Organizational Identity: The Use of Rhetorical History and its Relationship to Organizational Pride

Der Fakultät für Wirtschaftswissenschaften
der Universität Paderborn

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades
Doktor der Wirtschaftswissenschaften
- Doctor rerum politicarum -

vorgelegte Dissertation
von

Karin Knorr, M.Sc.
geboren am 18.01.1992
in Bielefeld

Erscheinungsjahr 2023

Synopsis

Synopsis

1 Introduction

The concept of identity has its roots in ancient times. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle were already concerned with personal identity, who a person is, and what place they take in the world (Gioia, 1998). In the organizational setting, the concept of identity was first introduced, developed, and defined centuries later by Albert and Whetten (1985), derived from work on individual identity. Since then, the concept of organizational identity has received significant and growing attention, gained increasing popularity (Corley et al., 2006; He & Balmer, 2007; Pratt et al., 2016), and has become central in organizational and management research (He & Brown, 2013).

According to Albert and Whetten (1985), organizational identity has two purposes. First, scientists employ it to define and describe aspects of organizations, focusing on what the organization is. Second, organizations use it to characterize themselves and answer the self-reflective identity question of “who are we?” which also refers to the organization’s soul or essence (Ashforth & Mael, 1996). Moreover, Albert and Whetten (1985) suggest that the statement of organizational identity should satisfy three criteria and is typically defined as those aspects of the organization that are the most central, distinctive, and enduring. This understanding has been adopted by a majority of researchers making it the core definition of the organizational identity concept (Dhalla, 2007; Ravasi & van Rekom, 2003). However, although identity researchers generally refer to Albert and Whetten’s (1985) original definition of organizational identity, they have developed different interpretations and perspectives[1] on answering the organizational identity question. Thus, theoretical differences regarding the concept have been introduced (e.g., Ran & Golden, 2011; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Pratt et al., 2016).

First, following the social actor perspective, researchers view organizations “as actors in their own right [that can] take actions, utilize resources, enter into contract, and own property” (Scott, 2003, p. 7). Here, organizational identity represents a “set of institutional claims” (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006, p. 435) that serve as organizational self-definitions (Zundel et al., 2016) and that

[1] For example, He and Brown (2013) provide an overview of the functionalist, social constructionist, psychodynamic, and postmodern perspectives. Gioia, Patvardhan, et al. (2013) also refer to different perspectives and present social construction, social actor, institutionalist, and population ecologist views. Being aware that there are several different perspectives and interpretations, this dissertation only refers to the social construction and social actor perspective (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) since the papers of this dissertation consider the construction of organizational identity from these two theoretical interpretations.

provide central, enduring, and distinctive characteristics leading to status and quality (Haslam et al., 2017). These organizational identity claims are established by organizational leaders and/or spokespersons through the organization's location within a classification scheme and a set of social categories (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). According to Ravasi and Schultz (2006), this perspective emphasizes the sensegiving function (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991) of organizational identity, which provides a coherent guide to organizational members' behavior and highlights how other organizations should relate to the organization. Thus, these claims influence the internal and external perception of the organization (Gioia et al., 2000; Gioia & Hamilton, 2016; Whetten et al., 2014) and exist irrespective of individual organizational members (Whetten & Mackey, 2002). However, organizational members particularly use these claims to develop a collective self-understanding of the organization (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Moreover, the set of organizational identity claims needs "to be the same yesterday, today and tomorrow" (Whetten & Mackey, 2002, p. 396) and is consequently shaped by persistence (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Viewing the organization as a social actor not only helps define identity claims but also distinguishes the concept of organizational identity from other theoretical concepts such as identification, culture, and image as a representation of the organization reflected and expressed by outsiders (Whetten, 2006). Researchers investigating organizational identity from the sensemaking lens concentrate, for example, on claims evidenced in the organization's mission statements on the organization's own or on aggregator websites, social media platforms, or in public commitments and statements (Bartel et al., 2016; Haslam et al., 2017; Levine & Eckerd, 2019; Ortiz, 2022; Ran & Duimering, 2007; Serra et al., 2022).

Second, following the social construction perspective, researchers have shifted the focus from the formal set of claims (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) and consider organizational identity as "collective understandings of the features presumed to be central and relatively permanent, and that distinguish the organization from other organizations" (Gioia et al., 2000, p. 64). Thus, the construction of the organizational identity is not a cognitive process within the organizational members' minds but collective beliefs that emerge through interactions with other internal and external stakeholders (Vough et al., 2020). The exchange among organizational members and their interpretation of the organization's actions and its organizational identity construction underline the sensemaking process (Aeon & Lamertz, 2021; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Vough et al., 2020). In this respect, organizational members negotiate and influence the organizational identity (Gioia, 1998; Nag et al., 2007) since they can reinterpret and disagree with the claims used by the organization or utilize different claims (Alvesson & Empson, 2008; Hsu & Elsbach, 2013; Oliver & Vough, 2020). Clegg et al. (2007) state that the organizational identity reflects the inter-subjective reality “constituted through agreement and sharing of meaning among organizational members” (p. 497). Thus, organizational members can reconsider and update the organizational identity (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Ran & Golden, 2011; Weick, 1995), underlining that the organizational members do not simply accept the “set of institutional claims”. Therefore, the sensemaking process is characterized by human agency (Weick et al., 2005). Accordingly, researchers investigating organizational identity from the sensemaking lens survey, for example, employees (e.g., Cole & Bruch, 2006) or management teams (e.g., Ravasi & Philipps, 2011).

As shown, researchers conceptualize organizational identity differently (Schinoff et al., 2016). While some view organizational identity as a set of claims the organization introduces (sensegiving) (e.g., Whetten, 2006; Whetten & Mackey, 2002), others regard organizational identity as the organizational members’ socially constructed understanding of who the organization is (sensemaking) (e.g., Vough et al., 2020; Gioia et al., 2000). Although the different conceptualizations were traditionally considered contradictory, some researchers have emphasized that these conceptualizations are complementary, if not recursive (Schinoff et al., 2016). For example, Ravasi and Schultz (2006) argue that the two perspectives are “representing two sides of the same coin” (Gioia & Hamilton, 2016, p. 25) and suggest that “the juxtaposition of these perspectives will produce a more accurate representation of organizational identities” (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006, p. 436). Thus, the sensemaking and sensegiving processes complement and influence each other in developing organizational identity. Thereby, the sensegiving of the organization prompts the sensemaking responses of the organizational members (Clark & Geppert, 2011; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Similarly, Gioia et al. (2010) suggest that focusing on one perspective or process is insufficient and that a synthesis of both is needed for a complete understanding of the organizational identity concept (see also Pratt et al., 2016).

For the last decades, researchers from both interpretive perspectives have focused on what aspects are attributed to organizational identity and have shown that different factors can influence organizational identity and contribute to its conceptualization. For instance, an organization’s industry sector can constitute the organizational identity (Ran & Duimering, 2007). In contrast, the influence of work practices, e.g., production methods, on organizational identity is controversial. While Nag et al. (2007) emphasize that work practices are inherent in organizational identity, Oliver and Vough (2020) suggest that everyday practices can impact the conceptualization of organizational identity. In addition to organizational practices, researchers have identified organizational products and artifacts as essential to conceptualizing organizational identity (Watkiss & Glynn, 2016). Moreover, Margolis and Hansen (2002) underline that the organization's purpose and philosophy constitute the organizational identity. Similarly, core values, and aspects of the organization's mission and vision represent the organizational identity (Schultz & Hernes, 2013; Oliver & Roos, 2007). Especially concerning the core values, as well as the mission and vision statements, scholars underline that corporate social responsibility and the construction of a green organizational identity are important (Chang & Chen, 2013; Chang et al., 2019; Song & Yu, 2018). Other researchers suggest that some aspects attributed to the organizational identity can be linked to anthropomorphic features. Thus, human-like characteristics or behaviors, like friendliness or ruthlessness, are attributed to the organization and its identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1996; Ashforth et al., 2020). However, not only human-like characteristics are ascribed a vital role in the organizational identity, but central individuals like founders can also play a crucial part. Consequently, when constructing their organizational identity, organizations may also systematically refer to founding figures, even though they have already passed away (Basque & Langley, 2018; Boers & Ljungkvist, 2019). Accordingly, research has shown that the construction of organizational identity involves not only aspects that relate to the present but also the organization's self-declared future or its past (Ran & Duimering, 2007). In this regard, entrepreneurs should formulate their vision of the future in accordance with past-related statements so that a coherent picture evolves (Suddaby et al., 2021).

Especially the utilization of the past is essential in constructing organizational identity (e.g., Ferri & Takahashi, 2022; Foroughi, 2020; Foster et al., 2016; Oertel & Thommes, 2018; Schultz & Hernes, 2013; Sinha et al., 2020; Suddaby et al., 2010). Integrating the past into the present is defined as history (Wadhawani et al., 2018). Zundel et al. (2016) emphasize that "[h]istory and identity may be particularly strongly linked given the centrality of narrative and storytelling to identity formation" (p. 212). However, history in organizations does not represent a straightforward reality but is utilized strategically through its reinterpretation and reconstruction (Bastien et al., 2020; Ge et al., 2022). In this process, organizations accentuate certain elements of the past, such as achievements or successes, but forget other critical historical phases, that tend to reflect the darker and turbulent side of the past (Maclean et al., 2018; Raffaelli, 2019; Schultz & Hernes, 2013; Stigliani & Ravasi, 2007). Similar behavior can be observed among organizational members as they also reframe, deny, or even ignore negative aspects of the past (Anteby & Molnár, 2012; Felix, 2020; Foroughi, 2020; Hatch & Schultz, 2017; Sasaki et al., 2020). Thus, it is a "rhetorical construction that can be shaped and manipulated to motivate, persuade, and shape action, both inside and outside an organization" (Suddaby et al., 2010, p. 147) and does not serve as a simple artifact (Ge et al., 2022). Due to its difficult imitability and easy manipulation, rhetorical history is applied as a strategic tool to achieve specific organizational goals, such as differentiating the organization from others based on its historical origins (Foster et al., 2011; Foster et al., 2017; Suddaby & Jaskiewicz, 2020). Moreover, it provides a competitive advantage by evoking legitimacy and authenticity (Cappelen & Pedersen, 2021; Clegg et al., 2007; Hamilton & D'Ippolito, 2022; Suddaby et al., 2010; Zundel et al., 2016).

In addition to these advantages, others are reflected in different life cycle stages making organizational identity a key aspect in each particular life stage of an organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985): For recently founded organizations, organizational identity not only serves to represent what the organization stands for, but it also provides stakeholders with assurance about the organization's importance (Corley & Gioia, 2004; Lerpold et al., 2007). This way, founders can leave a lasting imprint on the organization internally and, at the same time, aim to increase employee attractiveness and gain support from stakeholders, such as customers and investors, externally (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001; Snihur & Clarysse, 2022).

Later in the organization's life, organizational identity serves to "legitimize the organization and its action" (Ashforth & Mael, 1996, p. 29; see also Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Fisher et al., 2016; He & Baruch, 2010; Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001; Navis & Glynn, 2011; Sillince & Brown, 2009). For example, employees compare organizational identity to the actions taken by management to assess the legitimacy of those actions (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). Therefore, organizational identity also has a direction-setting function by providing rules of action and guiding the everyday behavior of managers and employees (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Annosi et al., 2017; He & Brown, 2013).

Furthermore, an organization's identity can foster employees' identification with the organization (Dutton et al., 1994). Since the employees regard the organization as a part of their self, they work harder to achieve the organization's goals and objectives (Avanzi et al., 2021; Fiol, 2001). Hence, managing organizational identity not only helps increase current employees' loyalty and retention but also gives organization access to larger and higher-quality applicant pools (Bankins & Waterhouse, 2019). Moreover, organizational identity is crucial in strategic decision-making processes (Hoon & Jacobs, 2014; Riantoputra, 2010) and forms expectations concerning appropriate and inappropriate strategies (Wickert et al., 2017). Some scholars argue that an interdependent relationship exists between the organizational identity, which tends to be mainly based on the past, and the future-oriented strategy (Corley, 2004; Lang, 2022; Ravasi et al., 2020; Sillince & Simpson, 2010; Stanske et al., 2019). Thus, organizational identity and strategy "are intertwined such that an organization may enact and express a valued identity through strategy and may infer, modify, or affirm an identity from strategy and the responses it evokes" (Ashforth & Mael, 1996, p. 33). Consequently, aligning organizational identity and strategy is essential for organizational survival (Athony & Tripsas, 2016; Bövers & Hoon, 2021). Besides serving as a source of strategy, organizational identity also facilitates positioning the organization in the market (Drori et al., 2016; Foster et al., 2017) and provides the organization with a competitive advantage through differentiation (Albert et al., 2000; Corley et al., 2006; Fiol, 1991; Langley et al., 2020). Moreover, organizations may use their identity to underline where they intend to go in the future in line with the question "Who [do] we want to be?" (Gioia & Thomas, 1996, p. 383) and "as a rudder for navigating difficult waters" (Albert et al., 2000, p. 13). This indicates that organizational identity is also essential in times of crisis and ensures organizational life and success (Annosi et al., 2017; Cornelissen et al., 2007; He & Baruch, 2010; He & Brown, 2013; Pugliese et al., 2022).

Consequently, organizational identity is not only crucial in the early stages of an organization's life cycle but also heavily influences the further course. Due to its effect on strategic decisions, it impacts both the organization's success and employee behavior. Being defined as the "soul" or "essence" of the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1996), scholars describe organizational identity as the central and most meaningful construct in organizational studies (Ravasi & Canato, 2013; Lang, 2022). As a result, organizational identity has become an increasingly important research area for scholars from a variety of disciplines, including, e.g., organizational behavior, organizational strategy, organizational theory, marketing, organizational psychology, and public relations (Ashforth et al., 2020; Brown, 2006; Haslam et al., 2017). This dissertation adds to this discourse with five papers.

Paper 1 focuses on Albert and Whetten's (1985) seminal work, which has become ubiquitous in the research field and is much referenced. By conducting a systematic literature review, we provide an overview of the parts of Albert and Whetten's (1985) organizational identity conceptualization that have been incorporated into subsequent research and how they have influenced research. We also shed light on the parts that have been approached less frequently and give scope for future research.

Paper 2 investigates the claims used by the organization for the sensegiving and organizational members for the sensemaking process. Previous studies underline that both use a set of claims for organizational identity construction. However, little research has been conducted on how and why differences between these constructions occur. Therefore, this paper gives a first insight into why these differences may arise, developing a theoretical model based on the results.

Paper 3 considers the use of rhetorical history for constructing organizational identity. More specifically, it aims to enhance our understanding of the success of rhetorical history and to identify patterns in its usage. In this respect, success is achieved when employees re-narrate the rhetorical history used by the organization. For this purpose, we investigate commonalities and idiosyncrasies in employees' resonance with rhetorical history claims and the occurrence of these claims in relation to absolute and relative temporal references.

Paper 4 explores organizational pride and the organizational identity elements by which it is triggered. Although organizational pride has been considered the most intensely experienced emotion in work-life, this construct has not received sufficient consideration. The paper provides a first insight into the elements of organizational identity that evoke organizational pride and concludes with propositions for future research. Furthermore, a theoretical model is developed to visualize the relationship between organizational identity and organizational pride.

As explicated before, the founding period is critical for organizational identity. During this time, founders often leave a residual imprint on the organization (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001; Snihur & Clarysse, 2022). Furthermore, important founding conditions become imprinted and remain over time (Levinthal, 2003). Introducing the idea of organizational imprinting, Stinchcombe (1965) states that organizations are permanently shaped by their founding context. Thus, this affects organizational identity (Bryant, 2014). Consequently, organizational values, practices, and routines, which may be part of organizational identity, may also be imprinted and long-lasting (Corley et al., 2006; Selznick, 1992). Thereby, unethical values and practices, including corrupt behavior, may be imprinted, as well. Paper 5 examines how the institutional environment at the time of founding persistently shapes perceptions of corruption that, in turn, are also imprinted in the organizational identity. Additionally, Paper 5 focuses on how institutional changes affect perceptions of values and business practices.

2 Presentation of Papers

As demonstrated in the foregoing, this dissertation comprises five self-contained research articles. The manuscripts differ regarding their research objective, scope, and style since they are prepared for submission to peer-reviewed scholarly journals in their own regard. In the following, I elucidate the research objectives and relevance of the papers, outline the main results, and summarize how these papers extend the scientific discourse. Moreover, Tables 1 to 5 list the papers' publications at scientific conferences and their status in the submission process of scientific journals.

(1) K. Knorr, F. Hein-Pensel (2022) "Since Albert and Whetten: The Dissemination of Albert and Whetten's Conceptualization of Organizational Identity". *Management Review Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-022-00311-7

The concept of organizational identity has become ubiquitous in various fields since the seminal work of Albert and Whetten (1985). Precisely, several studies have characterized Albert and Whetten's (1985) concept as an essential contribution (Gioia et al., 2000; He & Brown, 2013) and foundation for further research (Albert et al., 2000; Corley et al., 2006). Additionally, Albert et al. (2000, p. 13) describe it as a "root construct" for organizational research as they develop over 30 hypotheses highlighting further investigation.

Although previous literature reviews refer to organizational identity in general (e.g., He & Brown, 2013), none of them explains which parts or hypotheses of Albert and Whetten's (1985) seminal paper have been considered in research, which have been left out, and which potentially offer further research avenues. Therefore, it is vital to appreciate the foundation that Albert and Whetten (1985) have laid and to identify the parts of their concept that have been spread in order to better understand the organizational identity field that emerged from their research.

We systematically review the dissemination of Albert and Whetten's (1985) conceptualization of organizational identity by analyzing 1,041 English papers published between 1985 and mid-2022 that cite Albert and Whetten (1985) and listed in the Web of Science online databank.

The analysis consists of a combination of quantitative and qualitative text analyses. First, we applied topic modeling, yielding a probability distribution over topics for each document. The topic with the highest probability (i.e., dominant topic) provides a reliable indication of the document's main content. This quantitative text analysis revealed 18 significantly different topics. Second, we complemented the quantitative results of topic modeling with qualitative content analysis. Specifically, each topic was contextualized with first-order concepts. By comparing these first-order concepts, we generalized shared second-order themes. The first-order concepts and second-order themes were then used to derive the following five aggregated dimensions inductively: (1) Strategic Management (consisting of papers focusing on corporate governance, leadership, and their strategic application), (2) Organizational Fields (including papers that focus on specific types of businesses), (3) Organizational Development (considering papers that share a thematic focus on the organizational changes triggered by demands or obstacles and papers that focus on organizational development through the strategic and conscious change of the organizational identity), (4) Methodology/Research Approach (summarizing papers highlighting or using different empirical methods), and the most dominant aggregated dimension (5) Organizational Theory Research (consisting of papers that focus on the theoretical enrichment of organizational identity research).

Moreover, we employed a keyword-in-context analysis by searching citations of Albert and Whetten (1985) in the dataset and investigating how and which parts of the organizational identity concept are embedded in the literature. The results reveal that Albert and Whetten's (1985) three basic criteria an organizational identity has to satisfy—central character, distinctiveness, and temporal continuity—are frequently used to describe and characterize the phenomena of organizational identity. Moreover, we observe differences regarding the utilization of their hypotheses. While the hypotheses that concern the perception of organizational identity, especially internal identity, are frequently referenced, the hypotheses concerning the organizational life cycle or the comparison of organization types have found little resonance. The same applies to the methodological approach suggested by Albert and Whetten (1985). Accordingly, Albert and Whetten's (1985) conceptualization of organizational identity is only partially adopted in the literature.

By discussing and unveiling these findings, this study highlights research areas of organizational identity that give scope for future research and thereby contributes to organizational identity research. In particular, further research questions on the evolving character of organizational identity, the research methodology (i.e., metaphor analysis), and quantitative operationalization can be raised.

(2) F. Hein-Pensel, K. Knorr, S. Oertel, K. Thommes (2022) “The Face and the Soul of the Organization: Factors Explaining Differences between Organizational Image and Organizational Identity”.

Previous research underlines that organizational identity is considered a sensemaking process when organizational members’ negotiated understanding of “who we are as an organization” is approached (Aeon & Lamertz, 2021; Ashforth, 2016). In contrast, the sensegiving process describing what organizations actively communicate about themselves, who the organization is and what it does is labeled organizational image[2] (e.g., Balmer & Burghausen, 2019; Burghausen & Balmer, 2014). Although several researchers have already proposed an interaction between organizational identity and organizational image (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Gioia et al., 2000; Ravasi, 2016), addressing the differences and the factors that explain them has not received sufficient attention. However, approaching this research gap is of high importance as an interdependency between organizational identity and image exists. Significant discrepancies between the two can affect organizational members’ identity work (e.g., Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Kjærgaard et al., 2011), lead to changes in identity (Gioia et al., 2000), and damage the organizational members’ commitment and loyalty (Boros, 2009; Christensen & Askegaard, 2001). Moreover, aligning organizational identity and image is essential to successfully manage identity-threatening events (Ravasi et al., 2020).

Therefore, we analyze which content is used to construct the organizational identity as well as the image. In particular, we investigate the differences between these two constructs following a case study approach based on four German watchmaking organizations. We used two different data sources: First, for the organizational identity as a sensemaking process, we focused on 38 interviews with current and former members, managers, and

[2] In the previous chapter, the sensegiving process is presented as organizational identity from the perspective of the social actor. In Paper 2, this is labeled as organizational image. The reason for this is that in the literature organizational image is defined, on the one hand, as the projected characteristics the organization formulates and directs at outsiders. On the other hand, organizational image is defined as the reflected representation of the organization by outsiders (Rodrigues & Krishnamurthy, 2016). The former definition coincides with the one from the first chapter of this dissertation.

founders of these organizations. Second, to analyze the image defined by the organization for sensegiving, we used the organizations' self-representation on their websites.

By building on a comparative case method, the study points to organizational identity and image relying on similar claims regarding the holding group, roots, cluster, corporate culture, and corporate mission. Yet, they may differ content-wise. These findings confirm previous research that similar claims are used for organizational identity and image construction (Zundel et al., 2016). However, our results indicate that, while organizational members interpret these claims subjectively and idiosyncratically, the organizational image serves as an aggregated understanding of who the organization is and what the organization does (Ashforth, 2016; Wiley, 1988), which can differ from the impressions and understanding of the organizational identity of the members.

Moreover, we observe that internal factors, such as desired reputation or hierarchies and external factors, such as the local cluster density or geographic scope are central to the differences between organizational identity and image. Furthermore, depending on their scope of power, decision-makers can significantly influence the degree of differences between organizational image and identity by serving as a kind of mediator.

Although prior research reports that the two constructs are influenced by the same factors, it falls short in identifying them (Dhalla, 2007) and investigating the role of content in the identity-image relationship (Morsing & Roepstorff, 2015). Hence, by exploring these factors, we extend the state of the art of previous literature on the relationship, management and alignment of the two constructs.

Based on the theoretical framework and the study's results, we develop a model that illustrates the interdependence of organizational identity and image, including the factors that may evoke the differences between the two. Accordingly, we contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between organizational image and identity.

(3) F. Hein-Pensel, K. Knorr, S. Oertel, K. Thommes (2022) "Echos from the Past: The Temporal and Context Orchestration of Rhetorical History".

Organizations strategically utilize the past in the form of rhetorical history (Foster et al., 2017; Suddaby et al., 2022) to craft their organizational identity (Ferri & Takahashi, 2022; Lyle et al., 2022; Oertel & Thommes, 2018). Although many studies on rhetorical history and organizations' utilization of the past have been published (e.g., Ferri & Takahashi, 2022; Sinha et al., 2020), only a few address how rhetorical history is crafted by organizations and particularly how members of the organization re-narrate this offered interpretation of the past (Aeon & Lamertz, 2021). The question of resonance, however, is crucial to reach a better understanding of the success of rhetorical history. Despite the relevance of this question, research on commonalities and idiosyncrasies in organizational members' resonance with rhetorical history is still in its infancy (Suddaby et al., 2020; Suddaby et al., 2022).

By using quantitative and qualitative content analyses of 18 organizational web pages and 74 interviews with employees, our study addresses these research gaps. Our results indicate that seven claims of rhetorical history are both used by organizations and echoed by employees. However, our findings suggest that organizations refer more likely to points in time over which they have agency, stress crucial things they have deliberately chosen to do, and highlight internal turning points. Thus, in crafting rhetorical history, organizations mainly pronounce their active role and agency. Employees, in contrast, are more likely to echo external turning points, that is, narratives that have taken place in the organization, and put the organization in a more passive role. To some extent, this finding allows us to draw conclusions for studies on forgetting in the context of rhetorical history (Foroughi et al., 2020). Our study shows that forgetting has patterns and does not seem to affect all claims of rhetorical history to the same degree.

Moreover, analyzing the occurrences of rhetorical history claims in relation to their temporal reference, we observe that the past is not utilized in a consistent and linear sequence. The results reveal that organizations generally use temporal references differently compared to employees. However, there are shared peaks in temporal references to the past, which can be attributed to significant historical events.

Besides the absolute measuring of time, we also considered the relative view of time since more recent work increasingly emphasizes its importance (Shipp & Jansen, 2021). We observe that similarities between the rhetorical history used by the organization and the employees' re-narration become particularly obvious when treating time relatively—i.e., relative to the organization's age and independent of the objective time elapsed. This common pattern leads to shared valleys of oblivion and suggests that the temporal orientation of narrations shares some commonalities. Thus, we find patterns to suggest that rhetorical history revolves around a so-called reminiscence bump in which particular periods are better remembered than others (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000; Hirst et al., 2018). This synchrony allows us to rule out external effects since they are basically absolute in time, and our findings do not indicate that such external effects are treated relatively. Hence, we contribute to the existing discourse by showing that re-narrations of rhetorical history follow the human tendency to stress first and last events with only a cursory acknowledgment of events in between (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000; Hirst et al., 2018).

(4) K. Knorr (2022) "The Relationship between Organizational Pride and Organizational Identity: An Explorative Study".

Until now, scholars have mainly investigated aspects triggered by organizational pride, highlighting their primarily positive effects on organizational behavior (e.g., Kraemer & Gouthier, 2014; Zhou et al., 2018), the organization's competitive advantage, and its success (Katzenbach, 2003). In light of the high importance of organizational pride regarding these outcomes, it is essential to identify the antecedents of pride. Here, scholars observe that the organization's successful advertising campaigns (Celsi & Gilly, 2010), the brand, and the image can instill organizational pride (Scott & Lane, 2000). Thus, a connection between organizational pride and organizational identity is plausible. However, this connection has not been analyzed yet. Similarly, Durrah et al. (2020) have recently suggested that a relationship between organizational pride and organizational identity may exist and appeal for further investigation. Hence, this paper follows their suggestion and aims to bridge the two constructs of organizational identity and organizational pride in order to investigate which elements of organizational identity represent determinants for organizational pride among employees. Moreover, I also seek to determine if specific individual characteristics of organizational members and the organization's length of history moderate the relationship between organizational identity and pride and favor the existence of organizational pride.

To investigate what specific elements of organizational identity instill pride, I conducted personal interviews with 60 employees of the eleven organizations located in the watchmaking cluster in East Germany. Following the approach of Gioia, Corley, et al. (2013), I subsequently employed first-order open coding in the next step. This resulted in three organizational elements that instill organizational pride. Moreover, the results suggest that especially elements concerning the organization itself instill organizational pride, followed by the organization’s products and location/industry.

Additionally, I identify differences in pride-triggering identity elements when considering individual and organizational characteristics. I also find that employees can be both proud and not proud of the organization at the same time due to its organizational identity. In the course of the analysis, it also became apparent that, in addition to the direct influence of the organizational identity elements on employees’ pride, external parties’ opinions, especially peers, influence the formation of pride among employees. Thus, peers who perceive the organizational identity positively can also indirectly evoke pride. Based on these findings, I propose possible directions for future research and develop a first theoretical model for the relationship between organizational identity and organizational pride.

Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, it is the first attempt to consider organizational identity as an antecedent of organizational pride. Therefore, the results extend the existing scientific research on organizational pride by identifying further triggers. Additionally, this paper contributes to the literature on organizational identity since prior research mainly focuses on the construction of organizational identity and not what it entails (Alvesson & Robertson, 2016).

(5) T. Auer, K. Knorr, K. Thommes (2022) “Long-term Effects of Institutional Conditions on Perceived Corruption – A Study on Organizational Imprinting in Post-Communist Countries”. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, *32*(2), 478-497. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12506

In Central and Eastern European countries, corruption is still remarkably prevalent (Kriauciunas & Kale, 2006; Sandholtz & Taagepera, 2005). However, it varies among these countries (Karklins, 2002; Lambsdorff, 2007; Transparency International, 2018). One explanation for this variation is the imprinting of the communist legacy and its temporal effects. Imprinting theory suggests that structures of the initial phase of organizations are persistent and that perceptions of possible actions are shaped by these imprinted structures (Marquis & Tilcsik, 2013; Stinchcombe, 1965). Accordingly, organizations exposed to an institutional environment favoring corrupt behavior in their initial phase will internalize these perceptions over time and continue to pursue opportunities for unethical behavior. Only severe shocks may change imprinted features and thus perceptions of viable actions

(Dieleman, 2010; Dixon et al., 2007). Understanding why some organizations are more prone to corruption in certain environments in the first place is helpful in subsequently examining the effects of changes in the environment on organizational behavior (Zyglidopoulos et al., 2017). Thus, we investigate how the institutional environment at the time of founding persistently shapes managers' perceptions of corruption imprinted on the organizational structure.

We provide an empirical analysis using the survey data of the 5th round of the Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey. By running an ordinal logit regression, this study shows that managers of organizations founded earlier in a communist environment indicate a significantly higher perception of corruption at present time. Therefore, we infer that a longer exposure to the institutional environment solidifies and reinforces these perceptions over time through internal transmission. This outcome aligns with the findings of Banalieva et al. (2017) and Marquis and Qiao (2020) on the importance of the duration of communist influence on the organizational structure. The results also confirm the suggestion formulated by imprinting theory that the time of founding has a lasting impact on the organizational structure (Marquis & Tilcsik, 2013).

Moreover, by using a regression-discontinuity design, this study finds significant changes in the present perception of corruption for organizations founded before and after both a sudden (dissolution of Soviet Union) and smooth (EU accession) transition of the institutional environment. Comparing these organizations founded in varying institutional environments, we argue that the internalized values and policies at the time of founding conveyed by the institutional environment have a persisting effect on the organizations and their perceptions of corruption. We also point out that an institutional transformation aligns with changing values and policies adopted by the newly established organizations, leading to significant differences in perceptions of corruption. This result is in line with the idea of Dieleman's (2010) shock-imprinting, suggesting that sensitive periods affect organizational structures consistently.

Our results advance the scientific discourse by adding to the research on the susceptibility of organizational imprints during periods of institutional transition using perceptions of unethical behavior of organizations in countries affected by significant changes in the institutional environment. First, we demonstrate that the imprint of the organizational structure is intensified and less susceptible to temporal dynamics when more time for internalization is given. Second, we further the existing literature by not only considering the differences between the present perception of corruption in organizations founded immediately before and immediately after an upheaval period characterized by many insecurities but also by comparing the effects to those in a steady transition of the institutional environment. Thus, we gain a better understanding of the effect of institutional transformations on organizational imprints by indicating the significance of changing institutional policies for the adoption of aligning practices among newly established organizations.

We also outline managerial and policy implications deduced from our elaboration by highlighting the threat of normalized and transmitted conduct of unethical behavior that manifests in the organizations' structures and environments if the root causes for its emergence are not counteracted.

References

Aeon, B., & Lamertz, K. (2021). Those who control the past control the future: The dark side of rhetorical history. *Organization Studies, 42*(4), 575-593.

Albert, S., Ashforth, B., & Dutton, J. (2000). Organizational identity and identification: charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 13-17.

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *7*, 263-295.

Alvesson, M., & Empson, L. (2008). The construction of organizational identity: Comparative case studies of consulting firms. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *24*(1), 1-16.

Alvesson, M., & Robertson, M. (2016). Organizational identity – a critique. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp.160-180). Oxford University Press.

Annosi, M. C., Foss, N., Brunetta, F., & Magnusson, M. (2017). The interaction of control systems and stakeholder networks in shaping the identities of self-managed teams. *Organization Studies*, *38*(5), 619-645.

Anteby, M., & Molnár, V. (2012). Collective memory meets organizational identity: Remembering to forget in a firm's rhetorical history. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*(3), 515-540.

Anthony, C., & Tripsas, M. (2016). Organizational identity and innovation. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp. 417-435). Oxford University Press.

Ashforth, B. E. (2016). Organizational, subunit, and individual identities. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp. 79–92). Oxford University Press.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. A. (1996). Organizational Identity and Strategy as a Context for the Individual. *Advances in Strategic Management*, *13*, 19-64.

Ashforth, B. E., Schinoff, B. S., & Brickson, S. L. (2020). "My company is friendly,""Mine's a Rebel": anthropomorphism and shifting organizational identity from "What" to "Who". *Academy of Management Review*, *45*(1), 29-57.

Avanzi, L., Perinelli, E., Bressan, M., Balducci, C., Lombardi, L., Fraccaroli, F., & van Dick, R. (2021). The mediational effect of social support between organizational identification and employees' health: a three-wave study on the social cure model. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, *34*(4), 465-478.

Balmer, J. M. T., & Burghausen, M. (2019). Marketing, the past and corporate heritage. *Marketing Theory*, *19*(2), 217-227.

Banalieva, E. R., Karam, C. M., Ralston, D. A., Elenkov, D., Naoumova, I., Dabic, M., . . . Wallace, A. (2017). Communist footprint and subordinate influence behavior in post-communist transition economies. *Journal of World Business, 52*(2), 209-229.

Bankins, S., & Waterhouse, J. (2019). Organizational identity, image, and reputation: Examining the influence on perceptions of employer attractiveness in public sector organizations. *International Journal of Public Administration, 42*(3), 218-229.

Bartel, C., Baldi, C., & Dukerich, J. M. (2016). Fostering stakeholder identificatiton through expressed organizational identities. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp.475-493). Oxford University Press.

Basque, J., & Langley, A. (2018). Invoking Alphonse: The founder figure as a historical resource for organizational identity work. *Organization Studies*, *39*(12), 1685-1708.

Bastien, F., Foster, W. M., & Coraiola, D. M. (2020). Don’t talk about history: Indigenous views about the past and their implication for Organization Studies. In M. Maclean, S. R. Clegg, R. Suddaby & C. Harvey (Eds.), *Historical Organization Studies* (pp.90-103) London: Routledge.

Boers, B., & Ljungkvist, T. (2019). A founder's heritage: the development of organizational identity. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *31*(1), 73-95.

Boros, S. (2009). Identity and image: The soul and face of organizations. In S. Boros (Ed.), *Exploring Organizational Dynamics* (pp. 644-654). SAGE.

Bövers, J., & Hoon, C. (2021). Surviving disruptive change: The role of history in aligning strategy and identity in family businesses. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 12*(4), 100391.

Brown, A. D. (2006). A narrative approach to collective identities. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(4), 731-753.

Bryant, P. T. (2014). Imprinting by Design: The Microfoundations of Entrepreneurial Adaptation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 38*(5), 1081-1102.

Burghausen, M., & Balmer, J. M. (2014). Corporate heritage identity management and the multi-modal implementation of a corporate heritage identity. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(11), 2311-2323.

Cappelen, M. S., & Pedersen, J. S. (2021). Inventing culinary heritage through strategic historical ambiguity. *Organization Studies, 42*(2), 223-243.

Celsi, M. W., & Gilly, M. C. (2010). Employees as internal audience: how advertising affects employees’ customer focus. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 38*(4), 520-529.

Chang, C. H., & Chen, Y. S. (2013). Green organizational identity and green innovation. *Management Decision*, *51*(5), 1056-1070.

Chang, T. W., Chen, F. F., Luan, H. D., & Chen, Y. S. (2019). Effect of green organizational identity, green shared vision, and organizational citizenship behavior for the environment on green product development performance. *Sustainability*, *11*(3), 617.

Christensen, L. T., & Askegaard, S. (2001). Corporate identity and corporate image revisited: A semiotic perspective. *European Journal of Marketing*, *35*(3/4), 292-315.

Clark, E., & Geppert, M. (2011). Subsidiary integration as identity construction and institution building: A political sensemaking approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, *48*(2), 395-416.

Clegg, S. R., Rhodes, C., & Kornberger, M. (2007). Desperately seeking legitimacy: Organizational identity and emerging industries. *Organization Studies*, *28*(4), 495-513.

Cole, M. S., & Bruch, H. (2006). Organizational identity strength, identification, and commitment and their relationships to turnover intention: Does organizational hierarchy matter?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *27*(5), 585-605.

Conway, M. A., & Pleydell-Pearce, C. W. (2000). The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. *Psychological Review*, *107*(2), 261-288.

Corley, K. G. (2004). Defined by our strategy or our culture? Hierarchical differences in perceptions of organizational identity and change. *Human Relations*, *57*(9), 1145-1177.

Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2004). Identity ambiguity and change in the wake of a corporate spin-off. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *49*(2), 173-208.

Corley, K. G., Harquail, C. V., Pratt, M. G., Glynn, M. A., Fiol, M., & Hatch, M. J. (2006). Guiding organizational identity through aged adolescence. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *15*(2), 85-99.

Cornelissen, J. P., Haslam, S. A., & Balmer, J. M. (2007). Social identity, organizational identity and corporate identity: Towards an integrated understanding of processes, patternings and products. *British Journal of Management*, *18*(1), S1-S16.

Dhalla, R. (2007). The construction of organizational identity: Key contributing external and intra-organizational factors. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *10*(4), 245-260.

Dieleman, M. (2010). Shock-imprinting: External shocks and ethnic Chinese business groups in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *27*(3), 481-502.

Dixon, S. E. A., Meyer, K. E., & Day, M. (2007). Exploitation and exploration learning and the development of organizational capabilities: Case studies of the Russian oil industry. *Human Relations*, *60*(10), 1493-1523.

Drori, G. S., Delmestri, G., & Oberg, A. (2016). The iconography of universities as institutional narratives. *Higher Education*, *71*(2), 163-180.

Durrah, O., Allil, K., Gharib, M., & Hannawi, S. (2020). Organizational pride as an antecedent of employee creativity in the petrochemical industry. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *24*(2), 572-588.

Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(3), 517-554.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*(2), 239-263.

Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(3) 442-476.

Felix, B. (2020). Analyzing the formation of a paradoxical organizational identity. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *28*(6), 1227-1241.

Ferri, P., & Takahashi, A. R. W. (2022). Standing the test of time: understanding how long-living family firms make use of the past to preserve organizational identity. *Management & Organizational History, 17*(1-2), 76-96.

Fiol, C. M. (1991). Managing culture as a competitive resource: An identity-based view of sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 191-211.

Fiol, C. M. (2001). Revisiting an identity-based view of sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, *27*(6), 691-699.

Fisher, G., Kotha, S., & Lahiri, A. (2016). Changing with the times: An Integrated View of Identity, Legitimacy, and New Venture Life Cycles. *Academy of Management Review, 41*(3), 383-409.

Foroughi, H. (2020). Collective memories as a vehicle of fantasy and identification: Founding stories retold. *Organization Studies*, *41*(10), 1347-1367.

Foroughi, H., Coraiola, D. M., Rintamäki, J., Mena, S., & Foster, W. M. (2020). Organizational memory studies. *Organization Studies, 41*(12), 1725-1748.

Foster, W. M., Coraiola, D., & Suddaby, R. R. (2016). Useful rhetorical history: An ideographic analysis of Fortune 500 corporations. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 62, 12707.

Foster, W. M., Coraiola, D. M., Suddaby, R., Kroezen, J., & Chandler, D. (2017). The strategic use of historical narratives: A theoretical framework. *Business History, 59*(8), 1176-1200.

Foster, W. M., Suddaby, R., Minkus, A., & Wiebe, E. (2011). History as social memory assets: The example of Tim Hortons. *Management & Organizational History, 6*(1), 101-120.

Ge, B., De Massis, A., & Kotlar, J. (2022). Mining the past: History scripting strategies and competitive advantage in a family business. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 46*(1), 223-251.

Gioia, D. A. (1998). From Individual to Organizational Identity. In D. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in Organizations: Building Theory Through Conversations* (pp. 17-32). SAGE Publications.

Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal, 12*(6), 433-448.

Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods, 16*(1), 15-31.

Gioia, D. A., & Hamilton, A. L. (2016). Great debates in organizational identity study. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp. 21-38). Oxford University Press.

Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(3), 370-403.

Gioia, D. A., Patvardhan, S. D., Hamilton, A. L., & Corley, K. G. (2013). Organizational Identity Formation and Change. *The Academy of Management Annals, 7*(1), 123-193.

Gioia, D. A., Price, K. N., Hamilton, A. L., & Thomas, J. B. (2010). Forging an identity: An insider-outsider study of processes involved in the formation of organizational identity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *55*(1), 1-46.

Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 63-81.

Hamilton, S., & D'Ippolito, B. (2022). From Monsanto to 'Monsatan': Ownership and control of history as a strategic resource. *Business History*, 64(6), 1040-1070.

Haslam, S. A., Cornelissen, J. P., & Werner, M. D. (2017). Metatheories and metaphors of organizational identity: Integrating social constructionist, social identity, and social actor perspectives within a social interactionist model. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *19*(3), 318-336.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2017). Toward a theory of using history authentically: Historicizing in the Carlsberg Group. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 62(4), 657-697.

He, H., & Balmer, J. M. T. (2007). Identity studies: Multiple perspectives and implications for corporate-level marketing. *European Journal of Marketing, 41*(7/8), 765-785.

He, H., & Baruch, Y. (2010). Organizational identity and legitimacy under major environmental changes: Tales of two UK building societies. *British Journal of Management*, *21*(1), 44-62.

He, H., & Brown, A. D. (2013). Organizational identity and organizational identification: A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Group & Organization Management*, *38*(1), 3-35.

Hirst, W., Yamashiro, J. K., & Coman, A. (2018). Collective memory from a psychological perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 22*(5), 438-451.

Hoon, C., & Jacobs, C. D. (2014). Beyond belief: Strategic taboos and organizational identity in strategic agenda setting. *Strategic Organization, 12*(4), 244-273.

Hsu, G., & Elsbach, K. D. (2013). Explaining variation in organizational identity categorization. *Organization Science*, *24*(4), 996-1013.

Karklins, R. (2002). Typology of post-communist corruption. *Problems of post-communism. 49*(4), 22-32.

Katzenbach, J. (2003). Pride: a strategic asset. *Strategy & Leadership, 31*(5), 34-38.

Kjærgaard, A., Morsing, M., & Ravasi, D. (2011). Mediating Identity: A study of media influence on organizational identity construction in a celebrity firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, *48*(3), 514-543.

Kraemer, T., & Gouthier, M. H. (2014). How organizational pride and emotional exhaustion explain turnover intentions in call centers. *Journal of Service Management, 25*(1), 125-148.

Kriauciunas, A., & Kale, P. (2006). The impact of socialist imprinting and search on resource change: a study of firms in Lithuania. *Strategic Management Journal, 27*(7), 659-679.

Lambsdorff, J. G. (2007). *The methodology of the corruption perceptions index 2008*. Transparency International, University of Passau.

Lang, T. (2022). Being and becoming: Reconciling the temporal mismatch between organizational identity and strategy by providing identity with a future. *Strategic Management Review*.

Langley, A., Oliver, D., & Rouleau, L. (2020). Strategy and identities in organizations. In A. D. Brown (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organizations* (pp. 780-798). Oxford University Press.

Lerpold, L., Ravasi, D., Van Rekom, J., & Soenen, G. (2007). *Organizational identity in practice*. Routledge.

Levine, D. J., & Eckerd, A. (2019). Organizational sensegiving: Indicators and nonprofit signaling. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *30*(2), 213-231.

Levinthal, D.A. (2003). Imprinting and the evolution of firm capabilities. In C.E. Helfat (Ed.), *The SMS Blackwell handbook of organizational capabilities: Emergence, development, and change* (pp. 100–103). Blackwell.

Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, *22*(6-7), 545-564.

Lyle, M. C., Walsh, I. J., & Coraiola, D. M. (2022). What is NORML? Sedimented Meanings in Ambiguous Organizational Identities. *Organization Studies*, *43*(12), 1991–2012.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C., Sillince, J. A., & Golant, B. D. (2018). Intertextuality, rhetorical history and the uses of the past in organizational transition. *Organization Studies,* 39(12), 1733-1755.

Margolis, S. L., & Hansen, C. D. (2002). A model for organizational identity: Exploring the path to sustainability during change. *Human Resource Development Review*, *1*(3), 277-303.

Marquis, C., & Tilcsik, A. (2013). Imprinting: Toward a multilevel theory. *Academy of Management Annals, 7*(1), 193-243.

Marquis, C., & Qiao, K. (2020). Waking from Mao's dream: Communist ideological imprinting and the internationalization of entrepreneurial ventures in China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(3), 795-830.

Morsing, M., & Roepstorff, A. (2015). CSR as corporate political activity: Observations on IKEA's CSR identity-image dynamics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *128*(2), 395-409.

Nag, R., Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2007). The intersection of organizational identity, knowledge, and practice: Attempting strategic change via knowledge grafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(4), 821-847.

Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimate distinctiveness and the entrepreneurial identity: Influence on investor judgments of new venture plausibility. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(3), 479-499.

Oertel, S., & Thommes, K. (2018). History as a source of organizational identity creation. *Organization Studies*, *39*(12), 1709-1731.

Oliver, D., & Roos, J. (2007). Beyond text: Constructing organizational identity multimodally. *British Journal of Management*, *18*(4), 342-358.

Oliver, D., & Vough, H. C. (2020). Practicing identity in emergent firms: How practices shape founders' organizational identity claims. *Strategic Organization*, *18*(1), 75-105.

Ortiz, L. (2022). Leveraging the organizational mission statement to communicate identity, distinctiveness and purpose to primary and secondary stakeholders during COVID-19. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, *15*(2), 234-255.

Pratt, M. G., Schultz, M., Ashforth, B. E., & Ravasi, D. (2016). Introduction: Organizational Identity, Mapping Where We Have Been, Where We Are, and Where We Might Go. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp. 1-20). Oxford University Press.

Pugliese, E., Pica, G., Bonaiuto, F., Cancellieri, U. G., van Knippenberg, D., & Bonaiuto, M. (2022). Coping with organizational crisis: buffering effects of organization sector prototypicality and employee organizational identification. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1-17.

Raffaelli, R. (2019). Technology reemergence: Creating new value for old technologies in Swiss mechanical watchmaking, 1970–2008. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *64*(3), 576-618.

Ran, B., & Duimering, P. R. (2007). Imaging the organization: Language use in organizational identity claims. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *21*(2), 155-187.

Ran, B., & Golden, T. J. (2011). Who are we? The social construction of organizational identity through sense-exchanging. *Administration & Society*, *43*(4), 417-445.

Ravasi, D. (2016). Organizational identity, culture, and image. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp. 65-78). Oxford University Press.

Ravasi, D., & Canato, A. (2013). How do I know who you think you are? A review of research methods on organizational identity. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *15*(2), 185-204.

Ravasi, D., & Phillips, N. (2011). Strategies of alignment: Organizational identity management and strategic change at Bang & Olufsen. *Strategic Organization*, *9*(2), 103-135.

Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(3), 433-458.

Ravasi, D., Tripsas, M., & Langley, A. (2020). Exploring the strategy-identity nexus. *Strategic Organization*, *18*(1), 5-19.

Ravasi, D., & van Rekom, J. (2003). Key issues in organizational identity and identification theory. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *6*(2), 118-132.

Riantoputra, C. D. (2010). Know thyself: Examining factors that influence the activation of organizational identity concepts in top managers' minds. *Group & Organization Management*, *35*(1), 8-38.

Rodrigues, C., & Krishnamurthy, A. (2016). Mirror, mirror on the wall: Identity-Image Interactions for the Sales Force in High Threat Situations. *European Management Review, 13*, 307-323.

Sandholtz, W., & Taagepera, R. (2005). Corruption, culture, and communism. *International Review of Sociology*, *15*(1), 109-131.

Sasaki, I., Kotlar, J., Ravasi, D., & Vaara, E. (2020). Dealing with revered past: Historical identity statements and strategic change in Japanese family firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, *41*(3), 590-623.

Schinoff, B. S., Rogers, K. M., & Corley, K. G. (2016). How Do We Communicate Who We Are? Examining How Organizational Identity is Conveyed to Members. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp. 219-238). Oxford University Press.

Schultz, M., & Hernes, T. (2013). A temporal perspective on organizational identity. *Organization Science*, *24*(1), 1-21.

Scott, W. R. (2003). *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open systems*. Prentice Hall.

Scott, S. G., & Lane, V. R. (2000). A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 43-62.

Selznick, P. (1992). *The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community*. University of California Press.

Serra, F. A. R., Mazieri, M. R., Scafuto, I. C., Cruz, J. A. W., & Pinoti, F. (2022). The mission statement in Catholic higher education organizations and identity challenges. *International Journal of Educational Management, 36*(6), 984-1001.

Shipp, A. J., & Jansen, K. J. (2021). The “Other” Time: A Review of the Subjective Experience of Time in Organizations. *Academy of Management Annals, 15*(1), 299-334.

Sillince, J. A. A., & Brown, A. D. (2009). Multiple organizational identities and legitimacy: The rhetoric of police websites. *Human Relations*, *62*(12), 1829-1856.

Sillince, J. A. A., & Simpson, B. (2010). The strategy and identity relationship: Towards a processual understanding. *The Globalization of Strategy Research, 27*, 111-143.

Sinha, P. N., Jaskiewicz, P., Gibb, J., & Combs, J. G. (2020). Managing history: How New Zealand’s Gallagher Group used rhetorical narratives to reprioritize and modify imprinted strategic guideposts. *Strategic Management Journal, 41*(3), 557-589.

Snihur, Y., & Clarysse, B. (2022). Sowing the seeds of failure: Organizational identity dynamics in new venture pivoting. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *37*(1), 106164.

Suddaby, R., Coraiola, D., Harvey, C., & Foster, W. (2020). History and the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, *41*(3), 530-556.

Suddaby, R., Foster, W. M., & Quinn-Trank, C. (2010). Rhetorical history as a source of competitive advantage. *The Globalization of Strategy Research*, *27*, 147-173.

Suddaby, R., Israelsen, T., Bastien, F., Saylors, R., &Coraiola, D. (2022). Rhetorical History as Institutional Work. *Journal of Management Studies*, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12860

Suddaby, R., Israelsen, T., Mitchell, J. R., & Lim, D. S. (2021). Entrepreneurial Visions as Rhetorical History: A Diegetic Narrative Model of Stakeholder Enrollment. *Academy of Management Review*.

Suddaby, R., & Jaskiewicz, P. (2020). Managing traditions: A critical capability for family business success. *Family Business Review*, *33*(3), 234-243.

Song, W., & Yu, H. (2018). Green innovation strategy and green innovation: The roles of green creativity and green organizational identity. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *25*(2), 135-150.

Stanske, S., Rauch, M., & Canato, A. (2019). Anti-identity strategizing: The dynamic interplay of "who we are" and "who we are not". *Strategic Organization, 18*(1), 136-170.

Stigliani, I., & Ravasi, D. (2007). Organizational artefacts and the expression of identity in corporate museums at Alfa-Romeo, Kartell, and Piaggio. In L. Lerpold, D. Ravasi, J. v. Rekom & G. Soenen (Eds.), *Organizational Identity in Practice* (pp.197-215). Routledge.

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Organizations and social structure. *Handbook of Organizations, 44*(2), 142-193.

Transparency International (2018). *Corruption perceptions index*. https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018.

Vough, H. C., Caza, B. B., & Maitlis, S. (2020). Making Sense of Myself: Exploring the Relationship between Identity and sensemaking. In A. D. Brown (Ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organization* (pp. 244-260). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wadhwani, R. D., Suddaby, R., Mordhorst, M., & Popp, A. (2018). History as organizing: Uses of the past in organization studies. *Organization Studies*, *39*(12), 1663-1683.

Watkiss, L., & Glynn, M. A. (2016). Materiality and Identity: How organizational products, artifacts, and Practices Instantiate Organizational Identity. In M. G. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth & D. Ravasi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (pp. 317-334). New York: Oxford University Press.

Weick, K. E. 1995. *Sensemaking in Organizations.* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, *16*(4), 409-421.

Whetten, D. A. (2006). Albert and Whetten revisited: Strengthening the concept of organizational identity. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *15*(3), 219-234.

Whetten, D., Foreman, P., & Dyer, W. G. (2014). Organizational identity and family business. In L. Melin, M. Nordqvist & P. Sharma (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of family business* (pp. 480-497). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Whetten, D. A., & Mackey, A. (2002). A social actor conception of organizational identity and its implications for the study of organizational reputation. *Business & Society, 41*(4), 393-414.

Wickert, C., Vaccaro, A., & Cornelissen, J. (2017). "Buying" corporate social responsibility: Organisational identity orientation as a determinant of practice adoption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *142*(3), 497-514.

Wiley, N. (1988). The micro-macro problem in social theory. *Sociological Theory*, *6*(2), 254.

Zhou, Z., Luo, B. N., & Tang, T. L. P. (2018). Corporate social responsibility excites 'exponential' positive employee engagement: The Matthew effect in CSR and sustainable policy. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *25*(4), 339-354.

Zundel, M., Holt, R., & Popp, A. (2016). Using history in the creation of organizational identity. *Management & Organizational History*, *11*(2), 211-235.

Zyglidopoulos, S., Hirsch, P., Martin de Holan, P., & Phillips, N. (2017). Expanding research on corporate corruption, management, and organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 26*(3), 247-253.