

Tingting Yan, Wendy Tate, Mark Pagell Co-Editors in Chief, Journal of Supply Chain Management

Call for Papers for the sixth Emerging Discourse Incubator:

Radical innovations and extreme disruptions: How could a firm thrive from the co-evolution of the two?

*“Upon disaster depends good fortune;
within good fortune hides disaster.”*

*— Lao Tzu, Tao Te Ching, a Chinese classic text traditionally
credited to the 6th-century BC sage Laozi”*

The topic for JSCM's sixth emerging discourse incubator (EDI) is to explore innovation-disruption mutual-causality by bridging the supply chain innovation and disruption literatures. To compete today, companies often resort to radical innovations in products, processes, services, profit models, supply chain configurations, and more (Bellamy, Dhanorkar, & Subramanian, 2020). At the same time, extreme turbulence caused by natural disasters and man-made disruptions pushes firms to build resilient supply chains (Sodhi & Tang, 2020). Both radical innovations and extreme disruptions, create a high level of uncertainty. Hence, these two seemingly opposite forces drive organizations and individuals to constantly evolve, adapt and improve in order to survive and thrive (Ketchen Jr & Craighead, 2021; Wieland, 2020).

Radical innovations are man-made uncertainty that are usually associated with creating growth opportunities: upward uncertainty. Extreme disruptions could be either man-made or natural uncertainty that are usually associated with large decreases in performance: downward uncertainty. Despite these differences, both affect supply chain management by significantly disrupting routines and creating ambiguity about outcomes. Therefore, radical innovations and extreme disruptions have been well studied by supply chain scholars.

However, these two streams of research very rarely intersect. The supply chain disruption literature has focused on categorizing disruptions and examining corresponding mitigation strategies (Bode, Wagner, Petersen, & Ellram, 2011; Talluri, Kull, Yildiz, & Yoon, 2013). Among many different types of supply chain disruptions, disruptions originating from suppliers have received extensive attention due to their significant impacts on a firm's operational performance (Tomlin, 2006). Interestingly, the supply chain innovation literature has also advocated for the important roles of suppliers in contributing to a buying firm's innovation performance (Kumar, Narayanan, & Salvador, 2020; Narasimhan & Narayanan, 2013). Therefore, suppliers could be a source of disruptions or a resource for innovation. However, these two streams of work have not sufficiently examined how radical innovations and extreme disruptions might co-evolve overtime.

High levels of uncertainty, either as a driving force or a consequence, are associated with both radical innovations and extreme disruptions. Hence, the occurrence of one could trigger the emergence of the other. Innovations could either trigger or prevent disruptions. For instance, the development, production and distribution of new products or services introduces new

suppliers, processes or even business models, thus increasing the likelihood of supply chain disruptions. Customers might not like an innovation, supply might not be sufficient for surprisingly high demand for the innovation, or competitor's innovations or the leakage of intellectual property could trigger an unexpected drop in demand (Ried, Eckerd, Kaufmann, & Carter, 2021). At the same time, an innovative supply chain might support the development of higher risk management capabilities, which will help prevent disruptions from happening (Kwak, Seo, & Mason, 2018).

Equally, disruptions could create opportunities and motivations for firms to innovate. A new environmental policy could disrupt supply chains by banning the sourcing of certain materials, which would then motivate firms to invest in green innovations. The recent COVID-19 pandemic, though devastating at a global scale, also created slack resources such as idle workforces and facilities, which motivated firms to revise business processes, create new products, improvise new business models, or seek new customers for surviving or even thriving during the crisis (Harris, Bhatti, Buckley, & Sharma, 2020; Kovács & Falagara Sigala, 2021; Wang, Hong, Li, & Gao, 2020).

Therefore, research needs to explore the mutual causality between innovations and disruption by bridging the supply chain innovation and disruption literatures. The goal of this EDI is to develop integrated supply chain management theories that help a supply chain to better handle uncertainty, be it upward in terms of innovations, downward in terms of disruptions or both. One possible starting point could be paradox theory. This theory explains how tensions and potentially conflicting demands are addressed, which could help researchers to explore the relationships between radical innovations and extreme disruptions in a complex network of stakeholders, interdependencies and systems (Miron-Spektor, Ingram, Keller, Smith, & Lewis, 2018; Wieland, 2020). Therefore, it could allow researchers to adopt a unified way of examining a firm's innovation and risk management strategies to identify theory-building/testing opportunities (Azadegan & Dooley, 2021). However, other theoretical perspectives such as the complex adaptive system view or dynamic capabilities are appropriate and welcome for this EDI. Finally, the building of new theories is always welcomed in JSCM.

General topics include, but are not limited to:

- What factors could explain a firm's post-disruption investment in radical innovation?
- How does a firm's supply management strategy affect post-innovation disruption or post-disruption innovation in the supply chain?
- How do different types of supply chain risk management (innovation) strategies affect a firm's innovations (resilience)?
- What strategies, practices, or cultures enhance a firm's capability in managing uncertainty, caused by either innovations, disruptions or both?
- How do structural, relational and cognitive characteristics of a firm's supply network affect its ability to manage post-innovation disruptions or post-disruption innovations?
- From a complex adaptive systems view, what role do emergence and control, the two mechanisms that explain organizational behaviors and performance, play in explaining the innovation-disruption mutual-causality relationship in a global, complex supply network?

Authors are encouraged to review emerging research that has started to explore the innovation-disruption intersection (Ketchen Jr & Craighead, 2021; Kwak et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2020).

We also encourage authors to consider the innovation-disruption mutual causality in the context of “big” issues, such as climate change, transparency and traceability of multi-tier supply networks, global issues for multinational companies, and advanced technologies (Charpin, Powell, & Roth, 2020; Sodhi & Tang, 2020; Turrini, Besiou, Papies, & Meissner, 2020; Villena, Wilhelm, & Xiao, 2020). These issues are big because no single organization or supply chain would be able to resolve them. Therefore, they present the right context to build theories that integrate innovation and disruption.

What we are NOT looking for in this EDI are descriptive studies that simply report firm innovations because of extreme disruptions such as Covid-19 or disruptions resulting from firm innovations, without theorizing the causal relationship between innovation and disruption.

All submissions are expected to contribute to theory; we envisage that exploring the innovation-disruption mutual-causality will offer rich opportunities to elaborate on existing theory or build new theory. At a minimum, by expanding research to consider post-disruption innovations or post-innovation disruptions, all submissions should explicate boundary conditions, laying a foundation for further theoretical development. For any questions, please contact Tingting Yan, tingting.yan@wayne.edu, Wendy Tate, wendy.tate@utk.edu, and Mark Pagell, mark.pagell@ucd.ie.

Timeline:

May 2022: Initial call for submissions

January 2023: Invited papers and Co-Editors’ introduction of the invited papers is expected to appear online in order to initiate the discourse

January 2023-January 2024: Submission window for regular submissions

References:

- Azadegan, A., & Dooley, K. J. 2021. A typology of supply network resilience strategies: complex collaborations in a complex world. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*.
- Bellamy, M. A., Dhanorkar, S., & Subramanian, R. 2020. Administrative environmental innovations, supply network structure, and environmental disclosure. *Journal of operations management*, 66(7-8): 895-932.
- Bode, C., Wagner, S. M., Petersen, K. J., & Ellram, L. M. 2011. Understanding responses to supply chain disruptions: Insights from information processing and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(4): 833-856.
- Charpin, R., Powell, E. E., & Roth, A. V. 2020. The influence of perceived host country political risk on foreign subunits' supplier development strategies. *Journal of Operations Management*.
- Harris, M., Bhatti, Y., Buckley, J., & Sharma, D. 2020. Fast and frugal innovations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature medicine*, 26(6): 814-817.
- Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Craighead, C. W. 2021. Toward a theory of supply chain entrepreneurial embeddedness in disrupted and normal states. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*.
- Kovács, G., & Falagara Sigala, I. 2021. Lessons learned from humanitarian logistics to manage supply chain disruptions. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 57(1): 41-49.

- Kumar, S., Narayanan, S., & Salvador, F. 2020. Innovation in supply networks—A research framework and roadmap. *Journal of operations management*, 66(7-8): 754-767.
- Kwak, D.-W., Seo, Y.-J., & Mason, R. 2018. Investigating the relationship between supply chain innovation, risk management capabilities and competitive advantage in global supply chains. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*.
- Miron-Spektor, E., Ingram, A., Keller, J., Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. 2018. Microfoundations of organizational paradox: The problem is how we think about the problem. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1): 26-45.
- Narasimhan, R., & Narayanan, S. 2013. Perspectives on supply network-enabled innovations. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 49(4): 27-42.
- Ried, L., Eckerd, S., Kaufmann, L., & Carter, C. 2021. Spillover effects of information leakages in buyer-supplier-supplier triads. *Journal of operations management*, 67(3): 280-306.
- Sodhi, M. S., & Tang, C. S. 2020. Supply Chain Management for Extreme Conditions: Research Opportunities. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*.
- Talluri, S., Kull, T. J., Yildiz, H., & Yoon, J. 2013. Assessing the efficiency of risk mitigation strategies in supply chains. *Journal of Business logistics*, 34(4): 253-269.
- Tomlin, B. 2006. On the value of mitigation and contingency strategies for managing supply chain disruption risks. *Management science*, 52(5): 639-657.
- Turrini, L., Besiou, M., Papies, D., & Meissner, J. 2020. The role of operational expenditures and misalignments in fundraising for international humanitarian aid. *Journal of Operations Management*, 66(4): 379-417.
- Villena, V. H., Wilhelm, M., & Xiao, C. Y. 2020. Untangling drivers for supplier environmental and social responsibility: An investigation in Philips Lighting's Chinese supply chain. *Journal of Operations Management*.
- Wang, Y., Hong, A., Li, X., & Gao, J. 2020. Marketing innovations during a global crisis: A study of China firms' response to COVID-19. *Journal of Business Research*, 116: 214-220.
- Wieland, A. 2020. Dancing the supply chain: Toward transformative supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*.