



ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT ODC NEWSLETTER

Organization Development and Change Division

R. Wayne Boss, Editor

Winter 2014

Published by the ODC Division

2014 ODC DIVISION SCHOLARLY PROGRAM: CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

David Grant
ODC Program Chair

The ODC Division represents a community of scholars and practitioners who create and disseminate impactful and rigorous knowledge to enrich constructive change management and organization development. The domain of ODC includes the development of theory and innovative practice relevant to change at the individual, group, organizational and institutional levels. Major topics include: change processes within organizations, with or without assistance by change agents; active attempts to intervene in organized systems to improve their effectiveness, and scholarly studies of such interventions; multi- or cross-cultural dynamics of systems change in the global context; the roles of change leaders and agents; and issues surrounding self-awareness and responsibility of ODC theory and practice.

Special Instructions for Submissions to the Scholarly Program of the AOM 2014 Meeting in Philadelphia: The ODC division invites submission of innovative empirical or conceptual papers and symposia that develop theory and practice relevant to strategic and organizational change, development, transformation, and leadership. Topics and explorations specifically oriented to the 2014 all-Academy theme: “The Power of Words” are especially encouraged. The all-Academy theme encourages submissions that focus on the many forms, and uses, of words in organizations, and the ways in which they facilitate or hinder the outcomes that various organizational stakeholders seek. The term “Words” is used in the broadest sense, i.e. words might appear in the form of spoken utterances, written text, or other symbolic media. They might be conveyed through, for example, narrative and storytelling, or conversation and dialogue.

As ODC scholars and practitioners, the power of words deeply influences our understanding of
(See Grant, page 2)

TOWARD AN ALTERNATIVE FORM OF PLAY IN ORGANIZATIONS: A PRACTICE-BASED PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIAL LUDIC ACTIVITIES

Martin Spraggon
Virginia Bodolica
American University of Sharjah, UAE
2013 ODC Division Best Rupert F. Chisholm Practice-to-Theory Award

Although the field of organizational research has long been torn between perspectives on work, play and practice (Sandberg & Tsoukas, 2011), the current depiction of workplace play remains incomplete. Strategy as practice tradition, dominated by studies on serious play, emerged to refocus scholarly attention on human agency by observing the micro-practices of strategy practitioners at work. Serious play research portrays play as an intrusive managerial attempt to functionalize playful pastimes in retreat laboratories for achieving work-related objectives (Jarzabkowski et al., 2007). Yet,

(See Spraggon and Bodolica, page 3)

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| David Grant, 2014 ODC Division Scholarly Program: Call for Submissions | 1 |
| Martin Spraggon & Virginia Bodolica, Toward an Alternative Form of Play in Organizations: A Practice-Based Perspective on Social Ludic Activities, 2013 ODC Division Best Rupert F. Chisholm Practice-to-Theory Paper Award | 1 |
| ODC Division Executive Committee 2013-2014 | 2 |
| Julie Wolfram Cox, 2014 ODC Division Professional Development Workshops: Call For Proposals | 6 |
| Organization Development and Change (ODC) Doctoral Consortium | 7 |
| Anna Gerstrom, Surviving Organizational Death: How Members Draw upon and Reconstruct Organizational Identity in Times of Organizational Death, 2013 ODC Division Best Student Paper | 8 |
| Yuchen Zang & David A. Alexander, Books by ODC Division Members 2008-2011 | 11 |
| Feedback to the Editor | 13 |

**ODC DIVISION EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE 2013-2014**

Jeffrey Ford, Division Chairperson
Ohio State University
Email: ford.1@osu.edu

Sonja Sackmann, Division Chair Elect
University Bw Munich, Gallen, Switzerland
Email: ssackmann@hispeed.ch

David Grant, Program Chair
University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
Email: david.grant@sydney.edu.au

Julie Wolfram Cox, PDW Chair
Monash University, Victoria, Australia
Email: julie.wolfram.cox@monash.edu

John Amis, Representative-at-Large (5-year term)
University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Email: john.amis@ed.ac.uk

Nancy Wallis, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
Pitzer College, Newport Coast, CA
Email: nancy.wallis@pitzer.edu

Bill Cooke, Representative-at-Large (2-year term)
Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Email: b.cooke@lancaster.ac.uk

*Robert Carpino, Executive Scholar-Practitioner
(2-year term)*
Quest Diagnostics
Email: Robert.Carpino@calstatela.edu

*Katherine (Kate) Heynoski, Executive Scholar-
Practitioner (2-year term)*
Battelle for Kids
Email: kheynoski@battelleforkids.org

Julie Smendzuik-O'Brien, Student Representative
Fielding Graduate University
Email: jsmendzuik@gmail.com

*Quy Nguyen Huy, International Representative-at-
Large*
INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France
Email: quy.huy@insead.edu

Gavin Schwarz, Secretary/Treasurer
University of New South Wales
Email: g.schwarz@unsw.edu.au

Andre Avramchuk, Director of Communications
California State University
Email: arttooz@aol.com

R. Wayne Boss, Newsletter Editor
University of Colorado at Boulder
Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

(From Grant, page 1)

change and the ways in which we carry out our research, practice and teaching. The 2014 All-Academy theme therefore encourages us to consider issues such as:

- To what extent, and how, does the theory and practice of ODC acknowledge the power of words in bringing about various forms of change?
- What do we actually mean by “the power of words” in the context of ODC? What fundamental assumptions and ethical considerations in relation to ODC does this raise?
- What can we learn about ODC from discourse theory and analysis, communications studies, socio-linguistics and other fields of enquiry that highlight the importance of words and their effects? How can our theories, models and frameworks be further specified, extended and developed as a result of drawing on such fields of enquiry?
- How might using specific methods and approaches such as conversation analysis, content analysis, narrative and storytelling analysis, rhetoric analysis, metaphor analysis, semiotics, or multi-modal analysis inform the study and practice of ODC? How can we unveil the power of words using qualitative and/or quantitative research designs?
- How have recent developments in ODC such as “New OD” or “Dialogic” OD and change highlighted the power of words? In what ways have these contributed to the study and practice of ODC?
- In what ways, and to what effect, do leaders and others involved in the planning and execution of change, draw on the power of words? How might they use words to change behavior and attitudes or to inspire affectively so as to build emotional commitment to change?
- In what ways, and to what effect, is the power of words used to mobilize people to resist change? What is the role of words in the constitution of other reactions to change, including acceptance, ambivalence and cynicism?
- How do stakeholders in change use words to mobilize emotions such as hope, dissatisfaction,

enthusiasm, fear, or anger in order to influence change activities and outcomes?

- How do stakeholders in change use devices such as metaphor, tropes, figurative language, humor, irony or rhetoric in ways that influence understanding and practice of change?
- How is the power of words amplified or attenuated through digital technologies? Can such technology in the form of, for example, social media be harnessed in ways that lead to more effective and positive forms of change? Does it allow stakeholders in change to more effectively challenge, question or resist those managing and leading change?
- Can the power of words be examined independent of material factors? How is the impact of words affected by those who speak them and by socio-political, situational, geographical and historical contexts?
- How is the power of words reflected in the ways we write about ODC? How might we be more reflexive about writing and publication conventions in ODC and about whose interests are privileged by such conventions?

Papers and Symposia submitted to the ODC Division might address these or the many other issues that emanate from this year's AOM theme. They may also address issues more closely aligned with the ODC Division domain statement.

If you are interested in submitting a paper or a symposium proposal through the ODC Division, please visit <http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/> and refer to the section on submission information for papers and symposia. The submission deadline is January 14, 2014, 5:00 p.m. EST.

Division Awards: Awards, some with an honorarium, will be given for the best paper in the following categories:

- Best Paper Overall
- Best Rupe Chisolm Practice-to-Theory Paper
- Best Paper Based on a Dissertation
- Best Student Paper (written exclusively by students, individually or with other students, no faculty or practitioner co-authors permitted)
- Best Action Research Paper

Please refer to our website for more detail on these awards: <http://division.aomonline.org/odc>. Papers based on a dissertation, written exclusively by students (individually or with other students), or written about action research should be clearly identified as such at the time of submission (make a note on the title page and also in the accompanying email indicating the award for which you want the paper to be considered).

The ODC Division also recognizes a Best Reviewer Award. All award winners are celebrated at the ODC Business Meeting.

(From Spraggon and Bodolica, page 1)

this research overlooks other forms of play which are situated in the actual work environment rather than in experimental workshops, spontaneous rather than controlled, employee-initiated rather than manager-driven, and naturally organized rather than artificially triggered. By overemphasizing human agency and neglecting the supremacy of practices (Chia & MacKay, 2007), serious play studies disregard the wider outcomes that transcend individualities, the social contexts in which actors are embedded and that actors are instructed by social structures to enact their strategies (Whittington, 2006).

This article aims to respond to recent calls for a deeper examination of other manifestations of play in work settings (Mainemelis & Ronson, 2006). Relying on a practice-based framework that considers the dialectical relationships between the micro and macro levels (Orlikowski, 2000) and incorporates the practice, practitioner and praxis elements (Whittington, 2006), we introduce the concept of social ludic activities (SLAs) as an alternative form of playful practice in organizations. Studying the recurrent and situated enactments of SLAs' practice enables us to understand the ongoing and recursive relations between the ways in which SLAs are carried out and transformed, the social players of SLAs and the practice of SLAs, which is both the medium and end of SLAs' players' praxis. We draw upon two empirical vignettes on SLAs' enactment as subversive resistance and productive engagement with work to generate valuable practice-based implications.

SLAs as a Playful Practice

SLAs are conceived as a practice through which actors spontaneously enact play to aesthetically cope with workplace surprises, breakdowns or disturbances that are perceived by practitioners as challenging instances intruding in their corporate life. SLAs represent a provisional world at work which conveys general principles and dispositions for playful action and offers a material, mental and spiritual stage for players to enact their interpretation of the practice in their ordinary job-related context (Whittington, 2006). Given the intuitive, pre-reflexive and unintentional nature of SLAs, the intensity of, absorption in, mirth of, devotion to and the maddening power of these activities can be understood by the logic of practice rather than by the logic of scientific rationality (Sandberg & Tsoukas, 2011).

SLAs can be seen via actors' praxis as a routinized, ritualistic behavior encompassing tightly intertwined elements such as bodily movements, cognitive processes, know-how, know-why, objects and emotions (Schatzki et al., 2001). Representing coherent clustered *gestalts* of embodied playful manifestations, the different deployments of SLAs can be observed in actors' coping with their tasks. SLAs offer social order as they embrace specific ways of acting, moving, thinking, feeling, interpreting and understanding that are rooted in and revealed via players' bodily performances. By participating in the SLA practice, which is reproduced in different work spaces and temporalities, players shape, follow and reinforce the practice and internalize the particular mode of disposing themselves to enact it (Whittington, 2006).

SLAs are grounded in a specific social and material site in which the circumstances and ways of learning and knowing are implicitly established by the community members that form and transform this practice (Orlikowski, 2000). Yet, being part of a practice constitutes a means to acquire specific practical understanding and either perpetuate or contest, via situated practice, current habitus that is alive in and sustained by a practice community. Ritualistic activities may be challenged by actors in their praxis of a practice as they experience surprises, bodily action misfits or knowledge gaps when coping with their objects of work. Actors are seen "not as simple automata, but as artful interpreters of practices" (Whittington, 2006). Thus, in their prax-

is of practice, practitioners may adjust *and* reproduce the stock of practices on which they draw.

SLAs versus Serious Play

SLAs differ from serious play along several dimensions. While serious play occurs as a result of a deliberate managerial effort to explore strategic alternatives through playful design (Statler et al., 2011), SLAs are enacted spontaneously by employees' praxis in their coping with company-induced events, without requiring external managerial coordination. Contrary to serious play that promotes managers' supremacy involving top-down controlling and designing, SLAs are seen from an employee perspective being emergent and populated of surprises. While serious play is confined to a set of supervised activities that are played by coerced practitioners in a given place and at a stipulated time, employees engage in the SLA practice of their own free will and in their ongoing pursuit of job-related tasks. Because SLAs take place in the implicit, silent and ordinary aspects of everyday life, studying them allows understanding how actors interpret challenging situations and deal with them in their natural work habitat.

Serious play studies equalize the notion of practice to micro-processes or to what people actually do, where actors are not seen as carriers and products of practices but merely as the conscious initiators of practices. Their unit of analysis constitutes individualities rather than the practices themselves, which represent the ontological foundation for explaining the emergence of strategizing (Sandberg & Tsoukas, 2011). Managers are implicitly conceived as independent, autonomous agents who carry out activities purposefully to enact strategy rather than as practitioners who are disciplined and structured by the rules, norms and ends of their practices. Adopting a different philosophical conjecture regarding agency and action, practice-based scholars posit that intentionality is not necessarily a precondition for strategizing (Chia & MacKay, 2007) where the habitus or internalized dispositions are the actual protagonists of players' actions. By positioning the transmission of practices at the center of strategic analysis, strategizing is seen as a consequence of the intrinsic predisposition of actors to unselfconsciously cope with organization-induced events (Jarzabkowski et al., 2007).

Due to its overemphasis on micro-processes, strategy as practice falls into the ontological supremacy problem between the macro and micro levels, instead of focusing on the emerging patterned actions that arise from the primacy of practices (Chia & MacKay, 2007). The philosophical underpinnings of the practice approach allow overcoming the micro-macro, mind-body and agency-structure dichotomies by focusing on the ontological sovereignty of practices or 'trans-individual' phenomena over individualities or conventional notions of rules, mind or intentionality (Whittington, 2006). Instead of studying the role of cognition, individuals or groups, practice scholars concentrate on the recursive and dialectical interdependencies between the human and the material or the object and the subject. Because practices pivot around an object of work that shapes actors' activities, objects are viewed as indispensable and inseparable components of practices (Engeström & Blackler, 2005). Disciplined, socialized and structured by the norms, understandings and ends of the SLA practice, players organize their actions around their boundary and epistemic objects of work (Carlile, 2002). Yet, serious play participants are prompted by intervening managers to formulate strategies by manipulating their work objects, which represent tri-dimensional discrete artifacts with pre-given meanings.

Inscribed in a strategy as practice view, serious play espouses the perspective of managers who are concerned with achieving instrumental ends. Inheriting some instrumental features from serious play and some atelic dimensions from play, SLAs are framed within a practice-based approach and represent the employees' perspective. While serious play focuses on managerial strategizing to obtain value-enhancing results, SLAs are conceived as a pre-reflexive, unintentional and open-ended practice that enables actors to enact play in a way that may or may not result in productive outcomes. Although SLA practitioners can deploy play as strategy for resisting formal authority, SLAs can also be played to generate valuable ends in response to satisfactorily-perceived contexts where employees willingly engage in learning and knowing in their situated praxis.

Implications Drawn from the Empirical Vignettes

Relying on non-participant observations in small software firms, we analyze two empirical vignettes to illustrate SLAs' deployment to resist managerial oppression (Alpha) or produce valuable outcomes

(Beta). The vignettes offer a description of the context of SLAs' enactments, the actual routines and legitimized firm activities (i.e., praxis), the software development practice and the points of view of developers and managers (i.e., practitioners). First, although actors' praxis is instructed by practices, these practices can be contested, challenged or adapted in praxis by skillful practitioners in their copings with unexpected events (Orlikowski, 2000). Since the skills of Alpha's employees drew on experimental on-the-job learning, they enacted SLAs to oppose managerial expectations on the mandatory usage of templates imported from outside.

Second, practices originate from recurrent, proven and legitimized local praxis (Schatzki et al., 2001). Beta's CEO established a propitious cultural environment for enabling the employees to internalize and adapt industry 'best practices' in their everyday strategy praxis.

Third, it is critical to understand who the practitioners are and how their personal background can influence the dialectical relationship between praxis and practices (Whittington, 2006). The high-caliber educational profile of Beta's CEO along with his engagement in professional networks had been influential in the way he interpreted practices and structured the workplace arrangements.

Fourth, viewing strategy practitioners as perpetrators or conduits of practices (Kraatz & Moore, 2002), their mobility constitutes a critical mechanism through which practices can be transferred across contexts. Playing a pivotal role in reproducing, deploying and instituting external practices into their firms through their praxis, Alpha's and Beta's CEOs acted as carriers of practices. Yet, when reproduced practices are repeatedly adjusted, adapted and accommodated in local praxis to deal with specific events (Jarzabkowski et al., 2007), practitioners can also be seen as innovators and creators of strategy practices. Finally, effective strategy praxis is a function of practitioners' abilities and competences to access and put in place prevalent practices (Whittington, 2006). While the initiatives of Beta's CEO produced a practical success, those of Alpha's CEO resulted in a practical failure. Successful praxis requires from practitioners to not only participate in dominant strategy practices but also skillfully interpret and effectively apply those practices in a particular setting.

References

- Carlile, P. (2002). A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new product development. *Organization Science*, 13, 442-455.
- Chia, R., & MacKay, B. (2007). Post-processual challenges for the emerging strategy-as-practice perspective: Discovering strategy in the logic of practice. *Human Relations*, 60, 217-242.
- Engeström, Y., & Blackler, F. (2005). On the life of the object. *Organization*, 12, 307-330.
- Jarzabkowski, P., Balogun, J., & Seidl, D. (2007). Strategizing: The challenges of a practice perspective. *Human Relations*, 60, 5-27.
- Kraatz, M. S., & Moore, J. E. (2002). Executive migration and institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 120-143.
- Mainemelis, C., & Ronson, S. (2006). Ideas are born in field of play: Towards a theory of play and creativity in organizational settings. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27, 81-131.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organization Science*, 11, 404-428.
- Sandberg, J., & Tsoukas, H. (2011). Grasping the logic of practice: Theorizing through practical rationality. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 338-360.
- Schatzki, T. R., Knorr-Cetina, K., & von Savigny, E. (2001). *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Statler, M., Heracleous, L., & Jacobs, C. D. (2011). Serious play as a practice of paradox. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47, 236-256.
- Whittington, R. (2006). Completing the practice turn in strategy research. *Organization Studies*, 27, 613-634.

2014 ODC DIVISION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS: CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Julie Wolfram Cox
ODC PDW Chair

PDWs are a platform for colleagues to share knowledge and expertise and foster the development of workshop participants. Coordinated by the Academy's many divisions, interest groups, and theme committees, PDW sessions are different from regular academy sessions in that they can have a longer time frame and use a more interactive and participative format. PDW sessions will be held prior to the AOM scholarly program from 8:00 a.m. on Friday, August 1, through 8:00 p.m. on Saturday, August 2, 2014.

This year's AOM meeting theme is "The Power of Words." The full Call for Submissions is at <http://aom.org/annualmeeting/callforsubmissions> and the 2014 call for PDWs and related instructions can be found at <http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/pdw/>.

As ODC scholars and practitioners, the power of words deeply influences our understanding of change and the ways in which we carry out our research, practice, and teaching. The 2014 All-Academy theme therefore encourages us to consider issues that include, but are not limited to, the following questions:

- How do practitioners utilize the power of words and of silences in bringing about various forms of change?
- How is the nature and extent of change evident through new conversations, vocabularies and linguistic codes?
- How are assumptions about power reflected in the words of organization development and change theory and practice? How, in turn, may the words and practices of ODC speak to and influence structures of power in and beyond organizations?
- What ethical questions emerge from the words used to shape or resist change?
- How might discourse theory and analysis, communications studies, socio-linguistics and other fields of enquiry that highlight the importance

of words and their effects be used to strengthen research and practice in ODC?

- How can we unveil the power of words using qualitative and/or quantitative research designs? How do words, including those of key texts, influence and limit our methodological choices in ODC research and research careers?
- How might specific methods and approaches such as conversation analysis, content analysis, narrative and storytelling analysis, rhetoric analysis, metaphor analysis, semiotics, or multi-modal analysis be used to inform the study and practice of ODC?
- How have recent developments in ODC such as “New OD” or “Dialogic” OD and change highlighted the power of words in change interventions?
- How can PDWs go beyond the power of words to introduce and facilitate such developments?
- How do leaders and other stakeholders in change draw on devices such as metaphor, tropes, figurative language, humor, irony and rhetoric in order to influence, resist and respond to change activities and outcomes?
- How is the power of their words amplified or attenuated through digital technologies?
- How is the impact of words about organizational development and change affected by those who speak them and by socio-political, situational, geographical and historical contexts? When do words linger?
- How does the power of words influence the separation of divisions and interest groups at AOM and how might our PDW program encourage intersectional analyses and productive collaborations with other divisions?

PDW proposals to the ODC Division might address these or the many other issues that emanate from this year’s AOM theme. They may also address issues more closely aligned with the ODC Division Domain Statement.

Space allocated to PDWs is limited, so PDW proposals that would be of interest to several divisions or interest groups are encouraged, although a PDW can only be submitted to one Division. We also encourage PDWs that create a meeting place for

ODC practitioners and academics as well as for members of different divisions. (Any co-sponsors will be determined after submission.) A doctoral consortium will be included and a submission for an early career PDW for post-doctoral ODC members is strongly encouraged. Organizers of successful past PDWs are encouraged to propose a further PDW for 2014 in line with the meeting theme.

The submission deadline is January 14th, 2014, 5:00 p.m. EST (New York time) (earlier submissions are strongly encouraged). All submissions must be sent via the AOM submissions system at <http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/>, which will open on November 5, 2013.

If you have any questions, or have an idea for a possible proposal that you would like to discuss, please contact the ODC PDW Program Chair, Julie Wolfram Cox, at odc@monash.edu before December 13, 2013.

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE (ODC) DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM, AUGUST 1- 2, 2014

The 2014 ODC Doctoral Consortium will be held on August 1 and 2, 2014 as part of the pre-conference program at the Academy of Management meetings in Philadelphia.

This Doctoral Student Consortium is for doctoral students interested in studying issues associated with human systems and organizational change. We welcome and encourage students at all stages of their dissertations—those who are well advanced in their dissertation work as well as those who are in an early stage in their dissertations.

The consortium will provide opportunities for structured discussion and informal interaction between doctoral students and faculty on issues of research, publishing and early career issues. In small group coaching sessions, participants will have the opportunity to present and discuss their dissertation research with faculty members who will give feedback and help further advance participants’ work toward successful completion, publishable results, and smooth transitions into their academic careers. This is a great opportunity to meet some of the prominent scholars in the field and network with peers.

Participating faculty / panelists will include:

- John Amis, U. of Edinburgh, UK
- André Avramchuk, Cal State U. Los Angeles, USA
- Julia Balogun, U. of Bath, UK
- Rune By, Editor, Journal of Change Management
- Bill Cooke, U. of Lancaster, UK
- David Grant, U. of Sydney, Australia
- Ann Feyerherm, Pepperdine U., USA
- Jeffrey Ford, Ohio State U., USA
- Jim Ludema, Benedictine U., USA
- Huy Quy, INSEAD, France
- Cliff Oswick, Cass Business School, UK
- Sonja Sackmann, University Bw Munich, Germany
- Gavin Schwarz, UNSW, Sydney, Australia
- Inger Stensaker, NHH, Norway
- James Vardaman, Mississippi State U., USA
- Julie Wolfram Cox, Monash U., Australia
- Richard Woodman, Texas A&M, former JABS editor

Broad, relevant topical areas of the dissertation work may focus on issues of:

- Organization growth & development
- Change management
- Strategy-as-practice
- Social movements in organizations
- Organizational improvisation
- Organizational learning
- Responses to change
- Network dynamics
- Transformational leadership
- Innovation
- Micro-dynamics of change

- Change agent-target dynamics
- Multi-cultural dimensions of systems change
- Complex responsive processes
- Topics related to institutional change

To apply, please send an email with the following three documents attached to Sonja Sackmann (sonja.sackmann@unibw.de) by May 15, 2014 (or earlier):

A recommendation letter from your dean, department chair, **or** major advisor that verifies your (a) status/progress and (b) year in your school's doctoral program.

A one-page bio summarizing your contact information, research and teaching interests, and publications. *This one-page bio will be distributed among consortium participants.*

A 3-5 page (typed and double-spaced) summary of your dissertation project, including the research question, rationale, hypotheses/propositions, proposed methods and results (if applicable). *This will be distributed to consortium faculty and participants in advance of the August sessions.*

Selections will be made by June 1 (or earlier). Any questions can be directed to Sonja Sackmann at sonja.sackmann@unibw.de.

**SURVIVING ORGANIZATIONAL
DEATH: HOW MEMBERS DRAW UPON
AND RECONSTRUCT ORGANIZATIONAL
IDENTITY IN TIMES OF
ORGANIZATIONAL DEATH**

Anna Gerstrom
Aarhus University

2013 ODC Division Best Student Paper

Identity and identification in organizational settings have been studied extensively within recent years (Alvesson, Empson 2008, Coupland, Brown 2012) Nevertheless, there is a dearth of knowledge about what happens to organizational identity during times of crisis or death (Walsh, Glynn 2008). We know little, for example, about how an organization's identity is constructed during bankruptcy. This is inappropriate for at least two reasons. From

theory we know that decline is an integrated part of an organization's life cycle—that death is part of life in organizations (Cunningham 1997, Shepherd 2003, Wigblad, Lewer 2007, Walsh, Bartunek 2009, Ginter et al. 1992). Empirically, we have witnessed a global financial crisis that shocked the world and brought bankruptcy to the front and center of daily life (Walsh, Bartunek 2009, Hazen 2009). Death and bankruptcy can be characterized as organizational events impacting the lives of many—especially the people inhabiting the failing organization. Traditionally, research has stopped when the organization was terminated (Walsh, Bartunek 2012). Fortunately, however, when organizations die, people do not die with them. Organizational members live on: they find new organizational life where they come to perform. But their subsequent behavior is guided by their past experiences (Garud, Dunbar & Bartel 2011, Plowman, Beck 2009, Christianson et al. 2009) and their beliefs about who they were as an organization: their legacy organizational identity (Walsh, Glynn 2008). Therefore, the deficiency of research on the death process (Wigblad, Lewer 2007, Walsh, Bartunek 2009, Walsh, Bartunek 2012, Dean A. 2009, Sutton 1987, Hamilton 2006), including constructions of the organization's identity during this process, seems inappropriate. The aim of this paper is to address this gap and contribute to a broader understanding of organizational life—including death—and identification.

Theoretical Foundation

According to extant theory, organizational reality and identity shape each other (Plowman, Beck 2009, Christianson et al. 2009, Weick 1995, Sørderberg, Vaara 2003, Glynn 2008, Dutton, Dukerich 1991, Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld 2005, He, Baruch 2010). In fact, an organization's identity provides a shared, interpretive filter through which organizational members view and evaluate reality including events (Glynn 2008) like bankruptcy. "*Who we think we are as organizational actors, shapes what we enact and how we interpret*" (Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld 2005: 416). On the other hand, interpretations of endogenous as well as exogenous events influence constructions of organizational identities (Schneider 1997, Glynn 2008, Creed, Dejordy & Lok 2010, Gioia et al. 2010, Lok 2010, Pedersen, Dobbin 2006). Following these lines, it can be anticipated that organizational identity and organizational death are parts of an interde-

pendent relationship in which they form each other. Little, however, is known about how these concepts form and relate to each other.

To understand such issues, the paper draws on Whetten's (2006: 220) definition of *organizational identity* "as the central and enduring attributes of an organization that distinguish it from other organizations" to conceptualize *legacy organizational identity* as "what is central, distinctive, and enduring about . . . who we were as an organization" (Walsh, Glynn 2008: 262-266).

Moreover, organizational image is considered relevant for understanding identity in times of death because "*Who we are lies importantly in the hands of others*" (Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld 2005: 416). If others' perception of the organization changes, the organizational image and identity may be *destabilized* (ibid). External stakeholders play a vital role in the continuous negotiation of the organization's identity and in "*holding the organization accountable for its identity claims*" (Ashforth, Rogers & Corley 2011). Therefore, organizational image also influences how an organization interprets and responds to events because ". . . *an organization's image guides and activates individuals' interpretations of an issue and motivations for action on it*" (Dutton, Dukerich 1991: 520). Hence, organizational image serves as an important *mirror* when members decide how to interpret and respond to threatening issues (ibid) like organizational death. Following these lines, organizational image forms organizational interpretations of identity and identity threats (Ravasi, Schultz 2006, Dutton, Dukerich 1991, Anderson et al. 2006, Hatch, Schultz 2002, Hatch, Schultz 1997). Therefore, it can be anticipated that organizational image also plays a role in the constructions of legacy organizational identity after death. Little, however, is known about how these constructs form and relate to each other.

To understand such issues, the following analysis draws on Dutton and Dukerich's (1991: 520) definition of organizational image as "*the way members believe others see the organization*" to conceptualize '*legacy organizational image as the way members believe others saw the organization*'.

Thus, in this study the organization—including its identity and image—lie in the eyes of its members (Schneider 1997): it is the inhabitants of the organi-

zation that construct and define both the organization's (legacy) identity and (legacy) image.

Methodological Design

In order to explore empirically organizational identity after death, I conduct an inductive and in-depth analysis of a bank going bankrupt.

The bank was founded in the late 1800. The bank was located in the small country of Denmark in a small town with approximately 1.500 inhabitants (2011 number). The year before the bank went bankrupt, it had an annual turnover of more than 100.000.000 DKK: approximately 25.000.000 USD (2012 currency). At the time it went bankrupt, it employed around 50 people.

The primary data sources are interviews with members of the bank. Saturation is reached with confidence after interviews with 20 organizational members. The members represent all hierarchical levels within the company from front line employees, to managers, to the director as well as the board members and the head of the board. Informants worked within different functional areas. Both men and women were interviewed and tenure ranged from less than one year to more than 40 years.

To access and explore aspects of organizational life (Kondra 2009) and death and arrive at an in-depth understanding of these issues, interviews were qualitative and narrative (Kvale 2008).

Explorative Analysis

The explorative analysis consists of three steps.

In the first step, I analyze the *organizational identity* prior to the crisis and find that the study takes point of departure in an organization with three identity claims:

- Local
- Solid
- Competitive

In the second step, I analyze the *organizational death* process and find that members narrate the process in three faces each including two events:

- Before death
- Media addresses banks' exposure to declining real estate market

- Media addresses the bank's exposure to declining real estate market
- During death
- The director is dismissed
- The bank is declared bankrupt
- After death
- Media addresses the acquiring bank's exposure to agricultural problems
- The acquiring bank's budget for local support is reduced

In the third step, I analyze the relationship between identity and death and find that the two construct are intertwined in two ways.

- Members' interpretations of and responses to the death events draw on the organization's identity
- Members' constructions and definitions of the organization's identity draw on the death events

Findings

The analysis illustrates how members draw on their organizational identity when interpreting and responding to identity threats and how these interpretations and responses have implications for members' construction of the organizational identity. In this case, the identity is maintained, preserved, altered, revolutionized, re-preserved and re-altered in a sequence conditioned by the unfolding of different significant events. In the paper's figure 1 the descriptive understanding of the familiar case is transformed into more generalized knowledge (Golden-Biddle, Locke 1993: 605) that may be capable of informing other cases of legacy organizational identity construction after disruptive death.

Discussion

The main contribution of the paper is the way it illustrates how parts of an organization's identity end while other parts endure – even after termination of the organization. In this sense, the paper contributes to organizational debates regarding the enduring character of identity as well as the concept of legacy identity (Walsh, Glynn 2008).

The main implication of the paper lies in the way it illustrates how organizational members experience a death process: how they handle some of the chal-

lenges they face. If being a manager in a dying organization means managing death, it is important that managers understand how organizational members interpret and respond to organizational death. Managers confronted with the task of managing during death seldom have a stock of accumulated death experience that they can draw from (Sutton 1987, Wigblad, Hanson 2006) and therefore the knowledge presented in this paper can be of value to managers in such situations.

Conclusion

The global financial crisis that marked the beginning of the 21st century shook the game board and changed not only the game, but also the players of the game. This paper is an exploration of how a local champion developed into a national tragedy and how this transformation was linked to its organizational identity.

References available from the author.

BOOKS BY ODC DIVISION MEMBERS 2008-2011

Yuchen Zang
David A. Alexander
University of Colorado at Boulder

In an effort to continue measuring the research productivity of ODC members, we have compiled the following list of books from January 2008 to December 2011. This list represents an exhaustive search of the Business Source Complete and PsychINFO databases using the name of each ODC member as the criterion for an author search. This list is presented in alphabetical order with one entry for each book.

We recognize that despite our best efforts, this list is certainly not comprehensive. While there are many reasons for this, there is one worth mentioning. Some common author names made searches more difficult, and at times it proved impossible to determine which books belonged to ODC members. In all cases, we erred on the side of caution. If you know of any books that have been omitted from this list, we request that you send those citations to the editor (wayne.boss@colorado.edu), and he will include them in the next issue of the *ODC Newsletter*.

Alderfer, Clayton P. (2011). *The practice of organizational diagnosis: Theory and methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Argyris, Chris. (2008). *Teaching smart people how to learn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press Books.

Baker, Ann C. (2010). *Catalytic conversations: Organizational communication and innovation*. New York: Routledge.

Beer, Michael; Foote, Nathaniel; & Eisenstat, Russell A. (2009). *High commitment, high performance: How to build a resilient organization for sustained advantage*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Behrens, Alfredo. (2009). *Culture and management in the Americas*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Borg, Ingwer, & Mastrangelo, Paul M. (2008). *Employee surveys in management: Theories, tools, and practical applications*. Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.

Boudreau, John W., & Lawler, Edward E. (2009). *Achieving excellence in human resources management: An assessment of human resource functions*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Bruch, Heike, & Vogel, Bernd. (2011). *Fully charged: How great leaders boost their organization's energy and ignite high performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Burke, W. Warner. (2008). *Organization change: Theory and practice (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Burke, W. Warner. (2011). *Organization change: Theory and practice (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Butler, Michael J. (2009). *International conflict management*. New York: Routledge.

Cooper, Cary L.; Field, John; Goswami, Usha; Jenkins, Rachel; & Sahakian, Barbara J. (2010). *Mental capital and wellbeing*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Cooper, Cary L.; Quick, James Campbell; & Schabracq, Marc J. (2009). *International handbook of work and health psychology (3rd ed.)*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Culbert, Samuel A. (2008). *Beyond bullsh*t: straight-talk at work*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford Business Books.
- Daft, Richard L. (2010). *The executive and the elephant: A leader's guide for building inner excellence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deiser, Roland. (2009). *Designing the smart organization: How breakthrough corporate learning initiatives drive strategic change and innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Disney, Jennifer Leigh. (2008). *Women's activism and feminist agency in Mozambique and Nicaragua*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Emerson, Brian; & Loehr, Ann. (2008). *A manager's guide to coaching: Simple and effective ways to get the best out of your employees*. New York: AMACOM/American Management Association.
- Freedman, Arthur M.; Levinson, Harry; & Bradt, Kenneth H. (2009). *Consulting psychology: Selected articles by Harry Levinson*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Friedman, Stewart D. (2008). *Total leadership: Be a better leader, have a richer life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Greenwood, Royston. (2008). *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gunz, Hugh, & Peiperl, Maury. (2008). *Handbook of career studies*: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hess, Edward D. (2010). *Smart growth: Building an enduring business by managing the risks of growth*. New York: Columbia Business School Publishing.
- Holt, Robin, & Thorpe, Richard (Eds.). (2008). *The Sage dictionary of qualitative management research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jamieson, David W. (2010). *Consultation for organizational change*. Greenwich, CT: IAP Information Age Publishing.
- Jue, Arthur L.; Marr, Jackie Alcalde; & Kassotakis, Mary Ellen. (2010). *Social media at work: How networking tools propel organizational performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kahn, William A. (2009). *The student's guide to successful project teams*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Kets de Vries, Manfred. (2010). *Reflections on leadership and career development: On the couch with Manfred Kets de Vries*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kingsley, Jan, & Wankel, Charles (Eds.). (2009). *Higher education in virtual worlds: Teaching and learning in second life*. United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Kleiner, Art. (2008). *The age of heretics: A history of the radical thinkers who reinvented corporate management (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, Edward E., Creelman, David, & Worley, Christopher G. (2011). *Management reset: Organizing for sustainable effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Madsen, Susan R. (2008). *On becoming a woman leader: Learning from the experiences of university presidents*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCarthy, John F., & Warren, Carol (Eds.). (2009). *Community, environment and local governance in Indonesia: Locating the commonweal*. United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Michel, Alexandra, & Wortham, Stanton Emerson Fisher. (2009). *Bullish on uncertainty: How organizational cultures transform participants*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Mone, Edward M., & London, Manuel. (2010). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*. New York: Routledge.
- Mullaly, Mark, & Thomas, Janice. (2008). *Researching the value of project management*. Newton Square, PA: Project Management Institute.
- Muller, Ralf, & Turner, J. Rodney. (2010). *Project-oriented leadership*: United Kingdom: Gower.
- Schein, Edgar H. (2009). *Helping: How to offer, give, and receive help*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Schein, Edgar H. (2009). *The corporate culture survival guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, Ian. (2010). *The public sector in Hong Kong: Government, policy, people*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Selig, Jennifer Leigh, & Slattery, Dennis Patrick (Eds.). (2009). *Reimagining education: Essays on reviving the soul of learning*. New Orleans, LA: Spring Journal Books.

Smither, James W., & London, Manuel. (2009). *Performance management: Putting research into action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thorpe, Richard, Jackson, Paul, & Easterby-Smith, Mark. (2008). *Management research (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Turner, J. Rodney. (2009). *The handbook of project-based management: Leading strategic change in organizations (3rd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Waddell, Steve. (2011). *Global action networks: Creating our future together*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wankel, Charles (Ed.). (2009). *Encyclopedia of business in today's world: Vol. 4*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wankel, Charles. (2011). *Educating educators with social media*. United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing.

Wankel, Laura, & Wankel, Charles (Eds.). (2011). *Higher education administration with social media: Including applications in student affairs, enrollment management, alumni relations, and career centers*. United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing.

Wiebe, Elden, Durepos, Gabrielle, & Mills, Albert J. (Eds.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yost, Paul R., & Plunket, Mary Mannion. (2009). *Real time leadership development*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Zappala, Salvatore, Cassese, Antonio, & Gaeta, Paola (Eds.). (2008). *The human dimension of international law: Selected papers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

FEEDBACK TO THE EDITOR

We welcome your feedback and would appreciate your comments below. Selected comments on articles in the *ODC Newsletter* may be published in the next issue, so please indicate if you prefer your comments to be withheld. Please address all correspondence to:

R. Wayne Boss
 Academy of Management ODC Newsletter
 Leeds School of Business
 Campus Box 419
 University of Colorado at Boulder
 Boulder, Colorado 80309
 (303)492-8488
 Email: wayne.boss@colorado.edu

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

1. Do you have any comments that you would like to share with the editor (comments on articles from the last issue, comments on this issue, suggestions, etc.)?

NEWS ABOUT MEMBERS

2. Is there any important information about you or a colleague that you would like to have appear in the next issue?

PUBLICATIONS

3. Please list all recent or forthcoming publications by you or a colleague. (Indicate full citation.)
