'we' when  
34  
35 necessary, as participants create a common ground for balancing technology's dark side. Digital  
36  
37 technology is *personified*, *othered* and *aggrandised* through metaphors and hyperboles. This  
38  
39 presents technology as a common adversary, an external *Other* requiring macro-level balancing  
40  
41 by a societal 'we'. Personification further displaces responsibility for the moral running of the  
42  
43 business *away* from the people and towards an abstract entity with its own agency and power.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 To sustain such identifications, managers draw from rhetorical devices that co-exist and  
50  
51 are interconnected. Specifically, participants make movements between: (1) time, by *futurizing*  
52  
53 (projecting a positive vision of the future), (2) space, by *externalizing* (moving outside the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 organization to homes, other organizations, or governments), and (3) level, by either *magnifying*  
4  
5 or *individualizing* (presenting issues so that they can only be solved by society, or by  
6  
7 individuals). *Futurizing* avoids the need for immediate action, with resolutions displaced into the  
8  
9 future. *Externalizing* serves the purpose of demarcating technology and its negative  
10  
11 consequences away from the specific organization. *Individualizing* emphasizes individual agency  
12  
13 suggesting that the majority of ethical decision-making around digital technology usage may be  
14  
15 managed in an ad-hoc and personal manner, placing responsibility at the micro-level. Finally,  
16  
17 *magnifying* an issue makes it too big for any one organization to deal with.  
18  
19

20  
21 The first two of these devices are consistent with Schad et al.'s (2016) possible responses  
22  
23 to paradox: spatial and temporal separation. The movement between levels (*individualizing* and  
24  
25 *magnifying*), however, is also an important strategy that directly relates to identification. Unlike  
26  
27 Schad et al.'s (2016) view of possible opposition or synthesis either of which may fix  
28  
29 responsibility or damage identification, managers seek balance, or rather a 'false balance'. These  
30  
31 devices also echo Erkama and Vaara's (2010) strategies used to gain legitimacy related to change  
32  
33 in a factory shutdown, especially autopoiesis and cosmos. For example, we note similar  
34  
35 strategies when participants use self-referential, or autopoietic rhetoric to legitimize action based  
36  
37 on a stated organizational strategy (i.e., improving efficiency/profitability), and where cosmos  
38  
39 presents change as inevitable, in our case the inevitability of digital transformation.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 We also respond to Gaim et al.'s (2020) call for studies on the 'false mastery of  
45  
46 paradoxes', by showing that more attention might also be given to false premise in paradox  
47  
48 studies, as an alternative to accepting paradox at face value, then theorising possible solutions  
49  
50 (Pina e Cunha and Putnam, 2019). Gaim et al. (2020) note that VW's attempt to exploit the idea  
51  
52 of clean diesel represented a desire for market exploitation despite knowledge of technological  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 limitations, rather than an ‘out there’ paradox, based on equally legitimate claims. The paradox  
4  
5 of digital technologies that afford positive business opportunities but cause societal harm, also  
6  
7 start with business interests, but reveals both the construction *and* resolution of a paradox as part  
8  
9 of the same legitimizing rhetoric.  
10  
11  
12  
13

### 14 **Challenging Balance as Terministic Screen**

15  
16  
17 Digital technologies differ from other areas in CSR (supply chains or climate change) as the dark  
18  
19 sides are *prominent* and *visible* to participants dominating much business and media discourse.  
20  
21 Whilst managers experience digital technology as affording opportunities in the workplace, they  
22  
23 also inevitably experience the negative impacts in their personal lives. These intrusions  
24  
25 are immediate and pressing. Therefore, the dark sides of technology are not distant and abstract  
26  
27 problems (as climate change might be), but issues happening in the here and now, in  
28  
29 participants’ homes, and with potential harm to their own family. We would therefore resist  
30  
31 concluding that participants are merely hypocritical (c.f. Hoffman, 2018). Instead, these  
32  
33 rhetorical devices can be seen as a protective discursive mechanism (c.f. Smith and Lewis,  
34  
35 2011). Managers defend positions not (only) in return for payment, but to ensure the  
36  
37 maintenance of identifications. Indeed, we can see this as a key aspect of their role. It is by  
38  
39 resolving contradictions in their experience for themselves that they can also ensure specific  
40  
41 responsibility isn’t placed onto their organization.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Rhetorical constructions of balance become what Burke (1969) refers to as a *terministic*  
48  
49 *screen*; the basis by which the reality of digital technology is subsequently perceived and  
50  
51 understood. Technology is an external force that ‘we’ (society) must deal with, balancing the  
52  
53 equal needs of society and business over time as we do so. This satisfies the demands of Castello  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and Lozano's (2011) professional CSR rhetoric, legitimizing the pursuit of shareholder value,  
4 while demonstrating support for 'normative and widely endorsed principles of behaviour'.  
5  
6 Participants' use of 'balance' can also be understood as a specific form of *strategic ambiguity*  
7  
8 (Faber, 2003) - a strategic paradox - convincing the interlocutor of their reasonableness as  
9  
10 practitioners sensitive to the situation, whilst maintaining competing positions as professional  
11  
12 representatives of their companies *and* concerned citizens. Participants also appear to subscribe  
13  
14 to aspirational talk around citizenship, inclusivity, and social contribution, yet as Christensen et  
15  
16 al. (2020) note, aspirational talk can actually shield managers from demands for immediate  
17  
18 action. Hence, not all aspirational talk might produce positive organization change and instead  
19  
20 may seek to avoid it.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Parallels can be drawn between this achievement and established areas of CSR  
27  
28 suggesting that such strategies are already normalized within organisations in other areas of  
29  
30 responsibility, but are revealed by the suddenness and proximity of digital technology in the lives  
31  
32 of responsibility managers as we listen to their accounts. Participants even draw such parallels,  
33  
34 noting how 'balance' has been achieved in other areas of responsibility, but also their proximity  
35  
36 to the contradictions of technology. This leads us to believe that the rhetoric of balance is  
37  
38 routinely used to (un)resolve business-society paradoxes, with the inevitable consequence that  
39  
40 whatever processes are actually adopted by business, there will always be further tensions with  
41  
42 society. Fleming and Jones (2013) suggest that CSR avoids addressing the fundamental problems  
43  
44 of the capitalist system that have led to social, economic and environmental crises. We now add  
45  
46 technology to this list and provide a mechanism by which such misdirection is undertaken. The  
47  
48 apparent paradox of the dark side of technology is therefore nested (Pina e Cunha and Putnam,  
49  
50 2019) within the larger paradox of corporate growth versus sustainability.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Digital technology is directly experienced, highly visible and with prominent changes  
4 prompting rhetorical self-persuasion that aims to create a normative discourse that is represented  
5 to society as inevitable and rational. Yet before this fully forms, alternative rhetorical positions  
6 and narratives may usefully be constructed that challenge the idea that business-society interests  
7 must be balanced (in the future, by other organizations, or society, or by individuals themselves).  
8 This may be by restating that societal interests should always come first, i.e., they need not be  
9 balanced against business priorities, because business can only exist within and as part of  
10 society. To claim balance between business interests and societal harm is therefore a false  
11 equivalence. It might also involve highlighting that there is no dark side to technology, only  
12 complex consequences of its commercial use that extend beyond the organization. This places  
13 responsibility clearly within organizations and with managers. The dark side is not part of some  
14 inaccessible *Other*, but embedded within organizational practices. More specifically, *futurizing*  
15 can be challenged by calls for immediate action, *externalizing* by calls for corporate action as a  
16 routine part of responsibility work, and *individualizing and magnifying* by calls to recognize the  
17 power relations implicit in markets.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Such a process involves understanding the rhetorical constructions inherent to managers'  
38 own narratives. Yet, the risk in presenting alternative terministic screens for technology is that  
39 they damage identification, producing more rhetorical effort. Participants already live the  
40 paradoxes they constitute, requiring self-persuasion and self-comfort. If their aspirational talk  
41 (Christensen et al., 2013) is to extend beyond an *argumentum ad temperantiam*, it must do so on  
42 the basis of highlighting and prioritizing family and society identifications, so that there is not  
43 just the 'outsider within' (Carrington et al., 2019) but a societal 'we' that denies a rhetoric that  
44 places business interest in opposition with society.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

Andersen, N. (2020) 'Redesigning corporate responsibility: How digitalization changes the role companies need to play for positive impacts on society' in D. Feldner (ed) *Redesigning Organizations: Concepts for the connected world*, pp. 137-147. Cham: Springer.

Balogun, J., Jacobs, C., Jarzabkowski, P., Mantere, S. and Vaara, E. (2014) 'Placing strategy discourse in context: Sociomateriality, sensemaking, and power', *Journal of Management Studies* 51(2): 175-201.

Billig, M. (1989a) 'The argumentative nature of holding strong views: A case study', *European Journal of Social Psychology* 19(3): 203-223.

Billig, M. (1998b) 'Rhetoric and the Unconscious', *Argumentation* 4(6): 199-216.

Bitzer, L. (1968) 'The Rhetorical Situation', *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1(1):1-14.

Boyd, J. and Waymer, D. (2011) 'Organizational Rhetoric: A Subject of Interest(s)', *Management Communication Quarterly* 25(3): 474-493.

Burke, K., (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1969a) *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1969b) *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Caragliu, A., Del Bo, C. and Nijkamp, P. (2011) 'Smart cities in Europe', *Journal of Urban Technology* 18(2): 65-82.

1  
2  
3 Carrington, M., Zwick, D. and Neville, B. (2019) 'Activism and abdication on the inside: The  
4 effect of everyday practice on corporate responsibility', *Journal of Business Ethics* 160(4): 973-  
5 999.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Castelló, I., M. Morsing, and F. Schultz (2013) 'Communicative Dynamics and the Polyphony of  
11 Corporate Social Responsibility in the Network Society', *Journal of Business Ethics* 118(4):  
12 683–694.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 Castelló, I. and Lozano, J.M. (2011) 'Searching for new forms of legitimacy through corporate  
18 responsibility rhetoric', *Journal of Business Ethics* 100(1): 11-29.  
19  
20

21  
22 Cheney, G., Christensen, L.T., Conrad, C. and Lair, D. J. (2004) 'Corporate Rhetoric as  
23 Organizational Discourse' in D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick and L. Putnam (eds) *The SAGE*  
24 *Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, pp. 79–103. London: Sage.  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 Christensen, L.T., Moring, M. and Thyssen, O. (2013) 'CSR as Aspirational Talk', *Organization*  
30 20(3): 372–93.  
31  
32

33  
34 Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M. and Thyssen, O. (2020) 'Talk–Action Dynamics: Modalities of  
35 aspirational talk', *Organization Studies*, 0170840619896267.  
36  
37

38  
39 Cunha, M.P.E. and Putnam, L.L., 2019. Paradox theory and the paradox of success. *Strategic*  
40 *organization*, 17(1), pp.95-106.  
41  
42

43  
44 Driver, M. (2017) 'Never social and entrepreneurial enough? Exploring the identity work of  
45 social entrepreneurs from a psychoanalytic perspective', *Organization* 24(6): 715-736.  
46  
47

48  
49 Erkama, N. and Vaara, E. (2010) 'Struggles over legitimacy in global organizational  
50 restructuring: A rhetorical perspective on legitimation strategies and dynamics in a shutdown  
51 case', *Organization Studies* 31(7): 813-839.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Flyverbom, M., Deibert, R. and Matten, D. (2017) 'The Governance of Digital Technology, Big  
4 Data, and the Internet: New Roles and Responsibilities for Business', *Business & Society* 58(1):  
5 3-19.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Gaim, M., Clegg, S., & Cunha, M.P.E. (2019) 'Managing Impressions Rather Than Emissions:  
11 Volkswagen and the false mastery of paradox', *Organization Studies* 0170840619891199  
12  
13

14  
15 Grant, D. and Hardy, C. (2004) 'Introduction: Struggles with Organizational Discourse',  
16 *Organization Studies* 25(1): 5-13.  
17  
18

19  
20 Hamilton, P. (2001) 'Rhetoric and employment relations', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*  
21 39(3): 433-449.  
22  
23

24  
25 Heath, R.L. (2011) 'External organizational rhetoric: Bridging management and sociopolitical  
26 discourse' *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3): 415-435.  
27  
28

29  
30 Hislop, D., Axtell, C., Collins, A., Daniels, K., Glover, J. and Niven, K. (2015) 'Variability in  
31 the use of mobile ICTs by homeworkers and its consequences for boundary management and  
32 social isolation', *Information and Organization* 25(4): 222-232.  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Hoff-Clausen, E., (2018) 'Rhetorical Agency What Enables and Restrains', *The Handbook of*  
38 *Organizational Rhetoric and Communication*, p.287.  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Hoffmann, J. (2018) 'Talking into (non)existence: Denying or constituting paradoxes of  
44 Corporate Social Responsibility', *Human Relations* 71(5): 668-691.  
45  
46

47  
48 Holt, R. and Macpherson, A. (2010) 'Sensemaking, rhetoric and the socially competent  
49 entrepreneur', *International Small Business Journal* 28(1): 20-42.  
50  
51

52  
53 Johnson, D.G. (2015) 'Technology with no human responsibility?', *Journal of Business*  
54 *Ethics* 127(4): 707-715.  
55  
56  
57



Ihlen, O. and Heath, R.L. (eds.) (2018). *The handbook of organizational rhetoric and communication*. John Wiley & Sons.

Laine, P. M., Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J. and Vaara, E. (2016) 'Mastery, submission, and subversion: On the performative construction of strategist identity', *Organization* 23(4): 505-524.

Lobschat, L., Mueller, B., Eggers, F., Brandimarte, L., Diefenbach, S., Kroschke, M. and Wirtz, J. (2019) 'Corporate digital responsibility', *Journal of Business Research*  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.10.006>

Meisenbach, R. and McMillan, J.J. (2006) 'Blurring the Boundries: Historical developments and future directions in organizational rhetoric', *Annals of the International Communication Association* 30(1):99-141.

Nienkamp, J. (2001) *Internal Rhetorics: toward a history and theory of self-persuasion*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Nienkamp, J. (2009) 'Internal Rhetorics: Constituting Selves in Diaries and Beyond' in M. Carrithers (ed) *Culture, Rhetoric, and the Vicissitudes of Life*, pp. 18-33. New York: Berghahn Books.

O'Connor, A. and Ihlen, Ø., 2018. Corporate social responsibility and rhetoric. *The handbook of organizational rhetoric and communication*, p.401.

Perlow, L.A. (2012) 'Sleeping with your smartphone: How to break the 24/7 habit and change the way you work', *Harvard Business Press*.

Putnam, L.L., Fairhurst, G.T. and Banghart, S. (2016) 'Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach', *The Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 65-171.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Schad, J., Lewis, M.W., Raisch, S. and Smith, W.K. (2016) 'Paradox research in management  
6 science: Looking back to move forward', *The Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 5-64.  
7  
8

9  
10 Smith, W.K. and Lewis, M.W. (2011) 'Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium  
11 model of organizing', *Academy of Management Review* 36(2):381-403.  
12  
13

14  
15 Suddaby, R. and Greenwood, R. (2005) 'Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy', *Administrative  
16 Science Quarterly* 50(1): 35-67.  
17  
18

19  
20 Symon, G. (2008) 'Developing the Political Perspective on Technological Change Through  
21 Rhetorical Analysis', *Management Communication Quarterly* 22(1): 74-98.  
22  
23


24  
25 Trittin, H., Scherer, A.G., Whenlan, G. and Munro, I. (2019) 'Exploring dark and unexpected  
26 sides of digitalization: How digital technologies challenge organizations and organizing',  
27 *Organization*. Available at [https://journals.sagepub.com/pb-](https://journals.sagepub.com/pb-assets/ORG%20Call%20for%20Papers.pdf)  
28 [assets/ORG%20Call%20for%20Papers.pdf](https://journals.sagepub.com/pb-assets/ORG%20Call%20for%20Papers.pdf) (accessed 20 March 2019)  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Wenzel, M., Koch, J., Cornelissen, J. P., Rothmann, W. and Senf, N. N. (2019) 'How  
35 organizational actors live out paradoxical tensions through power relations: The case of a youth  
36 prison', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 155:55-67.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 West, S.M. (2017) 'Data capitalism: Redefining the logics of surveillance and privacy', *Business  
42 & Society* 58(1): 20-41.  
43  
44

45  
46 Wickert, C. and De Bakker, F.G. (2018) 'Pitching for social change: Toward a relational  
47 approach to selling and buying social issues', *Academy of Management Discoveries* 4(1): 50-73.  
48  
49  
50

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41



**Figure 1: Balance as a terministic screen**

**Table 1: Description of participants**

No	Pseudonym	Role	Industry	Age	Interview length (mins)
1	Edward	Sustainability Manager	Utilities	48	52
2	George	Global Corporate Responsibility	Jewellery	47	61
3	Mary	Senior Manager Responsibility	Banking	37	79
4	Charles	Lead for the Environment	Local council	36	83
5	Victoria	Executive Responsible Business	Consultancy	54	74
6	Albert	Risk and Responsibility Manager	IT	41	90
7	Ruby	Corporate Responsibility Manager	Retail	N/A	70
8	Boris	Director of CSR and Events	Telecommunications	40	133
9	John	Director of Community Development	Banking	56	86
10	Jeremy	Corporate Sustainability Director	Consultancy	38	53
11	Paul	Corporate Responsibility and Sustainability Director	Assurance services	42	115
12	Hunter	Sustainability Director	Commercial estate services	36	71
13	Lucy	Sustainability Manager	Property company	50	85
14	Joseph	Corporate Responsibility Consultant	Telecommunications	34	70
15	Amanda	Sustainability Manager	Banking	29	50
16	Sarah	Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility Director	Confectionary	N/A	80
17	Anne	Sustainability Manager	Property company	33	55
18	Adam	Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility Director	Constructions	N/A	77
19	Tom	Head of Global Communications	Pharmaceuticals	41	65
20	Richard	Sustainability Director	FMCG	N/A	85
21	Kate	Stakeholder Manager	Heavy industry	54	63
22	Harry	Responsibility Manager	Banking	42	66
23	Michel	Global Sustainability Director	Chemicals	51	88
24	Isabelle	Global Measurement Manager	Digital platform	34	146
25	Liam	Group Director Sustainability	Heavy industry	53	108

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

26	Rebecca	Head of Responsibility	Telecommunications	50	76
27	James	Sustainability Manager	Automotive	53	79
28	Sophia	Senior Responsibility Adviser	Non-profit	40	78
29	Georgina	Corporate Sustainability Head	Consumer goods	N/A	61
30	Ross	Director	Auditing firm	43	70
31	Arthur	Director	Consulting services	37	73
32	Magdalena	Global Corporate Responsibility Communications	Energy production	36	84
33	Andrew	Governance and Risk Senior Analyst	Consumer goods	40	91
34	Noah	Corporate Stakeholder Engagement Manager	Non-profit	33	66
35	Tyrion	Director	Consulting services	48	85
36	Lucas	Corporate Responsibility Manager	Constructions	55	73
37	Daniel	Senior Manager Corporate Communications	Consulting services	48	66
38	Mateo	Corporate Sustainability Head	Entertainment	40	125
39	Dominic	Corporate Responsibility Manager	Banking	N/A	59