Abstract: This study examines the tensions embedded in the dynamics of responsible investment (RI) mainstreaming, and the arrangements through which individuals, a group or an institution cope with paradoxical tensions. Through an ethnographic study of asset managers building a framework for responsible investment, we found that four paradoxes specific to RI (lack of convention; stability and transformation; time horizon; judgment and metrics) were subject to multiple arrangements but did not need to be resolved for the process to reach an outcome.

The results suggest that the dynamics of paradoxes is a continuous circular process of constant shifting between both branches of each duality. We show that the typologies of paradoxes are a useful categorization tool, but we suggest that the untapped essence of paradox theory lies in its capacity to study the dynamics of a process.