DEBATE ESSAY

A *telo*-centric approach to rethink grand challenges: Digital wellbeing as an example

Shuang Ren[1] | **Soumyadeb Chowdhury[2]** | **Pawan Budhwar[3]**

[1]Queen's Business School, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

[2]TBS Business School, Toulouse, France

[3]Aston Business School, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

Correspondence
Shuang Ren, Queen's Business School, Queen's University Belfast, 185 Stranmillis Road, Belfast BT9 5EE, UK.
Email: s.ren@qub.ac.uk

Abstract

How can grand challenge-related issues be studied while comprehensively addressing contemporary needs? The literature on grand challenges has been growing, with an abundance of phenomena on which research is undertaken in a piecemeal fashion, without sufficiently offering integrated insights. In this debate essay, we challenge the proposal offered in Seelos, C., Mair, J. & Traeger, C. (2023) The future of grand challenges research: retiring a hopeful concept and endorsing research principles, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(2), 251–269 on retiring the grand challenge concept. Instead, we advocate for revitalizing, not retiring, so that grand challenges research can be adapted with the ultimate human purpose of achieving wellbeing. We propose that the solution lies in taking a *telo*-centric approach to navigate the intersections between various grand challenge issues, offering a novel lens to delve into the ultimate end of human endeavours and to ensure the continued relevance of the grant challenge concept. We exemplify the application of this *telo*-centric approach through the prism of digital wellbeing, demonstrating how it can pave the way for innovative theoretical frameworks, rigorous empirical investigations and practical developments. We conclude by forwarding future directions for research, practice and policy.

Eudaimonia, then, is something final and self-sufficient, and is the end of action [telos]
Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*
Translated by W. D. Ross[1]

Seelos et al. (2023) propose retiring the traditional grand challenges (GC) concept of their review, published in the special issue of this journal on Grand Societal Challenges: The Contributions of Business, Management and Organisation Studies (Kunisch et al., 2023). The conventional integration of GC into the realm of business and management research has historically aimed to orient scholarly attention towards intricate phenomena intertwined with significant societal implications (George et al., 2016). Seelos et al. (2023) scrutinize various applications and conceptualizations of GC in relation to associated phenomena and advocate for a departure from this concept. The authors assert that the GC concept, as it stands, does not provide a conducive avenue for advancing theory, empirical research and practical development in management and organizational studies.

While Seelos et al.'s (2023) proposition may seem audacious, it underscores pessimism about the GC concept's

---

[1]The Internet Classics Archive | *Nicomachean Ethics* by Aristotle (mit.edu).

efficacy in providing a workable template to address complex issues of broader societal significance. We concur with their critical assessments, recognizing the pressing need for enhanced conceptual clarity. However, we also contend that retiring the GC concept is a premature approach that does not fully grasp the essence of GC.

What then is the ultimate purpose driving all human endeavours, including GC? Aristotle delves into this inquiry through a philosophical concept of *telos*, referring to 'something's end—i.e., what it is for' that shapes human existence (*Physics*, 2.3, 194b). As illustrated in the opening quote, his answer to the final end or cause of human activities is *eudaimonia*, a Greek term rich in nuance and translated variously as flourishing, happiness or living/functioning well. This nuanced term resonates in modern discussions, often centring on wellbeing (Kashdan et al., 2008; Moran, 2018; Waterman, 1990). For Aristotle, wellbeing stands as the ultimate, highest and most complete end of our actions (i.e., *telos*), with all other pursuits, such as wealth, success and relationship, serving as subordinate means to promote wellbeing. Subordinate pursuits are evident in human history, where we aim to enhance various aspects of our lives such as fostering economic growth, enhancing efficiency and productivity and facilitating easier access to resources and markets. While profoundly reshaping the socioeconomic landscape, these transformations have also given rise to contemporary challenges, such as climate change and inequality, collectively known as GC.

So, rather than an outright retirement, we propose a *telo*-centric recalibration that recognizes the interconnectedness of everything within the GC umbrella. As an umbrella construct (Hirsch & Levin, 1999), GC encompass a rapidly growing accumulation of varied social and environmental phenomena, presenting a seemingly bewildering abundance of issues. Seelos et al. (2023) identify this abundance as problematic, since each GC-related issue could appear 'random', hindering conceptual clarity and coherence. Our positioning is different. We argue that the significant limitation in the current application and conceptualization of GC research is due to an idiosyncratic approach to addressing GC issues, where everything interacts with everything else (Klag & Langley, 2023). We propose a more thoughtful recalibration through a *telo*-centric effort, reconnecting with the very purpose, final end or ultimate meaning of human activities contributing to GC.

Specifically, we acknowledge the limitations within the existing literature in which GC issues are often presented in a somewhat siloed manner. The proliferation of configurations involving overlaps between two or more specific GC issues adds another layer of complexity, making it even more challenging to interrogate interdependencies.

In light of these challenges, we advocate for delving into the *telos* of addressing GC issues, bringing forth the innate need and ultimate desire for the *wellbeing* of human existence underlying the myriad issues within the GC umbrella. A *telo*-centric approach is about identifying the shared assumptions across diverse GC, encapsulating the fundamental essence of GC research—unveiling the ultimate human aspiration for wellbeing. This paradigm shift is poised to breathe new life into GC research, aligning it with the most profound human desire.

To engage in a critical examination of Seelos et al.'s (2023) argument, in the following sections we will first highlight the imperative and value of exploring the teleological significance of GC issues, emphasizing how wellbeing lies at their ultimate end. Next, we turn to an emerging GC issue, that is, digital transformation, and introduce *digital wellbeing* (DWB) as an example. This illustrates how a *telo*-centric approach holds promise for unlocking new avenues, such as a new concept of DWB, which in turn generates innovative theoretical frameworks, rigorous empirical investigations and pragmatic developments in the GC space. We conclude this debate essay by proposing future research directions.

TELEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF GC ISSUES: WELLBEING

Human history is a testament to our inherent curiosity and ambition to push boundaries, conquer challenges and make the world a better place. Since the earliest days of civilization, our ancestors have embarked on GC, whether discovering fire, developing agriculture or venturing into the uncharted territories of the globe. Through these pursuits, human desires are guided by a fundamental drive for achieving wellbeing—living a healthy, flourishing, meaningful and fulfilling life. This origin of human desire also contributes to expansive domains where contemporary GC phenomena unfold—society, workplaces and families. The societal, workplace and familial environments are inevitably permeated with purposes, values and goals, as we bring a multitude of desires, preferences and perspectives. Human activities are inherently normative, that is, value laden.

In Aristotle's terms, *telos* serves as the 'why' of being (e.g., the existence of things) (Bazac, 2016). For instance, welwitschia achieves its *telos* of becoming the most resilient desert plant by absorbing water from sea fog and deep groundwater, and growing very slowly to conserve energy. For humans, we achieve our *telos* of staying alive, staying healthy and being a good person (the ultimate pleasure of happiness, or wellbeing). Wellbeing is a broad term that is difficult to define precisely across all contexts.

A *TELO*-CENTRIC APPROACH TO RETHINK GRAND CHALLENGES

I/MR

INTERNATIONAL
JOURNAL *of*
MANAGEMENT REVIEWS

BRITISH ACADEMY
OF MANAGEMENT

3

In simple terms and considered in its most comprehensive scope, it is defined by the Cambridge Dictionary as 'the state of feeling healthy and happy' (Cambridge University Press, 2023).

The purpose of what we do has been of concern in various philosophical and scholarly inquiries, in which the importance of wellbeing is evident (Barnes et al., 2023). For needs-based theories, Maslow (1943) proposes a hierarchy of needs model where physiological needs (getting a livelihood) must be met before higher-order pursuits. Self-determination theory (Deci et al., 2017) asserts that meeting the needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness fosters wellbeing. Salutogenic theories such as the job demands–resources model (Demerouti et al., 2001) and conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll et al., 2018) focus on limited resources, arguing that the depletion of resources ultimately undermines people's wellbeing.

GC issues are the 'pains' that humans learn to avoid to achieve *telos*. These issues can be manifested in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which serve as tangible areas of focus for concerted efforts and shared goals to comprehensively address human thriving and wellbeing. Research on GC helps to keep us out of harm's way. Therefore, establishing a concept of GC, or labelling issues as GC, is just a *means*. The *end* (i.e., the *telos*) should be what we, as researchers, strive for. The purpose of human activity underlying the contribution to and problem-solving of GC issues is beyond the goals, strategies and actions manifested in specific SDGs.

Seelos et al. (2023) trace the origin of GC research by mentioning system scholarship, a perspective once perceived to hold promise for addressing societal issues. However, as they observe, 'research on system perspectives evolved in disciplinary siloes that never agreed on a shared and consistent use of the term [systems]' (p. 253). In advocating for a *telo*-centric approach, we draw attention to complexity theory (Manson, 2001), which could have a broader scope that encompasses open, dynamic interactions in complex systems, just as GC-related issues. Complexity theory enables fresh insights into GC and their *telos*. As it emphasizes the emergence of complex systems, complexity theory recognizes the dynamics of the interactions between the system's entities—the relations between the entities are important, in the sense that they set boundary conditions of what would emerge. It denotes an ontological priority of relations, with relationality establishing meaning-making for us all. Hence, GC are a concerted effort aimed at addressing complex and critical issues on a global scale.

We argue that the *telo*-centric approach addresses the siloed limitations observed in prior literature. It bridges the gap created by diverse GC viewpoints concerning the ultimate end of human endeavour (an ontological assumption). In essence, GC research, at its core, strives to create conditions that enhance the quality of life for people across the globe. It embodies a holistic paradigm towards wellbeing, acknowledging the intricate interplay of diverse factors within complex systems. In line with complexity theory, it is through the relational processes that the purposes are provoked, refined and clarified. The significance of these purposes to the people affected by them is shaped and established through relationality shared with each other.

DWB: THE *TELOS* OF DIGITALIZATION GC RESEARCH

Digitalization GC are rapidly evolving, permeating almost every facet of human existence (Ren & Dey, 2023). The transformative force of digitalization not only shapes our daily lives, but also presents an array of interconnected complex systems for industries, economies and governance (Budhwar et al., 2023). It introduces challenges ranging from data privacy, ownership and cybersecurity to algorithmic biases and ethical implications of artificial intelligence, while at the same time accentuating existing societal divides, contributing to a digital divide that exacerbates existing societal inequality (e.g., Chowdhury et al., 2024). In this digital age, the rise of emerging technologies requires creating new capabilities and strategies at the intersection of technology, human adaptivity and organizational resilience (Chowdhury et al., 2023; Colbert et al., 2016).

So, *what is it for* when society faces the emerging digitalization GC? Specifically, in the work domain, employees now manage not only traditional work demands but also disruptions caused by the penetration of digitalization in work processes, collaborations and social interactions (Cascio & Montealegre, 2016; Guest, 2017), which challenge employees' experience and functioning at work. Research has provided empirical evidence on technostress (Langer & Landers, 2021), biases and stereotypes against certain employee groups (e.g., portraying older workers as technophobic; Fitzgerald et al., 2014), employment insecurity (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021; Tschang & Almirall, 2021) and work–life balance (Ren et al., 2023), due to digitalization, that could hinder work-derived wellbeing, such as job satisfaction and work engagement (Ilies et al., 2024).

Against this backdrop, our *telos* and desires remain consistent—maintaining the overall quality of an employee's experience and functioning at the intersection of evolving work demands and new forms of digitalization. Philosophically, *telos*, or the inherent purpose and ultimate aim, has been a cornerstone of many

debates regarding human flourishing and a good life, which revolve around the realization of one's potential and the attainment of a fulfilling life (Kraut, 2015). In the context of the digital workplace, this philosophical framework serves to understand how employees can achieve a sense of purpose and wellbeing amidst the rapid changes brought about by digitalization.

As we navigate digitalization GC, it is crucial to consider how these changes align with or disrupt our fundamental *telos*. This is a new form of domain-specific wellbeing, which, differing from the conventional work-related wellbeing, is grounded in human–digital technology interaction. It is becoming a new, acute challenge that individuals, organizations, societies and policymakers are not yet well equipped for. The key is to balance technological advancements with the preservation of human-centric values, ensuring that the digital transformation serves to enhance rather than detract from overall employee wellbeing in the digital age.

This leads us to the concept of DWB as an exemplar of the 'end' or ultimate goal in addressing the GC posed by digitalization, that is, new forms of employee wellbeing in the evolving digitalized workplace. We define DWB as a multi-level phenomenon that occurs out of new, unique challenges related to navigating the ever-connected nature of digitalized workplaces: (1) the blurring of personal–professional domains; (2) mental fatigue from information overload and incessant digital communication; (3) increased pressure of digital multitasking; and (4) exacerbated societal challenges of equity and inclusion, given the digital divide between different socioeconomic groups.

Considering that DWB is a contemporary manifestation of the *telo*-centric approach to GC research on digitalization in the work domain, it is about 'optimal employee functioning and experience in digitalized workplaces'. DWB encompasses the notion that technological integration into the workplace should support and enhance employees' mental, emotional and social health. It aims to mitigate the negative impacts of digitalization, ensure fair and inclusive work environments, and promote a healthy balance between work and personal life. By prioritizing DWB, organizations can create environments where employees not only adapt to new digital tools and processes but also thrive in a supportive, balanced and fulfilling work environment. This, in turn, aligns with the broader *telos* of fostering a workforce that is engaged, satisfied and capable of achieving its highest potential in the digital age.

Our introduction of DWB to the GC literature not only makes ontological and epistemic contributions, but also serves as a linchpin to unite various intricacies that shape the narrative of reality. As a manifestation of *telos*, DWB represents the ultimate ends that GC research on digitalization should recognize and incorporate into its interpretation, analysis and solutions. For instance, existing initiatives aimed at improving people's digital life—like the screen-time monitoring applications developed by technology providers such as Google and Apple—often focus on subordinate means, in Aristotle's terms, of unplugging. However, unplugging is not the ultimate end of *telos*, and alone may not consistently promote the achievement of *telos* (i.e., employee DWB in this case). The teleological significance of digitalization GC necessitates a more holistic consideration than previous discussions.

DWB provides an overarching paradigm that could integrate preceding discussions on digitalization GC, encompassing topics such as job automation, digital skills shortages and employee digital adaptation (Ren et al., 2023). In the implementation and adoption of systematic digital practices and guidelines, DWB requires minimizing the potential adverse effects of automation driven by digitalization (Industry 4.0 technologies) on employees. In facilitating organizations towards digital transformation, DWB calls for empowering employees and creating an environment where they are equipped with sufficient knowledge and resources to adapt and navigate digital platforms securely, efficiently and with ease. In the development of a regulatory framework amidst increased reliance on digital platform and data-driven processes, DWB requires a strategic focus on addressing diversity, equity and belonging of employee groups with different access, affordability and readiness for digitalized workplaces. Unfortunately, DWB has yet to claim a central role in GC research on digitalization, but the time has come for it to take centre stage.

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

DWB exemplifies the tangible outcomes achievable through our proposed *telo*-centric approach to GC, demonstrating its capacity to yield fresh and original insights. In contrast to the retirement proposition outlined in Seelos et al. (2023), the *telo*-centric approach presents a viable alternative. While Seelos and colleagues advocate for treating GC as a set of research principles grounded in urgency, broadening theoretical and empirical scope, the efficacy of such broad research principles remains uncertain in guiding future research and practice. Also, resorting to broad principles does not address the fundamental issues that constrain the GC literature, that is, the seeming randomness of the abundance of GC issues. By returning to the *telos* of human activities, our illustration of DWB demonstrates how the *telo*-centric

recalibration can help to address perceived randomness and enhance research impact by recognizing and navigating the intricate interdependencies among various GC-related phenomena. Indeed, the *telo*-centric exploration, particularly with the introduction of DWB, offers a multitude of promising avenues across theoretical, practical and policy domains, extending beyond existing conceptual constraints and paving the way for innovation in the GC literature, which we turn to next.

Theory-building direction

New discourse

A *telo*-centric approach prompts the initiation of fresh discourse and discussions in GC research. Delving into Aristotle's philosophy, it becomes evident that achieving human *telos* involves the practice of moral goods (Aristotle, 1970). In Aristotle's terms, the way in which human *telos* is achieved is through practicing moral goods (Aristotle, 1970). This underscores the imperative to advance research and practice on digital sustainability, responsibility and ethics in the evolving digital landscape.

DWB—the instantiation of the *telo*-centric approach to studying GC—provides a more tangible way to operationalize the ideas outlined in Seelos et al. (2023). For instance, Seelos et al. (2023) referred to the principle of *engaging with complexity*. DWB is a prime example of a multifaceted and dynamic phenomenon that concerns employees, organizations and beyond. Thus, drawing attention to the ultimate end of digitalization (i.e., DWB) embraces the intricate and interconnected nature of GC, ensuring that discussions and research foster more comprehensive and effective solutions. Such advancements are crucial for shaping GC research to be both ambitious and deeply engaged with the phenomena it investigates.

Interdisciplinary collaboration

A *telo*-centric approach highlights the importance of interdisciplinary research. When we centre our focus around achieving wellbeing, no single discipline can provide all the necessary solutions. Again, using DWB as an example: it is a domain-specific wellbeing concept, which in itself has been explored in various disciplines such as sociology, organizational psychology, technology and health. While Seelos et al. (2023) referred to the principle of integrating *diverse theoretical perspectives*, DWB is again the instantiation of inherently an interdisciplinary concept associated with GC. Introducing DWB to the GC literature will necessitate a comprehensive understanding and

effective application of DWB, importing insights from different disciplines, enhancing the robustness and relevance of research outcomes.

Development of a DWB-specific theory

As DWB emerges as a focal point, there arises a need for a dedicated theoretical framework specific to DWB that could encompass the intricate interplay between digital technologies, human behaviour and overall wellbeing, providing a systematic and comprehensive understanding of contributing factors, underlying mechanisms and potential consequences. Seelos et al. (2023) called for building *cumulative knowledge* through the integration of theories and existing understandings of GC. While this is sensible, our *telo*-centric approach goes beyond a mere principle by proposing the possibility of a specific theory (i.e., DWB theory). This effort will pave the way for more targeted and nuanced research in the evolving landscape of digitalization.

Empirical-research direction

Development of a robust DWB scale

Given that DWB is a nascent concept, there is an urgent need for a rigorous development of a scale that not only captures its essence but also differentiates it empirically from other wellbeing-related constructs. The scale construction process should involve formulating a comprehensive set of items that holistically represent the dimensions of DWB. These items are designed with precision to ensure their relevance and applicability in the digitalized workplace context. Rigorous psychometric evaluations, including reliability and validity testing, need to be undertaken to ensure that the DWB scale is a robust and reliable instrument for measuring this intended construct. A key challenge associated with the GC literature, as observed by Seelos et al. (2023), is the lack of *conceptual clarity*. The empirical research direction here emphasizes the necessity of clearly defined and empirically validated constructs to advance practical application in addressing digitalization GC. By doing so, researchers can facilitate the development of knowledge informed by significant, yet often overlooked or hard-to-observe, facets of DWB.

Establishing the nomological network of DWB

A systematic and integrated investigation of the challenges and solutions is needed for DWB—one that not

only clarifies the meaning and measurement of DWB, but also examines its antecedents, mechanisms, immediate effects and broader implications for resilience, productivity and overall quality of life. By developing a robust DWB measurement model, we provide a concrete tool that can measure the impact of digitalization on employee wellbeing, thereby addressing digitalization GC directly. This scale can help identify the specific digital stressors and challenges faced by employees, allowing for targeted interventions that promote DWB.

Investigating DWB at different levels

As a multi-level phenomenon, DWB can operate at the individual level, which requires empirical analysis of how person × situation interact to impact on individual employees. This analysis could also include assessing the relationship between DWB and other valued individual outcomes, such as employee career progression, in-role and extra-role performance. When operating at the organizational level, research on DWB could involve exploring how collective DWB influences organizational outcomes, such as productivity, innovation and employee retention. In addition, this also helps to go beyond the principle of *engagement with multiple stakeholders* outlined in Seelos et al. (2023), unfolding the importance of considering different perspectives and levels of impact to create comprehensive solutions that address digitalization GC effectively.

Practical-impact direction

The *telo*-centric approach encourages a holistic consideration of challenges, where the ultimate goal is not just about solving individual problems but enhancing overall human wellbeing considering the rapid digitalization initiatives. This can influence organizations to design solutions that consider the broader impacts on societal, environmental and economic factors, ensuring sustainable development.

Designing *telo*-centric digital tools

Organizations can prioritize the development of digital tools that enhance employee wellbeing. This includes designing user interfaces that are intuitive and easy to navigate, which helps to reduce the cognitive load on employees, simplify user experiences, make digital interactions more efficient and less stressful, incorporate features that promote mental health and ensure digital tools enhance rather than detract from work–life balance. By prioritizing

these aspects, organizations can ensure that digitalization contributes positively to the overall wellbeing of employees, making technology a facilitator of wellness rather than a source of stress, ultimately leading to improved productivity and sustainable practices. Reflecting on the issues related to *realism and practical relevance* in Seelos et al. (2023), the development of such tools is grounded in real-world challenges in digitalized workplaces concerning DWB.

Workplace policies for digital health

Organizations can establish policies that recognize the risks of digital overuse, such as setting up guidelines for screen time and meeting norms to include breaks from continuous digital interaction and creating 'digital detox' initiatives. These policies help mitigate the negative impacts of prolonged digital engagement, such as eye strain, mental fatigue and technostress. Such measures not only improve overall workplace wellness but also enhance productivity by ensuring that employees are not overwhelmed by constant digital connectivity. These strategic interventions demonstrate a proactive approach to addressing digitalization GC and enhancing employee wellbeing, recognizing the importance of balancing technology use with health-preserving practices. Such proactivity addresses the *urgency* of digitalization GC identified in Seelos et al. (2023), with immediate and decisive actions to address pressing issues in the digital age.

Assessment and feedback mechanisms

Establishing regular assessments of the impact of digital tools on employee wellbeing is a critical step for organizations in managing the complexities introduced by the emerging GC of rapid digitalization. These assessments allow for agile responses, such as modifying software to reduce complexity, altering workflows to decrease digital strain, or introducing new tools that better meet the needs of the workforce. The objective is to create a feedback loop where digital tools and workflows are continuously refined based on direct input regarding their impact on wellbeing. In parallel, establishing robust feedback mechanisms is crucial in aligning digital transformation initiatives with employee wellbeing, providing a safe and accessible way for employees to express concerns and suggest improvements regarding digital aspects of the work environment. This feedback helps to strategize long-term digital policies to prioritize human factors and demonstrate organizations' commitment to maintaining an inclusive and

supportive digital workplace, showing that employee DWB is a core consideration in organizations' digital strategy. Future practical directions in this vein will help in *broadening the empirical scope*, as called for by Seelos et al. (2023).

Telo-centric sustainable digital practices

Effective employee DWB management can lead to purposeful and optimal digital technology use, which is expected to minimize the energy consumption of digital services and reduce digital carbon footprints by avoiding redundant use and supporting organizations' environmental goals. Seelos et al.'s (2023) principle of *engaging with complexity* urged researchers to embrace the intricate and interconnected nature of GC to develop more robust and comprehensive solutions. Therefore, prioritizing employee DWB, organizations can encourage behaviours that align with sustainable practices, such as digital minimalism and the selection of energy-efficient technologies, leading to improved environmental sustainability outcomes.

Policy-implication direction

Using DWB as an example, a *telo*-centric approach to GC has policy implications.

Audit framework for government to monitor and assess DWB needs and progress

Establishing a robust audit framework that will enable governments to monitor and assess the ongoing state and efficacy of DWB initiatives across various sectors would be instrumental in identifying trends, pinpointing areas needing improvement and developing more targeted policies that address the needs of employees and organizations. This proactive approach will ensure that DWB policies continuously evolve and remain relevant and effective amidst the rapidly evolving GC landscape. Such frameworks address Seelos et al.'s (2023) call for *broadening the empirical scope*, ensuring that policy development is grounded in comprehensive and diverse data, thereby enhancing the robustness and relevance of the policies.

Embedding equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) principles

Integrating EDI principles into DWB policies will ensure that these initiatives are accessible to all employees,

regardless of their demographic background or digital proficiency. Policies crafted with EDI considerations might include providing diverse and equitable access to digital health resources, tailoring DWB programmes to meet specific needs of various groups (e.g., different age groups, cultural backgrounds or disabilities) and ensuring that all employees have equal opportunities to benefit from initiatives. Such inclusive policies can foster a more inclusive and supportive workplace environment, where every individual's wellbeing is valued and supported. This brings back an often-overlooked *urgency* (Seelos et al., 2023), highlighting the immediate need to address disparities and ensure inclusivity in DWB initiatives to tackle societal challenges effectively.

Policy development for continuous learning and adaptation

Governments and organizations should adopt policies that promote continuous learning and adaptation. Such policies will ensure that the workforce remains adept at managing digital tools in ways that promote good health and productivity, adapting to new technologies without compromising wellbeing. For instance, collaborations between government bodies, technology companies, educational institutions and non-profits can jointly develop programmes and initiatives that enhance digital health and manage the GC posed by digitalization.

Regulatory standards for digital tools

Implementing regulatory standards for the design and operation of digital tools can significantly enhance DWB, prioritizing user-centric design, minimizing features that could lead to digital addiction and promoting features that support DWB. Therefore, regulatory standards will provide a formal mechanism to influence how digital tools are constructed from the ground up, ensuring they contribute positively to the user's health and wellbeing, considering the needs of users and the context of use. This goes beyond Seelos et al.'s (2023) principle of *realism* and practical relevance, which emphasizes the need for research and policy to be grounded in practical realities, aimed at generating tangible, beneficial outcomes for society.

CONCLUSION

The introduction of the GC concept to business and management research has transformative momentum to situate research within society at large. In the ever-evolving

landscape of this body of work, the GC concept has come under increasing scrutiny, with Seelos and colleagues—in their paper published in this journal (Seelos et al., 2023)—advocating for its retirement. Their proposition is grounded in the absence of clearly defined empirical referents, conceptual attributes and theoretical justification in the available GC literature. While it is essential to recognize the limitations associated with the GC concept, it is equally crucial to consider the fundamental human desire for seeking wellbeing (*telos*)—the very essence of GC research in our view, but which has been underspecified so far, contributing to the siloed presentation of GC research. In this debate essay, we hence argue that instead of retiring the GC concept, we should revitalize it by aligning it with the *telos* of human activities and the origin of human desires to explore and conquer the unknown. We advocate for finding common assumptions between different GC to probe the fundamental *telos*, that is, striving for wellbeing.

The emerging digitalization GC have exacerbated the limitations of a siloed, piecemeal approach to studying GC. In this debate essay, we identify DWB as the *telos* of GC in today's digitalization era. We introduce DWB as a contemporary manifestation of our inherent human desire for balance and fulfilment. Through the prism of DWB, we illustrate how it can foster theory innovation and new empirical and practical work. We hope that our proposal will revitalize the GC literature by encouraging more meaningful and responsible business and management research that provides answers to how and why we can collectively achieve our *telos*. Indeed, as Aristotle notes, 'living well and doing well are the same as being happy'.

ORCID

Shuang Ren https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8768-8447
Soumyadeb Chowdhury https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8074-248X

REFERENCES

Aristotle (1970) *Aristotle's physics, Books 1 & 2*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barnes, C.M., Wagner, D.T., Schabram, K. & Boncoeur, D. (2023) Human sustainability and work: a meta-synthesis and new theoretical framework. *Journal of Management*, 49(6), 1965–1996.

Bazac, A. (2016) The philosophy of the raison d'être: Aristotle's telos and Kant's categorical imperative. *Biocosmology–neo-Aristotelism*, 6(2), 286–304.

Budhwar, P., Chowdhury, S., Wood, G., Aguinis, H., Bamber, G. J., Beltran, J. R. et al. (2023) Human resource management in the age of generative artificial intelligence: perspectives and research directions on ChatGPT. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 33(3), 606–659.

Cambridge University Press (2023) Online dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/well-being?q=wellbeing

Cascio, W.F. & Montealegre, R. (2016) How technology is changing work and organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3, 349–375.

Chowdhury, S., Budhwar, P. & Wood, G. (2024) Generative artificial intelligence in business: towards a strategic human resource management framework. *British Journal of Management*, https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12824

Chowdhury, S., Dey, P., Joel-Edgar, S., Bhattacharya, S., Rodriguez-Espindola, O., Abadie, A. & Truong, L. (2023) Unlocking the value of artificial intelligence in human resource management through AI capability framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), 100899.

Colbert, A., Yee, N. & George, G. (2016) The digital workforce and the workplace of the future. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(3), 731–739.

Deci, E.L., Olafsen, A.H. & Ryan, R.M. (2017) Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 4(1), 19–43.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001) The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499–512.

Fitzgerald, M., Kruschwitz, N., Bonnet, D. & Welch, M. (2014) Embracing digital technology: a new strategic imperative. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55(2), 1.

George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A. & Tihanyi, L. (2016) Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 1880–1895.

Guest, D.E. (2017) Human resource management and employee well-being: towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 22–38.

Hirsch, P.M. & Levin, D.Z. (1999) Umbrella advocates versus validity police: a life-cycle model. *Organization Science*, 10, 199–212.

Hobfoll, S.E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.P. & Westman, M. (2018) Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 5(1), 103–128.

Ilies, R., Bono, J.E. & Bakker, A.B. (2024) Crafting well-being: employees can enhance their own well-being by savoring, reflecting upon, and capitalizing on positive work experiences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11, 63–91.

Kashdan, T.B., Biswas-Diener, R. & King, L.A. (2008) Reconsidering happiness: the costs of distinguishing between hedonics and eudaimonia. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(4), 219–233.

Klag, M. & Langley, A. (2023) When everything interacts with everything else: intervening in messes. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 37(1), 37–54.

Kraut, R. (2015) Aristotle on well-being. In *The Routledge handbook of philosophy of well-being*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 20–28.

Kunisch, S., zu Knyphausen-Aufsess, D., Bapuji, H., Aguinis, H., Bansal, T., Tsui, A.S. & Pinto, J. (2023) Using review articles to address societal grand challenges. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(2), 240–250.

Langer, M. & Landers, R.N. (2021) The future of artificial intelligence at work: a review on effects of decision automation and augmentation on workers targeted by algorithms and third-party observers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 123, 106878.

Manson, S.M. (2001) Simplifying complexity: a review of complexity theory. *Geoforum*, 32(3), 405–414.

Maslow, A.H. (1943) A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review*, 50(4), 370.

Moran, J. (2018) Aristotle on eudaimonia ('happiness'). *Thinker*, 17(48), 91–99.

Raisch, S. & Krakowski, S. (2021) Artificial intelligence and management: the automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192–210.

Ren, S. & Dey, P.K. (2023) Generative AI and sustainable HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*, https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12524

Ren, S., Hu, J., Tang, G.Y. & Chadee, D. (2023) Digital connectivity for work after hours: its curvilinear relationship with employee job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 76(3), 731–757.

Seelos, C., Mair, J. & Traeger, C. (2023) The future of grand challenges research: retiring a hopeful concept and endorsing research principles. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(2), 251–269.

Tschang, F.T. & Almirall, E. (2021) Artificial intelligence as augmenting automation: implications for employment. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 35(4), 642–659.

Waterman, A.S. (1990) The relevance of Aristotle's conception of eudaimonia for the psychological study of happiness. *Theoretical & Philosophical Psychology*, 10(1), 39.