



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Li, Q., Grimm, J. & Jarzabkowski, P. (2026). Theorizing Cross-Boundary Strategizing as Situated in Multi-Layered Supply Chains: A Strategy-as-Practice Approach to Supply Chain Management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, doi: 10.1111/jscm.70035

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/38274/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.70035>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Theorizing Cross-Boundary Strategizing as Situated in Multilayered Supply Chains: A Strategy-as-Practice Approach to Supply Chain Management

Qian Li¹  | Julia Grimm^{2,3}  | Paula Jarzabkowski^{4,5} 

¹Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK | ²Stockholm Business School, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden | ³House of Sustainable Society, Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm, Sweden | ⁴UQ Business School, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia | ⁵Bayes Business School, City St George's, University of London, London, UK

Correspondence: Qian Li (qian.li.3@warwick.ac.uk)

Received: 5 September 2025 | **Revised:** 27 June 2026 | **Accepted:** 21 August 2026

Keywords: qualitative research | research design | strategy as practice

ABSTRACT

Supply chain strategy is increasingly recognized as a multilayered phenomenon, with firms strategizing not only within their own boundaries but across supply chain tiers, jurisdictions, and wider regulatory and ecological systems. Yet most existing supply chain management research tends to treat these tiers, jurisdictions, and systems as contexts for strategizing rather than as something strategizing helps to constitute, leaving the cross-boundary character undertheorized. This article introduces the strategy-as-practice (SAP) lens as an epistemic tool for theorizing cross-boundary strategizing in multilayered supply chains. Drawing on SAP's tripartite framework of practices, practitioners, and praxis (three Ps), we show that strategizing is inherently cross-boundary, both implicitly through the knowledge practitioners draw on beyond their organization and explicitly through direct interaction with counterparts in other firms and institutions. We introduce three approaches SAP scholars use to conceptualize the complex systems within which strategizing is situated: a "tall" ontology separating intraorganizational from extraorganizational practice, a "flat" ontology treating strategizing as a web of practices stretching sideways, and a zoom-in/zoom-out approach tracing connectivity and identifying consequentiality across layers. Using a heuristic case of a European solar company and its Chinese supplier network, we show how each approach can shape the research orientation and theoretical payoff. We close with a research agenda for cross-boundary strategizing in supply chains and argue that supply chains have the potential to extend SAP's own theoretical apparatus.

1 | Supply Chain Strategy as a Multilayered Phenomenon

Supply chains today operate amid geopolitical tensions, climate crisis, and mounting demands for transparency, sustainability, and resilience. Organizations no longer strategize only within their own walls; they must coordinate across supply chain layers, including tiers, jurisdictions, regulatory regimes, and broader ecological and social systems (e.g., Wieland 2021; Wieland and Durach 2021; Carter et al. 2015). Research has accordingly come

to characterize supply chains as a multilayered phenomenon and strategizing in this context as a cross-boundary activity. It is cross-boundary implicitly when practitioners draw on their knowledge of other actors, jurisdictions, regimes, and systems to enact everyday practices, such as selecting suppliers based on experience and understanding of them (e.g., Aminoff et al. 2026; Kurpjuweit et al. 2021) or contextualizing sustainability requirements by drawing on knowledge about the laws of a country in which suppliers are located (Xiao et al. 2019). It is explicitly cross-boundary when practitioners directly engage with other

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2026 The Author(s). *Journal of Supply Chain Management* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

firms, regulators, or certification bodies to accomplish strategic outcomes (e.g., Santos et al. 2023), such as logistics service providers engaging with public authorities for urban sustainability (e.g., de Tarragon et al. 2024). This situated, implicit, and explicit cross-boundary strategizing produces the recursive dynamics, emergent interdependencies, and adaptive cycles that characterize multilayered supply chains (Wieland 2021).

Yet existing supply chain management research has largely treated supply chain tiers, jurisdictions, and regulatory and social-ecological systems as contexts, scope conditions, or triggers that explain why practices and outcomes occur rather than as something that strategizing itself helps constitute (e.g., de Tarragon et al. 2024; Santos et al. 2023; Razmdoost and Alinaghian 2024; Roscoe et al. 2022; Zhang et al. 2024). Although research has generated important theoretical insights with this “backdrop” approach, it also leaves cross-boundary strategizing undertheorized and, with it, the situatedness, knowledgeability, and consequentiality of supply chain strategy across layers, which strategy-as-practice can help us with.

This article introduces the strategy-as-practice (SAP) lens as an epistemic tool to examine cross-boundary strategizing in supply chain management research. By “epistemic tool,” we mean using a theoretical lens—its assumptions about the social world and its vocabulary—as an apparatus for asking different questions about a phenomenon, rather than simply redescribing it. SAP treats strategy not as a static property of firms but as something socially accomplished through a tripartite framework of practices, practitioners, and praxis (Jarzabkowski et al. 2007). Practices are the routinized repertoire of doings and sayings involved in strategizing; practitioners are the actors who mobilize them; and praxis is the unfolding flow of activity through which strategy is made (Whittington 2006). Because practitioners always draw on knowledge that extends beyond their organization, and because practices and praxis routinely connect to other firms, tiers, and institutions, strategizing is cross-boundary by nature (Deken et al. 2018; Jarzabkowski and Bednarek 2018).

To fully theorize cross-boundary strategizing, however, it is not enough to invoke SAP’s tripartite framework of practitioners, practices, and praxis. Strategizing must also be situated in some broader system in which it occurs; a multilayered supply chain can, after all, be interpreted as a complex system. SAP scholars have conceptualized such systems in three ways to visualize a multilayered supply chain, drawing on the work of Whittington (2006), Seidl and Whittington (2014), and Nicolini (2009). The first approach retains a “tall” ontology that analytically separates intraorganizational from extraorganizational practice: A multilayered supply chain can be seen as dual-layered, with practices circulating in an extraorganizational field (shared standards, templates, and regulatory requirements) that practitioners then adopt, adapt, and enact within their own organizational boundary; these enactments also recursively constitute the extraorganizational practices. This approach is well suited to theorizing how practices travel and what they become as they cross boundaries. The second approach adopts a more radical “flat” ontology that dissolves the categories of “level” and “boundary” altogether, visualizing a multilayered supply chain as a single web of practices stretching sideways, in which strategizing is cross-boundary not because anyone

crosses a boundary but because practices, practitioners, and praxis are already relationally entangled across what a “tall” ontology would call separate organizations. This approach is well suited to theorizing emergent interdependence across boundaries: outcomes that no single actor intended or controlled. The third approach takes the multilayered character of the system into account. Still, it treats it as something researchers can move across: zooming in on local, episodic interactions between practitioners and zooming out to trace how those episodes connect and accumulate into consequences at other layers of the system. This approach is well suited to theorizing how local strategizing reshapes the very structural conditions within which subsequent strategizing occurs. Each of the three approaches thus situates the three Ps differently, and each opens a different set of questions about recursivity, interdependence, and adaptation in multilayered supply chains.

The remainder of the article proceeds as follows. We first develop the notion of strategizing as a cross-boundary phenomenon, showing how each facet of the tripartite framework—practices, practitioners, and praxis—already cuts across organizational and institutional boundaries. We then introduce the three approaches to visualizing the complex system within which this cross-boundary strategizing is situated and explain what each makes theoretically possible. These conceptualizations are put to work through a heuristic case that shows how each shapes research design and the theoretical contribution it could generate. We conclude with a research agenda for cross-boundary strategizing in supply chains and an argument that supply chains, in turn, can extend SAP’s own theoretical apparatus.

2 | Strategizing as a Cross-Boundary Phenomenon

Before we introduce strategizing as a cross-boundary phenomenon, it is useful to explain what a practice is, what makes a practice strategic, and how strategy in SAP differs from other accounts of strategy. Following social practice theory, SAP defines practices as “organized, open-ended spatial-temporal manifold[s] of actions” (Schatzki 2005, 471), accomplished “through actors’ practical knowledge of how surrounding systems of rules and norms constrain and/or enable the actions they choose to perform” (Rouleau and Cloutier 2022, 729). With a practice ontology, a social phenomenon is understood as a larger network of relationships in which multiple practices are embedded within one another (Contu and Willmott 2003; Seidl and Whittington 2014; Nicolini 2009). Activities and practices become strategic when they have important consequences (Jarzabkowski et al. 2021), are labeled strategic, are carried out by strategists, or form an important recurrent pattern (Seidl et al. 2024). And SAP considers strategy to be situated within a flow of emergent activities, termed praxis, in which practitioners enact specific practices that instantiate the contextual knowledge of their sphere. Strategy in SAP is, in other words, socially accomplished, situated “doing” (Jarzabkowski et al. 2007; Whittington 2006), rather than a static property of firms that predicts performance; a set of valuable, rare, inimitable, non-substitutable resources (e.g., Barney 1991); or a set of discrete, imitable “practices” (e.g., Bromiley and Rau 2014). While using the language of practices, Bromiley and Rau’s (2014) work does not adopt a practice ontology; rather, it takes an epistemological

position closer to that of the resource-based view than to social practice theory (see Jarzabkowski et al. 2016). SAP's focus on situated doing also differs from the individualistic, cognition-based "headwork" in strategic management (e.g., Greve 1998; Song et al. 2002). In addition, strategy in SAP goes further than the emergent strategy approach (Burgelman 1984; Mintzberg and Waters 1985) by explaining how a planned strategy is realized or emerges in practice, attending to practitioners, their situated actions and interactions, and the resultant strategic consequences (Balogun et al. 2014; Vaara and Whittington 2012; Weiser et al. 2020).

These three elements—practices, practitioners, and praxis, which we refer to as SAP's tripartite framework or three Ps—are not independent components but mutually constitutive: Strategizing is always situated in an emergent flow of praxis in which practitioners enact specific practices (Jarzabkowski et al. 2007). Research adopting the SAP lens, however, tends to foreground one of the three Ps while backgrounding the others. This is a choice of analytical emphasis, not a reflection of how strategizing works, because each of the three Ps already cuts across organizational and institutional boundaries. We now discuss these aspects in turn: practices are relationally constituted across and beyond firms, such that strategizing within an organization is already implicitly cross-boundary; practitioners carry knowledge into their everyday doing that spans jurisdictions, hierarchies, and cultures, and praxis unfolds as a flow of episodes that connect local interactions to consequences across the system. Together, these three aspects show that strategizing is cross-boundary by nature.

2.1 | Practices as Relational

Practices are routinized, patterned types of activity providing "the behavioral, cognitive, procedural, discursive and physical resources" to accomplish something (Jarzabkowski et al. 2007, 9). Practices are what people do to deliver a strategy—shared repertoires that shape how strategy is performed. SAP research has examined strategy as relational practices through which actors within and across organizational boundaries accomplish strategies (e.g., Balogun and Johnson 2004, 2005; Jarzabkowski and Bednarek 2018; Seidl and Werle 2018). It theorizes strategy as relationally constituted and contextually situated, meaning that a business strategy, despite being at a firm "level," is formulated in relation to others, such as competitors and clients, or suppliers and buyers in a supply chain context. For example, Jarzabkowski and Bednarek (2018) demonstrate that firms do not choose their competitive strategy from an ideal typology, such as cost leadership or differentiation. Rather, a competitive strategy is relationally constructed through practices, such as selectively releasing information, positioning price relative to competitors, and leveraging client relationships. Therefore, strategizing within an organization is implicitly cross-boundary because firms need to engage with their counterparts to formulate their strategy. Focusing on one firm does not necessarily isolate it from the web of relationships that constitute its social reality (i.e., the industry, sector, or field).

The focus on practices can also be explicitly directed toward cross-boundary strategizing. Many studies in SAP have

uncovered relational tensions between firms and how these tensions are negotiated and navigated in the constitution of strategy, showing consequences that are not always expected. Using supply chains as a context and drawing on a strategizing lens, Deken et al. (2018) demonstrate how managers at an automotive manufacturer constructed resource complementarity with multiple potential start-up partners through recursive cycles of what the authors term "prospective resourcing"—a process in which the value and fit of a prospective partner's resources are not given in advance but are jointly and provisionally constructed through ongoing strategizing interactions, and which mediates the interplay between strategizing and collaboration rather than following a fixed, linear sequence. Their study shows that resource complementarity across organizational boundaries is a consequential accomplishment of cross-boundary practices, not a precondition to which strategizing merely responds.

Other research has focused on relational practices adopted to manage tensions in multiparty collaboration around pressing societal issues, such as endemic poverty, inequity, and climate crisis (Ferraro et al. 2015). For instance, Couture et al. (2023) show how actors in a multistakeholder initiative used broadening and containing practices to sustain collective commitment to the environmental challenge of managing water quality in Australia's Great Barrier Reef. These practices must be understood as contextually situated, emerging from the social interactions among multiple stakeholders and shaped by sociocultural conventions and norms. These examples have shown that social practice, as the unit of analysis, is relational and can unpack various cross-boundary interactions. What researchers choose to focus on is a matter of research design.

Some studies in supply chain strategy have started to examine tensions and negotiations in cross-boundary interactions (e.g., Rouyre et al. 2024; Xiao et al. 2019). For example, Rouyre et al. (2024) examined how formal and informal governance mechanisms are deployed and renegotiated in response to cooperative tensions between and across private space companies and public organizations. In their longitudinal study of the Galileo satellite project, improvisation through informal interaction between engineers across boundaries is framed as a mechanism that subverts the formal governance architecture. While generating important insights into the complexity of cross-organizational collaboration, the study could further specify the situatedness of "improvisation through informal interaction" beyond its current focus on "informal" governance mechanisms. Specifically, it is unclear whether these interactions were shaped by engineers' communication practices, which may have been conditioned by their professional norms, their organizations' cultures, or their interpersonal interactions. Attending to these questions could further deepen understanding of cross-boundary strategizing as situated, enabling researchers to determine whether such knowledge is transferable to cross-organizational collaboration to improve outcomes.

2.2 | Practitioners and Cross-Boundary Knowledge

Practitioners are the organizational actors who mobilize practices to pursue strategic objectives, that is, "those individuals who draw upon practices to act" (Jarzabkowski et al. 2007, 9).

The concept focuses on who does strategy, how they act in their positions, and what practices they enact through their identities, roles, and knowledge. The SAP lens acknowledges that practitioners' geographical, hierarchical, and divisional positions shape the knowledge they bring to their strategy work (Mantere and Vaara 2008; Rouleau and Cloutier 2022; Whittington 1996). Crucially, practitioners are naturally situated in a multilayered system comprising a firm, an interorganizational project, an industry, a jurisdiction, and even a national culture. They draw their knowledge and understanding of these layers—in which they are situated—into their doing. In other words, practitioners instantiate their contextual knowledge and enact practices in a flow of activities across boundaries. As such, when focusing on practitioners, SAP research has theorized how practitioners do things, contributing to theoretical debates such as sensemaking, framing (Balogun et al. 2014; Seidl and Werle 2018), and knowledgeability (Rouleau and Cloutier 2022; Whittington 1996).

SAP research on practitioners has highlighted their agency in accomplishing strategy. This agency can be captured in their practices, which reflect their deep knowledge and contextual understanding that spans boundaries, connecting a situation within a firm to a social norm in a geographic location. For instance, Rouleau (2005) has focused on middle managers implementing a new strategy by translating it for customers, telling stories aligned with customer expectations, and inscribing words and actions around the strategy to gain customer acceptance of it in a region with historical tension between Anglophone and Francophone actors. Middle managers in this case do not simply sell a fashion collection; they demonstrate their deep knowledge of the new strategy and understanding of how to interact with customers by tailoring their messages and presentations. Although this study focuses on practitioners at one firm, it simultaneously bridges the layers of firm strategy and sociocultural context.

Other studies focus explicitly on interactions among practitioners from different firms in cross-organizational collaboration. For instance, Seidl and Werle (2018) examine actors' framing practices in a multifirm strategic alliance. They find that actors in these firms can collaborate to interpret and address a strategic issue that is problematic for them all. They show that participation in or withdrawal from an interorganizational initiative is shaped by how actors frame the issue and align their perspectives (Seidl and Werle 2018). It is important to note that such knowing and framing are not purely cognitive; rather, they are socially and contextually enacted as practitioners interact to make sense of what should and could be done in a particular situation. These interactions encapsulate the participants' extensive knowledge about a situation or context in their actions and interactions. Balogun and Johnson (2004, 2005) show how the social practices of interaction among middle managers across divisional boundaries shape their interpretation of a top-down strategy with unintended, albeit not necessarily negative, consequences for its implementation. These examples demonstrate that focusing on practitioners has potential for cross-boundary theorizing, as practitioners can draw on their understanding of sociocultural conditions to respond to strategic challenges within their firms, or juxtapose their interpretations of an issue with how it is framed collectively across divisional or organizational boundaries. As such, practitioner-centered research is

also useful for theorizing cross-boundary strategizing, drawing attention to how conditions at the different layers, including firms, tiers, and jurisdictions, can be understood by practitioners and how such understanding and knowledge are instantiated in their practices and constitute a flow of activities.

A considerable amount of supply chain research has focused on practitioners and their role as boundary spanners, that is, practitioners positioned at the interface between organizations, jurisdictions, and institutional logics. The boundary-spanning practitioners (e.g., the sustainability manager navigating between regulatory compliance and procurement efficiency) are organizational actors through whom interfirm strategic dynamics are enacted and negotiated. For instance, in Chakkol et al.'s (2018) research on servitization strategy, the authors focused on the functions, roles, and practices of boundary spanners. Drawing on interviews with individuals in 11 firms within one sector, they found that boundary spanners shifted from communicating product and price features to strategic communication, reducing dissonance, and leveraging offerings in solution provisions. Srai et al. (2025) examined how academia and regulatory bodies, as boundary spanners, can help converge learning in early-stage R&D consortia. Thus far, SAP research has not paid sufficient attention to boundary spanners as agents in cross-organizational strategizing. As such, supply chain research focusing on boundary spanners can help extend SAP's research on practitioners and our understanding of how they strategize to implement strategies across implicit or explicit boundaries.

2.3 | Praxis Across Implicit and Explicit Boundaries

Praxis concerns “what is going on in society and what people are doing” (Jarzabkowski et al. 2007, 9), encompassing the broader flow of actions and interactions through which strategic activity emerges within specific temporal, organizational, and societal contexts. Praxis differs from practices, which are the routinized activities of practitioners, whereas praxis is the unfolding stream of these activities across time and space that is labeled as “strategy.” SAP literature pays attention to praxis by tracing how this stream of activity emerges across multiple strategic episodes—those situated interactions through which practitioners accomplish strategy. As the unfolding sequence of consequential moments through which strategy is made and remade, praxis captures local, regional, or global influences in episodes or series of episodes that occur within or across organizational boundaries (Jarzabkowski et al. 2015).

Current SAP research on praxis has either focused on local situations, predominantly within firms, or taken a large-scale view (Seidl and Whittington 2014) that cuts across actions, interactions, and organizational boundaries that constitute how an industry works. In local settings, research has not focused on cross-boundary interactions per se. For instance, Bencherki et al. (2021) demonstrate how “matters of concern” were developed, escalated, and became strategic issues through actors' conversational practices, such as substantiating, by offering “different words, numbers, drawings, and so on” to highlight the criticality of an issue, or by “summarizing the matters of

concern and the organization's action with respect to it" before the end of a meeting (Bencherki et al. 2021, 615). Similarly, Knight et al. (2025) show that the atmospheric dynamics of a meeting (i.e., the discursive practices of clarifying, entrenching, and building on interpretations) shape whether and how a strategic issue is collectively resolved.

However, research that employs a large-scale approach presents examples of unpacking the praxis of cross-boundary strategizing, both implicitly and explicitly. For instance, research has traced how the multiple competitive actions of practitioners within firms across thousands of deals shape the cycles of a global market (Jarzabkowski et al. 2015; Jarzabkowski and Bednarek 2018). Hence, whether focusing on meetings within an organization or tracing flows across organizations, the SAP approach to praxis centers analysis on a stream of practices and draws on episodic observations across time and space to understand the emergent processes through which strategy is made. These studies reveal that strategy is not made in boardrooms by senior executives but is constituted and reconstituted in the microdynamics of ordinary interactions, with consequences across multiple intraorganizational and interorganizational layers that no single actor could anticipate or control.

Multilayered supply chains are an important context for extending the understanding of praxis. Existing studies in supply chain management have shown the potential for such contributions. One such example is Zhang et al.'s (2024) study on Daxing Airport's transition practice from projects to operation, which involved "12 government departments, 24 investment entities, and countless participating entities, with approximately 74,000 people involved at the peak of the transition" (Zhang et al. 2024, 113). In that study, the authors conducted a 17-month ethnography. They identified a stream of practices based on their observations and interviews, such as building connections and achieving continuity, cross-pollinating ideas, establishing temporary organizations, creating feedback loops, and rotating employees. Although the authors of the study ultimately aggregated their findings into high-level constructs such as structure, process, and people, their work has shown that large-scale research in and around supply chains can uncover a nuanced understanding of cross-boundary strategizing at multiple layers. With a research design that helps theorize cross-boundary strategizing, supply chain phenomena not only hold potential for unpacking praxis but also for understanding the consequentiality of the practices and capturing the knowledge that practitioners instantiate in their activities.

3 | Situating Cross-Boundary Strategizing in a Complex System

The corpus of SAP research mentioned above (e.g., Jarzabkowski et al. 2015; Jarzabkowski and Bednarek 2018) has demonstrated what a praxis-focused research agenda can achieve. However, unleashing such potential either requires a book format to accommodate the holistic understanding or a research program, with each project capturing a snapshot of the praxis. This raises the question of how we might design our research programs to trace praxis and unpack the dynamics of strategy in multilayered supply chains. Designing such a program requires a

broader understanding of how practice scholars conceptualize large-scale phenomena, in which cross-boundary strategizing is situated. We now introduce three approaches to conceptualizing complex social phenomena that we use to visualize multilayered supply chains, drawing on the work of Whittington (2006), Seidl and Whittington (2014), and Nicolini (2009): (1) a "tall" ontology that analytically separates intraorganizational from extraorganizational practice, in which a multilayered supply chain is seen as dual-layered, with practices circulating in an extraorganizational field that practitioners then adopt, adapt, and enact within their own organizational boundary; (2) a "flat" ontology that rejects the notion of "levels" or "boundaries" and thus visualizes a multilayered supply chain as a single web of practices stretching sideways, in which strategizing is cross-boundary because practices, practitioners, and praxis are already relationally entangled; and (3) a dual lens in which researchers can move across the multilayered character of the system by zooming in on local, episodic interactions between practitioners, and zooming out to trace their connectivity and consequentiality to other layers of the system. The "tall" and "flat" ontologies represent distinct analytical commitments about what a multilayered system fundamentally is, whereas zooming in and out is a strategy for switching between these theoretical lenses rather than a third ontology or a reconciliation of the two; each switch brackets whichever layer is not currently in view, holding it as background rather than dissolving or integrating it. Although these three approaches are suitable for addressing differing research questions about recursivity, interdependence, and adaptivity in a system like a multilayered supply chain, it is important to note that all three approaches are based on the same idea: A social phenomenon is a web of practices, and each approach is a perspective that a group of scholars has adopted to explain this. Some approaches impose familiar conceptual categories, such as "macrolevel" and "microlevel," for analytic clarity, thereby enabling extensive adoption in SAP (Li and Jarzabkowski 2025). Others remain committed to a more radical "flat" ontology that has the potential for further development. This article uses these three approaches to visualize and enable theorizing of a multilayered supply chain through the SAP lens.

3.1 | Examining Practices Across Intraorganizational and Extraorganizational Boundaries

The first approach to conceptualizing a complex system as a web of practices integrates intraorganizational and extraorganizational practices (Whittington 2006). Here, social reality is analytically demarcated by an organizational boundary. Simply put, outside this boundary—extraorganizationally—lies a bundle of practices that practitioners within this boundary can draw on and enact to accomplish their strategic goals through activities. With this approach, a multilayered supply chain system is demarcated conceptually by an organization's boundary, offering many possibilities for theorizing cross-boundary strategizing in supply chain management and showing strategy as recursively constituted. First, it can be used to conceptualize the same practice across organizational boundaries, such as a particular sustainability practice or a supplier compliance questionnaire (e.g., Santos et al. 2023). These practices are assumed to exist in the extraorganizational field and to be shared by other firms in

the same tier or adopted by those in different tiers. Firms adopt these practices by implementing them within their boundary. Scholars have long argued that practices are developed by somebody and disseminated in the industry or field (e.g., Abrahamson and Fombrun 1992). In this case, we propose an approach to studying cross-boundary strategizing by focusing on how supply chain practices move across intraorganizational and extraorganizational boundaries and how cross-boundary strategizing unfolds from the perspectives of either adopters or disseminators, unpacking the intraorganizational and extraorganizational dynamics that characterize contemporary supply chains.

Second, practitioners play a central role in drawing practices from extraorganizational fields (Whittington 2006). When adopting or implementing these practices, practitioners are likely to adapt them in praxis, that is, the flow of actual activities in enacting the practice. Specifically, practitioners' local knowledge enables adaptation in praxis, making the practice workable within their organization. For example, in Rouleau's (2005) case of middle managers in Montreal, Canada, practitioners essentially strategize across boundaries by adopting and adapting a practice from the extraorganizational sociocultural field into their organizations, which requires knowledge about the practice and its skillful enactment within their organizational boundary. We thus propose a second approach to studying cross-boundary strategizing by focusing on how a field-level practice is imported into an organization and adapted by knowledgeable practitioners to produce patterns of strategic activity within that organization (Jarzabkowski et al. 2007).

Research in supply chain management has begun to draw attention to the adoption of supply chain practices. For instance, Santos et al. (2023) explore how sub-suppliers build knowledge and learn sustainability practices within a multitiered poultry production supply chain. Focusing on learning, Santos and her associates find that first-tier suppliers translate practices for sub-suppliers, whose learning was shaped by their context. Specifically, sub-suppliers learn from a peer's experiences through embedded material practices, and sometimes through abandoning old knowledge. This study is one example of what cross-boundary strategizing may look like in supply chain management. Although it is valuable to understand how sub-suppliers learn, such learning seems to be conditioned by the sub-supplier's context, which, if we follow this intraorganizational and extraorganizational practice-integration approach, itself is a bundle of practices. Taking a practice lens may allow researchers to uncover what has been done and to elucidate how a practice can be adopted successfully across contexts, thus enhancing transferability and generalizability. Another example is Nath et al.'s (2020) study on the sustainability strategy of sub-supplier firms. In their study, sub-suppliers decoupled sustainability requirements from the implementation of supply chain management practices through a consensual strategy or a concealment strategy. The authors explained these different strategies from the perspective of institutional logics, yet such logics are, themselves, a web of practices (e.g., Smets et al. 2015). Using the SAP lens, researchers could trace such sustainability and other practices, surfacing tensions and contradictions that could yield a better understanding of how to make these practices work across contexts within a layered supply chain.

3.2 | Tracing Praxis in a “Flattened” System of a Web of Practices

The second approach to conceptualizing a complex system is to view it as a web of practices that “stretches sideways” (Nicolini 2009; Seidl and Whittington 2014). Practices are connected, entangled, and span across time and space (e.g., Rouleau 2005; Sele et al. 2024). Central to this view is the notion that social, cultural, and historical contexts and conditions are ensembles or bundles of practices that involve particular ways of doing things. The “flat” ontology was introduced to overcome a long-standing debate over the macro–micro binary by emphasizing actors and their actions and drawing attention to relations (Sele et al. 2024). Hence, conceptualizing a complex system as a “flat” web of practices voids the notion of the level of analysis—“social life does not admit levels” (cited in Sele et al. 2024, 533)—because it is comprised of practices and praxis acted upon by practitioners. The “macro” or “micro” is merely an analytic category in which multilayered supply chains must be understood as stretching sideways rather than vertically. With this worldview, theorizing cross-boundary strategizing is problematized because boundaries themselves become an ambiguous conceptual category. Nonetheless, as we argued earlier, practices are inherently cross-boundary, such that positioning price relative to competitors and leveraging client relationships to construct a competitive advantage constitute cross-boundary strategizing because they concern other stakeholders (Jarzabkowski and Bednarek 2018). These practices also reflect what practitioners know about their competitors, clients, and the competitive landscape in which they are situated. As such, with this approach, strategizing in a supply chain extends sideways, even when it is implicitly multilayered and involves boundary crossing.

Although the “flat” ontology has always been a key part of the SAP literature, it tends to be conceptual rather than empirical. One challenge is to make sense of a complex web of practices without analytical categories such as the “macro” and “micro.” Recent research has suggested that practices in a “flat” ontology can be traced through spatial, temporal, and agentic relations (Sele et al. 2024), that is, how actors and their actions are connected directly or indirectly in ways that produce social phenomena (spatial relation), how they are temporally related to each other (temporal relation), and what is happening between actors and actions without assuming agency a priori (agentic relation). Based on these three types of relations, Sele et al. (2024) reanalyzed the data from Mair et al.'s (2016) study on an NGO-led social initiative in India. By tracing the connections of actors, Sele et al. (2024, 536–537) found that “phenomena and their situated power [are] a consequence of actions and relations,” a finding that illuminates “the constitution of grand challenges and how they are upheld.” Therefore, despite challenges, conceptualizing a complex system as a web of practices stretching sideways offers unique opportunities to trace connections among activities and practices in strategizing, to track the emergence of potentially novel activities and practices (Nicolini 2009), and to shed light on emerging interdependence in contemporary supply chains.

This “flat ontology” approach is useful for considering cross-boundary strategizing in a supply chain study as a web of practices. For instance, Razmdoost and Alinaghian (2024) studied how practitioners in buying firms introduced social

procurement practices, that is, procuring from social enterprises. Drawing on institutional work, the authors identified four types of work: reducing institutional conflicts, crossing institutional boundaries, legitimizing institutional change, and spreading the new institutional logic. These types of work imply cross-boundary strategizing within the buying firm and between the buying firm and the social enterprise suppliers. With a “flat” ontology, researchers could further trace such work without necessarily locating it within institutional logics, to uncover what practitioners do in introducing social procurement; how their doing meets with existing, albeit differing ways of doing; and how they overcome conflicts and generate new processes and procedures.

However, it is critical to note that, with a “flat” ontology, the notions of “tier,” “level,” and “jurisdiction” are concepts that researchers could invoke to refer to a web of practices. These concepts should be seen as boundary objects or organizing categories rather than ontologically given. As such, researchers could track how these doings reshape what counts as legitimate procurement across a supply chain without invoking these concepts. By assuming a “flat” ontology, future research could gain insights into how a practice is reproduced and how relationships within a supply chain are reconfigured by the new practice. Similarly, researchers could track and unpack situated strategizing. For instance, in a study of opportunistic buying behavior, Gelderman et al. (2020) identify three behaviors—bluff poker, noncompliance, and bullying behavior—that suggest power dynamics in social interactions between buyers and suppliers. Their study adopts a causal model of triggers, mechanisms, and consequences in explaining opportunistic buying. Yet by tracing what buyers and suppliers do in their interactions, greater insights could be gained into situations where opportunistic buying occurs, offering further opportunities to connect with other practices, such as buyer incentives and common practices considered part of an industry’s culture.

3.3 | Zooming in and out in a Multilayered System as a Web of Practices

The third approach to conceptualizing a complex system is to visualize it as a web of practices that scholars can zoom in on to identify localized actions and interactions and zoom out to trace connectivity between these locales and explain their effects and consequentiality. The fundamental idea of this approach is that “studying practice requires choosing different angles for observation and interpretation frameworks without necessarily giving prominence to any one of these vistas” (Nicolini 2009, 1396). The zoom-in-and-out approach can be used to unpack relationships between two or more layers, given that each layer comprises a web of practices. However, when zooming in, researchers tend to focus on “micro” interactions or local negotiations before zooming out to “macro” dynamics or broader global circumstances. The localized interactions are studied by observing and tracking practitioners’ sayings and doings in conversations, which often involve bodies, materials, and tools. Zooming out, researchers are advised to articulate the associations and connections among bundles of practices and to track their local and trans-local effects (Nicolini 2009, 1412). The zoom-in-and-out approach is useful for identifying the interdependence

between and consequentiality of practices that constitute multi-layered supply chains. The key is to start with practices—what people say and do—and then trace the connectivity from there.

SAP research has examined localized strategizing interactions in meetings and boardrooms, such as how matters of concern are escalated into strategic issues in conversation or how decision-making is shaped by atmospheric dynamics in meetings (e.g., Bencherki et al. 2021; Knight et al. 2025). Whereas these studies have implicitly informed our understanding of the local effects of a bundle of practices identified by researchers, that bundle is consequential beyond the local context. However, in the format of journal articles, it is rare to see studies that connect such localized interactions with wider societal, market, or industry practices, such as the global reinsurance market (Jarzabkowski et al. 2015), beyond illustrative cases (e.g., Nicolini 2009; Sele et al. 2024). It remains challenging for SAP researchers to attend to both local interactions and trans-local or global effects. Partly, this is because the subject of a typical SAP study is within an organizational boundary, although increasingly attention is shifting to interorganizational strategizing (Seidl and Werle 2018). Supply chain researchers are thus in an advantageous position to use zooming in and out to track localized practices and trace their connectivity and effects across the multilayered supply chain system.

Indeed, several studies in supply chain management have demonstrated this potential. For instance, de Tarragon et al. (2024) situate logistics service providers within an urban ecosystem that nests firm-level practices inside a broader municipal and societal system. They “find” that logistics service providers (LSPs) are caught between the city logistics ecosystem, where they are increasingly squeezed by shippers to maximize profits, and the urban ecosystem, where they are rejected by public authorities for sustainability concerns. The authors concluded that, in a successful alignment scenario, LSPs should be supported by public authorities to improve sustainability and by shippers to match profit requirements. With a zoom-in-and-out approach, researchers could track what LSPs do and trace the effects their practices have on the practices of different stakeholders in city logistics and urban ecosystems. By tracing practices across boundaries, researchers may inform practical recommendations for achieving the proposed successful alignment scenario, which current research falls short of addressing.

In summary, we introduce three approaches that can be used in theorizing situated cross-boundary strategizing: a dual-layered system demarcated by the organizational boundary in which researchers can theorize practice adoption and diffusion between these layers, drawing attention to practitioners’ practical knowledge and their praxis; a single-layered (“flattened”) system comprising interconnected practices stretching sideways, where scholars can follow practices to understand how they generate flows of praxis that in turn generate novel activities and practices; and a multilayered system that can be zoomed in and out of to trace consequentiality of localized practices and their connectivity across webs of practices to inform cross-boundary effects. We use these approaches to visualize a multilayered supply chain, enabling us to demonstrate various research designs that focus on practices, practitioners, and praxis within the broader practice-theoretical tradition.

4 | Designing a Cross-Boundary Strategizing Study: The NordSol Case

We now flesh out how the SAP lens could inform a potential research design for studying cross-boundary strategizing in supply chain management, drawing on an illustrative heuristic case study. The NordSol case is a fictional case inspired by themes in Schrage et al. (2026), a separately published empirical study; the two works are independent, and this case makes no empirical claims that depend on that study. Furthermore, the regulatory setting is used only as a heuristic backdrop, because regulation itself can be theorized as constituted depending on the research design and focus. For our purposes, readers should not treat any specific details as authoritative, and no evidentiary claims are made. Rather, our aim with this heuristic case is to make visible how each of the three approaches—examining practices across intraorganizational and extraorganizational boundaries, tracing praxis in a flattened web of practices, and zooming in and out of a multilayered system—shapes what a researcher could attend to, how they could design their inquiry, and what theoretical contributions they could generate. We begin with a brief description of the case, followed by three subsections that demonstrate each approach in turn.

4.1 | Background to NordSol Case

The heuristic case revolves around *NordSol*, a mid-sized French solar energy company developing solar installations across Europe. NordSol sources photovoltaic panels from a network of multiple Chinese suppliers—the manufacturers—whom we collectively refer to here as *SolarMakers*—whose upstream subsupply base is large, shifting, and opaque. Within NordSol, a sustainability team and a procurement function share an office in Paris but operate with different priorities: Sustainability is oriented toward regulatory risk and reputational exposure; procurement is oriented toward panel cost per watt and project delivery schedules. At SolarMakers, new demands for upstream transparency arrive without established routines to answer them, and compliance responses reflect the genuine difficulty of operationalizing expectations whose institutional infrastructure is uneven across contexts.

The tensions in this case intensify as new sustainability expectations from clients and regulators reshape NordSol's internal decision-making. A cross-functional working group is convened for the first time, bringing sustainability, procurement, and legal functions into direct dialogue. Joint sessions with SolarMakers are established; NordSol offers commercial incentives in exchange for greater supply chain transparency; a small number of upstream suppliers are brought into direct dialogue with NordSol's sustainability team. These initiatives are not the outcome of a strategic plan. They are the outcome of the situated interactions of specific practitioners, acting from specific positions, at specific moments. For instance, a cross-functional working group was formed after a panel order was nearly approved without sustainability sign-off, and the sustainability manager mentioned the near-miss to a colleague in legal, who suggested the two functions start meeting regularly with procurement. It is this constellation that each of the three approaches that we use

to visualize the supply chain system above would illuminate, as we now demonstrate.

4.2 | Examining Practice Adoption Across Intraorganizational and Extraorganizational Boundaries

The first approach demarcates organizational boundaries. Cross-boundary strategizing is situated at such boundaries and may be analyzed using SAP's three Ps—practices, practitioners, and praxis—each of which is at work across this boundary implicitly or explicitly. Supply chain *practices* originate in the extraorganizational field (shared repertoires, standards, and templates that circulate across firms and tiers) and are adopted and enacted within the intraorganizational boundary. *Practitioners* draw on these practices from the extraorganizational field and instantiate them in their organizations, whereas *praxis* (the flow of actual activities through which a practice is adapted as it crosses the boundary) is what makes that adoption consequential rather than nominal. Cross-boundary strategizing, on this view, is therefore not the boundary crossing itself but the work the three Ps of SAP do as they cross it: practices supplying the repertoire, practitioners supplying the positional knowledge, and praxis supplying the flow of activity in which the practice is adapted. A researcher applying this approach attends to two questions: how does a practice move across the organizational boundary, and how does practitioners' local knowledge shape what the practice becomes in their praxis?

Let us now illustrate this with the NordSol case. Using a supplier self-assessment questionnaire for supply chain visibility is considered an extraorganizational practice that firms across sectors do for sustainability regulation and supply chain due diligence. When NordSol introduces it as part of its sustainability governance, it is adopting a practice from the extraorganizational field, implementing it within its organizational boundary. From SolarMakers' perspective, using this questionnaire is also an extraorganizational compliance practice. However, this practice is enacted differently by each SolarMaker due to its internal infrastructure, distinctive relationships with lower tier suppliers, and firm-specific operational routines.

A researcher attending to intraorganizational and extraorganizational boundary dynamics would make visible the discrepancy between the extraorganizationally standardized form of this practice and its adoption and adaptation in practice. The questionnaire is designed to achieve extraorganizational upstream supply chain visibility. But as it is enacted intraorganizationally at NordSol, it is processed in an approval meeting and reviewed by a sustainability manager, working within the limits of what a completed questionnaire, as an artifact, reveals. Therefore, it constitutes a different praxis: due diligence performance that is locally satisfying but structurally limited. At SolarMakers, the enactment differs again: the compliance officers answer in general terms about their lower tier suppliers, with which they have no direct relationship, producing a response that is locally truthful but informationally constrained. Neither party is being deceptive; both are enacting

the same extraorganizational practice from within different organizational boundaries, with different intraorganizational resources.

A researcher designing a study around this approach could focus on tracing enactments across boundaries: how the extraorganizational practice of using a questionnaire for supply chain visibility is adopted and institutionalized within NordSol's intraorganizational boundary (which functions are involved, what sign-off processes are established, and how completion is interpreted) and how SolarMakers enact it within their own boundaries (what routines are mobilized, how gaps are managed, and what the compliance officer's praxis actually looks like). The practices diffusing through tiers, being modified in translation, and generating unanticipated effects that supply chain management research has long observed become theoretically tractable when the unit of analysis is the practice moving across boundaries. Practitioners are central to this theorization: It is through their local knowledge, positional resources, and praxis that a practice from the extraorganizational field is instantiated, modified, and sometimes subverted within an organizational boundary. Cross-boundary strategizing is here an ongoing accomplishment of adopting, enacting, and adapting practices across intraorganizational and extraorganizational boundaries. Importantly, when researchers draw on an SAP lens, the boundary provides the empirical location where they could observe the adoption of a practice. However, the analytical work is done by examining the three Ps involved in adopting and adapting the practice.

4.3 | Tracing Praxis in a “Flattened” Web of Practices

The second approach of the “flat” ontology focuses on how practices connect, entangle, and stretch sideways across a web of practices. With this flat ontology, a multilayered supply chain is not a hierarchy of tiers and jurisdictions but a plane of interconnected practices, through which praxis flows temporally, spatially, and agentially (Sele et al. 2024). Removing the boundary as an organizing category does not remove SAP's three Ps or alter the premise that practices are inherently cross-boundary through practitioners and praxis; if anything, it foregrounds them, because practices, practitioners, and praxis are now the only resources left for making sense of the web. Cross-boundary strategizing, therefore, does not imply movement across a boundary but rather the constitution of new practice connections through the situated actions of practitioners, who enact practices and generate praxis without that activity being organized by any prior boundary.

Returning to NordSol for illustrative purposes, the flat ontology directs attention away from “what happened between NordSol and SolarMakers” and toward the web of practices through which the sustainability governance situation is constituted. Consider a specific episode: three practitioners—a sustainability manager, a procurement manager, and a legal colleague at NordSol—meet to negotiate the threshold above which procurement decisions require sustainability sign-off. The procurement manager arrives after speaking informally with key clients, who signal that they may eventually audit

their suppliers' suppliers. She does not mention this directly, but it shifts how she frames her position. The sustainability manager, who has been pushing for a lower threshold for months, registers the shift and proposes a pilot rather than pressing his original demand. The legal colleague drafts language. By the end of the meeting, the threshold has moved and no one has been overruled. The strategic configuration of NordSol's supply chain governance has shifted through a chain of practices enacted by three practitioners through their situated interactions.

Drawing on a “flat” ontology, this episode is not internal to NordSol, and it is SAP's three Ps that show why: The procurement manager and the sustainability manager are the *practitioners* whose positional knowledge (her client conversations and his months of pushing for a lower threshold) is brought to bear on the negotiation. The threshold itself and the legal colleague's drafted language are artifacts of professional *practices*—repertoires that, once enacted, will carry forward into procurement processes, supplier audits, and future compliance activities. And the meeting itself is *praxis*: the flow of situated, consequential activity through which the practitioners' knowledge and the practice are brought together, and the threshold moves. The procurement manager's unspoken reframing, triggered by her client conversations, is already a connection across the web of practices among firms within the supply chain. The sustainability manager's tactical restraint reflects practices of navigating the regulatory environment—practices he has learned to enact strategically. The legal colleague's drafting of threshold language produces an artifact—the drafted language—that instantiates a new practice, one that will subsequently connect to procurement processes, supplier audits, and future regulatory compliance activities. Following Sele et al. (2024), a researcher tracing this web could attend to spatial relations (which actors and actions are directly or indirectly connected, and how), temporal relations (how earlier practices shape and constrain later ones), and agentic relations (how the episode produces effects without any single actor controlling them)—relations that are themselves only visible when practices, practitioners, and praxis are the units being traced. What would be visible is not an organization implementing a strategy, but a web of practices continuously reconstituted by practitioners through praxis.

Methodologically, this approach demands a research design that resists the organizational boundary as an organizing device. A researcher would follow practices rather than firms: tracing how the sustainability manager's practices connect to client practices, regulatory practices, and procurement practices within the same “flat” web; observing how SolarMakers' compliance practices link to procurement practices on their side, to upstream supplier practices, and to the legal and regulatory practices that shape what compliance means in their context. The theoretical contribution of such a study would not be a typology of interorganizational governance mechanisms but an account of how practices are relationally constituted and how praxis generates novel practices and connections that produce emergent interdependence across the supply chain. The “flat” ontology makes available such an account of cross-boundary strategizing as the continuous, relational

constitution of a web of practices, in which no single boundary is primary, and no actor fully controls the outcome.

4.4 | Zooming in and out of the NordSol Supply Chain as a Multilayered System

The third approach, zooming in and out, accepts the multilayered character of the supply chain system while insisting that it is constituted by practices and praxis at each layer. It is the researcher's task to zoom in to observe situated interactions and zoom out to trace their connectivity and consequentiality. The NordSol case example offers several episodes that demonstrate what such a zoom-in-and-zoom-out approach can enable theoretically.

Zooming in, a researcher following the NordSol case would attend to local episodes in which strategizing takes place. One such episode could be about a panel order being approved despite an incomplete sustainability file: The project deadline is pressing, the sustainability manager is not consulted, and when he checks the system the following morning, he finds that the threshold technically was not crossed. The episode reveals a gap in the practice they designed together: The threshold is tied to order value, but the governance risk is supplier-specific. In another episode, NordSol's sustainability manager and SolarMakers' account directors discuss upstream supply chain transparency. SolarMakers share supplier lists covering only those suppliers whose compliance they can confirm—not the full subsupply base. The practice of upstream disclosure is being constituted differently on each side of the boundary, and neither party is misleading the other. In a third episode, external guidance on sustainability obligations is published, and a colleague from the legal department forward it internally with a single observation that it changes what can reasonably be required. The guidance has not altered the underlying obligations. But it has altered what counts as adequate strategizing within them. A new episode begins. None of these episodes is recoverable through a retrospective interview; they are the local dynamics through which strategy is continuously made and remade, observable in meeting minutes and real-time conversations in which practitioners deploy discursive strategies to reshape how obligations are interpreted and enacted. Each, again, is analytically visible through the three Ps: a *practice* that is incomplete, ambiguous, or freshly reframed; the specific *practitioners* (the sustainability manager, the account director, the legal colleague) whose positions determine what they see and can act on; and the *praxis* of the moment itself, in which the gap, the disclosure, or the reframing actually happens.

Zooming out from these episodes, a researcher would trace connectivity and consequentiality across layers. The gap in the threshold design (zoomed in, a missed consultation in a procurement decision) connects upward to NordSol's governance architecture (a practice designed at the level of cross-functional coordination) and outward to the regulatory field (where mandatory due diligence expectations define what constitutes adequate oversight of supplier-specific risk). SolarMakers' selective disclosure (zoomed in, compliance officers' accounts of their available supplier lists) connects upward to the interorganizational relationship between NordSol and SolarMakers (where

graduated transparency is being negotiated) and outward to the upstream supply chain (where lower tier supplier practices remain opaque to buyers further down the chain). The legal colleague's reframing (zoomed in, a forwarded document with a brief observation) connects downward to procurement decisions (which must now anticipate a different standard of adequacy) and upward to the emerging European regulatory environment (where the standards for due diligence are being actively constituted through practice).

The zoom-in-and-out approach thus enables a researcher to hold the localized dynamics and the wider supply chain connectivity within the same analytical frame without collapsing one into the other. Zooming in makes the praxis visible: the specific sayings and doings of specific practitioners at specific moments, through which strategy is accomplished (or not). Zooming out makes the consequentiality visible: how those localized accomplishments connect to practices at other layers, generate trans-local effects, and cumulatively reshape the conditions within which subsequent strategizing occurs. In the NordSol case, the consequence of successive localized episodes is a supply chain governance architecture that is formally adequate (a threshold exists, a questionnaire is completed, and a disclosure is made) but substantively limited in its ability to achieve the upstream visibility it is designed to produce. This is not a failure of individual actors; it is the cumulative consequence of the recursive coconstitution of practices across layers. It is this consequentiality that the zoom-in-and-out approach can help us theorize. Studying praxis demands longitudinal immersion: participant observation in working groups, shadowing of practitioners across interorganizational episodes, and access to documentary traces as they circulate and reshape strategizing. These are theoretical necessities, not methodological embellishments: Praxis operates simultaneously across boundaries, and an SAP-designed study that holds these layers in view produces theoretical insight into supply chain strategy as recursively coconstituted.

In sum, we demonstrate that the three approaches to visualize a multilayered supply chain are not interchangeable descriptions of the same phenomenon but distinct analytical orientations that make different aspects of cross-boundary strategizing visible. The intraorganizational and extraorganizational perspective illuminates how practices travel across organizational boundaries and how practitioners' local knowledge shapes their adoption and adaptation, thereby theorizing the recursive constitution. The "flat" ontology illuminates how practices connect and entangle across a web of actors and actions without privileging organizational membership as the analytic unit, thereby theorizing emergent interdependence. The zoom-in-and-zoom-out approach illuminates how localized episodic interactions generate trans-local consequences and how consequentiality accumulates across layers, thereby theorizing recursive constitution. What remains constant across all three is that SAP's three Ps underpin the analytical work: Each approach is a different setting in which practices, practitioners, and praxis can be examined. A researcher who adopts one of these approaches without specifying the practices at stake, the practitioners enacting them, and the praxis through which they unfold would simply be conducting a study of organizational form, boundary, or system structure. Together, however, they offer a differentiated research repertoire for studying cross-boundary strategizing in

multilayered supply chains—one that is grounded in the practice ontology and animated by the empirical richness that supply chain research is best positioned to generate.

5 | Conclusion: Toward a Cross-Boundary Strategizing Research Agenda

This article set out to address a persistent tendency in supply chain management that treats supply chain tiers, jurisdictions, regulatory fields, and social-ecological systems as contexts or triggers for practices, rather than as constitutive elements of the strategizing itself. Existing studies have moved toward practice-theoretic questions without the theoretical apparatus to answer them systematically, and the multilayered, cross-boundary character of contemporary supply chains has remained largely undertheorized as a result. We have argued that the SAP lens, applied as an epistemic tool, provides that apparatus.

The argument we make develops throughout this article. We first show that strategizing is inherently cross-boundary, by demonstrating that each of SAP's three Ps—practices, practitioners, and praxis—already cuts across organizational and institutional boundaries, regardless of whether this is foregrounded in a study. Practices are relationally constituted and contextually situated; practitioners draw on knowledge that spans jurisdictions, hierarchies, and cultures; and praxis unfolds as a flow of consequential episodes that connect local interactions to trans-local effects. Importantly, these three Ps, rather than the language of practice theory more broadly, provide an epistemic tool for doing this work. Practice theory can establish that supply chain phenomena are constituted by practices. However, it tends to focus on practice itself rather than on who enacts those practices, from what position, or through what unfolding stream of activity a practice becomes consequential as a strategy. It is SAP's three Ps that make this specific, enabling application within and across the three approaches we use to visualize the supply chain system, and that distinguish an SAP-grounded account of cross-boundary strategizing from a general practice-theoretic description of supply chain phenomena. The supply chain, with its complex structure, regulatory heterogeneity, and power asymmetries across firms and jurisdictions, is not simply a convenient application context for SAP. It is an empirical terrain that presses SAP to account for what happens when practitioners' strategizing crosses not only organizational but also institutional and jurisdictional boundaries, something that Jarzabkowski and her colleagues' prior work on intraorganizational strategy and the global reinsurance market has demonstrated but has yet to theorize fully. When praxis flows across settings governed by fundamentally different regulatory logics (e.g., the European Union's mandatory due diligence and the compliance infrastructure of Chinese manufacturing supply bases), the recursivity of coconstitution operates across institutional environments, not only organizational ones. The supply chain context affords this extension of praxis to the interinstitutional level.

Drawing on Whittington (2006), Seidl and Whittington (2014), and Nicolini (2009), we introduced three approaches to conceptualizing the complex social system within which cross-boundary strategizing can be situated. These three approaches

are best understood as three images that enable cross-boundary strategizing to be theorized differently with the three Ps: Each approach specifies where the analyst stands to observe practices, practitioners, and praxis, whereas the three Ps themselves remain what is being observed. Each generates a distinct analytical orientation and a distinct theoretical payoff. The intraorganizational and extraorganizational approach illuminates practice adoption, diffusion, and adaptation across organizational boundaries and provides the tools to theorize what characterizes contemporary supply chains: how sustainability standards, due diligence requirements, and governance practices travel through tiers, are adapted by practitioners with different positional resources, and produce outcomes that diverge from their original form. The “flat” ontology dissolves the boundary as a primary analytical category. Instead, it traces how practices connect, entangle, and recursively reshape one another within a single web of practices, thus making emergent interdependence in supply chains theoretically tractable. The zoom-in-and-out approach holds both layers simultaneously: starting from the localized episodes in which strategizing is actually accomplished and trailing the connections outward to trans-local consequences, hence theorizing the recursive constitution that connects what practitioners do in a cross-functional meeting in Paris to the compliance infrastructure of a lower tier supplier in China.

The NordSol heuristic case illustrates what each approach offers for future research design. The case makes visible the value of the different SAP approaches by illustrating that the same supply chain situation—a French solar energy company governing sustainability across a Chinese manufacturing supply base under the evolving EU regulation—can be analyzed differently depending on which approach a researcher adopts. Studying it through intraorganizational and extraorganizational lenses highlights how the practice of using the supplier self-assessment questionnaire for transparency spans organizational boundaries, how it is enacted differently within each organization, and how its enactment can “make a difference” to practitioners' agency (e.g., Hald and Spring 2023). Studying it through the “flat” ontology directs attention to how the cross-functional threshold negotiation connects practices that might otherwise be treated as separate organizational layers. Studying it through the zoom-in-and-out approach directs attention to the cumulative gap between formal governance adequacy and substantive supply chain visibility, traceable only by following the localized episodes that produce it. Power runs through all three: which practices get institutionalized, whose ways of doing things prevail in cross-functional forums, and how actors with differing positions define sustainability compliance in the interorganizational field (Hardy et al. 2020).

5.1 | A Research Agenda for Cross-Boundary Strategizing in Multilayered Supply Chains

Table 1 translates these three approaches into a research agenda, organized around SAP's tripartite framework of practices, practitioners, and praxis. The questions it contains are not merely invitations to apply SAP to supply chain data. They are questions whose answers require the epistemological and methodological toolkit that SAP provides—longitudinal

TABLE 1 | A research agenda for cross-boundary strategizing in multilayered supply chains.

Approach	Unit of analysis	Key research orientations and questions	Theoretical payoff
Examining the three Ps across intraorganizational and extraorganizational boundaries Theorizing adoption, diffusion, and adaptation across organizational boundaries	Practices	- How does a supply chain practice (e.g., enacting a supplier questionnaire for supply chain visibility) travel from the extraorganizational field into the intraorganizational boundary, and how is it adapted in that adoption? - How is the same practice enacted divergently at different points in a multilayered supply chain?	Theorizing how practices travel across organizational boundaries and how the enactment diverges from the extraorganizational practice.
	Practitioners	- How do boundary-spanning practitioners draw on their knowledge of extraorganizational fields (regulatory environments, industry norms, and professional standards) in enacting practices within their organizational boundary? - How does practitioners' local knowledge shape the praxis of adopting and implementing a cross-boundary supply chain practice?	Theorizing how practitioners' positional knowledge shapes adaptation: how a practice from the extraorganizational field is instantiated, modified, or subverted within an organizational boundary.
	Praxis	- How does the flow of actual activities (praxis)—through which a practice is adopted—differ across organizational boundaries, and what does this reveal about multilayered supply chains? - How does an extraorganizational practice change (e.g., mandatory due diligence legislation and sustainability standards) as practitioners translate it across the intraorganizational and extraorganizational boundary?	Theorizing the recursive coconstitution of practice across boundaries: how the flow of activity makes adoption consequential rather than nominal.

(Continues)

TABLE 1 | (Continued)

Approach	Unit of analysis	Key research orientations and questions	Theoretical payoff
Tracing the three Ps in a “flattened” system of a web of practices Theorizing how practices connect, entangle, and stretch sideways across a single plane of action	Practices	- How are supply chain practices relationally constituted across a web of actors and actions, and how do these constitutive connections generate strategic outcomes that no single actor intended or controlled? - How does the introduction of a new supply chain practice (e.g., social procurement and codevelopment with start-up suppliers) generate new practice connections that reshape adjacent practices in the web?	Theorizing emergent interdependence: how the relational constitution of practices across a web of actors generates strategic outcomes no single actor intended or controlled.
	Practitioners	- How do practitioners in a supply chain web enact cross-boundary strategizing implicitly—through their positional knowledge and relational histories—without explicitly engaging across a formal organizational boundary? - How do the actions of practitioners at different nodes in the web connect spatially, temporally, and agentically to produce emergent interdependence?	Theorizing how practitioners’ positional knowledge connects across the web—spatially, temporally, and agentically—without a formal boundary organizing that connection.
	Praxis	- How does praxis flow across a web of supply chain practices, and how does the stream of actual activities generate novel practices and connections that were not anticipated at the outset? - How do competing webs of practices that highlight differing priorities (efficiency vs. sustainability, commercial vs. regulatory) manifest as tensions, and how are these tensions resolved or sustained in practice?	Theorizing the generation of novel practices and connections: how praxis flows across a web and reshapes the conditions of subsequent strategizing.

(Continues)

TABLE 1 | (Continued)

Approach	Unit of analysis	Key research orientations and questions	Theoretical payoff
Zooming in and out of a multilayered system as a web of practices Theorizing consequentiality and recursive constitution across layers of a multitiered supply chain	Practices	- How are supply chain governance practices (e.g., supplier audits, disclosure requirements, and threshold-setting) enacted differently at different layers of the supply chain, and with what cumulative consequences for the system as a whole? - How do local practices (e.g., a compliance officer completing a questionnaire and a procurement manager approving an order) connect to trans-local practices (e.g., mandatory due diligence regimes and industry sustainability standards) across the layers of the supply chain?	Theorizing cumulative consequences: how local practices connect to trans-local governance across layers, and with what systemic effects.
	Practitioners	- How do practitioners at different layers of a multilayered supply chain engage differently with the same regulatory or strategic demand, and how do their situated responses recursively reshape the structural conditions for strategizing at other layers? - How do boundary-spanning practitioners (sustainability managers, compliance officers, and account directors) negotiate the translation of practices across layers, and with what intended and unintended consequences for the supply chain system?	Theorizing recursive agency: how practitioners' situated responses at different layers recursively reshape the structural conditions for strategizing at other layers.
	Praxis	- How does the stream of cross-boundary strategizing episodes (zoomed in) connect to trans-local effects across the layers of a multitiered supply chain (zoomed out), and what does this reveal about the recursive coconstitution of supply chain strategy? - How do grand challenges—climate crisis, forced labor legislation, geopolitical disruption—enter supply chain strategizing as praxis at a societal scale, and how do practitioners at different layers translate these pressures into situated strategic activity?	Theorizing recursive constitution: how localized episodic interactions connect to trans-local effects and cumulatively reshape the supply chain system.

ethnographic fieldwork, multisited observation that follows practices across organizational and institutional boundaries, and analytical frameworks that attend to the situated particularity of strategizing rather than abstracting it into taxonomies or typologies. These are, precisely, the methodological orientations that recent calls in the *Journal of Supply Chain Management* have argued the field needs more of (Pagell and Wilhelm 2025; Wieland et al. 2024; Grimm et al. 2024). The research agenda is actionable in the sense that each question in Table 1 maps to a unit of analysis (a practice, a practitioner position, or a stream of praxis), an approach to visualize a complex system, and a theoretical angle in terms of how supply chain strategizing would be better understood as a result.

We close by noting that supply chain research can also offer promising opportunities for extending SAP research. SAP developed its core conceptual apparatus—the three Ps, the practice/praxis distinction, and the “taller” and “flatter” ontologies—largely in the context of intraorganizational strategy work or relatively bounded interorganizational markets such as global reinsurance. Supply chains, as an empirical terrain, press against the limits of that apparatus in three ways. First, the multilayered structure means that praxis does not simply flow between organizations but also across institutional environments with different legal infrastructures, professional logics, and regulatory architectures—extending what cross-boundary strategizing can mean in praxis. Second, the boundary-spanning practitioners of supply chains (e.g., sustainability managers, procurement officers, and compliance officers) occupy positions at the intersection of multiple institutions, making them an exceptionally rich site for theorizing how positional knowledge and recursive agency operate across jurisdictions. Third, the discrepancy between the standardized approach of using a practice to address a particular issue and its adaptation within and across actors in multilayered supply chains takes SAP theorizing beyond within-organizational phenomena to cross-boundary ones with cumulative systemic consequences. Taken together, these three extensions—of praxis across interinstitutional boundaries, of recursive agency to cross-jurisdictional settings, and of the standardization and adaptation of practices as they are performed across multiple layers—represent what supply chain research, approached with the SAP lens, can contribute to the practice-theoretical tradition.

References

- Abrahamson, E., and C. J. Fombrun. 1992. “Forging the Iron Cage: Interorganizational Networks and the Production of Macro-Culture.” *Journal of Management Studies* 29, no. 2: 175–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1992.tb00659.x>.
- Aminoff, A., H. Lorentz, N. Kazantsev, and T. Marttinen. 2026. “An Agile Approach to Sourcing Solutions: Embracing Uncertainty for Strategic Relevance.” *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 62, no. 1: 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.70007>.
- Balogun, J., C. Jacobs, P. Jarzabkowski, S. Mantere, and E. Vaara. 2014. “Placing Strategy Discourse in Context: Sociomateriality, Sensemaking, and Power.” *Journal of Management Studies* 51, no. 2: 175–201. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12059>.
- Balogun, J., and G. Johnson. 2004. “Organizational Restructuring and Middle Manager Sensemaking.” *Academy of Management Journal* 47, no. 4: 523–549. <https://doi.org/10.5465/20159600>.
- Balogun, J., and G. Johnson. 2005. “From Intended Strategies to Unintended Outcomes: The Impact of Change Recipient Sensemaking.” *Organization Studies* 26, no. 11: 1573–1601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605054624>.
- Barney, J. B. 1991. “Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage.” *Journal of Management* 17, no. 1: 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>.
- Bencherki, N., V. Sergi, F. Cooren, and C. Vásquez. 2021. “How Strategy Comes to Matter: Strategizing as the Communicative Materialization of Matters of Concern.” *Strategic Organization* 19, no. 4: 608–635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127019890380>.
- Bromiley, P., and D. Rau. 2014. “Towards a Practice-Based View of Strategy.” *Strategic Management Journal* 35, no. 8: 1249–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2238>.
- Burgelman, R. A. 1984. “Managing the Internal Corporate Venturing Process.” *Sloan Management Review* 25, no. 2: 33–48.
- Carter, C. R., G. Meschnig, and L. Kaufmann. 2015. “Moving to the Next Level: Why Our Discipline Needs More Multilevel Theorization.” *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 51, no. 4: 94–102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12083>.
- Chakkol, M., A. Karatzas, M. Johnson, and J. Godsell. 2018. “Building Bridges: Boundary Spanners in Servitized Supply Chains.” *International Journal of Operations & Production Management* 38, no. 2: 579–604. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-01-2016-0052>.
- Contu, A., and H. Willmott. 2003. “Re-Embedding Situatedness: The Importance of Power Relations in Learning Theory.” *Organization Science* 14, no. 3: 283–296. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.14.3.283.15167>.
- Couture, F., P. Jarzabkowski, and J. K. Lê. 2023. “Triggers, Traps, and Disconnect: How Governance Obstacles Hinder Progress on Grand Challenges.” *Academy of Management Journal* 66, no. 6: 1651–1680. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.1716>.
- de Tarragon, H., C. Theodoraki, M. Hlady-Rispal, and G. Casteran. 2024. “Unraveling the Urban Ecosystem: An Ethnographic Study of Logistics Service Providers.” *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 60, no. 4: 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12333>.
- Deken, F., H. Berends, G. Gemser, and K. Lauche. 2018. “Strategizing and the Initiation of Interorganizational Collaboration Through Prospective Resourcing.” *Academy of Management Journal* 61, no. 5: 1920–1950. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0687>.
- Ferraro, F., D. Etzion, and J. Gehman. 2015. “Tackling Grand Challenges Pragmatically: Robust Action Revisited.” *Organization Studies* 36, no. 3: 363–390. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840614563742>.
- Gelderman, C. J., J. Semeijn, and M. Verhappen. 2020. “Buyer Opportunism in Strategic Supplier Relationships: Triggers, Manifestations and Consequences.” *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management* 26, no. 2: 100581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2019.100581>.
- Greve, H. R. 1998. “Managerial Cognition and the Mimetic Adoption of Market Positions: What You See Is What You Do.” *Strategic Management Journal* 19, no. 10: 967–988. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199810\)19:10%3C967::AID-SMJ981%3E3.0.CO;2-L](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199810)19:10%3C967::AID-SMJ981%3E3.0.CO;2-L).
- Grimm, J., A. Langley, and J. Reinecke. 2024. “Process Research Methods for Studying Supply Chains and Their Management.” *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 60, no. 4: 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12331>.
- Hald, K. S., and M. Spring. 2023. “Actor–Network Theory: A Novel Approach to Supply Chain Management Theory Development.” *Journal*

- of Supply Chain Management 59, no. 2: 87–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12296>.
- Hardy, C., V. Bhakoo, and S. Maguire. 2020. “A New Methodology for Supply Chain Management: Discourse Analysis and Its Potential for Theoretical Advancement.” *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 56, no. 2: 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12222>.
- Jarzabkowski, P., J. Balogun, and D. Seidl. 2007. “Strategizing: The Challenges of a Practice Perspective.” *Human Relations* 60, no. 1: 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707075703>.
- Jarzabkowski, P., and R. Bednarek. 2018. “Toward a Social Practice Theory of Relational Competing.” *Strategic Management Journal* 39, no. 3: 794–829. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2724>.
- Jarzabkowski, P., R. Bednarek, and P. Spee. 2015. *Making a Market for Acts of God: The Practice of Risk Trading in the Global Reinsurance Industry*. Oxford University Press.
- Jarzabkowski, P., S. Kaplan, D. Seidl, and R. Whittington. 2016. “If You Aren’t Talking About Practices, Don’t Call It a Practice-Based View: Rejoinder to Bromiley and Rau in Strategic Organization.” *Strategic Organization* 14, no. 3: 270–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127016655998>.
- Jarzabkowski, P., M. Kavas, and E. Krull. 2021. “It’s Practice. But Is It Strategy? Reinvigorating Strategy-As-Practice by Rethinking Consequentiality.” *Organization Theory* 2, no. 3: 26317877211029665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877211029665>.
- Knight, E., J. Lok, P. Jarzabkowski, and M. Wenzel. 2025. “Sensing the Room: The Role of Atmosphere in Collective Sensemaking.” *Academy of Management Journal* 68, no. 2: 326–356. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2021.1389>.
- Kurpjuweit, S., S. M. Wagner, and T. Y. Choi. 2021. “Selecting Startups as Suppliers: A Typology of Supplier Selection Archetypes.” *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 57, no. 3: 25–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12230>.
- Li, Q., and P. Jarzabkowski. 2025. “Reinstating the Radical: Trajectory, Debates, and Proposals for Strategy as Practice.” *Journal of Business Research* 187: 115055. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.115055>.
- Mair, J., M. Wolf, and C. Seelos. 2016. “Scaffolding: A Process of Transforming Patterns of Inequality in Small-Scale Societies.” *Academy of Management Journal* 59, no. 6: 2021–2044. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0725>.
- Mantere, S., and E. Vaara. 2008. “On the Problem of Participation in Strategy: A Critical Discursive Perspective.” *Organization Science* 19, no. 2: 341–358. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.0296>.
- Mintzberg, H., and J. A. Waters. 1985. “Of Strategies, Deliberate and Emergent.” *Strategic Management Journal* 6, no. 3: 257–272. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250060306>.
- Nath, S. D., G. Eweje, and A. Sajjad. 2020. “The Hidden Side of Sub-Supplier Firms’ Sustainability—An Empirical Analysis.” *International Journal of Operations & Production Management* 40, no. 12: 1771–1799. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-05-2019-0403>.
- Nicolini, D. 2009. “Zooming in and Out: Studying Practices by Switching Theoretical Lenses and Trailing Connections.” *Organization Studies* 30, no. 12: 1391–1418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840609349875>.
- Pagell, M., and M. Wilhelm. 2025. “Putting the S in Sustainable Supply Chain Management: A People-Centric Research Agenda.” *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 61, no. 1: 83–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12337>.
- Razmdoost, K., and L. Alinaghian. 2024. “Advancing Social Procurement: An Institutional Work Perspective.” *International Journal of Operations & Production Management* 44, no. 7: 1354–1375. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-02-2023-0122>.
- Roscoe, S., E. Aktas, K. J. Petersen, H. D. Skipworth, R. B. Handfield, and F. Habib. 2022. “Redesigning Global Supply Chains During Compounding Geopolitical Disruptions: The Role of Supply Chain Logics.” *International Journal of Operations & Production Management* 42, no. 9: 1407–1434. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-12-2021-0777>.
- Rouleau, L. 2005. “Micro-Practices of Strategic Sensemaking and Sensegiving: How Middle Managers Interpret and Sell Change Every Day.” *Journal of Management Studies* 42, no. 7: 1413–1441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00549.x>.
- Rouleau, L., and C. Cloutier. 2022. “It’s Strategy. But Is It Practice? Desperately Seeking Social Practice in Strategy-as-Practice Research.” *Strategic Organization* 20, no. 4: 722–733. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221118334>.
- Rouyre, A., A.-S. Fernandez, and I. Estrada. 2024. “Co-Evolution of Governance Mechanisms and Coopetition in Public–Private Projects.” *Journal of Operations Management* 70, no. 1: 50–79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1281>.
- Santos, K. A., M. E. Silva, and S. C. F. Pereira. 2023. “(Un)learning Sustainability Practices in a Multi-Tiered Supply Chain: An Interpretive Study.” *International Journal of Operations & Production Management* 43, no. 8: 1226–1249. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-08-2022-0504>.
- Schatzki, T. R. 2005. “Peripheral Vision: The Sites of Organizations.” *Organization Studies* 26, no. 3: 465–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605050876>.
- Schrage, S., M. Berti, and J. Grimm. 2026. “Paradox and Power in Interorganizational Relationships: A Study of Social Sustainability Tensions in a Global Value Chain.” *Organization Studies* 47, no. 2: 247–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406251370500>.
- Seidl, D., S. Ma, and V. Splitter. 2024. “What Makes Activities Strategic: Toward a New Framework for Strategy-as-Practice Research.” *Strategic Management Journal* 45, no. 12: 2395–2419. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3668>.
- Seidl, D., and F. Werle. 2018. “Inter-Organizational Sensemaking in the Face of Strategic Meta-Problems: Requisite Variety and Dynamics of Participation.” *Strategic Management Journal* 39, no. 3: 830–858. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2723>.
- Seidl, D., and R. Whittington. 2014. “Enlarging the Strategy-as-Practice Research Agenda: Towards Taller and Flatter Ontologies.” *Organization Studies* 35, no. 10: 1407–1421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840614541886>.
- Sele, K., C. A. Mahringer, A. Danner-Schröder, T. Grisold, and B. Renzl. 2024. “We Are All Pattern Makers! How a Flat Ontology Connects Organizational Routines and Grand Challenges.” *Strategic Organization* 22, no. 3: 530–549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270231215685>.
- Smets, M., P. Jarzabkowski, G. T. Burke, and P. Spee. 2015. “Reinsurance Trading in Lloyd’s of London: Balancing Conflicting-yet-Complementary Logics in Practice.” *Academy of Management Journal* 58, no. 3: 932–970. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0638>.
- Song, M., R. J. Calantone, and C. A. Di Benedetto. 2002. “Competitive Forces and Strategic Choice Decisions: An Experimental Investigation in the United States and Japan.” *Strategic Management Journal* 23, no. 10: 969–978. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.258>.
- Srai, J. S., T. S. Harrington, N. R. Joglekar, and S. Narayanan. 2025. “Convergence of Product, Production, and Supply Chain Design Rules: Evidence From Pharmaceutical Pre-Competitive Collaboration Networks.” *Journal of Operations Management* 71, no. 3: 314–334. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1352>.
- Vaara, E., and R. Whittington. 2012. “Strategy-as-Practice: Taking Social Practices Seriously.” *Academy of Management Annals* 6, no. 1: 285–336. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2012.672039>.
- Weiser, A.-K., P. Jarzabkowski, and T. Laamanen. 2020. “Completing the Adaptive Turn: An Integrative View of Strategy Implementation.”

Academy of Management Annals 14, no. 2: 969–1031. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0137>.

Whittington, R. 1996. "Strategy as Practice." *Long Range Planning* 29, no. 5: 731–735. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301\(96\)00068-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(96)00068-4).

Whittington, R. 2006. "Completing the Practice Turn in Strategy Research." *Organization Studies* 27, no. 5: 613–634. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606064101>.

Wieland, A. 2021. "Dancing the Supply Chain: Toward Transformative Supply Chain Management." *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 57, no. 1: 58–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12248>.

Wieland, A., and C. F. Durach. 2021. "Two Perspectives on Supply Chain Resilience." *Journal of Business Logistics* 42, no. 3: 315–322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbl.12271>.

Wieland, A., W. L. Tate, and T. Yan. 2024. "A Guided Tour Through the Qualitative Research City." *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 60, no. 1: 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12315>.

Xiao, C., M. Wilhelm, T. van der Vaart, and D. P. van Donk. 2019. "Inside the Buying Firm: Exploring Responses to Paradoxical Tensions in Sustainable Supply Chain Management." *Journal of Supply Chain Management* 55, no. 1: 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12170>.

Zhang, X., J. Denicol, P. W. Chan, and Y. Le. 2024. "Designing the Transition to Operations in Large Inter-Organizational Projects: Strategy, Structure, Process, and People." *Journal of Operations Management* 70, no. 1: 107–136. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1275>.