

Studying organizations: identity, pluralism and change

Guest editors:

Davide Bizjak, Paolo Canonico, Mariavittoria Cicellin, Stefano Consiglio, Luigi Maria Sicca

The XX WOA (Workshop on Organization) Palermo 2019 – brings together the community of organization scholars around the concept of identity. They dealt with organizational identity, to be inquired by the category of design and behaviour, but they even dealt with the identity of organization studies, that are characterised by a strong disciplinary pluralism, and therefore with change.

Organizational identities represent an establishing field of inquiry (Brown, 2015; Ybema et al., 2009). The concept of identity in organization is inquired both from a conceptual and pragmatic point of view. Concerning the former, the structuration of the identity concepts addresses the definition of identity, the evolution of the identity over time, the process of identity construction, and which ways identity could be studied (Sveningsson and Alvesson, 2003; Gabriel, 1999; Kreiner et al., 2006). Concerning the latter, the identity as a phenomenon addresses the role played by this concept within organizational processes and performances, thus looking at relationships, motivations, control, institutional change and diversity management (Johansson et al., 2017; Endrissat et al., 2017). Therefore, empirical research on the theme is focusing on specific domains of inquiry, characterised by the relevance of the social face within organizational processes. If seen as a construction process, identity means also dialogue, conducted by more than one identity that take action on the same playground. Here it emerges the matter of pluralism. Are the collective identities pluralistic by definition? Otherwise, is the collective identity the sum of pluralities? Pluralism, if compared with identity becomes in turn a point of weakness or a point of strength of the organization (Shipilov et al., 2014). In this sense, the contribution by Beech (2011) promotes the conception of identity as an increasing construct, in which liminality supports the progressive identity construction aspects. However, if on the one hand, the capacity to relate with different actors could increase the strategic alternatives at the management disposal, on the other this capacity could create difficulties in univocally acknowledge the organizational action. Pluralism is thus tightly linked to the change (Eisenhardt, 2000).

Looking at the many and possible fields in which the organization identity has been dealt with in recent years, it follows a not exhaustive list of possible topics to take in consideration in participating to this call:

- family Business. Managerialization vs. Reciprocal adaption;
- innovation and change. From Knowledge to practice;

- organizational wellness and citizenship;
- organizational practices and human resource management, inside and outside organization;
- new professions, identity and social media;
- new professions, identity and cultural enterprises;
- organizational pluralism and performances.

The CFP is open to both theoretical and empirical papers, both qualitative and quantitative, with the objective of contributing to the dialogue between the concept of identity, pluralism, and change, and to contribute to the debate on identity in organization studies.

Full paper submission (following the journal guidelines, please see: https://www.impresaprogetto.it/sites/impresaprogetto.it/files/a/ipejm_-_guidelines_text_2017.pdf):

15th April 2019.

Reference list

- Beech, N. (2011), Liminality and the practices of identity reconstruction. *Human Relations*, 64, 285–302.
- Brown, A. D. (2015), Identities and identity work in organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(1), 20-40.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (2000), Paradox, spirals, ambivalence: The new language of change and pluralism. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 703-705.
- Endrissat, N., Kärreman, D., Noppeney, C. (2017), Incorporating the creative subject: Branding outside-in through identity incentives. *human relations*, 70(4), 488-515.
- Gabriel, Y. (1999), Beyond happy families: A critical reevaluation of the control-resistance-identity triangle. *Human Relations*, 52(2), 179-203.
- Johansson, J., Tienari, J., Valtonen, A. (2017), The body, identity and gender in managerial athleticism. *Human relations*, 70(9), 1141-1167.
- Kreiner, G. E., Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M. (2006), Identity dynamics in occupational dirty work: Integrating social identity and system justification perspectives. *Organization science*, 17(5), 619-636.
- Shipilov, A., Gulati, R., Kilduff, M., Li, S., Tsai, W. (2014), Relational Pluralism Within and Between Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 449–459. doi:10.5465/amj.2013.1145
- Sveningsson, S., Alvesson, M. (2003), Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human relations*, 56(10), 1163-1193.
- Ybema, S., Keenoy, T., Oswick, C., Beverungen, A., Ellis, N., Sabelis, I. (2009), Articulating identities. *Human Relations*, 62(3), 299-322.