

ATHABASCA UNIVERSITY

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES: DISTINGUISHED AND DIFFERENT
AN APPLICATION OF BOURDIEU'S "THINKING TOOLS" TO MAKING SENSE
OF AN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION

BY

ADRIANA VAN HILTEN

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF BUSINESS

ATHABASCA UNIVERSITY

MAY, 2018

© ADRIANA VAN HILTEN

Approval Page



The future of learning.

Approval of Dissertation

The undersigned certify that they have read the dissertation entitled:

TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES: DISTINGUISHED AND DIFFERENT
AN APPLICATION OF BOURDIEU'S "THINKING TOOLS" TO MAKING SENSE OF AN
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION

Submitted by:

Adriana van Hilten

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

The examination committee certifies that the dissertation
and the oral examination is approved

Internal Co-Supervisor:

Dr. Kay Devine
Athabasca University

External Co-Supervisor:

Dr. Amy Thurlow
Mount Saint Vincent University

Committee Member:

Dr. Albert Mills
Mount Saint Vincent University

External Examiner:

Dr. Roy Suddaby
University of Victoria/Newcastle University

May 7, 2018

¹ University Drive, Athabasca, AB, T9S 3A3 Canada
P: 780.675-6821 | Toll-free (CAN/U.S.) 1.800.788.9041 (6821)
fgs@athabascau.ca | fgs.athabascau.ca | athabascau.ca

Dedication

*To Alexandra and Almis, for believing in me.
Thank you for inspiring me to own my own dream, as you have yours,
and, for loving and supporting me as I made mine reality.*

Acknowledgements

I have many people who supported me on this journey: my internal advisor, Dr. Kay Devine, who scores a “hatrick” as my program director, my thesis advisor, and my advocate; my external advisor, Dr. Amy Thurlow, without whom it would not have been so pleasurable; my committee member, Dr. Albert Mills, who asked the question that initiated my research contribution; Dr. Roy Suddaby, my first doctoral course professor and final external examiner, who recognized me as a “piler” and provided me with Occam’s razor. Thank you.

My cohort, and fellow DBA students: I cannot imagine this journey without you. You all gave your time to advise, consult, commiserate and celebrate. Thank you.

The participants in the study: you gave me your trust, and shared with me your sensemaking of the change to a new tool. Thank you.

My family, who roused me before dawn, fed me, excused me to do my homework, and continued to love me, recognizing me as me and part of us; as well my extended family, both those who showed the way, and those with the courage to go elsewhere. You are all great. Thank you.

My friends, who shared their own journeys, listened to my ideas, and applauded my progress, but didn’t ask me “are you done yet?” Many thanks!

Athabasca University, for providing the program in the first place. What a great learning institution: from its professors, to its administrators, to its librarians, to its support staff and technology help desk. You are all interested in making this the best experience possible, and it shows. Thank you.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Abstract

This dissertation presents an emic qualitative study of the introduction of a new information system technology tool at a firm in the Canadian financial sector. The goals of the study are two-fold: to demonstrate the efficacy and appropriateness of Bourdieu's critical social theory as a framework for sensemaking in organizations, as well as to understand how users make sense of a new tool. Users' accounts of the change to the new tool, with context provided by internal organizational communications and information about the firm available externally, are examined through the analysis of antenarrative. It adds to the body of knowledge through this unique application of Bourdieu's theory, studying "the making sense of" a systems implementation in a professional firm and supports the body of knowledge referencing the importance of identity, context and plausibility in making sense of change. As well, it provides some insights into the work done by users to maintain, recover, reclaim or re-balance identities under threat. It also adds to the work initiated by Bourdieu in his discussion of 'split habitus', by demonstrating the possibility of simultaneously being in multiple (i.e., plural) habitus, and using the logic associated with each to make sense of the experience of using new tools in a work environment. Additionally, the study informs the practice of change associated with systems implementations, giving insight to the importance of "user identity logic(s)", and paying attention to situations in the design, development and implementation of the system that may be impacting user identity logic.

Keywords: Sensemaking, Critical Sensemaking, Bourdieu, Habitus, Antenarrative, Information Technology System Implementation

Table of Contents

Approval Page	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
What am I doing?	1
How am I doing this?.....	1
Why study change?.....	2
How to study change?.....	3
Why be critical?.....	5
What is my contribution to the body of knowledge?.....	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review	7
Introduction	7
Sensemaking approaches.....	7
Organizational change studies.....	9
Sense-making, identity and context.....	11
Sense-making and context.....	15
Sense-making, identity, logic, power and resistance.....	16
Sense-making technology change	18
Bourdieu in organizational and management studies.....	22
Making sense and Bourdieu	25
Conclusion	27
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework: Bourdieu’s critical theory.....	29
Introduction	29
Understanding Bourdieu: Key Concepts	29
Habitus.....	30

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Doxa.....	32
Field.....	34
The interplay of habitus, its doxa, field, and strategies.....	35
Capital: Economic, cultural, social, and symbolic.....	37
Symbolic Violence.....	39
Resistance.....	42
Summary.....	43
Theoretical Considerations: Paradigms and Research Modes.....	44
Bourdieu and Sense-making.....	45
Identity.....	45
Social Context.....	47
Strategies and Possibilities.....	48
Bourdieu and Social Agency.....	48
Bourdieu and Change.....	50
Bourdieu and Power.....	51
Bourdieu and Language.....	52
Bourdieu in Critical Research.....	53
How is it critical?.....	54
Conducting Bourdieusian Research.....	56
Sense-making ontology and epistemology.....	58
Conclusion.....	62
Chapter 4: Methodology.....	65
Introduction.....	65
My research question drives the research approach.....	65
My epistemological and philosophical positions.....	69
Research location, participants and the change phenomena.....	70
Research location.....	70
Participants.....	71
Change Phenomena.....	73
Data Collection, Data Analysis and Treatment.....	74
Data Collection.....	74

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Data Analysis.....	76
Doing Rigorous Research.....	79
Reflection on the data and my own “making sense”.....	81
Conclusion.....	83
Chapter 5: Analysis.....	85
Introduction.....	85
The organizational context.....	85
The context provided the media: “Best in class”.....	87
The context provided by internal communications: Organizational Changes.....	87
Summary of the organizational context.....	89
Analysis of Interviews.....	89
Who are we? Different and distinct.....	91
What do we know? Valued or violated?.....	98
Who do we know? Does it matter?.....	112
How we increase our relative standing with a new group.....	113
Re-balancing who we are by what we do...or not.....	116
Summary of analysis of the interviews in light of the organizational context.....	126
Chapter 6: Conclusions.....	127
Introduction.....	127
Reflexivity: How do I fit into the power structure?.....	127
Conclusions and implications.....	130
Limitations.....	134
Practical application: What is practical value of this study?.....	135
Contribution to the body of knowledge.....	137
Directions for future research.....	138
References.....	142
Appendix A: Athabasca University Research Ethics Approval.....	163
Appendix B: Permission to Conduct Research in the Organization.....	164
Appendix C: Interview Questions.....	165

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Appendix D: Letter of Information and Informed Consent.....166

Chapter 1: Introduction

What am I doing?

This paper presents my emic critical research into making sense of the introduction of a new tool, specifically, an electronic information technology system work tool in a professional firm. This study is meaningful to me, as I have been involved with various operational initiatives (new tools, new technology, new practices) and strategic change (mergers, acquisitions and divestitures, organizational and strategic direction changes). Some of the changes planned in our work tools I see as supporting the work we do, which I expect will be made sense of as “good” tools; other changes in our work tools I expect will be made sense of as “junk” (Levina & Vaast, 2005) since they hinder the efficient accomplishment of our work practice through using a different logic, and threaten to denigrate our identity at work. I am seeking to understand how we make sense of a tool, particularly one that may be construed as threatening our identity at work, and how we re-balance our position. Selfishly, I am trying to make sense of my own experience with the introduction of tools, and using this research setting allows me to focus time and energy to that task, as well as fulfilling requirements of this doctoral program.

How am I doing this?

In this paper, I introduce Bourdieu’s critical social theory (1989, 1990a/1980, 2006a/1973, 2006b/1984), which Bourdieu initially proposed as a means to make sense of the world, particularly why people act as they do in the social world. I posit that this theory can be effectively applied as a framework for sensemaking in an organization, and as a means of examining why people make sense as they do in that organization. Hence,

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

I use Bourdieu's "thinking tools" (Atkinson 2010, p. 16) of habitus, doxa, capital and symbolic violence as a means to make sense of change.

In this study, people in an organization experiencing a change are interviewed (the 'participants') about their experience. The organization is a knowledge-based professional services firm in the Canadian financial services sector, made up of groups that deal with audit and with policy, supported by a corporate services group (e.g. Information Technology, Accounting, and Human Resources). The change is a new information management system tool being implemented. The participants are members of the audit group, who, along with the rest of the organization, are expected to use the new tool. The firm's internal communications, and information about the organization available externally, provide additional context. The interviews, in context, make up the qualitative data regarding how participants are making sense of the new tool and its implications to their identity. Qualitative analysis, in particular discourse analysis, is used to examine participants' antenarratives (Rosile, Boje, Carlon, Downs, & Saylor, 2013; Vaara & Tienari, 2011) of the new tool.

Why study change?

Significant effort is put into change, and managing change within organizations (McCalman, Paton, & Siebert, 2016), given the prevalence of change (Heraclitus, as cited in Laertius, 1925), its attenuate cost, and the likelihood of failing to achieve expected results, gauged to be somewhere between 50% (Neufeld, Dong, & Higgins, 2014) and 70% (Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2004; Beer & Nohria, 2000; McClellan, 2011). In particular, user resistance is cited as a salient reason for the failure of change associated with the implementation of information technology systems (Kim & Kankanhalli, 2009).

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Each change initiative consumes money, time, and energy, as well as employee goodwill, impacting perceived legitimacy and trust (Dawson & McLean, 2013). Positive change outcomes are attributed to internal factors and self-action; negative outcomes are attributed to external factors such as events, or the actions of others (Brown & Jones, 1998). Management, primed to expect resistance, ‘recognizes it’, or takes the opportunity to attribute the failure of a change implementation to resistance, or labels as resistance all actions employees have taken in the past that displeased it (Ford, Ford, & D’Amelio, 2008; Piderit, 2000).

How to study change?

When people note a disruption to the norm, or their expectations thereof, they try to make sense of it (Helms Mills, 2003). A disruption may lead to confusion or ambiguity about what happened, what is happening, what it means for people, and what the future holds for them. People will try to make sense of what is going on, constructing plausible-to-them reasons or ideas (Weick, 1995). Subsequently, in making sense of that “change”, they may conclude that the change is significant or not, and/or may be positive or not, and these potential accounts exist simultaneously in an organization (Sonenshein, 2010). Hence, change is studied through participants’ accounts of change. My study similarly uses participant interviews, their accounts of the change, as they are the ones best situated to describe their own sensemaking, including the implications of the new tool, and how to incorporate the tool (or not) into their logic.

How people make sense of something may be studied through their thoughts (expressed verbally) or their actions (what they do, or what they say about what they do). Genres of communication include formal and informal spoken and written

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

communications ranging from water-cooler conversation to town-hall meetings, and from casual emails to company memos and newsletters (Balogun & Johnson, 2004); as well as non-verbal communications or embodied messages, like behaviours, actions, practices or routines (Brown & Lewis, 2011; Cunliffe & Coupland, 2012; Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). While sensemaking is not discourse per se, where participants provide narrative accounts of their sensemaking, or talk about their sensemaking actions, discourse analysis techniques can be used to study sensemaking. Thus, sensemaking may be studied through the communication or discourse surrounding change, where their stories reveal their sensemaking. Multiple sensemaking accounts may be found (Boje, 1995). No story is an absolute ‘truth’, but explains ‘truth’ as understood by the sense-makers (Brown & Humphries, 2003). How that particular truth was constructed is studied through the sense-maker’s discourse, including storytelling, narratives and antenarratives, that is, stories just unfolding and possibly not yet the definitive story about the change (Rosile et al., 2013). Discourse reveals how language constructs that reality for the sense-maker, “mak[ing] certain practices possible or inevitable... how it empowers and disempowers different identities... (or) how particular actors draw on the ...discourse to legitimate their positions and actions” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 8). By talking about particular identities and interests, they may become ‘the story’, at least for the time being (Vaara & Tienari, 2011). These sensemaking antenarratives, the unfolding stories, may serve to legitimate or discredit, support or resist, change. For example, the introduction of a new organizational process, routine or tool may be construed as threatening to our existing work identity. By failing to confirm (positive) identity (Knights & McCabe, 2002) our narrative accounts seek to restore identity. Some stories are accepted and repeated; others

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

are refuted and ‘shut down’ (Buchanan & Dawson, 2007; Heracleous, 2006). Hence, making sense of change may be studied through the discourse that surrounds it: narratives are indicative of what is accepted and what is not accepted as ‘plausible’, in turn pointing to the ‘knowledge’ rules and norms invoked to arrive at the sensemaking conclusion (Thurlow, 2010).

Why be critical?

I agree with Knights and McCabe (2002, p. 243) “given the contractual nature of employment, the vagaries of capitalism and the structural inequalities of power, fear is invariably a perennial feature of organizational life”. In total, I have worked more than 25 years, in various organizations encompassing public and private sector firms, and I have experienced the rules the powerful impose on how we may make sense. I know that even among the powerful, there is continued competition for identity status, and that people in power, and those seeking to increase their power, use “semantic elasticity” (Bourdieu, 1989) to name something as the same or different, thus imposing the logic of ‘same’ or ‘different’. Despite the advice from the Borg that “resistance is futile” (Star Trek: First Contact, 1996), I feel strongly about countering efforts by the powerful who challenge the positive identity of others; to ‘right that wrong’ and ‘make it better’. A critical perspective, incorporating a critical social theory such as Bourdieu’s logic of practice (1990a/1980) takes into account the role of strong entities in using their power to limit the sensemaking for a given identity (Dobbin, 2008). Further, the ultimate outcome of critical research is one of transformation (Alvesson & Deetz, 2006), making critical research an appropriate research approach for me. However, in taking a critical approach, I must also consider my position in the power hierarchy of the organization,

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

and potential areas of bias that may impact not only what participants share with me, but also what I hear and how I analyze the research data.

What is my contribution to the body of knowledge?

While sensemaking studies of change, including critical sensemaking studies, are not new (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Maitlis & Sonenshein, 2010; Sandburg & Tsoukas, 2015; Helms Mills & Thurlow, 2015), my research position is unique in two regards: First, I seek to use a new sensemaking tool, namely I posit that Bourdieu's (1989, 1990a/1980, 2006a/1973, 2006b/1984) social theory can be used as a critical lens or framework to study organizational change phenomena. In doing so, I meet Lahire's challenge (2002, p. 598) to pay homage to Bourdieu through carrying out an empirical investigation that will extend Bourdieu's theory in areas he "barely sketched out", thus taking "intellectual risk" and making an effort "to keep on imagining and creating beyond what Bourdieu actually thought or worded". Secondly, I am an emic researcher in a specific Canadian financial services firm, studying the introduction of a new systems tool and how a particular group of people make sense of it. Sensemaking theory postulates that participants' sense of who they are in the context of a change, as provided by the narrative accounts they construct, is a key determinant to their understanding and acceptance (or not) of the change.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the literature of making sense of change in organizations. Sensemaking is defined, and various approaches to sensemaking are identified. Bourdieu's critical philosophy (further detailed in Chapter 3) is introduced, particularly in regard to its usefulness in studying the making sense of change in my research setting. Studies of organizational change, including technology changes, are reviewed. Three key properties of sensemaking, namely identity, context and plausibility are explored, since, if Bourdieu's theory is to be used as a sensemaking approach, these are key factors it should accommodate.

Sensemaking approaches

Sense-making studies seek to explain how people make sense of a situation. Maitlis and Christianson (2014, p. 57) define sensemaking as "The process through which people work to understand the issues or events that are novel, ambiguous, confusing, or in some other way violate expectations." Sense-making theories generally follow one of two approaches: 1) the individual cognitive approach, where schema (or frames) provide the logic to make sense of things, or provide the expectations of how things should work (Orlikowski & Gash, 1994), or 2) the social cognitive approach, also known as the interpretive or social constructionist approach, where sensemaking is an interactive process focused on discursive activities (He & Brown, 2013, p. 7). Weick (1988, 1993, 1995, 2001) is synonymous with sensemaking, where sensemaking is understood to have seven key properties: it is social and discursive, tied to context and identity, it is retrospective and enacted, and it need only be plausible, not accurate

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

(Brown, 1998). This approach is used extensively in the literature (for example, see reviews of sensemaking studies by Brown, Colville, & Pye, 2015; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Maitlis & Sonenshein, 2010; as well as Weick, 1995, 2001). There have been few critiques of Weick's approach to studying sensemaking; one notable exception is Sandberg and Tsoukas (2015). They argue that Weick's (1995) sensemaking approach excluded prospective sensemaking (e.g. Dawson & McLean, 2013), excluded making sense using bodily senses or emotions (e.g. Bartunek, Rousseau, Rudolph, & DePalma, 2006), and neglected to take into consideration constraints to plausibility in sensemaking (e.g. Mills & Helms Mills, 2004). Various scholars have suggested alternatives to Weickian sensemaking. Lockett, Currie, Finn, Martin, and Waring (2014), amended the Weickian sensemaking "retrospective" property by introducing Bourdieusian concepts, such that "retrospective" meant that sensemaking was based on meaningful lived experience. Holt and Cornelissen (2014) suggest that sensemaking is best explained using a different philosophical approach, namely that of Heidegger, which would incorporate the possibility of sensemaking based on mood. Helms Mills, Thurlow, and Mills (2010) amended Weick's sensemaking approach with the concepts of rules (Mills & Murgatroyd, 1991), formative context (Unger, 1987) and power (Foucault, 1979), to develop a critical sensemaking framework showing how power constrains plausibility.

My study introduces a Bourdieusian framework of critical sensemaking, accommodating the individual cognitive approach as well as the social cognition approach, since the habitus is a "cognitive structure" (Cronin, 1996, p. 73), elements of which may be shared since experiences may be shared. Bourdieu (1989, p. 14)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

characterizes his work as “*constructivist structuralism or structuralist constructivism*” (italics in the original), where the cognitive schema through which the world makes sense are socially structured, and “the construction of social reality is not only an individual enterprise but may also become a collective enterprise” (p. 18), so that sensemaking is dependent on understanding an individual or group’s position in social space. From a Bourdieusian perspective, who you are provides the logic for sensemaking; where there is a struggle to make sense, there is a difference in logic; and, where logic is imposed, power is implicated. It is a critical theory in the sense that it provides “substantive insights about how modern systems of domination operate...revealing how power was embedded in everyday social relations and in individual consciousness” (Dobbin, 2008, p. 62).

Organizational change studies

Organizational change is defined as “some alteration (something is stopped, started, modified, etc.) in the existing organizational arrangements (strategies, structures, systems, cultures, etc.) and/or processes (planning, coordination, decision making etc.)” (Grant & Marshak, 2011, p. 205). The process of making sense, exposed through narrative and discourse when a change occurs (Weick, 1995), makes change a fertile ground for sensemaking studies.

Sensemaking studies typically use a narrative approach, where sensemakers’ stories are studied to understand the meaning being conveyed, understanding language to be reflective and representative of reality, or a discourse analysis approach, which sees language as structuring and constituting reality. The studies cited here include both narrative analysis and discourse analysis techniques, as this literature review is meant to

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

provide the reader with an understanding of sensemaking theories and properties. Further details of analysis choices and their appropriateness are provided in Chapter 3.

The discourse, or narratives, revealing sensemaking may exist and change over time as events continue to unfold (Boje, 2012; Cunliffe, Luhman, & Boje, 2004; Dawson & Buchanan, 2005; Grant & Marshak, 2011). Change is a “struggle to fix meaning” (Jian, 2011, p. 48) in circumstances, actions, and identities. Contested change in particular, provides opportunities for studying identity in sensemaking narratives, by making these issues salient in discursive accounts (Dawson & McLean, 2013). Different individuals will see things differently (Boje, 1995) coming up with different sensemaking accounts. Particularly, sensemaking accounts differ among those with different social or organizational roles or identities to be maintained or enhanced (Brown, 1998; Heracleous & Barrett, 2001; Humphries & Brown, 2002; Whittle & Mueller, 2012). Within a social environment, one sensemaking account will become dominant while others will be contested, subverted or silenced (Buchanan & Dawson, 2007). Change incongruent with the dominant understanding of, and value construed in, the identities of the stakeholders risk failure (Heracleous & Barrett, 2001). This understanding, or knowledge is exposed in the discourse shared during sensemaking (Humphries & Brown, 2008).

Accounts are shaped by identity as individuals make sense using the knowledge infused in their organizational identity (Dawson & McLean, 2013, p. 202). Further, in examining the sensemaking of firefighters at Mann Gulch, Weick (1993) argued that their tools were so closed tied to their identity as firefighters, that to drop their tools would be

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

to abandon their identity. By corollary, if a tool is tied to identity, then to pick up a tool would be to accept an identity in sensemaking.

Sense-making, identity and context

Identity is a combination of an individual's unique attributes as well as shared, group attributes such as occupation (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Identity "situates individuals in the context and thereby, suggest what to do, think and even feel" (Ashford & Kreiner, 1999, p. 417). Hence, identity is construed within a particular context, and one's role in that context. For example, an auditor in a hospital would not likely identify herself as an auditor, her professional identity. In the context of the hospital, she might identify herself as a patient, a patient's mother, a patient's daughter, a visitor, or a volunteer. However, a medical professional in a hospital would likely identify themselves by their professional role in the organization – e.g. a doctor, a nurse, an x-ray technician, a physiotherapist or a pharmacist. At a medical residency job fair, doctors might identify themselves as specialists in internal medicine, cardiac conditions, family medicine, geriatrics, paediatrics, or orthopaedics, or as interns hoping to attain a residency in a particular area of speciality, or in general practice. Similarly, the auditor within her company may identify herself as an auditor, but at an alumni meeting of her audit graduating class, she is most likely to identify herself by the year she graduated, or naming her current employer and her role there. So identity is tied to context.

While the literature uses terms such as social identity, organization identity, group identity, and professional identity, in my study identity is taken to mean "who people think they are in their context", as used by Lockett et al. (2014, p. 1104) in their Bourdieu-influenced definition of identity. As well, I note that Bourdieusian scholars use

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

the term identity, or a similar sense of “who I am”, including positions of ‘same’ versus ‘other’, in their understanding of “habitus”. For example, “identity positions are determined by the field”, (Butcher, 2013, p. 243) where a different habitus indicates an identity position of ‘other’; “habitus is thus the discursive and embodied history of who I am as an individual and the social group(s) or class to which I belong” (Butcher, 2013, p. 243); “in organizational contexts, a shared sense of place is evidenced by organizational and occupational identity constructs that derive from taken-for-granted metanarratives” (Butcher, 2013, p. 246); “our identity is never defined simply in terms of our individual properties, it also places us in some social space... We define ourselves partly in terms of what we come to accept as our appropriate place” (Taylor, 1999, p. 37); “defining identity by invariance, Bourdieu proposed an analysis of reproduction... including a study of the system of strategies of reproduction” (Pinto, 1999, p. 100); “it is in the habitus that speakers are socialized into their particular identity and social relations with others” (Bohman, 1999, p. 132); and “ways of thinking and perceiving, of being;... constitute an agent’s identity” (Bohman, 1999, p. 132). Moreover, to emphasize the contribution of Bourdieu to sensemaking theory, I use the Bourdieusian term of ‘habitus’ in addition to the term ‘identity’ with the same connotation, particularly in the analysis and conclusions of this paper.

Narrative accounts are developed so as to construct a self-enhanced, ‘ego-supportive’ identity (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Tajfel, 1974). Identity includes beliefs, feelings, attitudes and behaviours, where behaviours are “guided by the pursuit of positive social identity, through positive intergroup distinctiveness, which, in turn, is motivated by the need for positive self-esteem” (Hogg & Terry, 2000, p. 124) particularly

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

where group prestige is threatened. Distinction is achieved by maximizing intra-group similarities and inter-group differences, resulting in ‘us’ versus ‘other’. In discourse, there is an opportunity to maintain or enhance identity by attributing positive outcomes to internal factors and self-action and negative outcomes to external factors such as events, or the actions of others (Brown & Jones, 1998). Different discourses reflect different needs to make sense, manage impressions, protect self-esteem, and maintain or enhance identity (Brown, 1998).

There are many realities (Boje, 1995) “characterized by multiple narratives” (Brown, 2006, p. 734), reflecting, in part, different identities of the participants. Different groups within the organization will have different discourses, reflecting their different experiences, roles and perspectives, and identity (Brown, 2006). In particular, Reay, Goodrick, Waldorff, and Casebeer (2017, p. 1045) assert “professionals...define their own role identity by reciprocally situating themselves in relations to others through ongoing interaction”, making the findings of different groups of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ not unexpected (see for example, Brown, 1998; Dawson & Buchanan, 2005; Dawson & McLean, 2013). Change, including change discourses and changes in identity, incongruent with the dominant understanding of, and value construed in, the identities of the stakeholders risk failure (Heracleous & Barrett, 2001).

Individuals seek a positive sense of their identity, based on status, stability, permeability and legitimacy, and will self-categorize into a particular identity (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Pratt & Foreman, 2000). Narrative accounts are created and told “especially to construct identities and interests” in making sense of organizational change (Vaara & Tienari, 2011, p. 372). In constructing an account of “what’s going on”, people seek to

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

maintain a positive identity (c.f. Brown, 1998; Brown & Humphries, 2003; Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010; Reissner, 2011). Weick (1993) saw sensemaking as grounded in identity construction. Brown, Stacey, and Nandhakumar (2008) found that managing identity, or “impression management” is the basis of sensemaking, where positive outcomes are attributed to internal factors and self-action; negative outcomes are attributed to external factors such as events, or the actions of others thereby maintaining or enhancing identity (Brown & Jones, 1998). Beech, Kajzer-Mitchell, Oswick, and Saren (2011) argue that identity is a key factor in the process of change, particularly in sub-optimal outcomes. Gioia, Hamilton, and Patvardhan (2014), further argue that “image is everything” (p. 129), it is closely intertwined with identity, and that image (therefore identity) has transformative power in change. Work-related identity loss results in efforts to stabilize identity, where “individuals seek to build a valid loss-related identity narrative” that distances the self from being the architect of the loss (Conroy & O’Leary-Kelly, 2014, p. 72).

Social reality is “characterized by multiple narratives” (Brown, 2006, p. 734), reflecting various people, events, and account-makers. In particular, different groups within the organization will tell different stories, reflecting their different experiences, roles and perspectives, and collective identity (Brown, 2006). Some stories are centrally experienced and frequently told, others tend to remain within a particular reference group (Brown, 2006). As individuals work out their own narratives and share them, the individual narratives can be ignored, challenged, or validated and expanded upon by others (Heracleous, 2006). Stories are being written as events unfold, and are not finished on telling (Boje, 1995, 2012; Cunliffe et al., 2004). Stories are used to express reality,

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

and each individual and each group may have a different reality (Boje, 1995). Individuals construct an account to sensegive a particular social reality, social identity, or image, for example, to secure an identity of responsibility for a successful change, dissociate themselves from negative outcomes (Conroy & O’Leary-Kelly, 2014) or to avoid an “unfavourable personal” disposition such as greed (Whittle & Mueller, 2012, p. 115).

Studies of changes impacting participants with different identities at stake show a stronger divide of change discourses in the sensemaking context. For example, Heracleous and Barrett (2001) found that different groups had different discourses: there was discursive conflict between stakeholder groups (brokers and underwriters vs. market leaders), implicating identity differences, including the knowledge inherent in those identities, leading to different contexts as understood by these sense-makers.

Sense-making and context

Context includes both the present context, as well as the formative context individuals bring to their sensemaking through their individual past or collective experience and histories. Contextual factors may include other stakeholder discourses (Vaara & Tienari, 2011), including repeated, dominant discourse (Daily & Browning, 2014), ambivalent discourse (Piderit, 2000), contested discourse or discourse revealing interests thought by others to be tangential to the issue (Ford et al., 2008). Reissner’s (2011) study of multi-storied change accounts across three firms in three countries confirms the importance of context, including the historical, mega and meso discourses in the society and the organization. Context is important to understanding “how discourse frames, constructs and represents issues in particular ways” (Heracleous & Marshak, 2004, p. 1286).

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Sense-making, identity, logic, power and resistance

Individuals seek to create, maintain or enhance their identities in their sensemaking accounts (Weick, 1995). Where a situation is perceived as ambiguous, the sensemaking narrative will be focused on maintaining self-esteem and identity (Weick, 1995; see also Brown, 2000; Brown & Humphries, 2003; Brown & Jones, 1998; Brown et al., 2008; Dutton et al., 2010). Thus, different narratives may occur simultaneously as people sense-make within their context and identity. No story is an absolute ‘truth’, but explains ‘truth’ as understood by the narrator (Brown & Humphries, 2003). Incongruent or conflicting discourses may occur as each individual makes sense of his or her possibly unique identity and reality (Brown & Humphries, 2003; Buchanan & Dawson, 2007; Heracleous & Barrett, 2001; Whittle & Mueller, 2012). Individuals and groups enjoy different positions of authority and privilege, with the accounts of the privileged repeated (Heracleous, 2006) so that their sensemaking accounts become common sense, or logic of the common-sense variety, used by others in their sensemaking processes. This ability to create common sense, or logic is powerful; it is an exercise in power to distinguish or blur concepts and meanings in discourse (Bourdieu, 1991). Various narrative strategies may allow otherwise less powerful entities to maintain or achieve positive identity (Dawson & McLean, 2013), since identity is discursively construed as membership within a category (Clegg, 1998), and categories may be distinguished or blurred by the dominant (Bourdieu, 1991). The logic in the dominant discourse “shapes meaning, persuades others, legitimates interests, and reproduces social structure” (Grant & Marshak, 2011, p. 208). Conflicting, marginalized discourses by the dominated represent resistance insofar as these discourses challenge the legitimacy of “logic” created by the

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

dominant to control sensemaking (Bourdieu, 1991). The conflicting discourses found during periods of organizational change are then essentially demonstrations of power, and resistance or challenges to the power, to create or legitimize “logic”.

An ‘interest’ take on resistance is provided by Ford and Ford (1994) utilizing formal logic paradigms. In terms of dialectic logic (there are only two sides), resistance is “opposition to, or forces against change...[where] two identities try to occupy the same place at the same time” (Ford & Ford, 1994, p. 776). They further argue that there is no resistance per se using trialectic logic, rather resistance demonstrates that there is nothing attractive about the change, so there is no support for it. What would make a change (for example) attractive would be something of interest to those encountering a proposed change. By extension, a change would be unattractive through the loss of something of interest. Identity, particularly a positive identity, would be something of interest, and people would work towards something of interest, whereas they would not work toward something of disinterest, such as a loss of identity. A “deep-rooted desire for recognition” would prompt work to “reduce distinctions from ...more valued identities” (Samuel, 2013, p. 409). Support for this notion also comes from Wiedner, Barrett, and Oborn (2017), who argue that agents are drawn to what they value, including identities of power, hence a change might fail because it changes the power relationships in a field. This is consistent with the findings by Heracleous and Barrett (2001) in the ultimate failure of the introduction of a technology change that would alter relationships in the insurance market.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Sense-making technology change

Studies specifically examining the making sense of technological change find narratives of success and failure to be a function of identity, as with sensemaking studies in general. Studying plurivocal narratives in understanding and giving meaning in an information and communication technology ('ICT') change implementation, Brown (1998) highlighted the importance of identities at stake (in this context, doctors, nurses and laboratory technicians, as well as IT developers), where the development of the system included some powerful players in the design of the system who had no expertise in either the process being automated or the development of the ICT solution, so that the responses to the ICT system were "contingent on individuals' perceptions, understandings and legitimacy attribution" (p. 37). Organization "realities are based on narration" (Weick, 1995, p. 127), further, it is plurivocal (Boje, 1991). Organizations are also the site of hegemony (Knights & McCabe, 2002), privileging some over others (Boje, 1995), insofar as the exercise of power legitimizes one account over another thereby "reinforcing privileged power relations, maintaining credibility and guaranteeing continued successful career paths" (Brown, 1998, p. 38). Furthermore, in the case of a failed implementation, attempts to maintain and manage identity for each of the divergent groups involved required them to "put the blame for it on forces beyond their control" (Brown & Jones, 1998, p. 73) in order to manage their identity in the sensemaking process.

Similarly, Doolin (1999, 2002, 2003, 2004) studied the effects of a discourse of "management" to enrol clinicians in the change to a more accountable system of health care, complete with new systems technology that allowed for greater visibility into work

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

effort and hence greater likelihood of managerial intervention in determining care approaches and options. This discourse was not maintained socially, as clinicians did not identify with the identity construed in the “clinical leadership” narrative espoused by the ICT implementers: they were not managers; they were doctors. Accepting the identity of manager meant subrogating their powerful identity of doctor (Doolin, 2003), which they were unwilling to legitimize, leading to the ultimate failure of the new system.

Heracleous and Barrett (2001) studied a pilot implementation and eventual abandonment of an ICT system in the 300-year old London insurance market. The insurance market involves brokers on one side of the transaction (the sellers of risk, requiring insurance), and underwriters (the buyers, and pricers, of risk, providing insurance) on the other. While all parties initially espoused the discourse of implementing technology to continue their position of prominence in the insurance market, once the stakeholders understood the implications to their identity their discourses changed. On the one hand, brokers were concerned they would be replaced by machines; the time-honoured ‘look them in the eye’ sale and purchase of risk would be replaced with ‘flash sales’; the power, excitement and expense accounts of their roles would be gone; the man behind the curtain would be revealed. On the other side of the exchange of risk, underwriters were also concerned about the ‘shakeup in their identity’, fearing a loss of their powerful position (accepting and pricing risk), another disappointment in the adoption process. These changed discourses ultimately led to abandoning the system post-implementation.

Changes associated with technology implementations implicate identity.

Orlikowski and Gash (1994) investigated the differences in “technology frames”, that is,

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

“the underlying assumptions, expectations and knowledge ... and taken-for-granted notions... that people have” (p. 174) in making sense of technology use in organizations. Their findings of differences and incongruence in the technology frames of different identities (technologists (designers and developers) vis a vis users) provided “an interesting explanation of the difficulties and unanticipated outcomes associated with technology implementation ...and should be useful for ...practitioners managing the implementation of technology change” (p. 175) since “bring[ing] to the surface ... assumptions, expectations, and knowledge ... and possible change of inconsistencies and incongruences may reduce the likelihood of unintended misunderstandings and delusions...and avoided some of the difficulties experienced during the implementation” (p. 202) . Orlikowski and Gash (1994) use the concept of frames as “a built-up repertoire of tacit knowledge that is used to impose structure upon, and impart meaning to, otherwise ambiguous social and situational information to facilitate understanding” (Gioia, 1986, p. 56, as cited in Orlikowski & Gash, 1994, p.176). Orlikowski & Gash (1994, p. 176) further describe frames of reference as “implicit guidelines that serve to organize and shape ... interpretations of events [... which include...] assumptions, knowledge and expectations”, treating frames of reference as a proxy for identity. For me, this invokes Bourdieu’s concept of habitus and its associated doxa, or logic (1990a/1980).

Changes in technology are also sites of identity work, where narratives developed by participants seek to show themselves in a positive light, or seek to maintain a valued identity. Technological change may threaten identity through technology’s challenge to the unique skills associated with a specific identity, such as the recent study (Nelson &

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Irwin, 2014) of the introduction of internet search capabilities that challenged librarians' identity of having expert knowledge in searching and retrieving information. This supports work done by Weick (1993) as well as Miettinen and Virkkunen (2005) who argued that tools are tied to identity.

Investigating the discourses over the planning, design and implementation of an ICT change, Dawson and Buchanan (2005) provided insights into the accounts constructed in the process of a technology tool change initiative. Their findings highlight that technological change is a “complex political process represented by multiple versions of events which compete with each other for dominance as definitive change accounts” (p. 845). Multiple narratives were developed, refined, and replaced during the course of the change initiative, with each narrative sensemaking events, consequences, and outcomes. By analyzing predictive, ongoing and retrospective change narratives (during planning, during implementation, and after completion), they drew attention to the temporal and contextual importance of change narratives, and the political will involved in developing these narratives, thereby meriting the study of various stakeholder accounts over technological change stages of planning, design, implementation and use. Some narratives are more compelling than others (Dawson & Buchanan, 2005); compelling narratives are influential in determining the “nature and direction of future actions” (Buchanan & Dawson, 2007, p. 682). Compelling narratives are those with political staying power, reinforced by powerful individuals and groups (e.g. senior management, change agents, certain stakeholder groups with ‘expertise’) emphasizing “positive elements of their own involvement and downplaying, suppressing or ignoring those elements which are seen to represent ‘minor disruptions’ to an otherwise

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

‘successful’ programme” (Dawson & Buchanan, 2005, p. 853). Other accounts are seen as problematic, resisting change, or otherwise not legitimate versions of the ‘truth’.

Further reinforcing the powerful and their dominant discourse, ‘successful change management’ stories become the template for future change initiatives ignoring the alternative ‘truths’, experiences, and accounts of marginalized stakeholders.

Interestingly, as new powerful actors come on board, a previously powerful positive account may be replaced with a powerful negative account, changing historical ‘truth’ and moving the previous actor from ‘hero’ to ‘villain’ (Dawson & Buchanan, 2005), or not (Thurlow, 2007).

Bourdieu in organizational and management studies

Bourdieu’s social theory (1989, 1990a/1980; 2006a/1973, 2006b/1984) seeks to highlight how an individual’s early social experience, as a member of a given social class, provides the logic with which she subsequently makes sense of the world and what is happening in it. In management and organizational studies, the objective is to make sense of the organization and what is happening in it. I posit that Bourdieu’s social theory has great potential as an internally congruent, single theory to explain sensemaking, in a critical way, in organization and management studies, particularly in the area of organizational change. However, it has not been widely cited in organizational studies (Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007), with the exception of critical management studies in management information systems (Myers & Klein, 2011). As an example, Myers and Klein (2011) cite Kvasny and Keil (2006), who used Bourdieu’s theory in examining how the ‘digital divide’ in the use of ICT continued in disadvantaged groups, “predicated along historical systems of power and privilege” in the United States

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

despite “the seemingly democratic practice of education and free or low-cost computer and internet access” (Kvasny & Keil, 2006, p. 29). The study found pervasive assumptions about ‘free or low-cost’ that were not shared among the disadvantaged groups, such as the cost of childcare and bus transportation to the center where the ‘free’ computer sat, or ‘free’ to paid subscribers of cable TV. Bourdieu considered these “attitudes, dispositions, and ways of perceiving reality that are taken for granted by members of a social class or a society... the underpinnings of any system of domination, of the hierarchies that characterize relations both among individuals and among social classes in society” (DiMaggio, 1979, p. 1461).

Recent studies in organizational management issues have used elements of Bourdieu’s theoretical framework of habitus and its associated logic of practice, capital, and symbolic violence perpetrated by the dominant and accepted by the dominated. Wiedner et al. (2017), in applying Bourdieu’s framework to their organizational change study, although not focused on sensemaking nor using a sensemaking framework, noted that change may fail because agents, who are drawn to what they value, or have interest in, may see little or no value in the change. Moreover, how a particular change may or may not have value in shaping or reinforcing power relationships is key to understanding why a change may or may not take hold, and the resistance work of agents in that change (Wiedner et al., 2017).

Organizational development scholars and practitioners have treated resistance to change as something pathological inside the employee, as something that needed to be overcome possibly through shaming and blaming, or dismissing the employee; however, the Bourdieusian concept of habitus would suggest that resistance is not individual, but

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

collective action taking place in the context, or social structure including power relationships in which the change occurs (Shimoni, 2017). Moreover, Shimoni (2017) argues that a change process merely exposes the resistance always in the organization. Therefore he advocates understanding resistance by examining how agents' "resistance strategies maintain or change the field's (organization's) power relationships while protecting or improving their position in the organization's social structure" (p. 267). In a similar vein, Safavi and Omidvar (2016) use Bourdieu's concepts of field and symbolic capital to examine how power operates in the exercise of agency, suggesting that participants in a given routine of practice can exercise agency in resisting change based on their symbolic capital or power. Brown and Lewis (2011) use Bourdieu's concept of logic of practice to examine the impact of "routine of practice" on identity, finding that "identity work is not merely an expression of agency but also of power" (p. 888). Given the holistic nature of Bourdieu's theory (to include habitus, doxa, symbolic violence and power) and despite 'taste' and 'routines' being classic Bourdieusian terms of analysis, Brown and Lewis (2011) paradoxically analyzed the power impact from a Foucauldian perspective, suggesting that agents refused to be seen as organizational clones by using their personal judgment and taste in the performance of organizational routines.

Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) decry the references made to Bourdieu's work in critical studies, arguing that too often researchers do not take the whole of Bourdieu's work into their analysis (Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007; Sieweke, 2014). Bourdieu integrates power, field, habitus, and capital: a field is structured by power relationships between the dominant and the dominated; an individual's repository of social action is inscribed in the habitus, along with the logic of practice of the habitus, while possession of capital

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

indicates an individual's relative place of power (Vaughan, 2008). The habitus is acquired at birth, incorporating the past power relationships and struggles in the field, and determines the trajectory of future possibilities (Liu & Emirbayer, 2016). However, as Vaughan (2008, p. 68) highlights, incorporating such complex, integrated concepts in a single study is a "daunting prospect".

Making sense and Bourdieu

Vaughan (1996) applies Bourdieu's theory in her inquiry of the 1986 space shuttle Challenger accident, demonstrating how the "habitus derived from layered structures... affected working engineers' meaning, interpretation, and action" (p. 71). In "restructuring structure and culture from archival documents and interviews to see how people in a different time and place made sense of things" (p. 71), Vaughan (1996) identified conflict between dominated and dominant participants in the decision to launch, which ultimately led to the Challenger disaster.

Interestingly, Weick (1997) reviewed Vaughan's (1996) book on the Challenger accident, pronouncing it "an incredible piece of work!" (p. 401), noting that his sensemaking framework (Weick, 1995) bore rethinking as a result. Weick (1997, p. 397) commented on her recognition of the role of signals and signal strength in information processing within a specific context, the role of "credibility as a function of position" of power in a broad organization, "precedent and its capacity to influence subsequent decisions" such that plausibility precluded a search for additional or contrary information, as well as "the concepts of norms" to constrain sensemaking.

A sensemaking application of Bourdieu's framework comes from a multiple case study of three initiatives to integrate specialist care in the National Health Service

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

(‘NHS’) in England (Lockett et al., 2014). The researchers use a cognitive sensemaking, schema-based, framework for their study. They note “scholars have explored the influence of actor’s organization roles on the processes of sensemaking” (p. 1104) where actors in different groups sense-make the same event differently (e.g. Battilana, 2006; Heracleous & Barrett, 2001). Lockett et al. (2014) “explore how actors’ unique contexts, as encapsulated by their social positions, provide the important ‘raw materials’ for their sensemaking about organizational change” (p. 1102), suggesting that the social position (as determined by professional position in the hierarchical health care system) best suited to enabling change is one located in the middle. High position actors are more likely to be invested in their current schema (where they are at the top), low position actors are aware of their limited capital to influence higher status actors thereby also maintaining the status quo (the dominated accept domination by the dominant as a matter of course) whereas middle position actors have sufficient capital to sense-make their ability to influence the outcome, and are therefore recommended as change agents (Lockett et al., 2014). Using middle managers to sense-make and sense-give change is not an unusual strategy, and the types of messages they share in their discourse accommodate sensemaking of various natures: duality of change and stability (Chreim, 2005) and positive or negative valence (Sonenshein, 2010). As well, middle managers have contextual knowledge that can identify the germane issues to sense-makers, thereby facilitating change processes (Balogun & Johnson, 2004, 2005; Dutton, Ashford, O’Neill, & Lawrence, 2001; Rouleau & Balogun, 2011).

Novelty and ambiguity, triggers that would indicate change and the need to make sense of it, may lead to a discursive struggle in their resolution. Levina and Orlikowski

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

(2009), in the context of a novel consulting engagement, recognized the practice of consulting to be largely a linguistic activity through which realities were enacted. Thus, in that consulting is discursive, “discourses can be said to create a social reality by producing *concepts, objects and subject positions*” (italics in the original) (Clegg, Kornberger, & Rhodes, 2004). Consultants and their clients used discursive resources from their place of expertise to “transform power within and between” themselves (Levina & Orlikowski, 2009, p. 672), noting that “marginalized actors may draw on discursive alternatives from other contexts; enacting such alternative(s) ... may then lead to changes in power relations within and across organizations” (Levina & Orlikowski, 2009, p. 699). The researchers characterized these discursive power struggles as strategic moves to “shape social reality (Bourdieu & Thomsson, 1991)” (Levina & Orlikowski, 2009, p. 674), “working towards discursive change that privileges their interests and goals” (Hardy & Philips, 2004, p. 300), so as to increase their symbolic power and legitimacy in order to achieve change. Further, Levina and Orlikowski (2009) drew on Bourdieu’s concept of habitus and the logic of practice, to explain how distinction of practice “was critical in reproducing [a given] strong identity” (p. 699), which was a source of power struggle among participants on a project.

Conclusion

The process of making sense is exposed when a change occurs or an expectation is not met, making change fertile ground to study sensemaking using narrative, discursive approaches. Accounts of change are construed so as to maintain or enhance a preferred identity (Bartunek et al., 2006; Brown & Jones, 1998; Dawson & Buchanan, 2005), particularly the identity associated with positions of power (Brown, 1998; Doolin, 2003;

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Heracleous & Barrett, 2001) in an organization, where an organization is a field constructed of a series of relationships of power (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980; Brown, Kornerberg, Clegg, & Carter, 2010). Studies of technology changes are consistent with studies of other change in considering the importance of identity, and identity work in making sense of the change, and suggest that technologists (designers, developers) and users have significantly different identities, which include skills as well as assumptions and knowledge of technology, to be a factor in the ease of implementation of new systems technology (Brown, 1998; Nelson & Irwin, 2014; Orlikowski & Gash, 1994).

Bourdieu's critical social framework has been used in research associated with issues of change, including the introduction of management information systems and related tools, using various theoretical paradigms including sensemaking. Bourdieu's theory is consistent with key properties of sensemaking, namely identity, context and plausibility. Qualitative research methods largely have been used in conjunction with these studies. A criticism of these studies is the theoretical "cherry picking" of Bourdieu's integrated 'thinking tools' of habitus, field, capital and power (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008). My research seeks to demonstrate that using Bourdieu's tools in an integrated fashion is an appropriate theoretical approach to study sensemaking, and doing so provides insights into the role of identity and power relationships in an organization influencing the ability to make sense of change, in particular, a change in tools.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework: Bourdieu's critical theory

Introduction

Critical theorists provide the fundamental philosophies that inform critical research, with the theories of Bourdieu, Foucault, and Habermas recognized as providing the critical social theories underlying major streams of organizational research (Cronin, 1996; Delanty, 2011; Everett, 2002), including information systems development and implementation (Myers & Klein, 2011). Foucault is often cited in the work of critical organizational analysts (cf. Alvesson & Karreman, 2000; Boje, 1995; Hardy & Clegg, 1996; Thomas, Sargent, & Hardy, 2011; van Dijk, 1993). Critical researchers in the area of ICT implementations frequently cite Foucault (cf. Dawson & Buchanan, 2005; Doolin, 2003, 2004; Heracleous & Barrett, 2001) and occasionally Habermas (cf. Brown, 1998) or Bourdieu (cf. Whittle & Mueller, 2011) when considering power dynamics. I am studying how Bourdieu's perspective is relevant to understanding how people make sense of change. This chapter provides a brief outline of Bourdieu's theoretical position, and discusses how Bourdieu's theory is relevant to studying change, particularly from a critical perspective. As well, the ontology and epistemology of sensemaking theories, including Bourdieu's theory, are discussed.

Understanding Bourdieu: Key Concepts

Key concepts in understanding the 'thinking tools' of Bourdieu (1989, 1990a/1980, 2006a/1973, 2006b/1984) are habitus and its related doxa, field, capital (particularly symbolic capital), symbolic violence, as well as strategies. A brief overview of these concepts follows.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Habitus

Bourdieu (1989, p. 19) describes habitus as “both a system of schemes of production of practices and a system of perception and appreciation of practices...in both of these dimensions, its operation expresses the social position in which it was” created. The habitus “mediates between structure and practice; more specifically, ... structures ... reproduce themselves by producing agents endowed with the ... predispositions ... capable of engendering practices adapted to the structures and thereby contributing to the reproduction of the structures” (Bourdieu, 2006a/1973, p. 258), without consciously doing so. The structures of the habitus include both the possibilities and limits of the practices of the habitus, to the point where aspirations are set within the limits of the habitus, where a ‘sense of the limits’ comes from the “practical anticipation of the objective limits acquired by the experience of objective limits [leading to] a ‘sense of one’s place’ which leads one to exclude oneself from...[those] from which one is excluded” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 471). Importantly, habitus is not fixed and unified, a replica of the past, but rather it is dynamic, “subject to ‘permanent revision’ in practice” (Wacquant, 2016, p. 64). “Habitus is incorporated possibilities”, so that within a habitus, “people come to want what is objectively allotted to them, which Bourdieu has called ‘making a virtue of necessity’” (Harker, 1990, p. 91). Furthermore, “different conditions of existence produce different habitus” (Bourdieu, 2006b/1984, p. 293). Habitus is generated, maintained and perpetuated within the habitus (Bourdieu, 2006a/1973, 2006b/1984). Habitus confers the “the code, the classificatory schemes necessary to understand” the habitus so that within one habitus you do not have the tools to understand another habitus (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 19). That is, you have to be in it to know it, and you have to know it to be in it. You have to be in it and know it to recognize or reproduce it.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Thus, as the pauper was not born nor brought up in the realm of princes, he does not have the tools to understand the habitus of royalty, does not know how to perceive, interpret or act as royalty does, and given he knows his place, does not aspire to it. In this sense, the habitus is also a means by which present and future possibilities, that which is plausible, are denoted.

Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus' as 'the sense of the game incarnate, become nature' is structured through routines, regularities, tendencies, or norms, that is, ways of being and doing (Lamaison & Bourdieu, 1986). Yet, this 'sense of the game' is even more than norms and strategy for particular positions in the field of play under certain circumstances: just as a great hockey player knows more than the rules, or the strategies, the 'Great One' also knows how the puck moves under various ice conditions, and off the stick of other players, so that he can be where the puck will be (Gretzky, n.d.). Habitus is a way of being.

Habitus is, at the same time, an interpretive device, socially inscribed, "interior to history" (Foster, 1986, p. 105), a "deeply ingrained identity" (Everett, 2002, p. 65), " 'a sense of one's place' but also a 'sense of the place of others' " (Bourdieu, 1989 p. 19), a sense of the game beyond its rules. Habitus asserts what is valuable without ascertaining why it is valuable (Grenfell, 2014). Some argue that since habitus is a way of being, it is, in essence, culture (e.g. Foster, 1986, p. 105); however, Bourdieu would argue that this is a simplification of subjectivism: habitus is meant to convey properties of subjectivism and objectivism; the habitus structures disposition, seeking what is of interest (Barnard, 1990; Grenfell, 2014), rather than being a venue of socialization (Harker, 1990).

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Habitus is the means by which the objective and the subjective come together; “how social structure and individual agency are reconciled” (Maton, 2014, p. 49), indeed how the structure/agency dichotomy are united since group behaviour and agency are both present in the habitus. For example, I have my unique experiences, but I share those experiences with those of my gender, my age, my ethnicity, my nationality, my religion and my socio-economic class. My personal style is merely a deviation from the style socially available to me, given my shared and unique experiences. Habitus provides a “structured and structuring structure” (Bourdieu, 1990b, p. 170). As Maton (2014, p. 50) explains, the habitus

is ‘structured’ by one’s past and present circumstances, such as family upbringing and educational experiences. It is ‘structuring’ in that one’s habitus helps to shape one’s present and future practices. It is a ‘structure’ in that it is systematically ordered rather than random or unpatterned . . . The habitus is thus both structured by material conditions of existence and generates practices, beliefs, feelings and so forth in accordance with its own structure.

Doxa

The doxa of the habitus is the logic regulating behaviour without necessarily being “rules”. Rather doxa is a logic accounting for “assumptions that go without saying and which determine the limits of the doable and the thinkable” (Maton, 2014, p. 58). Maton goes on to liken Bourdieu’s concept of habitus to Foucault’s power/knowledge paradigm, since “once one has internalized an idea to the extent that it is part of one’s way of seeing and thinking about the world, it becomes second nature” (2014, p. 63). In this sense, Deer (2014, p. 114) considers doxa the “natural order of things; a pre-reflexive intuitive knowledge shaped by experience.”

Doxa is the common sense of a habitus: that that which “goes without saying because it comes without saying” (Everett, 2002, p. 66). The doxa are the structuring

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

principles of the habitus (Cronin, 1996), since the doxa make “the world seem self-evident” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 19). Legitimacy is not challenged in doxa, for the presuppositions that grant legitimacy are inherent in doxa (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980) i.e. one does not question what is of interest, or why it is of interest. Bourdieu compares the ‘acquisition’ of doxa to the acquisition of one’s mother tongue: it is understood, and reproduced with “unawareness of the unthought presuppositions” it contains, and the “ignorance of all that is tacitly granted” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 67).¹ Doxa is recognized within a habitus, and does not need to be discussed: it is assumed to be; it is taken for granted; it is logical. Doxa is not recognized outside the habitus, since that particular logic may not apply i.e. Doxa that is not doxa for a given habitus is illogical and is questioned; doxa that is of the given habitus is natural. For Bourdieu (1977/1972), this logic is the logic of practice (just as language acquisition is a matter of exposure and practice). Similar to the logic of a “virtuoso” in her field of expertise, over time practices are ingrained. Over time, a pianist no longer needs to think about where middle-C is located on the keyboard. It is where it should be, naturally. My father, a dairy farmer in Europe, did not think about how to milk a cow; he just did. It was routine: a routine of practice. When a principle of the doxa is violated, it can no longer be “taken for granted”,

¹ Bourdieu compares the generative principles of the habitus, creating doxa, to Noam Chomsky’s generative principles associated with the “deep structure” of language (Mahar, 1990). Heracleous & Barrett (2001) use deep structure to explain cognitive schema used in sensemaking.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

or “unformulated”; it becomes revealed by “heretical behaviour” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980; p. 116). That is, you discover the ‘rules’ of the habitus by breaking them and ‘being called out’ on that. A person who neglected to milk the cows before sending them out to pasture in the morning or before eating her breakfast was not a dairy farmer, simply put. That person violated the routine of practice embodying the logic of the habitus of ‘diary farmer’, so could not live in that habitus and could not be a dairy farmer.

Field

A field is a dynamic “network of social relations, structured systems of social positions within which struggles or maneuvers take place over resources, stakes and access” (Everett, 2002, p. 60). Moreover, “all fields have an internal hierarchy” (Schubert, 2014, p. 179), indicating power differentials. A field may also be thought of as a game such as hockey, or a game played in a social arena such as academia or banking, which are each a particular space bound by norms and strategies. Within a given field, one may have a certain membership, status, or power, which may or may not be relevant in another field, depending on the relationships in one field versus another (e.g. a high-scoring hockey player may not be recognized as skilled on a baseball field; a financial engineer may not be judged as a skilled client-relationship manager; an academic in mathematics and computer science may be recognized as an expert financial engineer and business leader c.f. Ron Dembo; Wikipedia, 2018). In this sense, the field has a particular context: that of hockey, baseball, investment banking, corporate banking, or academia. An individual competes for status within the field, “according to the criteria internal to the field” (Everett, 2002, p. 61), using various strategies to increase the value of his capital relative to others. For example, in academia the criteria for status would

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

include publications; in business the criteria would include profitability; in hockey the criteria would include number of goals scored. Further than simply being a game, a field is a “social space where everyone has an interest in winning – that is, securing the most advantageous positions within it” (Grenfell, 2014, p. 154).

The interplay of habitus, its doxa, field, and strategies

The concept of field is critical to Bourdieu’s theory: one cannot talk of habitus, and a logic of practice, without talking about field, or as Maton (2014, p. 60) advises: “any attempt to explain practice by using habitus alone is not Bourdieusian”. Outside the field of dairy farming, does it matter if you have breakfast before starting work? That particular logic of practice may not be relevant in investment banking or corporate banking. Where you ‘feel like a fish in water’, where your habitus and logic of practice fit into the field you find yourself in, your habitus and your doxa will be consistent with others in that context. Here, assumptions that go without saying are shared, and there is a common understanding of what is doable or thinkable. Cows need to be milked twice a day: once before breakfast and bringing them out to pasture and once when they are brought in from pasture before dinner. Hay needs to be cut and baled before the rains begin. A priest with a rural background won’t bother to call on the farmer in his cassock around those times of work, since, unbidden he knows the logic of practice of farming.

The field will also determine what game is being played, what it takes to win the game, i.e. the “interest”, and what strategies can be employed. (One does not play ice hockey on a football field. The winning team of the hockey game has more goals than the other team. The team’s interest is getting the most goals for itself. A goal is gained by shooting a puck into the net – specifically the net of the other team, not the net of your

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

own team – and not being called out for icing, or other game infraction, in the shooting of the puck.) The objective of any game is the maximization of the “interest”, whatever that may be. In investment banking, strategies are employed to maximize financial profit, whereas in the Kabyle society, which valued “honour” rather than economic wealth (Bourdieu, 1980a/1990), strategies maximized honour rather than wealth. Strategies are based on “the unconscious calculation of profit (ultimately the improvement of their own position in the field)”, that is, strategies are employed without intention (Grenfell, 2014, p. 152). Profit is a maximization strategy focused on the “interest” in the field, where interest “is a word used to grasp the logic of the field, which allows for instinctive and semi-conscious acts of behavior in terms of a maximization of profit in accordance with current symbolic forms” (Grenfell, 2014, p. 154). For example, in hockey the interest is goals, in Kayble the interest was honour. That which is valued is the “interest”. What is of “interest” is necessarily rare, and thus most valuable; what is common is not sought after and not valuable (Grenfell, 2014). What is valued is a means of earning capital in the field, only insofar as the value or interest is recognized, acknowledged and legitimated.

For my father, the dairy farmer in the 1930’s and 1940’s, the interest was yield (the amount of milk), which was a function of (hand) milking technique, so being a good hand-milker was valued as that would increase yield. (It was also the subject of insult, gentle or not so, underscoring its value as an identity (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 121).) Being a good hand-milker was a function of the ‘logic of practice’ for a dairy farmer: it was an embodied routine. It was the means by which he earned ‘capital’ in the dairy-farming field.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Strategies are the acts allowed in the field to obtain ‘interest’ and increase capital. “There can be no such thing as a *disinterested* act [but rather acts] are based on the need for recognition” (Grenfell, 2014 p. 163, italics in the origin), where recognition is the recognition, or the acknowledgement, of the ‘interest’ being pursued. Thus, “individuals have an interest which is defined by their circumstances and which allows them to act in a particular way within the context in which they find themselves in order to define and improve their position” (Grenfell, 2014, p. 152). In this regard, a valid game would be one where the interest is an identity of value, and acknowledgement of that identity is the goal; one plays to maximize the value of identity and what to ‘win’ is the acknowledgement of the value of identity.

Capital: Economic, cultural, social, and symbolic

Bourdieu (1989) defines four types of capital: economic capital (material, physical wealth); cultural capital (knowledge, vocabulary, lifestyle, taste, bearing, including familiarity therewith); social capital (“the powers and resources that come from networks or relationships” (Everett, 2002, p. 63)); and symbolic capital. Symbolic capital is “the form of capital that the various species of capital assume when they are perceived and recognized as legitimate” across fields (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 17).

Capital is held within a given field, and the value of the capital is determined by the habitus of the field (Mahar, Harker, & Wilkes, 1990). Capital within a field can be translated into capital in another field only if the new field recognizes the capital in the other field as being legitimate capital in this new field. For example, economic capital can be converted into symbolic capital in a cultural field insofar as money will buy access to culture (e.g. art pieces, art museum memberships, art history degrees from prestigious

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

universities). However, as seen by the “nouveau riche”, the acquisition of this habitus takes place over time, as one does not shed one’s original habitus: history matters (Kish-Gephart & Tochman Campbell, 2015). Cultural capital is embodied over time, whereas cultural objects may be purchased to obtain symbolic capital. At the same time, cultural capital depends on economic capital, insofar as physical wealth allows for the purchase of education and familiarity with culture and wealth, which perpetuates each.

Symbolic capital, the basis of power, is attained when the other forms of capital are acknowledged, recognized (or ‘misrecognized’) as legitimate (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980) in a particular field or fields. Forms of symbolic capital include prestige, renown, reputation and personal authority (Cronin, 1996). Symbolic capital provides the basis of power, and the perpetuation of that power, across all fields that the symbolic capital is recognized. Power allows one to become the spokesman for the group, recognized, authorized and sanctioned by the group (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980). The power of spokespersonship is then the power to “name”, to “classify”, social objects which “always include a degree of indeterminacy and vagueness, and thereby, a certain degree of semantic elasticity” (Bourdieu, 1989, p 20).

Individuals seek to maximize their capital position in the social space by increasing their capital and/or through using strategies that perpetuate the conditions that make their capital valuable, including the power to name or classify what has value, and declassifying or discrediting their opponents’ forms of capital and power (Bourdieu, 1989; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2013; Everett, 2002). One uses one’s power, including strategies available in the field to maintain the habitus to one’s advantage and to maintain one’s power. The doxa of the habitus, or logic, is necessarily a simplification of

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

complexity, so that particular strategies circumventing particular rules under particular circumstances (Lamaison & Bourdieu, 1986) may have success in increasing capital, including the possibility of (mis)recognizing capital, and so gaining power over another. The habitus is subject to dynamic forces as various strategies are employed to increase one's relative power over another (through the accumulation of more capital or through recognition/misrecognition of capital). For example, over time, acquisition of economic wealth creates symbolic capital in the art world through acquisition of art and the practice of art collection, which will initiate a change in the habitus.

Symbolic Violence

Symbolic violence occurs when there is a struggle to “make sense” using the doxa of the habitus, that is, when the value of symbolic capital (capital earned outside the habitus) is recognized (i.e. misrecognized as legitimate capital), and attempts to impose its own doxa. When the symbolic capital is sufficient, there is an ongoing reproduction of the power relationship in the habitus (Bourdieu, 1990b/1987), i.e. ongoing symbolic violence. This symbolic violence is exerted by the dominated against themselves since their doxa does not challenge the legitimacy of the dominant; the dominant have provided for a change in the doxa through a change in the criteria of recognizing capital through their power to name, label, classify and categorize. Power allows one to impose the criteria to assess value, resulting in ongoing power, because, of course, the powerful impose criteria that most benefit them, using “hidden mechanisms by which victims are determined” (Bourdieu, 2006a/1973, p. 270), “with every appearance of legitimacy” (Bourdieu, 2006a/1973, p. 269). These mechanisms are not concealed or disguised so much as they are “rendered invisible through a displacement of understanding and a

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

[reconstruction] as part of other aspects of the habitus that ‘go without saying’” (Mahar et al., 1990, p. 19). In this way, social hierarchies can be perpetuated by the original power relationship (Bourdieu, 2006a/1973). The original power relationship may even be monopolized, eliminating (for the period the habitus remains constant) the need for further strategic struggle for power, by granting symbolic power through title or socially recognized qualification (Bourdieu, 1989) (such as being crowned emperor, installed as president, or conferred an advanced degree), and so producing continued symbolic violence.

Importantly, strategies to improve symbolic capital (and produce symbolic violence) “must be disguised, transfigured, in a word, euphemized” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 126). While overt violence is

...collectively disapproved of and is liable to provoke either a violent [reaction or] the destruction of the very relationship that was to be exploited – symbolic violence, gentle, invisible violence, unrecognized as such, chosen as much as undergone, that of trust, obligation, personal loyalty, hospitality, gifts, debts, piety, in a word, of all the virtues honoured by the ethic of honour, presents itself as the most economical mode of domination (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 127)

(Note that in this field then, honour is the “interest” of value, that which wins the game.)

Strategies are “not conscious, or calculated...[but rather] the intuitive product of ‘knowing’ the rules of the game” (Mahar et al., 1990, p. 17). The habitus does not simply abandon a rule when new (symbolic) capital is introduced, hence the need for strategies. Strategies “are first defined, without any calculation, in relation to objective potentialities, immediately inscribed in the present, things to do or not do, things to say or not say, in relation to a probable upcoming future” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 53). The habitus already contains the “possibilities and impossibilities, freedoms and necessities,

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

opportunities and prohibitions...[so] generating dispositions objectively compatible with these conditions and in a sense pre-adapted to their demands” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 54). That is to say, strategies already consider the likelihood of their success in the future, determined by the past, including past outcomes, to the extent they occurred within the same habitus and on the same field. Thus, knowledge of potential strategies is constructed into schema acquired through the course of collective and individual history. Individuals in a given social position, with their associated capital, can act on a strategy to produce effects across the field, thereby allowing for individual agency in collectives or organizations.

Strategies may be reproductive strategies, whereby the powerful evaluate strategies and meaning in their favour, imposing them as ‘legitimate’ and therefore reproducing the habitus (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977/1970), or reconversion strategies, whereby one form of capital is converted into another, so as to “legitimately” maintain their position (Mahar et al., 1990, p. 19). Through the right of ‘spokesmanship’ (i.e. having the capital to be recognized as spokesperson, including where this power has been conferred by symbolic power, such as being granted a certificate, or crowned emperor) it is possible to deem a logic, a practice, or a strategy as acceptable or unacceptable, simply through the right or power to classify or name. “Symbolic power is the power to make things with words” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 23), to name or label through language, including stretching or shrinking the semantic elasticity of the label. The power to label enables the powerful to impose order on the world, by composing, synthesizing, dissolving or decomposing a group (Bourdieu, 1989), and reveals the interest of the powerful. The authorized spokesperson for the group invokes an exploitive oracle effect, for “if this

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

group is the group to which you belong, which gives you an identity, which means you are *really* a teacher, *really* a Protestant, *really* a Catholic, etc., you *really* have no choice but to obey” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 212, italics in the original). Grenfell (2014, p. 219) characterizes the power to name as “tantamount to an act of magic since, if accepted, allows one view to take precedence over another, itself a form of symbolic violence. Classification strategies mark an ambition to accept or modify a worldview.”

Linguistically, the “I” of the spokesperson “must conceal itself behind the professed interest of the group...[and in doing so]...usurps” the group (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 213).

This operationalization of power, to determine what is of interest and what logic is to be used on behalf of others, forms the ‘critical’ component of Bourdieu’s framework.

Resistance

Bourdieu suggests power is not absolute since “*there are always, in any society, conflicts between symbolic powers that aim at imposing the vision of legitimate divisions, that is, at constructing groups*” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 22, italics in the original). Political struggle is a struggle to legitimize classification and categorization i.e. a struggle to impose a “legitimate vision of the social world” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 22). The struggle is a struggle of ‘making meaning’ using the doxa of the habitus versus the doxa imposed by the dominant. Symbolic violence results when arbitrary systems of classification set by the powerful are misrecognized as natural (Schubert, 2014). This can be a confusing experience, resulting in a sense of unease, or resistance (Bourdieu, 1991).

Resistance to symbolic violence is difficult because symbolic violence is ‘gentle’; it is not blatantly obvious. It’s everywhere and nowhere (because it is misrecognized), and to escape from it is difficult. Resistance requires the recognition of the mis-

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

recognition i.e. to be aware that misrecognition has occurred, and to disclose the objective truth of the doxa in order to expose the symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1991). Resistance involves a disagreement with established opinions, that is, an unorthodox opinion or ‘heterodoxy’ i.e. dissent from the doxa established by the powerful (Schubert, 2014). Heterodoxy is the opportunity for the dominated to neutralize the power of the dominant and make other possibilities conceivable and credible “integrating ... previously tacit or repressed practices and experiences of an entire group, investing them with the legitimacy conferred by public expression and collective recognition” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 129). Resistance is a matter of “naming the unnameable” through the “labour of enunciation” or the “labour of dramatization” or other modes of public expression (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 129-130).

Summary

Different conditions of existence provide for different habitus. The habitus exists and is reproduced within a particular field; the habitus provides the doxa, or logic of practice of the field for the participants. The field determines what game is being played, what it takes to win the game, i.e. the “interest”, and what strategies can be employed. Accumulation of the “interest” provides capital: economic, cultural, social or symbolic, where the field determines the types of capital that are recognized. Capital secures power, such that power is exercised within a particular field. Symbolic capital is the means by which capital in one field is recognized, or legitimated in another field, and the basis on which power can be exerted and perpetuated across many fields. The accumulation of capital, including symbolic capital, provides power, and the dominant use invisible, inscribed strategies to recreate the power relations in the habitus. With

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

power comes the right of spokespersonship, which provides the authority to name, classify or label including the use of semantic elasticity to create or blur distinction; that is, to create or dissolve a group, and with it the habitus and related doxa of the dissolved group are invalidated. Symbolic violence occurs when capital is misrecognized, and the source of power, as legitimate. The powerful are able to reconstruct social objects according to their classification schema using the semantic elasticity of the naming of social objects (Bourdieu, 1989). Symbolic violence occurs where there is a struggle to impose a “legitimate vision of the social world” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 22), or a struggle to make meaning using one’s own doxa versus the doxa imposed by another. Resistance to the imposed doxa, heterodoxy, requires an awareness of the misrecognition, and calling it out, so as to create the opportunity for other possibilities, including re-establishing or validating the previously repressed practices and experiences of the group.

Theoretical Considerations: Paradigms and Research Modes

Bourdieu’s theoretical framework is best-suited to social inquiry, where a critical stance is taken, and discourse used as the method for examining the phenomena under study (Deer, 2014). However, using a Bourdieusian approach “contains the implication that to omit any one part impoverishes the final whole” (Grenfell, 2014, p. 212), including the requirement that the researcher identify her position in the object of study and how that position would impact the analysis, recognizing that “a variety of viewpoints on the object of study can coexist and that [the researcher’s] view” is not the only narrative (Deer, 2014, p. 203). The following sections elucidate further on various

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

elements of Bourdieu's theory and how they fit into my research question and methodology framework.

Bourdieu and Sense-making

Bourdieu's social theory, considered a "cognitive social theory" (Strydom, 2006, p. 218) simultaneously accommodates the individual cognitive and social cognitive processes of sensemaking (cf. Lockett et al., 2014) since the habitus is "a cognitive structure, the product of internalization of cultural schemes of interpretation and evaluation" (Cronin, 1996, p. 73). Moreover, the habitus is constituted by "cognitive and motivating structures" (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980 p. 56). Bourdieu advises that the "existence of symbolic capital, that is, of 'material' capital misrecognized and thus recognized...reminds us ...that the acts of cognition ...are implied" (1990a/1980, p. 122). You have to be in a particular habitus to 'get' the habitus; that is, "the mental structures through which [agents] apprehend the social world, [and] are essentially the product of the internalization of the structures of that world" (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 18). If you don't have the capital to be in a particular habitus, you cannot interpret (Foster, 1986), or make sense of that habitus, as you do not possess the cognitive structures to perceive that world (Bourdieu, 1989); that is, you do not have the sensemaking tools. Note that these cognitive structures are socially structured, as you need to be in the habitus (a social construction) to understand the habitus.

Identity

Bourdieu is aligned with the classic theory of social identity (Tajfel, 1974) where "social identity is defined and asserted through difference" (Bourdieu, 2006b/1984, p. 293), including distance from the ideal (Hogg & Terry, 2000). Membership in particular

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

social groups (or fields) is a “site of struggle between individuals and groups...[so that membership is] at stake in social power relations” (Everett, 2002, p. 58). Membership is “constructed, negotiated, bargained over, ventured...[to]...bring near that which is objectively near and keeps its distance from that which is objectively distant” (Lamaison & Bourdieu, 1986, p. 120). Likewise, “agents are endlessly occupied in the negotiation of their own identity” where strategies to do so include “retrospectively reconstructing a past fitted to the needs of the future...or constructing the future” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 21). Cronin (1996, p. 73) argues that the habitus “allows for the inner, symbolic dimensions of personal identity”, since the habitus is comprised of both the structuring principles of the group, as well as the personal experiences of the individual. Identity is a construct that travels between individual and group levels of analysis, providing a means for individual agency across organizations (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000). As outlined earlier, the remainder of this paper will use both habitus and identity to underscore how Bourdieu’s thinking tools of habitus, doxa and capital accommodates sensemaking theory, which uses the term ‘identity’ as a key property, where identity is considered in context.

Identity is a source of symbolic violence, since the spokesman for the group is empowered with the capability to give distinction. Bourdieu (1991, p. 118) advises that to identify is to “legitimate an arbitrary boundary, by fostering a misrecognition of the arbitrary nature of the limit and encouraging a recognition of it as legitimate”. The process of identifying, categorizing, labeling or naming creates a boundary for the identified, providing them with ‘distinction’ but also imposing an obligation to be, since

it signifies to someone what he is and how he should conduct himself as a consequence...it signifies to someone what his identity is, but in a way that both expresses it to him and imposes it on him by expressing it in front of everyone...and thus informing him in an authoritative manner of what he is and

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

what he must be (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 120-121).

As a subject of symbolic violence, identity is a concern over which there is struggle and potential for resistance.

Social Context

Individuals in the same social space “have points of view on this objective space which depend on their position within it and in which their will to transform or conserve it is often expressed” (Bourdieu, 2006b/1984, p. 291). Moreover, it is those within the particular habitus who have the “schemes of perception and appreciation” to identify the conditions, features and characteristics of the habitus (Bourdieu, 2006b/1984, p. 293). Bourdieu advises the “ordinary experience of the social world is a cognition [and] recognition of an order which is also established in the mind” by the schema of the habitus inhabited by the perceiver (Bourdieu, 2006b/1984, p. 294). So, the habitus is the context within which we structure experience and actions; it is the context within which we sense-make. The wider social context provides an opportunity to examine the doxa of the habitus, as there may be challenges to sensemaking as different powers come into play and doxa is revealed through being ‘called out’ by heterodoxy. Shared habitus and doxa makes sensemaking “common sense”, conversely, what is not logical (doxa is not shared, or is imposed) is not sensible. While Bourdieu (2006b/1984) considers context to be a world-view social context, organizational management studies considers context in terms of organizational context, and position within the organization. For example, Dutton et al. (2001) drew on Bourdieusian practice theory to show that contextual knowledge available to middle managers helped them identified germane issues that sense-givers can provide to sense-makers to help facilitate change.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Strategies and Possibilities

The doxa of the habitus provides norms, strategies, and hence what is plausible. When the spokesperson for a group (who is, and is powerful, because he has sufficient capital, including (mis)recognized capital) “elasticizes”, imposing a revised (strange-to-the-habitus) doxa can the possible become impossible and visa versa.

Being in a particular habitus offers the tools to develop possibilities and constraints to understanding, as well as lack of understanding or plausibility of another’s position (as the tools are not effective in the other’s habitus). Bourdieu (1990a/1980, p. 55) explains:

As an acquired system of generative schemes, the habitus makes possible the free production of all the thoughts, perceptions and actions inherent in the particular conditions of its production – and only those.... The habitus is an infinite capacity for generating products – thoughts, perceptions, expressions and actions – whose limits are set by the historically and socially situated conditions of its production, the conditioned and conditional freedom it provides is as remote from creation of unpredictable novelty as it is from simple mechanical reproduction of the original conditioning.

Bourdieu and Social Agency

Bourdieu mediates between “subjectivist theories of action in terms of the intentions of rational calculations of individual subjects and objectivist theories, such as structuralism, which explain practices ... grounded in collective symbolic structures” (Cronin, 1996, p. 64). Bourdieu is explicit in explaining his work transcends the arbitrary distinction between objectivism and subjectivism (Bourdieu, 1989), where the “acts of cognition that are implied in misrecognition and recognition are part of social reality and that the socially constituted subjectivity that produces [the acts of cognition]

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

belongs to objective reality” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 122). The social world is legitimized as “agents apply to the object structures of the social world structures of perception and appreciation which are issued out of these very structures and which tend to picture the world as self-evident” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 122). In essence, “social reality is not independent of the agents’ representations of it” (Cronin, 1996, p. 66).

Bourdieu’s theory satisfies the structure/agency debate as knowledge and practice move between the group and the individual through the habitus, while the habitus may also include individual knowledge/routine-producing experiences. Habitus is “intended to provide the mediating link between social structure (the macro) and individual action (the micro)” (Everett, 2002, p. 66). Habitus is structured through social relations leading to accepted practices (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980). Further, habitus operates at a subconscious level, not subject to introspection or control,

...structuring new experiences in accordance with the structures produced by past experiences, which are modified by new experiences within the limits defined by their power of selection, bringing about a unique integration, dominated by the earliest experiences, of the experiences statistically common to members of the same class. ... The habitus tends to ensure its own constancy and its defense against change through the selection it makes within new information by rejecting information capable of calling into question its accumulated information, if exposed to it accidentally or by force, and especially by avoiding exposure to such information. ...[thus] the habitus tends to favour experiences likely to reinforce it ...[and] tends to protect itself from crises and critical challenges... The schemes of perception and appreciation of the habitus which are the basis of all the avoidance strategies are largely the product of a non-conscious unwilling avoidance” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, pp. 60-61).

Habitus is common at the group level, since it is a result of common social history. However, individual differences are possible, since the “infinite combinations of the variables associated with the trajectories of each individual and the lineages from which he comes can account for the infinity of individual differences” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980,

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

p. 292). Habitus is durable, but not fixed, since it includes “a person’s own knowledge and understanding of the work...a person’s knowledge has a genuine constitutive power and is not merely a reflection” (Mahar et al., 1990, p. 11).

As an individual’s capital changes in relative proportion to others (through the strategies of the individual, and possibly then (mis)recognition of symbolic capital), such that his position within the relative social space changes, his habitus changes. The habitus is a structuring structure, but it is not inflexible (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980; Mahar et al., 1990).

Bourdieu and Change

Bourdieu’s theory can account for change in perception and understanding, leading to a change in the doxa. Doxa may change as it “outlives the conditions in which it was produced” (for example, as successive generations of people living in Europe undergo a change in habitus as the future progresses from wartime to peace to economic frailty, or as women join the workforce). In other words, “the simple possibility that things may proceed otherwise than as laid down by [the habitus] is sufficient to change the whole experience of practice and, by the same token, its logic” or doxa (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 99). Strategic moves by holders of large amounts of capital - who have the power to impose their views through spokespersonship – may influence a change in the doxa, wielding their power to reproduce their advantage. The powerful attempt to impose doxa by “imposing different definitions of the impossible, the possible, and the probable, [which] causes one group to experience practices or aspirations that another group finds unthinkable or scandalous, natural or reasonable, and vice versa” (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 62).

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

To produce change, one needs two conditions: Symbolic capital earned through previous strategic struggles, to grant the symbolic power to impose upon others' minds, to impose recognition as an authority; and, a vision of the new habitus that is founded in reality. Here, "symbolic power is a power of consecration or revelation, the power to consecrate or to reveal things that are already there" (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 23), so as to "manipulate accepted representations of the social world" (Cronin, 1996, p. 66). The future 'exists' when it is recognized by others (and hence considered legitimate).

The element of habitus and associated doxa that is not reproduced (i.e. a particular logic is no longer part of the habitus) is "the engine of change and the arena for human agency" identifying the "habitus as a generative principle" (Harker, 1990, p. 104). As strategies are inscribed in the habitus, as it changes, strategies may change as well (to have greater or lesser chance of success, or introduces new strategies), leading to changing opportunities to gain symbolic capital, and continuing opportunities for change in position in the field.

Bourdieu and Power

Power is achieved through the accumulation of capital, including symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1989). With power, one has the right to speak on behalf of the group, and to identify or name (e.g. bring into existence) social objects (Bourdieu, 1989). This power of identification also allows one to bring greater or lesser distinction to the social object (e.g. to name an aspect of a social object as different in some way from another, or alike after all); to create or blur distinction.

Bourdieu straddled the subjectivist and objectivist (structural) positions, and thereby was "sensitiv[e] to the symbolic aspects of power... and the role of the subject in

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

the exercise of power” (Cronin, 1996, p. 64). Bourdieu’s critical social theory accommodates how “identity is constituted through the internalization of social schemes of interpretation and evaluation” (p. 61); makes a “constitutive connection between power and discourses of legitimation” (p. 61- 62); and explains how agent’s strategies to increase capital to change the relative positions in relationships, are effective in producing a change in power relationships (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980). Bourdieu “sought the truth hidden by power” (Delanty, 2011, p. 81), as the dominant imposed their doxa thereby obscuring or invalidating the doxa of the dominated.

Bourdieu and Language

Bourdieu’s theory provides that words have the power to structure, and identifies language as an instrument of symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1991), insofar as a dominant position is invested with the right to name and label. Dominant positions are signified by dominant language and discourse (Heracleous, 2006). By articulating the ‘taken for granted’ in the doxa (i.e. the logic of the habitus) one exposes the unspoken power effects, “recognizing the very things on which misrecognition depends and which preserve” the habitus (Grenfell, 2010, p. 97). Since “the names which construct social reality as much as they express it are the crucial stakes of political struggle” (Bourdieu, 1977/1972, p. 134), then, the struggle for power is a struggle to make meaning, a struggle to claim one logic over another, a struggle to accept as natural one means of categorizing, classifying or labeling over another, where “categories encode power differentials within and between groups” (Schubert, 2014, p.187). Categories and classifications “distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make...in which their position in the objective classifications is expressed or betrayed” (Bourdieu, 1984/1979, p. 5-6). Thus, if I classify

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

as thin what someone else classifies as obese, we each betray our position in a matter of interest: weight, as being good or bad. Revelations of “anxiety and embarrassment ... signify and reproduce both the agent’s position in an existing social structure and the legitimacy of that structure” (Schubert, 2014, p. 187), so that narratives expressing anxiety, embarrassment or shame are indicative of a position of domination, where the doxa of the narrator could not make sense of a situation in light of his doxa versus the doxa of the dominant.

Bourdieu in Critical Research

Critical analysis of language (text, discourse, narrative) does not expect an objective reality (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2008). Analysis from an interpretative and linguistic point of view acknowledges that social realities are held in place through systems of “production, dissemination and reception” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 86) such as the habitus. Each constructed reality must have made sense to the narrator, and none is privileged over another in the data analysis.

Bourdieu expects researchers to be critical: to see what is obvious since it occurs with regularity, but be suspect of the “institutional mechanisms” that have the power to reproduce the obvious, otherwise their research is likely to reinforce the symbolic capital and symbolic violence of the field (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980, p. 133), where symbolic capital is the basis on which power can be exerted and perpetuated. Bourdieu also calls for the research to reflect on one’s privileged indigenous position (a position of power) inside the society one is studying (Delanty, 2011; Foster, 1986). Bourdieu demonstrated his “self-reflexive project” (Reed-Danahay, 2005, p.44), in, for example, *Homo Academicus* (Bourdieu, 1988), on the power of the academic institute to impose its doxa

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

and reproduce the academic habitus, which he published while the prestigious Chair of Sociology at the College de France and noting his elementary educational in a rural village as an unlikely beginning to achieving such a post. To be reflective, then, one must reveal one's interest, including the interest brought to developing the research question, or "problemitization" (Barnard, 1990, p. 79), exposing one's "truth claims" and the legitimacy of the research conclusions (Grenfell, 2010, p. 97).

Bourdieu's theory was developed and focused on "recognizable human concerns" such as education, succession on the family farm, and marriage strategies (Bourdieu, 1988; Lamaison & Bourdieu, 1986; Reed-Danahay, 2005), which (at least to me) are practical life considerations. A Bourdieusian perspective looks to the logic of practice (what makes it so), but also to emancipation (what would make it better?), so that 'being critical' has practical relevance (Grenfell, 2010; Delanty, 2011). Bourdieu is concerned with a new way of seeing the world to make change possible (Delanty, 2011) with a focus on improved conditions that should be part of research outcome (Grenfell, 2010), making his theory a model of critical research, composed of insight, critique and transformation (Alvesson & Deetz, 2006).

How is it critical?

The habitus contains both the dispositions that structure the individual's perceptions, and the representation of the habitus, including the power relationships in the habitus (Cronin, 1996). Tied to the habitus is its doxa (or logic), the how of making sense, since what is illogical is not sensible. In this regard, Bourdieu's theory is a sensemaking theory. Knowledge, in Bourdieu's lexicon, is of a "common sense, or 'doxic' variety, which also tells us what is normal or legitimate" (Everett, 2002, p. 59).

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

The habitus, and its doxa provide the means of recognizing and valuing capital, including economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital. Symbolic capital occurs when economic, cultural or social capital from another habitus is (mis)recognized as valuable in this habitus. Accumulation of capital, and strategies to maximize capital allows one to become powerful, and impose categorization schemes such that the doxa is altered and now recognizes the symbolic capital as valid capital in the habitus, masking other alternatives. In a particular field, sensemaking will be limited by the doxa of the habitus “by producing what Bourdieu calls a ‘sense of limits’ ... [insofar as] agents may fail to see how certain aspects of a field have become influential in their ways of seeing and performing work” (Ellway & Walsham, 2015, p. 139). As Bourdieu’s theory is a critical theory (Myers & Klein, 2011), recognizing the effects of power, it can be seen as a critical theory for ‘making sense’ of things.

Everett (2002, p. 56) advises

Bourdieu has us attend to symbolic structures whilst considering their relation to both the cognitive structures of the individual and social structures of society... specifically... language, categorizations, and labels, and their systems of production and mode of consumption, as critical in the reproduction and transformation of the social realm

thereby recognizing the individual and the wider context (a society or organization) within which the individual operates. Agency is accommodated through the various combinations of economic, cultural, and social capital an individual has, and the strategies available to increase these, as well as parlay them into symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980). Finally, “Bourdieu’s notion of power is relational or process oriented” (Everett, 2002, p. 57), where symbolic systems, like language, are “instruments of domination, not simply instruments of knowledge” (Everett, 2002, p. 58).

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

I posit that making sense of change might be studied from a critical Bourdieusian perspective, “where the capacity to impose meaning as legitimate would be an important part of organizational life” (Swartz, 2008, p. 46). My intent is to show merely that Bourdieu’s theory is a viable “thinking tool” (McGuire, 2016) to use in understanding how people make sense of change, rather than to challenge the traditional critical sensemaking framework (Helms Mills et al., 2010).

Bourdieu’s theory is a ‘sensemaking’ theory in the sense that the knowledge or the logic for making sense is the doxa, which is tied to the habitus. Bourdieu considers the importance of formative context in creating the habitus; identifies the importance of rules of the game, and recognizes capital as the means to power. Bourdieu’s theory can be used in its entirety, avoiding the concern scholars have of taking elements of a theory piecemeal (e.g. Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008). In this framework, the notion of habitus and its doxa are the means to ‘make sense’, and strategies to increase capital or create symbolic capital are the means of accumulating power to impose an alternative in the doxa of the habitus. Bourdieu’s dialectic position on the structure/agency debate linking individual and social processes (Swartz, 2008) would allow for understanding how individual sensemaking can move to collective sensemaking in an organization, and provide the opportunity for change to occur.

Conducting Bourdieusian Research

Bourdieu proposes that the doxa of the habitus contains ‘common sense’ knowledge, which includes the possibility of inappropriately recognizing capital from another field as legitimate, accruing the right of spokespersonship on the holder of the (now) symbolic capital. Thus, the doxa of a particular habitus may result in [unconscious]

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

symbolic violence on the dominated by themselves (i.e. self-harm), through misrecognizing symbolic capital, and the source of power, as legitimate. Strategies being used by people trying to increase their (symbolic) capital are invisible, inscribed strategies (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980). Further, habitus operates at a subconscious level, not subject to introspection or control. Finally, the habitus is generative, changing with changes in capital, and resulting in new doxa.

The ‘taken for granted’ aspects of doxa can be examined through analysis of discourse (Ellway & Walsham, 2015). However, the challenge for an emic researcher with the same habitus operating in the same field, is uncovering both the doxa of the habitus recognizing (symbolic) capital, and the means by which the capital is misrecognized, given that the habitus operates at a subconscious level, and strategies to increase (symbolic) capital are “invisible”. Moreover, the doxa changes since the habitus is generative. In addition, different people may occupy different habitus and hence different doxa. Finally, it may be difficult to recognize doxa, ‘that which goes without saying’ when one ‘lives’ in the habitus containing that doxa. Hence Bourdieu’s emphasis on the need for reflectivity in conducting research.

Finally, Bourdieu’s theory is consistent with research in strategies in reactions to change, including the resistance to change. Coch and French (1948, as cited in Burnes, 2015) asserted that “resistance does not arise from the individual, but from the context in which the change takes place” (Burnes, 2015, p. 92). Resistance may not be resistance per se, but a ‘lack of attraction’ to the interest presented in the logic of the change (Ford & Ford, 1994). Bourdieu held that resistance to change requires recognition that the logic being imposed by the change is non-sensible to habitus for the ‘interest’ at hand, and

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

further, resistance expresses the ‘true’ logic of the habitus in a particular context and field to the interest at hand.

Sense-making ontology and epistemology

The ontologies ascribed to in sensemaking studies typically take either a cognitive approach, taking place in the individual mind, or a social constructionist approach, taking place in an interactive social world (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). In the former, cognitive ontology, sensemaking is concerned with interpretative schema, maps or frameworks to draw on in sensemaking, or making meaning of experience. In the latter, the social constructionist approach, sensemaking is an interactive, social process, “locating sensemaking in the talk of organizational actors, examining their use of language, ...discursive competence, ...[and] narratives” (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014, p. 95). Here, the focus is on language, narratives or stories, and discursive activities. Social constructionist perspectives are “sometimes also referred to as interpretive or social cognition approaches” (He & Brown, 2013, p.7). Interestingly, some of these same scholars slice the ontology even more delicately, suggesting a further division of the social constructionist approach into “collective-social (interactions between people) or specifically discursive (linguistic, communicative process)” (Brown et al., 2015, p. 267). However, I do not think this delicate slicing is necessary for my study, since Bourdieu (1989) in clarifying his ontology with an American audience identifies his work as “of *constructivist structuralism* or *structuralist constructivism*” (italics in the original), where

Structuralism... exists within the social world itself and not only within symbolic systems (language, myths, etc.) objective structures independent of the consciousness and will of agents, which are capable of guiding and constraining their practices or representations. By constructivism, I mean that there is a twofold

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

social genesis, on the one hand of the schemes of perception, thought, and action...and on the other hand of social structures...notably those we ordinarily call social classes. (p. 14)

Further clarification is however required regarding the cognitive schema or "the mental structures through which [agents] apprehend the social world" (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 18). These mental structures are not invariant as

firstly, this construction is not carried out in a social vacuum but are subjected to structural constraints; secondly, that structuring structures, cognitive structures, are themselves socially structured because they have a social genesis; thirdly, that the construction of social reality is not only an individual enterprise but may also become a collective enterprise; ...and above all, failing to construct the space of positions leaves you no chance of seeing the point from which you see what you see." (Bourdieu, 1989, pp. 18-19)

Studies of sensemaking in management studies take either a "hermeneutic turn", or a "linguistic turn", where these "turns" respectively represent an interpretive and a structural epistemology (Phillips & Oswick, 2012). In the hermeneutic turn, stories are studied to provide insight to the interpretation or meaning of an event or process. In this interpretive epistemology, narrative analysts, "take the social world as it is and seek to understand the meaning of this world for participants" (Phillips & Oswick, 2012, p. 443). Narrative analysis interprets language as reflective and representative of reality.

Discourse analysts in the linguistic turn, study discourse to provide insight into the construction of the sensemaking account. In discourse analysis, language does not just reflect reality, it is reality: language constructs and constitutes reality (Dobbin, 2008).

Discourse analysis tries to uncover how social reality is constructed and maintained.

While hermeneutic research "highlights the importance of meaning and narrative in change processes" (Phillips & Oswick, 2012, p. 453) it does not explore how meaning was constructed. Discourse analysis "explores the ways in which the socially produced

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

ideas and objects that populate the world come to be, or are enacted, through discourse” (Phillips & Oswick, 2012, p. 443). Hence these authors position discourse analysis as an important research technique for studying sensemaking, identity, power, and how “social objects coming into being, change and disappear” (Phillips & Oswick, 2012, p. 438). However, rather than differentiate between narrative and discourse analysis based on an epistemological point of view, Phillips and Oswick (2012) recommend the methodological approach be appropriate to the level of discourse (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000). From the point of view of tight coupling between discourse and meaning or a “determination notion of discourse” (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000, p. 1130) the analysis of close range (micro-level and meso-level) discourse in its local situational context has structuring effects for local social reality, framing action and cognitions, determining or limiting possibilities such that it is a direct insight into sensemaking (Taylor & Robichaud, 2004). Discourse at higher levels (meso and mega) from a tight coupling perspective “illustrate the rules that decide how we can talk about and experience practices” (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000, p. 1138). The deterministic close-range approach, where there is a tight coupling between discourse and meaning at the close range level of discourse, is consistent with the approach taken by other researchers in the linguistic, social constructionist field (e.g. Brown, 1998; Reissner, Pagan, & Smith, 2011). That is, discourse shapes reality, and discourse and reality are mutually implicated (Grant & Marshak, 2011). However, narrative research is also appropriate with constructionist ontology, since “narrative itself is socially constructed as well as being the basis for constructing different realities” (Brown, Gabriel, & Gherardi, 2009, p.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

329). As editors to the special edition in *Organization* on “Storytelling and change” they note an increasing reluctance to

interpret or deconstruct the texts with which [researchers] engage... There are no interpretive or deconstructive fireworks, no efforts to reveal the hidden depth, occluded meanings or ulterior motives in the narratives. Instead, there is a certain display of trust in the text and a readiness to fit it readily in some theoretical scheme or other (Brown et al., 2009, p. 330).

Brown et al. (2009) note that “narrative research into organizational change is itself changing” (p. 330), with declining importance of epistemological and ontological lines. For example, where the underlying ontology is social constructionist, and the epistemology is structural, “talk is action” whereas an underlying cognitive ontology considers sensemaking a search for an appropriate cognitive schema or map (Helms Mills et al., 2010). Discourse analysis would be an appropriate technique for studying Bourdieu’s key concepts, since Bourdieu (1989, 1991) considers language and the habitus to be structured, and structuring elements.

As an organizational research method, Boje and his colleagues (Rosile et al., 2013, p. 561) recognize the interpretivist paradigm as “often including social constructivism, phenomenology, and hermeneutical interpretations” whose focus is “on social structures or on cognitive structures [and] tends to be exploratory”, where a researcher may be an “insider or outsider seeking to know the world through structured and identifiable narratives”. (They associate the work of Humphries and Brown (2002) with an interpretivist paradigm; but the work of Heracleous and Barrett (2001) as abstractionist since it looks at linguistic deep structures.) The interpretivist paradigm accommodates both narratives and living stories, with the former frequently associated with retrospective sensemaking of the past, and the latter with multiple voices providing a non-linear telling

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

of an emergent future (Rosile et al., 2013, p. 560). Antenarrative provides a focus between narrative and living stories, where the antenarratives are fragmented, potential ('trial balloon') narratives, concerned with how "lived experience is shaped, reified, and assimilated into narratives...[or] ways living stories turn into dominant narratives, struggle with counter-narratives [or] more micro living stories" (Rosile et al., 2013, p. 562). Emic and etic researches use the antenarrative approach when they are seeking marginalized or forgotten voices missing in the dominant narrative.

My study's methodology, described further in the next chapter, takes the approach of antenarrative analysis conducted at the close range level of discourse (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000) expressed in the accounts of user stakeholders (Rosile et al., 2013), where language constructs reality (Hardy, Lawrence, & Grant, 2005), incorporating the past and musing a future.

Conclusion

Bourdieu's theory is a paradigm aligned with undertaking research from a critical perspective, where social positions in phenomena are explored through an analysis of the discourse that surrounds it, which in my study is the making sense of a new tool.

Sense-making studies, typically conducted in a Weickian sensemaking framework, highlight the key sensemaking properties of context, identity, and plausibility (Weick, 1995). These concepts are not inconsistent with Bourdieu's 'thinking tools'. For Bourdieu, the context structures the habitus, outlining the norm and practices for a given social group. Moreover, you have to be in the habitus to know the habitus, providing an element of identity. The habitus contains the doxa, or the logic for how to make sense, for determining what may or may not be plausible and allowing for certain strategies to

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

be successful in maximizing “interest”. Capital is a proxy for value associated with a particular interest. Power is a struggle for capital and acknowledgement of its legitimacy. Positions of power control the naming and thereby legitimacy, of capital, including symbolic power such as honour, prestige and authority, (Cronin, 1996), and determine the appropriate doxa, or orthodoxy for valuing interests and capital, thereby controlling its reproduction to ensure continued power and legitimacy. Hence, the power to impose “differentiation and distinction results in a kind of violence being perpetrated [on the rare, valued “interest”] on those not belonging to the dominant social group...[so that]...fields operate according to dominant, orthodox forms of thinking and doing things” (Grenfell, 2014, p. 267). Social identity operates through the habitus, determining possibilities and trajectories on the field to enhance identity through various strategies to gain capital. “Groups and individuals accumulate and exchange ...capital(s)... in order to enhance their positions” (Swartz, 2008, p. 47) within the constraints specified in the habitus for what may or may not be said or done in interaction with others, particularly those in more powerful and less powerful positions. Position-taking is a strategic move (Lamaison & Bourdieu, 1986), and may involve the introduction of heterodoxy, an unorthodox opinion in reaction to established, dominant doxa in a field, or in essence, dissent and resistance (Schubert, 2014).

In my research study, I show how Bourdieu’s integrated theory is an appropriate sensemaking approach, and allows for making sense of the introduction of a new system in the organization. This study is during in a time of “tools change”, where participants are required to “pick up new tools”, an ideal situation to study since this should activate sensemaking of the change as the practice of logic gained in operation of the previous

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

tool will be challenged, and where changes may impact identity in the organization. I show how Bourdieu's framework is an appropriate research tool by which to study organizational sensemaking using the concepts of habitus, doxa, capital, symbolic violence and strategies. Bourdieu's theory accommodates key properties of sensemaking, namely, identity, context and plausibility. Bourdieu's theory is instructive (Swartz, 2008; Grenfell, 2014) in this research, where the links between individuals' habitus, and the positions taken by individuals in the field of the organization, each looking for legitimization or acknowledgement of the value of their "interest", will be in play.

Chapter 4: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter discusses the qualitative methodology I used to investigate my research question. This methodology is consistent with my research question and the theoretical frameworks outlined earlier, which in turn are aligned with my own epistemological and philosophical positions. The research location, the change phenomena, and selection of potential participants are described. Data collection, analysis and treatment, are outlined. The chapter closes with a discussion of how this research is a critical management study, and the value it can bring.

My research question drives the research approach

I am interested in how employees in the knowledge-based organization where I work make sense of a change, specifically in the implementation of new technology system, a tool to be used by employees across the organization in doing their work, how their identity impacts their sensemaking of the tool, how their sensemaking impacts identity, and how they restore their identity when it is threatened by this new tool. I do not have control over the design, rollout, acceptance or usage of the tool (other than my own usage). My research question is a 'how' question, using Bourdieu's theoretical framework to examine the phenomenology of a change underway where I do not have control over others' behaviour; therefore, it is well-suited to a qualitative research method.

As briefly outlined in Chapter 1, the organization is a professional services firm in the Canadian financial services sector, made up of groups that deal with audit and policy, supported by a corporate services group (e.g. Accounting, Human Resources, Information

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Technology). The change is a new information management system tool for creating, saving, storing, sharing and managing the documents of information used in doing work in the organization. The participants in my emic study are members of the audit group, who, along with the rest of the organization, are expected to use the new tool. The firm's internal communications, and information about the organization available externally, provide additional context. The interviews, in context, make up the qualitative data regarding how participants are making sense of the new tool. Qualitative analysis is used to examine their antenarrative accounts of the introduction of the new tool, and investigate strategies they use to maintain and recover their audit identity being threatened by this change in tools.

I anticipated that where there were different identities, there would be competing viewpoints and struggles to make sense of these different views, different or competing narratives, and that power might be revealed. There might be strategic or opportunistic development of enabling discourses by participants who desired greater legitimacy and hence power, or capital, in a field, or sought to secure an established or new identity. In the course of analyzing the interviews, I paid attention the micro (or small 'd') discourse of individuals in the local context of the organization, rather than a social mega (or big 'D') discourse (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000), since my question of interest related to how employees with various histories and experiences in our organization made sense of change, the resultant impact on identity, and strategies used to maintain positive identity (associated with maintaining or enhancing capital), rather than change or change management on a broader scale. Moreover, the nature of the research site supported the importance of the unique organizational, social context within which participants made

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

sense of the change, indicating that the appropriate level of analysis was at the micro- or meso- level of discourse analysis (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000; Vaara, Sonenshein, & Boje, 2016).

Traditional narrative analysis focuses on plot structures, where a tension unfolds and is resolved, with a beginning, middle and end, as well as on characters (villains and heroes) and symbols (Pentland, 1999). Instead, narratives may be fragmented discourse not yet fully developed, but a ‘trial balloon’ narrative. This partial narrative, termed ‘antenarrative’, is “conceptualized as fragments of organization discourse that construct identities and interests in time and space” (Vaara & Tienari, 2011, p. 370); it is a bet on how the future will unfold in prospective sensemaking (Rosile et al., 2013), with a focus on maintaining or enhancing identity (Weick, 2001), constrained by what is possible, or plausible, according to the logic of the sense-maker (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980). An antenarrative approach allows the researcher “to focus on ongoing prospective sensemaking and sense-giving, how storytelling is used as an action to promote or resist specific kinds of change (Vaara & Tienari, 2011, p. 372). Moreover “narrative constructions of identity and interests are used to legitimate or resist change” (Vaara & Tienari, 2011, p. 371). With different identities and interests ‘joining the conversation’ there may be “alternative and competing antenarratives of organizational change” (Vaara & Tienari, 2011, p. 370). Thus, the antenarrative approach allows one to focus on sense making revealed through antenarratives, and how these are used to enact or resist a prospective future (Vaara et al., 2016). Antenarrative is used to put forth a particular construction of the future, to control or influence others’ sensemaking, to enable or

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

constrain plausibility, to legitimize or resist the change (Balogun, Jacobs, Jarzabkowski, Mantere, & Vaara, 2014).

Researchers using antenarrative analysis in their research study seek to “understand how lived experience is shaped, reified, and assimilated into narratives...as well [as] on ways living stories turn into dominant narratives [and,] struggle with counter-narratives” (Rosile et al., 2013, p. 562). Researchers using antenarrative analysis may be insiders, emic researchers, who “seek especially the marginalized or forgotten voices...[and] question the status quo” (Rosile et al. 2013, p. 562). This stance of seeking the marginalized or forgotten voice and questioning the status quo makes antenarrative an appropriate methodology for critical research (Vaara et al., 2016).

Theoretical frameworks used in understanding the phenomena of change, and participants’ reactions to proposed change seek to understand how participants make sense of the change (cf. Brown, 1998; Doolin, 2003; Thurlow & Helms Mills, 2009). Narrative analysis provides a window to the logic or sensemaking people use in talking about change, indicating how their reality is being constructed (cf. Sonenshein, 2010). Recent research continues to make use of qualitative data, including antenarrative analysis in the sensemaking of change, particularly as it evolves over time (cf. Huy, Corley, & Kraatz, 2014; Vaara & Tienari, 2011). There are many ways to do qualitative, discursive analysis (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2008) utilizing various paradigms, philosophies, and theories (Rosile et al., 2013) giving me a sense of ‘permission’ to use this qualitative, narrative approach to apply Bourdieu’s framework to understanding how people are making sense of change.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

My epistemological and philosophical positions

With a nod to Brown et al. (2009) who note that “narrative research into organizational change is itself changing” (p. 330), with declining importance of epistemological and ontological lines, my discussion here is short. My research and analysis is based on a structural epistemology, consistent with the linguistic turn in research (Phillips & Oswick, 2012). The structural viewpoint indicates that language and linguist practices structure reality (Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Phillips & Oswick, 2012) such that discursive practices structure and enact reality for individuals in their narrative accounts. Discourse (what people say, including textual and oral discourse) is a window into how they make sense of things, insofar as these accounts are the external manifestation of internal processes (Phillips & Oswick, 2012). Discourse, from a structural viewpoint, is at least “tightly coupled” with reality and may be “collapsed” with reality (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000, p. 1147), so that a study of discourse provides insight into experiences, beliefs, stereotypes, cognition, values, feelings or ideas. From a structural standpoint, discourse frames our sense of self; it structures us; it defines and limits possibilities for us; it is what we believe, think and value; it is a direct insight into our making sense of things (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000).

Bourdieu positions his framework as the “analysis of objective structures - of those different fields – inseparable for the analysis of the genesis, within biological individuals, of the mental structures which are to some extent the product of the incorporation of social structures” (1990b/1987, p. 14), where social structures are constraints to the logic people use to make sense of situations. However, Bourdieu believes that social structures are not freely chosen, but “are the product of historical

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

struggles (in which agents participate in accordance with their position in the social space, and which the mental structures through which they may apprehend this space)” (1990b/1987, p.14). Therefore, in this framework, realities are socially constructed, a product of struggles for power, informed by past experiences, and constrained by plausibility, determined by a logic of practice (Bourdieu, 1990a/1980). In a polyvocal environment (Boje, 1995) where people have different histories, many accounts of reality are possible, where each person may have a distinct reality in the shared space of the organization. Where ‘the playing field is not level’, where there are more and less powerful players on the field, not all voices have equal say, and some accounts may be ‘silenced’ (Heracleous, 2006).

The methodology described below, of collecting and analyzing antenarrative, the potential narratives in the temporal and iterative process of “making sense” (Vaara & Tienari, 2011) is consistent with this epistemology and ontology, with my position as an emic researcher (Rosile et al., 2013), and is not inconsistent with Bourdieu’s theoretical framework and approach to his own research.

Research location, participants and the change phenomena

Research location

The research location is the organization where I was employed at the time, an institution in the Canadian financial services industry. The president of the organization provided his verbal agreement to this research in 2015, and this was confirmed by way of a letter from one of his executive team to me (included in the appendices). Permission was granted with minor constraints: the organization must remain anonymous, and I could interview only up to 30 employees who were not in senior management positions

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

(i.e. senior to me). I obtained research ethics approval through the Athabasca University Research Ethics Board (a copy of which is included in the appendices). I advised executive management in the organization as it changed (new executive team members) and as the research process progressed (e.g. obtained ethics approval in 2016, potential participants being approached, interviews initiated in 2017); support of the research in my organization continued throughout. All of the interviews took place on-site in the organization during regular working hours, in my closed-door office, with the exception of the first and last interviews, which, at the request of participants, took place after regular working hours, in a meeting room on-site, and in a local patio-bar, respectively.

Participants

The system was rolled out, or implemented, successively by audit team. Constrained by the total number of interviews my organization would allow divided by the total number of audit teams, I had a limited number of people I could interview on each team. I desired a balanced representation of men and women, with different job titles and responsibilities (e.g. auditor vs. senior auditor, with responsibilities for managing staff vs. not), different lengths of service in the organization, as well as including those that participated in the espace user team and those that did not. I expected that these variations might give rise to differences in perceived identities, potential identity threats, and strategies to counter those threats. Moreover, Bourdieu's approach called for representation from each of the potential groups. This left a short list of potential participants by team. Given that I had spent 15 years in the firm, and that there were approximately 300 people that worked in audit, I knew most of the people who could make up the pool of potential participants, so no one was eliminated on that

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

basis. Potential participants were solicited as their rollout was completed by way of an email, addressed individually, which included a brief description of the research, as well as the informed consent letter (included in the appendices), which was signed prior to beginning each interview. Two potential participants from different audit teams declined to participate, both women although with different demographics. In all, I conducted 23 interviews, at which point I concluded interviewing, expecting that I had reached data saturation (Baker & Edwards, 2012) and knowing that I had personally reached interview saturation.

Ethical considerations in conducting research with humans is complicated by working and researching in the same organization, due to a heightened sensitivity to privacy and potential for harm (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2008). Potential harm might include concerns about relative power positions of the researcher compared with research participants, impact on career, or impact on collegial relationships between members of the initiative project team and users within the organization. My research ethics application specifically addressed these issues, and was approved. (The certificate of approval is included in the appendices.) People on my team were excluded from the pool of potential participants. As well, I did not include people enrolled in the “recent university graduate” program that I was then coordinating and mentoring, or who had “graduated” from that program in the last five years. I was not in a position where I influenced any other performance reviews, nor was I involved in promotional assessments underway outside of the “recent university graduate” program. Potential interviewees were advised participation in the research study was voluntary, the organization was aware of, and supported this research, their anonymity would be

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

maintained, and the Athabasca University Research Ethics Board had approved the research approach. Prior to beginning each interview, the participant was ‘walked through’ the letter of consent (included in the appendices), and permission was requested, and evidenced through signature.

Change Phenomena

There were two systems initiatives underway in the period 2015 - 2017, one being rolled out across all groups of the firm, and one specifically for the Audit groups where my role in the organization is located. The former is called ‘espace’, the new Electronic Document Repository Management System (‘EDRMS’) for creating, saving, storing, sharing and managing the documents of information used in doing work in the organization. The latter is called Audit Tools & Technology (‘AT&T’), which is a new systems technology specifically to support audit work. The development and implementation schedules for these systems indicated that while espace would be implemented in 2016 (later revised to 2017), the AT&T system would likely not be rolled out until later, likely 2019 (now revised to 2020 or 2021). All employees in the organization are required to use espace, and all employees in the Audit division will be required to use the AT&T system. In espace, I expect there will be more challenges to maintain identities (with greater focus on document management), whereas AT&T will provide more opportunities to reinforce audit identities as it emphasizes the importance of making informed judgments in risk management and audit. For the purposes of this study, my focus was on espace due to its richer potential for sensemaking work, although some interview participants referenced development work underway in the AT&T system

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

as well as discussing the experience of change associated with the espace implementation.

There were other changes in the environment which may have impacted the experience of the systems change: the organization was going through a number of significant leadership (executive management) and organizational changes which began in June 2014 and continued through (and beyond) the period of my interviews. This formed part of the contextual environment within which the study was conducted. From my perspective, the espace initiative would have been considered a major corporate change if it were not for the many changes occurring in the organization, including the anticipated AT&T system as well as organizational structure and executive management changes.

Data Collection, Data Analysis and Treatment

Data Collection

Data included oral discourse, transcribed to text, and written discourse, namely:

1. Data available externally concerning the organization, with specific emphasis on materials that spoke to identity. These included newspaper and journal articles from the media (e.g. Globe & Mail), as well as information publicly available on the firm's external website.
2. Data naturally occurring in the organization, which provided social and environmental context, namely:
 - The CEO newsletter which provided a general information on goals and initiatives, produced approximately quarterly

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Executive communications including memos (e.g. from CEO, EVPs or SVPs), used to convey executive messages on projects, initiatives, organizational changes and other issues, which came out on an ad-hoc basis
- Organizational charts
- Announcements (e.g. on the espace introduction, implementation, and rollout schedule)
- Documents (including power point, word, and visio documents) housed in the organization-wide ‘public space’ on systems initiatives

These formed the dominant narratives in the firm, providing expectations of appropriate or acceptable ways to think and behave, meant to constrain or obscure other possibilities (Boje, 1995).

3. Data produced for the research, to elicit insight into the experience of change, by way of the one-on-one interviews I conducted.

The interviews provided the antenarratives about participants’ experience with the change (i.e. use of the new system post implementation), the first *in situ* accounts, where “accounts” are defined as “people’s own narrative descriptions of organizational processes, events and phenomena” (Vaara et al., 2016, p. 498).

Interviews were structured insofar as I had the same interview guide (included in the appendices) for each interview. Interview questions were open-ended so as to elicit participants’ experience of the introduction of espace. In the initial interviews I conducted, people talked about the various systems they used, and I realized that that was a good question to start interviews with, so I updated the interview guide accordingly i.e. “What do you think of the technology available to do your work?” As we went through

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

the interview, people touched on questions that I had anticipated asking later in the interview, so the actual order of questions depended on the participant's earlier responses. As well, participant responses would prompt follow-up questions that were unique among them. Interviews concluded with demographic information such as length of service, and confirmed position title and responsibilities, to provide additional information about the construction of the interviewee's identity.

All 23 interviews were conducted within 60 minutes; six (notably the first four as I was learning the technique of interviewing) interviews lasted longer than 50 minutes, eight interviews lasted 40-50 minutes, six lasted 30-40 minutes, and three interviews were time-constrained to 30 minutes or less at the request of the participants.

The organization rolled out *espace* in 2017; and my interviews were conducted post-implementation, with the exception of the interview with the first participant, due to her (then) impending retirement, availability (frequency of travel) and hence the need to set an interview date early, and the unexpected delays in implementation. The rollout was phased (by audit team), so the remaining 22 interviews were conducted over a four and a half month period from April to August 2017.

I had hoped to audio-record each interview; however three participants chose not to be audio-recorded. In these situations, I took notes to capture comments verbatim.

Data Analysis

Audio-recorded interviews, and verbatim comments captured in my notes were transcribed for the purposes of analysis.

I heard the interviews *in situ* and again at least twice in the process of transcription, which I did myself on the advice of Mann (2016). Resulting text was read a minimum of

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

five times, once at the conclusion of the transcription of the individual interview, twice at the conclusion of transcribing all interviews, and twice during the drafting of the analysis section of this paper. My coding manual identified codes derived from Bourdieu's theoretical framework (Saldana, 2016), namely, field, habitus, doxa, capital, symbolic violence and strategies. Habitus was understood as identity (who we are, in context), and doxa as the logic of practice of that identity (how we work given who we are). Capital was broken down into economic, cultural, social and symbolic. Cultural capital was understood as "technical knowledge" of the habitus, that is, as knowledge in the "practice" found in a habitus. Symbolic violence was understood as a struggle to make meaning (Bourdieu, 1989), where the struggle reflected an attempt to have a logic imposed, and hence an identity imposed. Strategies were understood as opportunities to gain capital (including symbolic capital) or redress symbolic violence through imposition of one's own logic; that is, an attempt to assert or re-claim identity.

Initially, interview text was parsed for the "field" of technology i.e. text from each interview used for further analysis was limited to those pieces that referred to technology or systems (including both where the technology was referenced by name, and where it was referred to, for example, as "it" or "that"). From there, text was coded for capital (economic, cultural, social and symbolic). Then, that same text was coded for habitus, doxa, symbolic violence and strategies. I looked for similarities and differences in habitus, doxa, and capital valued in the habitus (particularly knowledge associated with the practice of the habitus). Then, I looked for common themes in the capital coding by habitus. Cultural capital was largely revealed through knowledge (which 'made sense' to me in an audit work environment). I considered the "doxa" of the habitus revealed by its

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

logic either directly or indirectly (i.e. “calling out” of a lack of logic). The coding for doxa was often on the same text as the coding for cultural capital, so that the knowledge inscribed in the habitus was also part of the logic of the habitus. I looked at the text for instances of symbolic violence, where the doxa of a habitus, or logic of practice associated with an identity, had been challenged, and there was a struggle to making meaning, or maintain identity as a result. I coded for strategies people used to ‘right the wrong’ in the challenge to their doxa, or, in other words, the challenge to their identity. In addition, I considered strategies that were opportunities to claim a (mis)recognition of capital from another habitus (i.e. opportunities for symbolic capital recognition), and in doing so, claim additional identity value.

On completion of the coding, I examined each of the resulting coding “baskets” and began the process of describing that basket (Saldana, 2016), so that I moved away from using a code to a more fulsome description. For example, the habitus code revealed two distinct habitus (where the plural of ‘habitus’ is also ‘habitus’) related to audit as well as technology; the doxa code included concerns about both temporal and fiscal efficiency as well as controls and effectiveness in the participants’ narratives. This process provided insights into my findings in the interviews, for example, the possibilities of multiple habitus in the participants, common themes in the logic of practice of the habitus, and how these, and hence identity, had been violated in the implementation of the new system, as well as unique and common themes in the strategies people used to rebalance their identity.

I examined data naturally occurring in the organization (newsletters, announcements, reports) as well as external reports to give greater context to the struggle

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

to make meaning. I looked particularly at text relevant to the construction of identity associated with the habitus, possible identity threats (or threats to capital associated with identity or habitus), and reconstruction of identity (and capital associated with the habitus). In particular, I was looking for ways in which the construction of identity or the logic of practice in the habitus of participants in the study had been challenged, and how participants struggled with that challenge, attempting to rebalance or improve their identity construction.

Doing Rigorous Research

Conducting rigorous research includes identifying paradigm-consistent “ontological assumptions – the underlying belief structure of the researcher regarding ...the human experience” (Rosile et al., 2013, p. 572); goals of the research; and, the methodology to collect and analyze storytelling data. Consistently, the “checklist for reviewers” to assess rigor developed by Rosile et al. (2013) includes assessing the appropriateness of the method to the research question and the sampling methodology, as well as constraining research conclusions to the specifics of the research (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007).

This research question and methodological approach is firmly supported by the theoretical framework outlined earlier. Qualitative analysis is well suited to ‘how’ questions. I used naturally occurring text and interviews as sources of data. As a qualitative technique, interviews are one of the most important data gathering tools available (Myers & Newman, 2007). Moreover, by being an emic researcher, I avoided some of the pitfalls of interviewing that Myers and Newman (2007) enumerate: having limited knowledge of the past in this organization, the work that is done here, and what

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

constitutes a virtuoso at work, as well as interviewing complete strangers with whom there is no trust to divulge sensitive information under time and access pressures. Finally, due to the unique sensitivity of our work, it is unlikely that an etic researcher would have the same access to knowledge or insight to the inner workings of the organization. I speak the language of our work, I use the tools provided by the organization. I have a fifteen-year history with the organization and know the ‘shorthand’ used in our narratives. I am sensitive to the interests of participants as we go through a change in our tools, as much of my previous work in the organization had supported these tools.

This research adds to the body of knowledge in studying change critically, as an introduction of Bourdieu’s theoretical approach to sensemaking, in particular in this study, the sensemaking of a change in the tools in the logic of practice. This research may provide insights on how to support new systems or technology initiatives so as to improve implementation outcomes by understanding their impact on identity. This improvement may be as simple as validating the alternative realities of change experienced in the organization, where these alternative realities stem from alternative identities.

There are constraints to the extent to which this study can be used to generalize how people make sense of a new systems technology i.e. to how broadly the findings of the study can be extended to other situations including whether the analysis can be applied to discursive situations of the past, and predict those that will happen in the future (Gee, 2011). These research findings cannot be extended beyond this specific organization (given the unique nature of our work, our work identities, and the

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

operationalization of power in the organization) or beyond the sensemaking of this particular change in tools (since, for example, a system designed specifically for audit may come with consistent logic of practice for auditors, and hence have a different impact on identity).

Reflection on the data and my own “making sense”

Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) recommend researchers recognize their positions in the web of power relationships in their reflexivity notes. Similarly, Swartz (2008, p. 46) notes that Bourdieu called for reflexivity, critically examining “all assumptions and presuppositions not only of the sociological object investigated but also of the stance and location of the researcher relative to the object studied”. Reflexivity suggests that the researcher understand her contribution of self to the process of qualitative data gathering: her own story, her own culture or beliefs, and how these may colour or impact the story being heard (Bishop & Shepherd, 2011).

In the course of conducting the data analysis, examining identity and logic of practice, capital, struggles to make meaning and attempts to restore identity, I struggled with making sense informed by my own construct of my identity, history, experiences (including those of symbolic violence), biases, position in the hierarchy, and use of power; or in Bourdieusian speak my habitus, capital, symbolic violence and loss of capital. Thirteen years ago, my professional role put me at the forefront of the previous systems change for a change in tools specifically for the audit user group, where this tool and the change process associated with it had been a source of symbolic violence to the audit user group. Approximately six years ago, when the initial design of espace was unfolding, my recommendations were strongly against the design being proposed by IT

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

due to my understanding of the logic of practice of the audit identity. However, the design moved ahead as proposed by IT, suggesting early that symbolic violence, or a struggle to make meaning of the logic of the system versus the logic of practice of auditors, would be a theme in this study. My role was largely removed from the day-to-day activities of audit, so I was not credited with the identity associated with the audit habitus, yet I worked in that group. While my role previously had an element of responsibility to executive leadership, whatever symbolic capital or identity I had derived from proximity to executive leadership had disappeared over the past four years with a number of leadership changes and organizational restructurings. I needed to guard against this research study becoming a strategy to redress my loss of identity resulting from these leadership and organizational changes. While interviewing, I was clear with participants that the purpose of the research was to support my doctoral studies, however I also need to keep that in the forefront in conducting analysis, and to be open to finding themes I did not anticipate. I also needed to let go of the logic in my own habitus of finding the root of the problem, attributing responsibility, and addressing it. Bourdieu (1992) recommends to researchers to take the stance of an “outsider” in conducting emic research. I needed to be objective by being both insider and outsider: Insider to recognize the habitus of the people in the organization, and outsider by not taking for granted the doxa of that habitus. Moreover, I needed to consider my personal habitus, logic, symbolic violence and potential strategies in the need to rebalance my symbolic capital in the course of interviewing, analyzing, and coming to conclusion on, the research data.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Conclusion

My research question, location, situation and available materials were consistent with using qualitative, antenarrative analysis in examining how participants make sense of a change with a particular focus on how they construct their identity, threats thereto, and how they rebalance their identity. My question focused on “how” something is accomplished; my study location was my organization where I had little control over the phenomenon of interest or the participants’ behaviours and stories; I too experienced the change in my tools at work. There is sensitivity to the protection of information in my organization, which has a specialized position in the work it does, so that it is unlikely that an outsider would have the opportunity to study here or have the knowledge required to understand the work of the organization in sufficient detail to make sense of the institution-specific discourse. While an insider or emic researcher, I needed to also act as an outsider, so that my personal experiences in making sense of changes happening to me with regards to identity did not cloud the analysis. People will make sense differently, and different stories may vie for dominance in their retelling. Narrative, particularly antenarrative analysis provides a window into sense making as it unfolds. Using this method to study sense making, that is, how possible sensemaking is constrained by context and identity has been established through previous studies of change, and is consistent with the possibility of various or different antenarratives. Similarly, Bourdieu’s critical philosophy is consistent with different sensemaking possibilities across individuals, constrained and enabled by context and identity. Hence this study demonstrating the utility of Bourdieu’s critical social theory as a sensemaking framework, and applying Bourdieu’s thinking tools to understanding construction of the

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

sensemaking account in a change situation is consistent with a qualitative research methodology such as antenarrative.

Chapter 5: Analysis

Introduction

This chapter begins by outlining the organizational context in which the systems technology change was introduced. Following this, an analysis of the interviews conducted with participants is provided, focusing on Bourdieu's concepts relating to identity (habitus), and its related logic (doxa), and challenge thereto (symbolic violence) to make meaning in the implementation of the new tool "espace".

The organizational context

Vaughan (2008) cautions that the researcher, emic or etic, must master the history of the organization in its historical context: the past matters in understanding relationships of domination. Within my organization, there are three historical identity silos: the audit area where my role is situated with offices in three locations in major financial centers in Canada; the policy area and the corporate administration area co-located in a separate major city away from any of the audit offices. Movement between the three silos is rare; barriers to movement include expertise, geographic location, and language skills. Tools that will be introduced to the organization originate in different areas of the organization: espace is initiated from the administrative head office, whereas AT&T originates from auditing offices. These are all indicators that identity will be a concern in this study.

Auditors interact with the financial elite, which provides the ability to create separate and distinct, and valuable identities in comparison to our colleagues. Typically, auditors return to or come from industry; that is, auditors were once (and maybe again) employees of the firms they now auditing. This gives auditors credibility in the field, as

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

they “have been there” themselves. This allows auditors the opportunity to create positive identities within the organization, distinct from employees in the policy and administrative areas, seen as “policy wonks ... living in an ivory tower”, and, merely necessary. Individuals working in the policy area live and work cheek-by-jowl with the politically powerful, which allows them to construct positive self-identities. People working in the corporate and administrative area are the most versatile in that city, as they have skills that are transferable to other organizations, which provides them with an opportunity to construct a positive identity as well. In particular, people working in the Information Technology (IT) group (part of the corporate and administrative group) are most likely to be contract employees, and many come from consulting practices.

These factors all point to different identities at work, and different contexts, implicating different possibilities and plausibilities in sensemaking accounts. Individuals come from different positions of knowledge, norms and practice. They draw on different elements of ‘capital’ in constructing positions from which they determine ‘legitimacy’, including legitimate work. Understanding the narratives of audit participants in a change may well be a function of understanding its impact on their identity revealed in sensemaking accounts.

In Bourdieu’s terms, the habitus is generative, and incorporates information available in the environment in which it operates. Thus, to understand the interview data, I considered the wider context for the habitus and its doxa in the organization. I looked at publicly available media items (including those made publicly available by the firm), as well as internal announcements and communications, such as the firm’s corporate newsletter.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

The context provided the media: “Best in class”

Publicly available media reports indicate that auditors in this firm are regarded as strong Canadian auditors, with a solid reputation globally, and who had earned international honours (Asian Banker; Financial Post; Globe and Mail). [Note that details of these publications (date, page) are not provided, as these would reveal the identity of the organization being studied.] Auditor’s habitus therefore included a doxa, or logic, of themselves as having a high level of expertise associated with audit work, and attribution of esteemed auditors’ cultural capital. This was confirmed by results of the organization’s third-party-contracted surveys of clients, including clients’ boards of directors. Here, auditors are “characterized as being best in class”, based on their “in-depth knowledge... understanding of issues in the marketplace... and focus on appropriate issues” (firm’s public website, September 13, 2017; February 25, 2017). In that sense, auditors in this firm had a strong positive, ‘esteemed’ identity.

The context provided by internal communications: Organizational Changes

For Bourdieu, “official discourse imposes a point of view ... instituted as the official point of view” (1989, p. 22). The official discourse, providing the institutional point of view, therefore provides the common sense of, or for, the organization. In this way, the official discourse author holds the power to name, to label, to classify as distinct or to blur. To make distinct or to blur through labeling as different or as the same is the domain of the powerful (Bourdieu, 1989); it is the power to establish or erase identity. Recall that the powerful may maintain their power when it is conferred through title, such as President.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

A majority of the executive communications distributed to employees over the period beginning when the current president joined the firm to the conclusion of my interviews, dealt with structural change in the organization, such as: defining new groups, eliminating groups, combining groups, or splitting groups with implications to the employees in those groups (e.g. job creation or job loss). When the audit group was split into several groups, the change reflected what was already perceived from a habitus perspective. However, there was no challenge to the logic of practice: all auditors operated in the same way in terms of their practice of auditing, they distinguished themselves only by their industry specialty. Industry specialty did not interfere with the shared logic of practice of audit; it only represented differences in where risks would be found. (For example, the risks for a technology vendor are different than the risks for an asset manager. However, audits conducted at each would follow the same process.) This logic of practice was so basic, that there were frequent examples of people moving across industry specialties, whereas there were infrequent examples of people moving between audit, policy and corporate administration. Moreover, the “esteemed auditor” identity was not challenged through this distinction between groups, since there was no distinction in media reports between specialty areas, and third-party-contracted surveys of clients for the different industry specialties were largely consistent. As well, creating three groups (and hence three ‘heads’) where there had been one provided opportunities for promotion, among other things.

The president conveyed his key foci and initiatives in the organization through his newsletters (approximately quarterly). Within the first year, he named one of his key initiatives as ‘One Office: One Vision, One Activity, One Voice’ to address his concern

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

with the organization's culture. A year later his newsletter included the 'One Office Update' wherein he stated: "The expression 'One Office' has entered the lexicon... Many people use it, and some are measuring their behaviour against the One Office goals." I realized that my interviews had been conducted under the One Office goals, and likely impacted by the One Office behaviour implied, one of conformity. Importantly, the 'One Office' initiative represented the power to blur distinction between the audit groups, the policy group, and the corporate administration group. Now, the "esteemed auditor" identity was at risk, as this identity was lumped into the same group as IT, Human Resources, and Finance for example.

Summary of the organizational context

Publicly available media, internal announcements and corporate newsletters provide context to the period immediately prior to the espace implementation. The auditors' generative habitus and related doxa had a "best in class" distinction provided by external parties including their clients, yet laboured under the constraints imposed by the president of a blurred distinction between themselves and policy-makers and corporate administrative groups. This may provide insights to areas of symbolic violence, where the interview participants struggled to make meaning.

Analysis of Interviews

As a quick recap, Bourdieu's social theory begins with the field where the game is played, and habitus, which are essentially the rules of the game, but more, it is a sense of the game as well as its rules. The rules of the game are exposed by heretical behaviour, and being "called out" on that. The habitus confers the "logic of practice" associated with it: there is a way of doing things that is logical for that habitus. (For example,

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

seasoned marathon runners have a logic of practice around nutrition, training, including training routines specific to a particular race topography, and even clothing - you never wear the race t-shirt on race day (an obvious indicator of a “newbie”).) Players in the game have varying degrees of capital. In the habitus are also inscribed the potential strategies that players may use to increase their capital. Capital comes in various forms, including economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital. Capital is only valuable when it is recognized, and it may not be recognized across fields. Capital associated with expertise in athletics may not translate to capital in finance or fashion for example. Where their capital is not recognized within a field, owners may consider their capital “de-valued” (e.g. when a world-ranked figure skater is asked “how is ice-dancing an Olympic sport?”). Where capital is recognized across fields, it becomes symbolic capital, such as when technical expertise is valued in fashion fields (since our technology is an expression of fashion today). Power is the power to distinguish or blur distinction between entities, to name or label them as the same or different. Symbolic violence occurs when there is a struggle to make meaning, when the doxa or logic of a habitus is challenged, and thus the habitus itself is being challenged.

In analyzing the interview data, I began by looking at the utility of Bourdieu’s framework of habitus, doxa or “logic of practice”, and capital to understand how participants constructed their identity through language. I considered Bourdieu’s conceptualization of power as the ability to distinguish and symbolic violence as the struggle to make meaning, in attempts to maintain identity during the implementation of espace. Finally, I looked at the ways people attempted to reclaim their unique, preferred audit identity through challenging the logic of practice of the espace tool implementation.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Who are we? Different and distinct

A habitus is a way of being; you have to be in it to know it, and you have to be in it to reproduce it. The habitus provides a ‘sense of one’s place, but also the place of others’ (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 19). If we consider the field as “the implementation of new information management technology (“IT”)”, the arena where the game is being played, then in my study, I heard evidence of two distinct habitus: that of the habitus of IT, and the habitus of the audit user. People distinguished themselves as being in the audit habitus, identifying themselves as auditors, focused on managing exposure to risk, as heard in their articulation of their role:

I work with [clients] and make sure they're looking to all the risks and I'm making sure they're not taking too much risk; looking at...how the [people] are doing their work, how the controls functions are being overseen basically and making sure that [the client] is in a good space (i20)

The most important thing that [auditors are] doing should be trying to stay on top of the risks and how well those risks are being managed in [the client], and finding any issues generally (i23)

Most people in audit are really in the risk assessment business (i1)

We’re thinking from a risk perspective (i2)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

The whole job is to do risk assessment and it involves quite a bit of judgement...

(i21)

In addition, participants identified themselves as in the audit habitus (i.e., as having an audit identity) and as **not** in the IT habitus (i.e., as not having an IT identity), with comments such as:

It's a very, I don't know, technophobic group here I find in general. Just about anything that deals with technology people are like 'blah, I don't know how to use that' (i16)

I don't have an IT background or any kind of new systems ...they don't ask you about your technology background and stuff like that in hiring interviews (i20)

I don't believe that I was hired or compensated every two weeks for being an espace expert. You're hired for a different skillset (i9)

People in audit are not technical systems experts you know. I can have my opinions but I've got a limited experience with systems infrastructure and systems processes (i11)

New systems are not my area of expertise, so I can't address [that]...(i19)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

That was very helpful, setting up SMEs. I think that's really important, yeah for sure, especially for non- someone who's not great with technology like myself, yeah for sure. (i22)

and that the audit habitus (identity) was separate from the technology habitus (identity), by commenting

The design team is somewhat removed because a lot of these people are... [from elsewhere and] ...don't have audit experience, so they don't have that appreciation for what we do, so I think that's part of it (i8)

I'm not sure the IT people who designed the system have a clear understanding of audit work, and that's not their job to (i11)

In my study, all interview participants work in audit, and were clear that audit was not directly involved in the implementation of the new technology, as heard in:

This was being run by IT, which is based in head office (i1)

We started this project, or rather IT started this project back four or five years ago (i6)

They seemed to have kinda outsourced it to IT people...it seemed like it was sorta being managed by the IT area without like a partner in the audit area (i23)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Thus, in distinguishing their role and identifying themselves as in the audit habitus rather than the IT habitus, participants are clearly delineating the logic of practice and expertise of audit versus that of IT, and assigned responsibility for the project to IT. Here there is no blurring of knowledge, skills and capabilities, or responsibility. There is not a sense of partnering, or teamwork, or “one-ness” expressed by these participants, but rather there is clarity of identification as auditors, those who can claim an “esteemed” reputation. Participants provided insight to the importance of this esteemed recognition in regard to the state of “acceptance” of the espace implementation:

What would have helped buy-in [was to] know what work was conducted to find out what other auditors used. That may have helped with it being accepted...[for example] ‘from an audit perspective, this is tested methodology and people are moving toward it because’... show auditors who are more advanced than us, and the benefits they sought from [such a system]... then maybe people would have bought into it a little bit more. (i9)

The loss of the esteemed auditor identity through blurring with a lower-valued identity such as administration or housekeeping as the filing documents in espace “tidily” was seen to be, was challenged or mourned:

Honestly, it would have been more palatable if we hired individuals to, to be, kinda administrative information specialists. No one wants a job in a professional organization yet a job with administrative duties. (i15)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

‘OK, is this really what my job is?’ If they want to pay me this much to do administrative work ... (i15)

Where do you want people to spend their time? Is it administratively change the date ... or is it going out and actually doing audit work ... (i15)

You can view it as a filing cabinet...the administrative aspects of our work (i11)

There’s an element of discipline to espace in the sort of housekeeping side I think we’ll take a bit of getting used to. (i5)

I’m worried we’re always going to get nagged by people about ‘this isn’t the way I want you to save documents, you’ve left it in a mess’. I am worried we’re going to end up in a ‘keep things tidy’ mindset which will be yeah, just annoying yeah because it’ll distract from what we’re doing and the content of the work (i5)

This administrative or housekeeping concern was a contradiction of the identity of the esteemed auditor, who made professional judgments about a company’s ability to manage its risks. It seemed that executives’ identities were exempt from being blurred; their identities would not be expected to blur with administrative or housekeeping concerns regarding espace.

It would have been good showing somebody at the top using it (i3)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

I don't know if executives will be using this. I think they get their admins to use it (i12)

Auditors, who identified with multiple, but separate, identities, provided the importance of distinct identities. All interview participants work in the audit area. While I found that auditors articulated a separate logic of practice, or a separate identity from people in the IT area, four participants identified with both the technology and the audit habitus. As well as working in audit, these participants had either a background in technology (e.g. a university degree or significant experience using it as a tool in their out-of-the-office endeavours) and experience in technology development, or auditing technology builds. This highlights the possibility that a sense of place or identity is not single or fixed, and could be multiple as well as subject to revision. These people identified their ability to step in both worlds, or take on both identities, as follows.

I would say I would be an abnormal case as it relates to the implementation of technology... So in my past life I was a business analyst so I was responsible for kinda navigating not necessarily being the project manager but you have to act as a liaison as a business analyst between the business users and the developers, so the technology developers, the coders, the people responsible for the infrastructure. My job back in the day was to satisfy both... (i2)

I've been a lead auditor for about 10 years, so [I know] how we audit organizations, plus my knowledge from a technology background and understanding of the [technology] platform (i6)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

I have to say though I'm more of a technology person because I have a systems background, it's just another system for me. I mean, my background, I spent 10 years as a senior systems auditor... So, for me, technology is not a real challenge, because I spent like a lot of time doing that. (i12)

I think the technology part is easy (i13)

As well, they confirmed that the audit participants in general had difficulty with technology and its logic:

There's a lot of illiteracy regarding technology ... the whole IT thing they don't understand...they like to do what they're good at here; things that they don't understand, they don't want to go there... there's a real misunderstanding here as to how all that works (i12)

I know there are some people [here] who just don't feel comfortable with technology. Those people will have issues. (i13)

They also confirmed that technology experts did not operate in the audit habitus generally, and therefore could not know the logic of practice of practice of audit:

The people who were responsible for putting it in place are not audit experts...they're IT guys... they don't understand the audit process (i13)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

...between the tech folks and the business folks there was always a disconnect
(i2)

Interestingly, these participants did not blur the distinction between the audit habitus and the IT habitus, instead they recognized and distinguished between these habitus, and identified themselves as able to step into both. In this way they were able to maintain the esteemed identity of auditor, as well as taking on an additional, in this case, facilitating, useful or helpful (i.e. valuable), identity in the audit group as shown later in this chapter.

What do we know? Valued or violated?

The habitus contains the information to know or recognize what is important in that habitus, so it also knows how to value the appropriate capital for that habitus. In the habitus of audit, cultural capital appropriate to that habitus is valued. It focuses heavily on knowledge, but knowledge of a particular type: knowledge that was relevant to their habitus, or logic of practice. Since the user's focus is on risk assessment i.e. assessing the risks and the risk mitigants to control or reduce risk, then the related cultural capital includes knowledge of risks, processes, controls, and risk mitigation. Coding interviews for cultural capital relevant to the audit habitus shows how participants attributed value to knowledge elements of cultural capital. For example, part of the logic of practice of auditing is to have a process by which to conduct an audit, including identification of items to review and expectations of controls commensurate with risk. This logic of practice reduces audit risk by reducing the likelihood of a potential charge of "favouritism" across audits. A lack of process might indicate a lack of control for auditors, inconsistent with their logic of practice. Auditors would ask for manuals on the

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

operations of risk and risk control units, similarly they would expect to have their own manual of operations, or processes for how to conduct audits, as control to mitigate risk. It is just logical to them.

Participants were typically clear on the need to make the technology change, as heard in:

I understand the rationale (i7)

I have always been very comfortable with the rationale, the big picture rationale of espace...there was excellent high level communication about the rationale (i1)

However, they struggled with understanding the logic of the new technology; its design and how it should be used. The old technology system organized audit work by audit client; each client had its own file folder. Within the folder, subfolders were created for individual audits conducted at the client (e.g. by year, and by particular risk area that received greater attention that year). This was part of the logic of practice of auditing: lead auditors were responsible for particular client, and all auditors working on that client filed their information into the client file folder. Espace used a different architectural logic: there were no file folders, instead each document was tagged with information. The tagging did not include as a required item the name of the client, which was inconsistent with the established logic of practice of auditors where the client was the focus and around which information was organized. In the policy group and in the corporate administration groups, client information was not captured, since the work done in those groups was not relevant to a particular client: clients were not part of their

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

logic of practice. The corporate administration groups and the policy group were the first groups where espace was implemented. In fact, espace had been used by the IT group for several years, and a “proof of concept” was conducted with a very small (four person) team in the policy group, where clients were irrelevant for both groups. Auditors struggled to make meaning of a logic where the client was not relevant, indicating a symbolic violence against the logic of practice in the habitus of client-focus, and clear processes and controls. This logic of practice was part of their success, the means by which they had been evaluated as “best in class”. This denial of logic, or challenge to the uniqueness of auditors and their externally esteemed identity, was revealed through the unease and fear expressed about the new system’s architecture:

I would have liked to have seen more explanation on why this was going to be better...all I would hear, you know, basically they’re getting rid of the file folder format, that it’s not the way to go, it’s going to be easier to navigate (i20)

Because of the way that you can access information in espace, when we were seeing it didn’t come up under [one search] but it is in [another search] that created some fear and paranoia (i9)

We’re very leery of this tagging structure (i1)

Participants articulated requirements for their logic of practice of processes and controls in the design of the espace system to accommodate the complexity of their audit work (a distinction) and an understanding of their business model focused on individual

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

clients, unique to the audit group. In this sense, they articulated a need to have their unique identity recognized, valued, and supported through the system technology.

Give us comfort that you understand our business model sufficiently and that you understand how we may be different from other parts of the organization and demonstrate to us that you have translated that in the design of the system. (i1)

The complexity of the different processes that we need and as a result the different tagging paths we need in order to accurately save and retrieve documents is considerably greater than elsewhere (i1)

They'd set up 1-hour meetings and I'd say "you're asking me about all the audit processes. You need a day or half a day minimum to walk through this. (i23)

There wasn't really a lot of that upfront, finding out about not just about our terminology but how we function... they definitely didn't do a lot of that up front in terms of understanding our work. (i22)

There was no acknowledgement of the audit logic of practice and doxa, embodied as processes and controls in the new system. This denial of logic, and by extension, a challenge to the habitus or identity of auditors, was heard through auditor's struggle to make sense of the system delivered, and the ensuing stress it caused.

IT felt they were responsible for developing and delivering functionality, while we assumed that they were going to give us process. At the 11th hour and 59th

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

minute we have found out that no, they're not developing, not delivering process; they're only delivering functionality (i1)

Our Subject Matter Experts said that [head office] didn't understand the business processes and needs. (i18)

[They] hadn't really understood what audit was doing (i23)

Not getting the business requirements right, that was the worse part (i17)

I would have liked to see really more guidance, the issuance of guidance in terms of managing the workflow and processes (i17)

The lack of process, an affront to the audit doxa, challenged the uniqueness of the audit habitus. Since it was not acknowledged in the development of the espace system, there was a struggle to make sense of the solution, a source of symbolic violence to the supervisors.

You have a business problem and there may be an IT solution but you have to keep circling back "are we addressing the business problem"? (i1)

In theory, you know, having a decentralized mega-tag system makes sense, but does it fit audit and the way we think or the way we organize, or the way we

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

request information... It was a huge disconnect that really makes you think ‘was this the best system?’ (i17)

They could have done a better job on ...making sure it fit ...how our work is done. (i16)

Auditors saw the lack of process inherent in espace, an affront to their doxa, as a flaw or limitation in the system that needed to be addressed. Identifying this limitation during the User Acceptance Testing by audit users was an opportunity, or a strategy, for audit to demonstrate the value of their work, and the doxa associated with an audit habitus. When audit users revealed this flaw, people from audit were asked to become involved in addressing that limitation, and worked on an “espace user team”. Members of this team spent several months designing the workaround, understood as “a standardized process to file things” (i18). The team

... wrote a manual how to file documents (i18)

And there's been a huge amount of effort now put in the by the business, by audit now to develop the process (i1)

In our group, our [SMEs] came up with a wonderful spreadsheet of how and where we store information; it's like a guideline...made to help out with consistency... It's there for reference if we don't know how to file something. (i22)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Participants who indicated comfort in both habitus, and who worked in the espace user team confirmed the importance of incorporating audit processes in the system, demonstrating that they were in step with the logic of both habitus. One of these people used “we” in describing colleagues in both the audit habitus and in the technology habitus confirming affinity to both habitus. Participants saw this ability to step in both habitus as an opportunity to create symbolic capital, or identity value, where the knowledge from one habitus was valued in the other.

The initial designs and various iterations weren't necessarily as conducive to the way we work in audit (i6)

You really have to spend a lot of time to understand the system itself and once you understand the system you have to try and see what type of changes do we need to make our [audit] processes...fit. (i6)

Where we could have been a bit more effective is in translating those benefits into how audit, or how the business, actually operates and where you're going to make that connection. I think we could have made that connection a bit better. (i6)

We inserted ourselves into staff meeting so that we could run a demo of a typical processes (i6)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

IT guys are just that, they're IT guys and they can explain how this works but they don't understand the audit process that goes with it. We set up process guidelines and step-by-step ... with screenshots and everything...(i13)

Members of the “espace user team” who were not comfortable with the technology habitus were also uncomfortable being asked to develop the business processes to address the limitation. They recognized that they had no capital or knowledge to bring to bear in this field, that the technology field required a logic of practice they did not have. In fact, their audit logic of practice would have indicated that they had “no business” becoming involved in this, since they had no knowledge. This challenge to their doxa was reflected in their struggle to make meaning of being asked to perform where they had no capital (knowledge); it was an act of symbolic violence wherein they struggled to make meaning of their involvement in this exercise. In particular, one participant noted a number of challenges to the audit logic of practice, where magic by way of conjuring is simply illogical.

The business processes were, the designing the processes, you know, things like the playbook and where to put certain types of audit documents and designing all that stuff I think the auditors did that. Well in advance of that I think it would have made sense to have someone who was a technical expert also a systems design expert and a process design expert come in and fully evaluate the work that we do and design those playbooks well in advance and provide input into the technical design. People in audit are not technical systems experts you know... I can have my opinions but I've got a limited experience with systems infrastructure

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

and systems processes. I think the infrastructure and design of the system should have been based on expert judgement of our business processes. It should have designed around a very formal review of the work we do (i11)

I think you needed someone who was you know a business process expert to say "this is where to put the documents and these are the playbooks to use the system for these processes" (i11)

It would make sense to have someone with technical expertise design the business processes (i11)

So that's why I say it's terrible. From a [user-acceptance] tester, you became a designer, a business analyst not knowing if what we conjure up as part of our feedback made sense realistically, or how that impacts usability and people's initial understanding of the system, who knows right, because no-one's a real developer on our side. Again, it's just 'go with the flow' and 'make it up as you go' so it's been terrible in the sense that your scope expanded because we're...I'm not, I am personally not in a position to be designing these systems (i17)

Disregard for the audit logic of practice reinforced to auditors that their identity was being challenged. With the loss of the audit identity, they would also lose the "esteemed" value of this identity, and that was "terrible" (i17).

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

The logic of practice in the audit habitus requires that auditors look beyond the characteristics of a risk mitigant to its effectiveness. Characteristics are a list of qualities; effectiveness is demonstration of the qualities of the mitigants in managing risk. The auditor's logic of practice of demonstration, or evidence, was not supported in the implementation of espace, instead it was disregarded:

[Auditors] don't know what espace is going to be like ... They need to see it, they need to experience it, they really need at this point in time 'I'm from Missouri. Show me'. (i1)

You could have easily put it on a screen at a town hall; taken a five-minute walk-through; shown everybody how it works, simple as that. (i3)

Personally, I like to see this is what it should look like and then I have an understanding of 'ok, how do I get there. And once I see what it's supposed to look like then I have an appreciation for 'ok, yes, this is going to be helpful', or 'no, this isn't going to be helpful' (i15)

Having a visual image of what this, what espace would look like, would allay some anxiety (i9)

People who operated in both habitus recognized the value of the demonstrations they provided to members of the audit group, including both demonstration of the espace product itself as well as demonstrating the logic of its processes, indicating that they used

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

this knowledge from the audit habitus. In Bourdieu's framework, this may also be seen as a potential strategy to enhance their own capital, or standing, in the audit group.

We could run a demo of a typical process...we could really show people "this is how you're going to conduct a monitoring process, this is how you're going to conduct a review" (i6)

We set up process guidelines and step-by-step with screenshots and everything...with [the screenshots] I could see, does that make sense or not. As you're following through on the screen, it's easy to kinda see 'is that set up properly' (i13)

Auditors pride themselves on being rational, of having expectations that fit the circumstances. One size does not fit all, but should fit the size and extent of the risk. This is critical where resources are fixed, since being risk-based is a means of being efficient. Being risk-based is a logic of practice for auditors, it is part of who they are. That is, auditors investigate areas of highest importance or risk, and where little importance or risk exists, they expend little effort and resources. As a corollary, where effort and resources are expended, there is an expectation of significance or importance attached to work. This logic of practice was not evident to participants in the espace solution presented to them.

The [review] process seems to be fairly cumbersome so far ...it seems that you should be able to use the system more effectively ...it's important that it's an efficient and effective system because we do have to refer to this information

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

regularly in the course of our audit work especially as you go through the ... process... At the audit level you're filing the information. You may have to refer back to it from time to time, but for the whole review process it's important that it's effective and efficient. ... Espace is clearly the repository for all our reams and reams of audit documentation so it's important that it's efficient and effective in terms of filing (i22)

I assumed when we moved to espace some of this efficiency would be there (i3)

It is so fundamental to the work we do that we are able to efficiently store and retrieve documents (i1)

I learned that it's not really an efficient use of time for people who aren't experts... (i11)

Does espace make us better or more efficient at our work? (i19)

Participants who stepped in both habitus noted the same challenges to the efficiency doxa of audit, confirming their audit logic of practice i.e. that they were an auditor.

The amount of time we're spending on espace and what we're going to get out of it, and where they think it's going in the future, I think there's a big gap there. How much energy did we spend on espace and was it too much ... maybe your investment in this particular technology is greater than need be (i12)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

It would be more efficient if they had access to people who know the tools a lot better, who are really experts at it. (i13)

The core is 'am I losing productivity or efficiency when I'm trying to manage my information' because that's the most important thing. (i6)

The expectation for efficiency extended to fiscal efficiency and fiscal responsibility. Auditors had to be risk-based, and efficient with their resources, otherwise conducting audits would become more costly to the firm (without an increase in revenues this would impact the bottom-line). This logic of practice in the audit habitus was challenged, leaving auditors struggling to make meaning of fiscal efficiency and responsibility in the development of the espace solution.

I think the process could have been made more efficient by an expert or a team of experts, and in the long run it would have been cheaper too because of the man hours spent in audit on this - All that playbook design ... To me, the big one [improvement], we could've had an expert design the playbooks it would have saved I guess a lot of work (i11)

We were spending a lot of man-hours, and we're talking some of these people are fairly senior, talking about something that we were guessing about how we might use it. We burned through a lot of hours and a lot of money to argue sometime about something very small (i17)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

I'm not sure I get a sense of espace being important ... which is ironic given how much we've spent on this (i15)

Why else would you spend the money if you don't use the system? (i3)

It just seems there are some external forces that drive [these] very expensive initiatives (i23)

This expectation of fiscal efficiency was also expressed by those comfortable in both habitus, reflecting the audit logic of practice of fiscal efficiency, as well as a technology logic of practice of "you get what you pay for".

You do it properly, you spend the money, or you get what you pay for (i12)

Participants who noted their ability to step in both habitus recognized the challenges to those on the espace user team who did not operate in both habitus, who did not have capital by way of knowledge and ability associated with the technology habitus, and yet were asked to assist in designing workarounds to address limitations:

The person that was assigned to espace said "I've never done this before, I've had no training in this, I'm really uncomfortable" but she just had to do it... I thought that was really unfair ... (i12)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

This supports the uniqueness of the various identities (or habitus); that is, those who step in two habitus recognize the uniqueness of each habitus, each with its unique logic of practice, knowledge and skills.

Who do we know? Does it matter?

Social capital was largely missing from the interviews, which would not be unexpected from auditors who largely valued knowledge and avoided criticisms of favouritism as their logics of practice. There was one exception where the participant (who had earlier indicated comfort in the audit habitus only) reported on the impact of the participation of a fellow auditor (with a technology background) on the espace user team:

Having people that you actually deal with made it more palatable, because you know it's going to be good for you. They're telling you it's going to be good for your work, efficient and all that. (i20)

I've worked with a lot of the people who were helping with the training or seconded [to the espace project] for three or four months, you want to make sure that you don't disappoint them... you want to make sure that you you're going to do the work and it's going to work our well, because there are people you trust and you get along with and you don't want them to fail either that was the main thing: there was the face of people that you were dealing with you want to make sure this was going to work out properly. (i20)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

How we increase our relative standing with a new group

Knowledge in the second habitus recognized; opportunities for symbolic capital

Symbolic capital is capital that is recognized outside the habitus in which it is originally valued as economic, cultural, or social capital. Four participants indicated their comfort in both the technology habitus and the audit habitus, and this provided an opportunity for capital (cultural capital by way of knowledge inscribed in the technology habitus) to be recognized as symbolic capital in the audit habitus. Two of these people were tasked with² participating on the espace user team to address limitations identified in User Acceptance Testing (“UAT”). These two participants understood their participation and recommended solution as providing value to the audit habitus by invoking audit processes, and demonstrating these processes. Unlike the people who did not have comfort in the technology habitus yet were asked to participate in the espace user team, these two participants did not express a sense of violation by participating in the espace user team, but emphasized their ability and the value they brought to the solution by using technology knowledge from their technology habitus and applying it to improve the espace solution for those in the audit habitus. This was a strategy they

² Managers made the determination of which of their team members would participate on the espace user team. Depending on the manager, this determination would have been a function of who was available (not in the midst of conducting a critical audit), whom they were most able to do without for a period of time, or who might have value to add to the espace user team. That is, the technology expertise of some participants may or may not have been a factor in their manager assigning these people to the espace user team.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

employed to gain recognition of their technology capital, providing the opportunity for symbolic capital in the audit habitus, and “a certain stature in the organization” (i6).

So we have some type of common ground or a balanced approach that allows us to use the latest technology that enables us to do different things that we're not normally used to which are beneficial but at the same time make sure that our audit processes fit the technology (i6)

Through more intensive involvement ...[I] started to have the ability to influence the design and evolution of the system before going live... (i6)

The navigational perspectivewas where we were able to influence the design and make that dovetail with our audit processes (i6)

You really have to spend a lot of time to understand the system itself and once you understand the system you have to try and see what type of changes do we need to make our processes...fit...the benefits are to have that tangible connection to audit processes. (i6)

We set up process guidelines and step-by-step ... with screenshots and everything...we did more in the sense that we spent about a month or two just setting up these process guidelines (i13)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

The importance of assembling a high-performing team in the business...it speaks to having the right people at the right place at the right time...having a group of high-performing people being able to influence [the design]...You want to have the right set of people who know the business, understand the technology and have a certain stature in the organization...(i6)

Two participants comfortable in both habitus were not tasked with participating in the espace user team, and hence were denied the opportunity to gain symbolic capital this way. However, these participants took other opportunities to demonstrate their technology knowledge, and how doxa in the audit habitus was challenged in developing the espace solution. This strategy was an attempt to have their technology habitus capital recognized, and to earn symbolic capital. For example, a basic element of the audit process is an evaluation of controls, whether they exist, and how effective they are. For the participants who operated in the audit habitus and the technology habitus, there was an opportunity to call out the symbolic violence against the doxa of controls by the technology. Moreover, it was also a challenge to the logic of practice of technology development, which would not blatantly ignore the opportunity to build controls into a system.

A critical step was missed in the process ... in the system there are no controls to make sure it's going to the right spot and there's no compliance checking... (i12)

That is, where comfort in both habitus had been highlighted, challenges to the doxa included challenges to the audit as well as the technology habitus logic of practice. The technology habitus, the rules of the technology development game, and its doxa, that

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

which goes without saying, may be revealed through heretical behaviour which is called out. In the interview excerpt below, the participant highlights technology-heretical behaviour by the audit group given her technology logic of practice.

We should have a service level agreement with IT, they're delivering the service and we're the customer...we're the customer, they should be giving us a report on what's happening. [Somebody] said 'we're all customers', well no, someone's got to be the customer, and someone has to be the service delivery. They designed it for you and once you signed off on the testing, they're finished, they delivered their service, they're out; but people don't get that here, they don't get that at all
(i12)

This indicates there is a logic of practice that the audit group does not understand; there is a habitus that is not theirs: they don't know it, so can't be in it.

Re-balancing who we are by what we do...or not

Bourdieu's theory postulates that strategies to enhance one's value are inscribed, or already exist, in the habitus. I heard various strategies used to re-position the value of the audit habitus, or re-value the audit identity. These strategies attempt to satisfy the struggle to make meaning of the implementation experience from the audit habitus point of view by maintaining or enhancing the audit identity. These are strategies to act consistently with the logic of practice of the audit habitus, or more succinctly, to reassert "esteemed" audit identity. These strategies challenged the logic of practice of espace (e.g. mis-use or lack of use of the system), or indicated that their own logic of practice prevailed (e.g. minimizing the importance of using espace or emphasizing completing

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

audit priorities over using espace) thereby re-asserting their audit identity. In essence, auditors did not ‘practice the logic’ of good espace use, and in doing so, asserted their audit logic of practice i.e. their esteemed auditor identity.

i. Misuse

Participants indicated that they were not using espace conscientiously, or at least not as thoughtfully as expected, in effect, misusing it. This indicated that they were not participating in the doxa of effective information management accepted in other areas of the firm that had already implemented espace. By challenging the logic of practice of other areas of the firm, they re-asserted their difference, in order to reclaim their unique preferred audit identity.

Now we’re just trying to get things done and get it into the machine right, [rather than being concerned] if people haven’t placed it in the right spot (i9)

I’m not worried about where I’m sticking this in espace because no-one’s going to catch me...what if I put it in the wrong spot? Sorry. If you put in the wrong spot, it’s not the end of the world. By the time [they] figure out whether I put this in the wrong bucket, I’ll be gone ... (i12)

Some participants felt that they were using the system correctly, but others were not as conscientious; that is, not participating in the doxa of effective information management. This is indicative of an attempt to re-assert the uniqueness of the audit identity through resisting the logic of espace.

The other problem ... [others] are starting to use espace, so I see the naming conventions are all over the place. I think that discipline has not really been put

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

forth yet but I'm sure that in due course it will be. Differences in naming conventions or not using those naming conventions are definitely going to cause a lot of grief. There has to be a certain discipline ...that really has to be adhered to very closely and it has to become secondhand nature really and I don't think we're quite there yet.... that is a bit problematic ... I'm not sure people put that same amount of diligence into what they're doing. Some people are just going about it - I don't want to use the word "haphazardly" but ah, ah clearly not going about it in a very mindful manner (i8)

We just have to kinda get some consistency around that...the naming convention...I don't think we've established consistency around it as a team despite the fact ...we got a full binder [of reference material]. There's some inconsistency there and it's become more evident. (i9)

People need to make sure they tag the file properly ...if [they] don't tag [their] files then it will be very hard to find (i13)

Some participants attributed misuse to the design of the system (by IT), or the training received (from IT), as a strategy to reduce the value of the IT logic of practice, and thereby in relative terms, increasing their own logic of practice, and hence their distinguished and distinct audit identity.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Some functions don't work well, for example, the master file [concept]. I think there is a high chance of error in identifying master documents unless you save another copy on your C drive (i18)

Espace is supposed to be our official document repository, but again, sometimes we have to go outside of it because the system just doesn't accept it (i17)

People are just putting things wherever, it's so easy to do whatever you want and there's no checking edits...no controls built into the system (i12)

I think people aren't filing them really well, so I'm not sure where to find things (i23)

We are not fully informed about how to use tagging (i18)

I'm not sure they all received the same ah, I don't know if they received ample training to be honest with you. (i8)

They didn't have enough time to give people the training they needed (i4)

ii. Lack of use

Rather than mis-using the system, some participants indicated that they simply weren't using it; they had not "picked up this tool". Hence they asserted their unique, esteemed auditor identity by not participating in the logic of practice of espace.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

We'll have to put more files into [espace]...Right now they're on my C drive.

(i20)

In terms of storage of our documents, they still reside on our um on our local hard drives (i8)

It's still the same in terms of keeping a back-up on your C drive. (i18)

There's been a drop-off of interest in espace. Is that due to comfort of use, or because people are storing their documents on their C drive? (i19)

I still use my hard-drive. (i21)

They still use their hard-drive to save things because you just don't want to go through that thought process of what document set should this go into. Once you make people do that, they automatically say 'you know what, just forget it, I'll just do it on my hard drive and I'll put it in later' ... I'm pretty sure most people are using their hard-drive and H-drive and documents are still not all on espace including me because sometimes I just don't know where to save it on espace. I don't know what doc set it goes into and I don't feel like going through the whole process. I'll figure it out later. (i16)

iii. Minimize the contribution of espace

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

A strategy to deal with affront to the audit logic of practice was to minimize the contribution espace made, by emphasizing how it didn't impact our logic of practice (how we conducted our audits), it didn't impact the core work of audit, and it didn't require advanced knowledge (such as the knowledge auditors have). This minimizing strategy had the effect of minimizing the value of espace, a means to minimize its logic versus the "esteemed auditor" logic.

It doesn't change our assessment process...it just may affect how we're able to find information in the future (i15)

Audit work hasn't changed...it's all the same content, it's just in a different format with a different process...for information management and the responsibility to understand those processes (i11)

It's not rocket science, you know, it's storage... It's document storage at the end of the day it should be fine as long as you can find those documents (i11)

Espace is just really...a place for us to store our materials and documents that we produce. It's a storage infrastructure. (i17)

It's just a place to store data, espace. (i12)

Espace is just a saving tool for me. (i9)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

The whole job is to do risk assessment...do any of those technologies help us assess a company? (i21)

Our work is still the same. You have to file your documents. It just takes longer. (i18)

Espace doesn't really change the audit process or what we do on a daily basis, it's where we store and retrieve information. It's not important in terms of the fundamental role of our job. We need a place to store these judgments and records of decision, as an audit trail.... For me, mainly, it's a space where we file and retrieve information. I mean from an audit perspective, that's what it is for me. (i22)

The job is to do risk assessment and it involves quite a bit of judgment as well as personality to convey your concerns to the [client]. That's the whole thing. ... We need a document storage space. Just make it easier. (i21)

iv. Minimize the importance of espace

Participants inferred that espace was not important, since it was not important to their managers. Hence they did not need to spend effort on it and did not need to suffer from the imposition of an identity that spent time on administrative matters. This asserted the preferred audit identity.

Whether or not espace is important. I'm not sure that I get a sense of it being important to the people above me... So that may be why people aren't spending

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

time structuring things properly because maybe they don't see that as being important. (i15)

I wasn't hearing from my boss or anybody senior why we needed to do this, why our time is important. (i23)

And it's not something your boss is actively monitoring. (i8)

v. Minimize the priority of using espace

Participants attempted to minimize the value of espace, and hence associated low-identity filing activities, by invoking its relative immateriality versus the importance of the core work of auditing. There was seen to be little cost of not taking on administrative duties but a severe cost of ignoring the logic of practice of audit. This served to maintain the distinguished and esteemed audit identity as well.

What's material to me is not espace...Filing stuff, that's not important to me. It's not a big priority for people. If the priority here was to get everything tagged properly, that's probably not what's happening... There's such a time crunch, we're short-staffed, there's lots of stuff going on and there's just not enough time in the day to do all the stuff. I don't think the people really think the tagging is all that important because compared to their other priorities it's just not a priority. (i12)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

...but if you've got a meeting at the [client] tomorrow and you've got to put something in a bucket, it's not your major concern. Reality is, you're gonna get fried in that meeting. It's where you file stuff – it's just not a priority right. (i12)

It's been limited [how much we've been using it] but that's just a factor of time. How much time people have to devote to this right now. You don't want to have all of your people devoting tons of time to it. (i22)

It makes me wonder how much of my time should I be spending on being or expecting my managers or auditors in making sure that documents are saved properly and you know getting rid of accidental versioning, or how much of it is 'ok, we'll just try better next quarter' (i15)

I think some people don't care [how they tag in espace] in the sense of it's a waste of time to worry about it too much – and because they have so many other things to do – and because people think 'well, we're stuck with it anyway'. (i15)

What do we want people to spend their time doing? (i15)

I'm working on so many things um, sometimes you know you're so caught up in just trying to meet deadlines and then ...the next deliverable meantime you're attending 10 different meetings and that filing something on espace becomes a lesser priority. And it's not something your boss is actively monitoring. (i8)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

You go to one of your direct reports ‘where is this file?’ and they haven’t put it in espace yet. ‘So when are you going to do it?’ ‘Well, whenever I have time for it’
(i20)

I find that sometimes we’re short on time and I think that was probably one of the biggest challenges (i9)

I was just too busy to think about it (i20)

vi. Maximize the priority of audit-related initiatives

Participants strove to re-balance their relative value through emphasizing the importance of initiatives associated with the core work of auditing versus the relative unimportance of espace. By prioritizing audit initiatives, such as the Methodology initiative, it was possible to prioritize and distinguish the audit identity.

I do believe people give lesser priority to the adoption of espace given that ...Methodology is everyone's bread and butter. Espace is just a tool, people see it as technology it's just a computer thing you know. People allocate a lot more of their resources and time to getting the Methodology right as opposed to espace.
(i8)

vii. Create a preferred identity

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

People who stepped in both habitus created a preferred identity for themselves, as having a “certain stature” that valued different identities. That is, they created a dual, preferred identity that included the esteemed auditor identity:

You want to have the right set of people who know the business, understand the technology and have a certain stature in the organization...(i6)

Summary of analysis of the interviews in light of the organizational context

My theoretic viewpoint, Bourdieu’s critical theory was my means of making sense of the participants’ sensemaking of the new espace tool. From the analysis of the interviews, taking into consideration the broader organizational context, I had found that espace was seen as a challenge to the logic of practice of auditors, and an affront to their unique identity as “esteemed auditors”. In turn, some auditors challenged the logic of, and importance of espace, and did not participate in ‘good espace practice’ thereby attempting to reclaim their own logic of practice, i.e. their distinguished and different auditor identity. Additional support for the existence of multiple, distinct identities came from auditors who identified themselves as being able to step into both the audit and the technology habitus, and understanding the logic of practice of each. Auditors who stepped in both habitus used this as a strategy to improve their own position by narratively claiming the esteemed auditor identity and then attributing capital to the value of their technology habitus logic of practice i.e. attributing value to it since they helped the ‘esteemed’ auditor understand this new tool.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

Introduction

This dissertation began with a quest to understand the sensemaking of a new tool, and strategies used to rebalance identity in the face of that new tool. Previous chapters have considered the literature on making sense of change, the importance of identity in making-sense, and identity salience in the outcomes of technology change initiatives. I outlined my theoretical framework for this study, Bourdieu's critical social theory as a departure from Weickian-based sensemaking, and the narrative-based methodology to investigate the phenomena of change. I provided the analysis of the discourse shared by participants, with information about the organization in the backdrop. This chapter completes the dissertation. It provides thoughts on my self-impact in the study i.e. areas where I may have affected and been affected by, the research interviews and their analysis, and hence impacting what I conclude. The chapter continues by discussing the research conclusions and implications, as well as the study's limitations and contributions to the body of knowledge. Finally, the practical value of the study is highlighted, along with potential avenues of future research.

Reflexivity: How do I fit into the power structure?

While conducting this emic research, my position in the organization was at the lowest level of the executive scale. I interviewed people who were also at my level in the audit group, as well as people at the audit manager and auditor levels (i.e. non-executive). I did not interview people from the outside of the audit group, nor senior executives or administrative assistants in the audit group. While I identify myself as an "insider" to the organization and to audit, my role in planning and strategy is not vital to the organization

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

nor to audit. My role sits on the periphery of the audit group (I would be seen as far from the “ideal” auditor in terms of social identity) and am likely seen by them as part of the corporate administration group despite the role showing on the Audit organizational chart, and for this reason, the corporate administration group does see me as part of their group either. I am, as Bourdieu wrote (1962/1958, p. 144), “cast between two worlds and rejected by both”, and hence I have very little capital in either. A proclivity to speak my mind and my illusion of freedom to do so (Bourdieu, 1990b), combined with my (female) gender and my (“advancing”) age may have served to erode any capital associated with my position. Moreover, subsequent to the completion of conducting the interviews for this research, my position and I have been eliminated from the organization. I suggest this supports the notion that I had very little capital, including from the point of view of the interviewees (who were aware of my tenuous position in the organization), and hence I did not have power to wield in that regard. Interviewees were aware that this research was being conducted for the purposes of a doctoral dissertation, and none of them had attained that level of education (although all would have had undergraduate degrees as a condition of employment, and some would have had a Master’s degree or a professional designation), so that may have been intimidating, but outside the power structure of the organization. I did not interview my staff, nor people with whom I would have had an “official” mentoring role in the previous five years (I was in charge of the “recent university graduate hiring program” so would have influenced their careers in their first three years in the organization). Hence, there was a minimization of my potential power in the organization in the course of conducting this research.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

I did have potential areas of bias that may have impacted what participants shared with me and what I heard, as well as how I analyzed the research data. Between the initial discussions of using the software chosen for espace, and its initial aborted implementation (mentioned by participants in the interviews), my team was involved in a pilot design of espace, where we identified a number of issues and concerns with designing and implementing it as proposed given our understanding of the requirements the Audit user group would have. Subsequently, my team, including business analysts with expertise particularly in the gathering of business requirements for systems tools, was organizationally dissolved. I felt invalidated, unvalued, and violated with regards to my opinion of the viability of the espace product as designed and in my desire for this new tool to be successfully integrated into the organization. This contributed to my choice to use a critical framework to examine the phenomena of the introduction of a new tool to my workplace. However, I recognized I had, like Bourdieu admitted (1990b) of his work in Algeria (Bourdieu, 1962/1958) “set myself up as an observer of a game I was still playing” (Bourdieu, 1990b, p. 254), and needed to guard against my self-interest and blind spots, and in particular, not use this study “as a weapon to settle [my] past” (Bourdieu, 1990b, p. 253).

Reflecting on my initial position on the tool being designed, I was concerned about the information management approach in the system, i.e. its architectural logic. It was based on an architectural logic, or methodology that contravened my doxa based on the understanding of audit as organized by client; i.e. we understood information to be client-based, whereas espace made very little accommodation for a client-based focus. I anticipated that few (although at least one) of the participants would know of my initial

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

position and recommendations regarding espace's architectural logic, so I expected that this information, if known, may impact what participants shared. (The system's logic was based on the freedom to "tag", where none of the required tags included the name of the client.) The one participant who would know my position was an auditor who identified in both the audit and technology habitus, and it had been the subject of conversation between us in the past. In addition, since my logic and the logic of the system were at odds, I was already experiencing symbolic violence. I needed to ensure that I didn't "see" that everywhere in my interviews. My advisor was particularly helpful in this regard, and I appreciated the several sets of eyes involved in reviewing my work.

Conclusions and implications

In this study, I proposed Bourdieu's social theory as a viable critical framework for studying sensemaking. I used the Bourdieusian thinking tools of habitus, doxa, capital and symbolic violence to investigate participants' antenarratives surrounding the introduction of a new systems technology tool. Based on the analysis of the interviews I conducted with participants in the change, I found that using Bourdieu's key concepts (habitus, doxa, capital and symbolic violence) to examine the phenomena of a change in tools exposed the struggle to make sense of the tool, given their identity as auditor. Those auditors with a second identity related to technology had additional knowledge with which to make sense of the situation. The key sensemaking properties of identity, context and plausibility were upheld using a Bourdieusian-informed sensemaking approach. Hence, Bourdieu's theory is a viable critical framework to study sensemaking in my research setting.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

In hearing participants' antenarratives of the change, I found strong support for the separate and distinct identity of auditor, which, based on the information available in the organization's external context, was a distinguished, esteemed identity, imbued with capital. Participants' construction of this positive identity was made separate and distinct from that of the technology habitus that they attributed to the IT group, who were credited with the design and development of the architectural logic of the espace system.

In my study, richness, or variations in educational background, industry and other experience, and area of specialty in the firm provided participants who were comfortable in more than one habitus simultaneously, specifically, the audit and the technology habitus. All participants in the study classified themselves as auditors, distinct from other groups, claiming the 'esteemed auditor' identity conveyed through the external context. Those auditors who had the capability to distinguish themselves further (by having comfort in the technology habitus: knowing it sufficiently to be in it) took the opportunity to make that distinction in their antenarratives. These participants characterized themselves as having the audit habitus logic of practice with its associated esteemed identity, and in addition, having the technology habitus logic of practice. This supports Bourdieu's proposition (1992) that a split, or second habitus is possible. Some of these individuals (those on the espace user team) were able to propose the value of their dual habitus in facilitating the espace implementation, bringing sense to the logic of espace to auditors, and used this as a strategy to enhance their own position, anticipating the opportunity for symbolic capital (recognition of their technology capital in audit) as well as audit-related capital (helping the team understand espace, and making it better for them). This demonstrates the structure/agency duality of the habitus, and that individuals

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

use strategies available to them to increase their relative (capital) position. Only those who stepped in the technology habitus, and who had the experience of being on the espace user team were able to invoke this ‘facilitating’ characteristic in their capital quest.

Where the logic of the new tool did not align with the logic of the habitus of auditor (with a separate identity, skillset and practice, focused on the client, and esteemed externally), a struggle to make sense resulted. The unique identity of auditor was not recognized, the logic of its habitus was not recognized, and the capital associated with its externally esteemed value was not recognized. Symbolic violence occurred where there was a struggle to make meaning i.e. where the tool violated the logic of practice of the audit group, including their client-centered focus, expectations of efficiency, processes, controls as well as the evidentiary basis of their professional judgment. The logic of practice is indicative of habitus (identity), hence by denying the logic, the identity as well as the recognition of the capital imbued in that identity were denied; that is, the auditor’s separate esteemed identity was not confirmed in the logic of espace. This supports work by others (e.g. Reay et al., 2017), which indicates that identities contain logics to support (or not) a change.

Understanding how their identity was violated provided insight to the various strategies that people used in dealing with the new tool that might allow them to re-balance their identities as separate and positive, and so maintain their esteemed identity. Since the espace logic of practice failed to confirm their positive identity (Knights & McCabe, 2002), participants sought to restore identity through their antenarratives of the new tool. Participants spoke of not picking up the new tool, (or using it inconsistently or

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

haphazardly), that is, they did not make the new tool part of their practice, and therefore asserted the logic of practice of their own, preferred identity as heard in their antenarratives about the new tool (Miettinen & Virkkunen, 2005). This supports other studies of sensemaking change (Bartunek et al., 2006; Beech et al., 2011; Brown, 1998; Doolin, 2003; Heracleous & Barrett, 2001), where a change in tools that pointed to a loss of identity risked failure. As well, it supports work that suggests that rather than employee resistance being an innate factor (Ford & Ford, 1994), identity, the “interest” of the game being played, was key in responses to the change. Use of the tool did not align with their claim of the professional auditor, an esteemed identity. Refuting the lower identity of “housekeeping” associated with ‘good use’ of the tool was a means to reclaim their esteemed auditor identity.

This study’s findings suggest that the smoothest change is one where the change does not violate the user’s doxa, or damage a preferred, positive identity. That is, it will be an easier change if the tool and its logic are consistent with the logic or common sense of the positive identity held by users. In this study, the logic of the espace architecture was inconsistent with the logic of practice of the auditor’s client focus, and the logic of practice of espace as being ‘housekeeping’ was inconsistent with the logic of practice of the auditor in making efficient, evidence-based professional judgments. Secondly, it suggests that the wider context is important in understanding the reception to change. Participants in this study narrated stories that related to distinction of a distinguished identity, in particular, their claim to an esteemed identity. Use of the espace tool was inconsistent with the identity of esteemed auditor supported in the external context, leading to lack of ‘good espace’ habits.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Studies of technology changes are consistent with studies of other change in considering the importance of identity, and identity work in making sense of the change, and further suggest that technologists (designers, developers) and users have significantly different identities, which include skills as well as assumptions and knowledge of technology. This study supported earlier work concluding that identity was a factor in the ease of implementation of new systems technology (Brown, 1998; Nelson & Irwin, 2014; Orlikowski & Gash, 1994).

Limitations

The conclusions drawn in this study relate specifically to the unique context within which the study was conducted. Specifically, this study took place in a professional services firm in the Canadian financial sector, with participants involved in audit, concerning the introduction of a tool not specific to auditors, and implemented across the entire organization for the purposes of electronic document storage and retrieval. Moreover, it took place during a time when tool change was occurring simultaneously with attempts to change organizational culture, which may have had complicating effects not specifically addressed in this study.

Bourdieu's critical social theory is used in management research, although Sieweke (2014) found that as Emirbayer and Johnson (2008) argued, few studies engage Bourdieu's thinking tools in an integrated fashion. In conducting literature searches I found little in the management organization field of sensemaking change, using Bourdieu's theory as a framework for analysis, to orient this study. This may make socialization of using Bourdieu's theory as an approach to study "making sense" more challenging. Sense-making studies are generally framed in terms of Weick's (1995)

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

sensemaking theory, and there are various articles reviewing these sensemaking studies (e.g. Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Maitlis & Sonenshein, 2010) that provided support for epistemological and ontological consistency between the theoretical framework of sensemaking and the approach used in specific research studies. I found this to be a challenging area in my work, and there may be areas where the connections and consistencies are not as strong as I would like them to be. Moreover, I am still learning to understand and work with (through a logic of practice) Bourdieu's thinking tools, and there may have been opportunities in my analysis to do a better job of integrating his concepts.

A stronger use of a critical framework would have had me free to critique assumptions and transform the process, however, Bourdieu advised (1990b) that freedom is freedom from the illusion of freedom. At this point, the transformation process coming out of this study is more personal: I can work to understand the logic of another's habitus and incorporate this "common sense" and logic of practice when developing or revising tools, or when simply interacting with an "other". My father advised me to try walking in another man's wooden shoes – I've discovered there's more than one pair of shoes she can have and walk in.

Practical application: What is practical value of this study?

A practical application of this study's findings is the suggestion that gathering business requirements is insufficient to predict the likelihood of success in a technology system implementation. This study speaks to the importance of understanding the user's identity and associated logic of practice if implementers expect the tool to be used successfully and proficiently by the user. Normal practice in technology systems

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

development involves gathering business requirements from users, regardless of the Systems Development Life Cycle (SDLC) approach (e.g. ‘Waterfall’, ‘Agile’) used (Ally & Ning, 2015; Bormane, Grzibovska, Berzisa, & Grabis, 2016; Stoica, Mircea, & Ghilic-Micu, 2013). Gathering and understanding business requirements is intended to “bring to the surface ... assumptions, expectations, and knowledge ... [so that] ... inconsistencies and incongruences may reduce the likelihood of unintended misunderstandings and delusions...and avoided some of the difficulties experienced in during the implementation” (Orlikowski & Gash, 1994, p. 202). While gathering and understanding the user’s business requirements is standard practice, at no point does SDLC expect that developers will gather information about the impact of the system to the user’s identity. In this study gathering business requirements received short shrift, as heard in:

[They] hadn’t really understood what audit was doing (i23)

They'd set up 1-hour meetings and I'd say "you're asking me about all the audit processes. You need a day or half a day minimum to walk through this. (i23)

There wasn't really a lot of that upfront, finding out about not just about our terminology but how we function...they definitely didn't do a lot of that up front in terms of understanding our work. (i22)

while identity impacts did not appear to be considered at all in developing the tool. A practical recommendation from this study then would be to thoroughly collect business requirements and also identity-impact information in order to increase the likelihood of achieving implementation (usage) success.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Contribution to the body of knowledge

I have made contributions to the body of knowledge in several ways: Firstly, I found that Bourdieu's social theory, and associated 'thinking tools', used holistically, provided a viable framework to study sensemaking: it is an alternative to sensemaking approaches based on Weick (1995), including critical sensemaking (Helms Mills et al., 2010). I used a Bourdieusian approach to study participant sensemaking of the introduction of new systems technology tools in a business setting, specifically in a field concerned primarily with auditing and the assessment of risks and controls. My findings, using discourse analysis of antenarratives, were consistent with previous studies using tradition Weickian-based sensemaking, including critical sensemaking (Helms Mills et al., 2010), in that participants' identity, the context, and the plausibility of logic were key features in sensemaking the change to the new tool.

I have added to the body of knowledge of habitus, by demonstrating the possibility of multiple, distinct habitus operating simultaneously. Bourdieu (1992) postulated the possibility of acquiring an additional habitus later in life, although he expected that conflicts between the two could arise. Other researchers have discussed the possibilities of a second habitus, for example, Cornelissen (2016) suggested that the second habitus was an extension of the original. Instead I found that a second habitus, distinct from the first, could operate simultaneously with the original. Moreover, I did not find conflict between those who could operate in two habitus, and those that could operate in only one when considering the impact of the tool: all auditors had a preference to maintaining a positive, preferred identity. Bourdieu anticipated habitus was obtained early on and a second habitus may be acquired later in life, whereas I found habitus

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

developed when one had been introduced to the logic of practice and sufficient practice had been accommodated so that the practice had become “knowing without knowing”, that is, a “habitus”. In this study, both the audit and technology habitus were a function of education (formal or informal) and experience.

Finally, the implications of this study contribute to the body of knowledge in systems technology design and development, since the practical implications of this study recommend understanding the capital value imbued in the identity of the user, and the associated logic of practice associated with that identity, whereas current practice anticipates a stage of “business requirements gathering” only, which is insufficient to understand the value of the identity of the user.

Directions for future research

Future research might specifically address the power mechanisms that allow people to refute or require them to comply with a given logic of practice. This would involve a greater understanding and analysis of the mechanisms of power in Bourdieu’s theory; namely the power to name (label or classify, to create or dissolve identity) and by doing so to obscure or blur the logic of practice of a given habitus. This would also take into consideration Bourdieu’s theoretical concept of heterodoxy (Schubert, 2014), or dissent from established positions, which is the means by which Bourdieu suggests resistance to symbolic domination and violence is possible. Thus, for example, a study could examine the heterodoxy implicit in counter-narrative (non-dominant narrative) to establish how specific logic in the “interest in the game” for the non-dominant was being violated, how this underlay the struggle to make meaning. For example, analysis of the “One Office” doxa in light of the user antenarratives collected may allow for the

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

opportunity to incorporate, in an integrated fashion, the concepts of habitus, symbolic violence and heterodoxy in participants' narratives of lack or misuse of espace in practice.

Along this same line, an interesting future study might include participants from both the user and developer groups to discover the doxa the developers used in their assessment of user needs. This may reveal that symbolic violence can occur in both directions at the same time, and in turn, have impact on the design of the system for the user. It may reveal that symbolic violence to the developer group occurred at a different level, which constrained their ability to investigate or gather user requirements in greater detail.

Alternatively, future research might focus on the introduction of a new tool meant specifically for the audit users, and developed by audit users, therefore incorporating their logic into the practice associated with the new tool. This type of tool (e.g. AT&T), which suggests that the logic of the system and the doxa of the habitus of auditor would be aligned, may have a lower likelihood of symbolic violence on the identity of the user.

A future study might include a longitudinal assessment. For example, if I undertook another set of interviews in several years time, auditors would have had time to become familiar with the espace tool, to practice as it were. This practice might allow a change in doxa, where the logic of the tool became part of their logic. Alternatively, the antenarratives concerning identity may become more solidified, with the tool falling into greater disuse or misuse.

With the demonstration that participants can be comfortable in more than one habitus at the same time, achieved through a period of practice, then a possible further

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

study may show that with sufficient time, an alternative habitus and its doxa can be assimilated, where the doxa of that habitus is consistent with the change implemented. (This may of course be challenging given how often technology turns over and how long a period of practice is required.) It may be that if this study were undertaken five years after implementation, then the tool would have been assessed as more successful than it was assessed immediately after implementation, that is, the antenarratives of lack of use and misuse of espace may not survive to become the narrative of the change. A possible implication is that if one is immersed in the habitus of “change” (versus a habitus of academia, or a habitus of audit, or a habitus of IT) for a sufficient period, with the opportunity to assimilate the doxa of change, then the skills associated with living change will become available. Then change might be more successful (depending, of course, on whether the change followed the doxa or principles of change “learned” in the habitus of change in which one was immersed e.g. did it follow the appropriate logic of how a change is introduced, how it is implemented, and how its success is measured).

Further study of the wider context of the organization, and subsequent narratives of users may indicate the narrative of change becomes the one determined by “One Office”, where the representative of that office, its spokesman has the right to label, name, distinguish a “thing” according to his logic. The cultural change associated with “One Office” may be understood as culture of control, and the espace system an opportunity to exert control over the auditors who considered themselves “esteemed”, since information systems are a form of control (Orlikowski, 1991).

Future studies may look more closely at the role of emotions in change. This has been an area of investigation in institutional theory (Voronov & Vince, 2012) which

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

affiliates itself with Bourdieu (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) and change management studies (Bartunek et al., 2006; Huy et al., 2014). For example, in my interviews I think I heard “resignation” in describing the implementation, some more severe than others. I heard “frustration” in describing both the requirement to participate in the espace user team and the implementation of espace. Reed-Danahay (2005) examines Bourdieu’s treatment of emotions in his work, and Collins (2006) suggests that Bourdieu’s treatment of emotions remains little considered, and deserves greater attention. This may be a fruitful area for further studies using Bourdieu’s social theory as a framework of analysis, which could add to the body of knowledge, or, at least ‘join in the conversation’.

References

- Albert, S., Ashforth, B.E., & Dutton, J.E. (2000). Organizational identity and identification: Chartering new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 13 – 17.
- Ally, A., & Ning, Z. (2015). What the current system development trends tell us about systems development methodologies: Toward explaining SSDAM, Agile and IDEF0 methodologies. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science*, 19(9), 9 – 15.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2006). Critical theory and postmodern approaches to organizational studies. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T.B. Lawrence, & W.R. Nord (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of organizational studies* (2nd ed., pp. 255 – 283). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Karreman, D. (2000). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations*, 53, 1125 - 1149.
- Ashforth, B.E., & Kreiner, G.E. (1999). “How can you do it?": Dirty work and constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 413 – 434.
- Atkinson, W. (2010). Phenomenological additions to the Bourdieusian toolbox: Two problems for Bourdieu, two solutions from Schutz. *Sociological Theory*, 28(1), 1 – 19.
- Baker, S.E., & Edwards, R. (2012). *How many qualitative interviews is enough? Expert voices and early career reflections on sampling and cases in qualitative research* (National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper). Retrieved from National

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Centre for Research Methods website: www.eprints.ncrm.ac.uk, and also available at <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/16515053.pdf>

Balogun, J., & Hope Hailey, V. (2004). *Exploring Strategic Change* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Prentice Hall.

Balogun, J., Jacobs, C., Jarzabkowski, P., Mantere, S., & Vaara, E. (2014). Placing strategy discourse in context: Sociomateriality, sensemaking and power. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(2), 175 – 201.

Balogun, J., & Johnson, G. (2004). Organizational restructuring and middle management sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4), 523 – 549.

Balogun, J., & Johnson, G. (2005). From intended strategies to unintended outcomes: The impact of change recipient sensemaking. *Organizational Studies*, 26 (11), 1573 – 1601.

Barnard, H. (1990). Bourdieu and ethnography: Reflexivity, politics and praxis. In R. Harker, C. Mahar & C. Wilkes (Eds.). *An introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu: The practice of theory* (pp. 58 - 85). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Bartunek, J.M., Rousseau, D.M., Rudolph, J.W., & DePalma, J.A. (2006). On the receiving end: Sensemaking, emotion, and assessments of an organizational change initiated by others. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 42, 182-206.
DOI: 10.1177/0021886305285455

Battilana, J. (2006). Agency and institutions: The enabling role of individuals' social position. *Organization*, 13(5), 653 – 676. DOI: 10.1177/1350508406067008

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Beech, N., Kajzer-Mitchell, I., Oswick, C., & Saren, M. (2011). Barriers to change and identity work in the swampy lowland. *Journal of Change Management*, 11(3), 289 – 304. DOI: 10.1080/14697017.2011.564591
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(3), 133-141
- Bishop, E.C., & Shepherd, M.L. (2011). Examining reflexivity through the narrative paradigm. *Qualitative Health Research*, 21(9), 1283 – 1294.
- Bohman, J. (1999). Practical reason and cultural constraint: Agency in Bourdieu's theory of practice. In R. Shusterman (Ed.) *Bourdieu: A critical reader* (pp. 129 - 152). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Boje, D.M. (1991). The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(1), 106-126.
- Boje, D.M. (1995). Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as 'Tamara-land'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 997 – 1035.
- Boje, D.M. (2012). Reflections: What does quantum physics of storytelling mean for change management? *Journal of Change Management*, 12(3) 253 – 271. DOI: 10.1080/14697017.2011.609330
- Bormane, L., Grzibovska, J., Berzisa, S., & Grabis, J. (2016). Impact of requirements elicitation processes on success of information system development projects. *Information Technology & Management Science*, 19 (1), 57 – 64. DOI: 10.1515/itms-2016-0012.
- Bourdieu, P. (1962). *The Algerians*. (A.C.M. Ross, Trans.) Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. (R. Nice, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. (R. Nice, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. (P. Collier, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1) p. 14-25.

Bourdieu, P. (1990a). *The logic of practice*. (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990b). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. (M. Adamson, Trans.) Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1992). The practice of reflexive society. In P. Bourdieu, & L. Wacquant, *An invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (pp. 217 – 260). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2006a). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In D.B. Grusky, & S. Szelenyi, (Eds.). *Inequality: classic readings in race, class, and gender* (pp. 257 – 271). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2006b). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. In D.B. Grusky, & S. Szelenyi, S. (Ed.). *Inequality: classic readings in race, class, and gender* (pp. 287 – 318). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. - C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London, England: Sage Publications.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2013). Symbolic capital and social classes. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 13(2), 292 – 302.

Brown, A.D. (1998). Narrative, politics and legitimacy in an IT implementation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35(1), 35-58.

Brown, A.D. (2000). Making sense of inquiry sensemaking. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(1), 45-75.

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

Brown, A.D., Colville, I., & Pye, A. (2015). Making sense of sensemaking in *Organizational Studies*. *Organizational Studies*, 36(2), 265 – 277. DOI: 10.1177/0170840614559259

Brown, A.D., Gabriel, Y., & Gherardi, S. (2009). Storytelling and change: An unfolding story. *Organization* 16(3), 323 – 333. DOI: 10.1177/1350508409102298

Brown, A.D., & Humphries, M. (2003). Epic and tragic tales: Making sense of change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 39(2), 121 - 145.

Brown, A.D., & Jones, M.R. (1998). Doomed to failure: Narratives of inevitability and conspiracy in a failed IS project. *Organizational Studies*, 19(1), 73 – 88.

Brown, A.D., Kornerberg, M., Clegg, S.R., & Carter, C. (2010). ‘Invisible walls’ and ‘silent hierarchies’: A case study of power relations in an architecture firm. *Human Relations*, 63(4), 525 – 549. DOI: 10.1177/0018726709339862

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Brown, A.D., & Lewis, M.A. (2011). Identity, discipline and routines. *Organizational Studies*, 32(7), 871 – 895. DOI: 10.1177/0170840611407018
- Brown, A.D., Stacey, P., & Nandhakumar, J. (2008). Making sense of sensemaking narrative. *Human Relations*, 61(8), 1035-1062. DOI: 10.1177/0018726708094858
- Buchanan, D., & Dawson, P. (2007). Discourse and audience: Organizational change as a multi-story process. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(5), 669 – 686. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00669.x
- Burnes, B. (2015). Understanding resistance to change – Building on Coch and French. *Journal of Change Management*, 15(2), 92 – 116. DOI: 10.1080/14697.2014.969755
- Butcher, T. (2013). Longing to Belong. *Qualitative Research in Organizational Studies and Management*, 8(3), 242 – 257. DOI: 10.1108/QROM-05-2012-1065
- Chreim, S. (2005). The continuity - change duality in narrative texts of organizational identity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(3), 567 - 593.
- Clegg, S. (1998). Foucault, power and organizations. In A. McKinlay & K. Starkey (Eds.) *Foucault, Management and Organizational Theory* (pp. 29 – 38). London, England: SAGE
- Clegg, S.R., Kronberger, M., & Rhodes, C. (2004). Noise, parasites and translation: Theory and practice in management consulting. *Management Learning*, 35(1), 31 – 44. DOI: 10.1177/1350507604041163
- Collins, P. (2006). Book review: *Locating Bourdieu* by D. Reed-Danahay. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 12(1), 266 – 269.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Conroy, S.A., & O’Leary – Kelly (2014). Letting go and moving on: Work-related identity loss and recovery. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(1), 67 – 87. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2011.0396
- Cornelissen, S. (2016). Turning distaste into taste: Context-specific habitus and the practical congruity of culture. *Theory & Society* 45, 501- 529. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-016-9280-0.
- Cronin, C. (1996). Bourdieu and Foucault on power and modernity. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 22(6), 55 – 85. DOI: 10.1177/019145379602200603.
- Cunliffe, A., & Coupland, C. (2012). From hero to villain to hero: Making experience sensible through embodied narrative sensemaking. *Human Relations*, 65, 63-88
DOI: 10.1177/0018726711424321
- Cunliffe, A., Luhman, J., & Boje, D. (2004). Narrative temporality: Implications for organizational research. *Organizational Studies*, 25(2), 261 – 286. DOI: 10.1177/017084060404038
- Dailey, S.L., & Browning, L. (2014). Retelling stories in organizations: Understanding the functions of narrative repetition. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(1), 22 - 49. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2011.0329
- Dawson, P. & Buchanan, D. (2005). The way it really happened: Competing narratives in the political process of technological change. *Human Relations*, 58(7), 845 – 865. DOI: 10.1177/0018726705057807
- Dawson, P., & McLean, P. (2013). Miners’ tales: Stories and the storytelling process for understanding the collective sensemaking of employees during contested change.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Group & Organizational Management*, 38, 198- 229 DOI:
10.1177/1059601112472367
- Deer, C. (2014). Doxa. In M. Grenfell (Ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (2nd ed.) (pp. 114 - 125). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Deer, C. (2014). Reflexivity. In M. Grenfell (Ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (2nd ed.) (pp. 195 - 208). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Delanty, G. (2011). Varieties of critique in sociological theory and their methodological implications for social research. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 19(1), 68 - 92.
- DiMaggio, P. (1979). Review: On Pierre Bourdieu. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(6), 1460-1474
- DiMaggio, P.J., & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147 – 160.
- Dobbin, F. (2008). The poverty of organizational theory: Comment on: “Bourdieu and organizational analysis”. *Theory & Society*, 37, 53 – 63. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-007-9051-z
- Doolin, B. (1999). Casemix Management in a New Zealand Hospital: Rationalisation and Resistance. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 15(3), 399 – 419.
- Doolin, B. (2002). Enterprise Discourse, Professional Identity and the Organisational Control of Hospital Clinicians. *Organization Studies*, 23(3), 369 – 390.
- Doolin, B. (2003). Narratives of change: Discourse, technology and organization. *Organization*, 10(4), 751 – 770. DOI: 10.1177/13505084030104002

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Doolin, B. (2004). Power and resistance in the implementation of a medical management information system. *Information Systems Journal* 14(4), 343 – 362.
- Dutton, J.E., Ashford, S.J., O'Neill, R.M., & Lawrence, K.A. (2001). Moves that matter: Issue selling and organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 716 - 736.
- Dutton, J.E., Roberts, L.M., & Bednar, J. (2010). Pathways for positive identity construction at work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social resources. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2), 265 - 293.
- Eisenhardt, K.M., & Graebner, M.E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25 - 32.
- Ellway, B.P.W., & Walsham, G. (2015). A doxa-informed practice analysis: reflexivity and representations, technology and action. *Information Systems Journal*, 25, 133 – 160. DOI: 10.1111/isj.12041
- Emirbayer, M., & Johnson, V. (2008). Bourdieu and organizational analysis. *Theory & Society*, 37, 1 – 44. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-007-9052 – y.
- Eriksson, P. & Kovalainen, A. (2008). *Qualitative Methods in Business Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Everett, J. (2002). Organizational research and the praxeology of Pierre Bourdieu. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5(1), 56 - 80.
- Ford, J.D., & Ford, L.W. (1994). Logics of identity, contradiction, and attraction in change. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 756 - 785.
- Ford, J.D., Ford, L.W., & D'Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 362 – 377.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Foster, S.W. (1986). Reading Pierre Bourdieu. *Cultural Anthropology*, 1(1), 103 - 110.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Gee, J.P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gioia, D.A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 443 – 448.

Gioia, D.A., Hamilton, A.M., & Patvardhan, S.D. (2014). Image is everything: Reflections on the dominance of image in modern organizational life. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 34, 129 – 154. DOI: 10.1016/j.riob.2014.01.001

Grant, D., & Marshak R.J. (2011). Toward a discourse-centered understanding of organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(2), 204 - 235. DOI: 10.1177/0021886310397612

Grenfell, M. (2014). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Grenfell, M. (2010). Being critical: The practical logic of Bourdieu's metanoia. *Critical Studies in Education*, 51(1), 85 – 93.

Gretzky, W. (n.d.). BrainyQuote.com. Retrieved April 23, 2016, from BrainyQuote.com
Web site: <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/w/waynegretz131510.html>

Hardy, C., & Clegg, S.R. (1996). Some dare call it power. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational studies* (pp. 622 – 641). London, England: Sage Publications.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Hardy, C., Lawrence, T.B., & Grant, D. (2005). Discourse and collaboration: The role of conversations and collective identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 58 – 77.
- Hardy, C., & Phillips, N. (2004). Discourse and power. In D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick, N. Phillips, & L. Putnam (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational discourse* (pp. 299 – 316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harker, R. (1990). Bourdieu: Education and reproduction. In R. Harker, C. Mahar & C. Wilkes (Eds.). *An introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu: The practice of theory* (pp. 90 - 108). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- 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. DOI: 10.1177/1059601112473815
- Helms Mills, J. (2003). *Making sense of organizational change*. London: Routledge
- Helms Mills, J., & Thurlow, A. (2015). Telling tales out of school: Sensemaking and legitimacy in an organizational change process. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31, 246 – 254. DOI: 10.1016/j.scaman.2014.10.002
- Helms Mills, J., Thurlow, A., & Mills, A.J. (2010). Making sense of sensemaking: The critical sensemaking approach. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 5(2), 182 - 195. DOI 10.1108/17465641011068857
- Heracleous, L. (2006). A tale of three discourses: The dominant, the strategic, and the marginalized. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(5), 1059 - 1087.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Heracleous, L., & Barrett, M. (2001). Organizational change as discourse: Communicative actions and deep structures in the context of information technology implementation. *Academy of Management Journal* 44(4), 755 - 778.
- Heracleous, L., & Marshak, R.J. (2004). Conceptualizing organizational discourse as situated symbolic action. *Human Relations*, 57, 1285 - 1312. DOI: 10.1177/0018726704048356
- Hogg, M.A., & Terry, D.J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 121 - 140.
- Holt, R. & Cornelissen, J. (2014). Sensemaking revisited. *Management Learning*, 45(5), 525 – 539. DOI: 10.1177/1350507613486422
- Humphries, M., & Brown, A.D. (2002). Narratives of organizational identity and identification: A case study of hegemony and resistance. *Organizational Studies*, 23, 421 - 447.
- Humphries, M., & Brown, A.D. (2008). An analysis of corporate social responsibility at Credit Line: A narrative approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80, 403 – 418. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-007-9426-0
- Huy, Q. N., Corley, K.G., & Kraatz, M.S. (2014). From support to mutiny: Shifting legitimacy judgments and emotional reactions impacting the implementation of radical change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6), 1650 – 1680. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2012.0074
- Jian, G. (2011). Articulating circumstance, identity and practice: Toward a discursive framework of organizational changing. *Organization*, 18(1), 45 - 64. DOI: 10.1177/1350508410373672

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Kim, H., & Kankanhalli, A. (2009). Investigating user resistance to information systems implementation: A status quo bias perspective. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(3), 567 – 582.
- Kish-Gephart, J.J., & Tochman Campbell, J. (2015). You don't forget your roots: The influence of CEO social class background on strategic risk taking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6), 1614 – 1636. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2013.1204
- Knights, D., & McCabe, D. (2002). A road less travelled: Beyond managerial, critical and processual approaches to total quality management. *Journal of Organizational Change*, 15(3), 235 – 254. DOI: 10.1108/09534810210429282
- Kvasny, L., & Keil, M. (2006). The challenges of redressing the digital divide: A tale of two US cities. *Information Systems Journal*, 16, 23–53
- Laertius, D. (1925). *Lives of eminent philosophers* (R.D. Hicks, Trans.). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Lahire, B. (2002). How to keep a critical tradition alive: A tribute to Pierre Bourdieu. *Review of International Political Economy*, 9(4), 595 – 600. DOI: 10.1080/0969229022000021808
- Lamaison, P., & Bourdieu, P. (1986). From rules to strategies: An interview with Pierre Bourdieu. *Cultural Anthropology*, 1(1), 110 – 120.
- Levina, N. & Orlikowski, W.J. (2009). Understanding shifting power relations within and across organizations: A critical genre analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 673 - 703.
- Levina, N. & Vaast, E. (2005). The emergence of boundary spanning competence in practice: Implications for implementation and use of information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(2), 335-363.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Liu, S., & Emirbayer, M. (2016). Field and ecology. *Sociological Theory*, 34(1), 62 – 79. DOI: 10.1177/0735275116632556
- Lockett, A., Currie, G., Finn, R., Martin, G., & Waring, J. (2014). The influence of social position on sensemaking about organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 1102 – 1128. DOI.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0055
- Mahar, C. (1990). Pierre Bourdieu: The intellectual project. In R. Harker, C. Mahar & C. Wilkes (Eds.). *An introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu: The practice of theory* (pp. 26 - 57). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Mahar, C., Harker, R., & Wilkes, C. (1990). The basic theoretical position. In R. Harker, C. Mahar & C. Wilkes (Eds.). *An introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu: The practice of theory* (pp. 1 - 25). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Maitlis, S., & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 57 – 125. DOI: 10.1080/19416520.2014.873177
- Maitlis, S. & Sonenshein, S. (2010). Sensemaking in crisis and change: Inspiration and insights from Weick (1988). *Journal of Management Studies*, 47 (3), 551 – 580. DOI: 10.1111/j. 1467-6486.2010.00908.x
- Mann, S. (2016). *The research interview: Reflective practice and reflexivity in Research Processes*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maton, K. (2014). Habitus. In M. Grenfell (Ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (2nd ed.) (pp. 48 – 64). New York, NY: Routledge.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- McCalman, J., Paton, R.A., & Siebert, S. (2016). *Change management: A guide to effective implementation* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- McClellan, J.G. (2011). Reconsidering communication and the discursive politics of organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, 11(4), 465-480 DOI: 10.1080/14697017.2011.630508
- McGuire, W. (2016). Cross-field effects of social policy on the biosciences: Using Bourdieu's relational methodology to understand change. *Minerva*, 54, 325 – 351. DOI: 10.1007/s11024-9300-2
- Miettinen, R., & Virkkunen, J. (2005). Epistemic Objects, Artifacts and Organizational Change. *Organization*, 12(3) 437 – 456. DOI: 10.1177/1350508405051279
- Mills, A.J., & Helms Mills, J. (2004). When plausibility fails: Towards a critical sensemaking approach to resistance. In R. Thomas, A.J. Mills, & J. Helms Mills (Eds.) *Identity Politics at Work: Resisting Gender and Gendered Resistance* (pp. 141 – 159). London: Routledge.
- Mills, A.J. & Murgatroyd, S.J. (1991). *Organizational rules: A framework for understanding organizations*. Open University Press: Milton Keynes.
- Myers, M.D. & Klein, H. (2011). A set of principles for conducting critical research in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(1), 17 – 36.
- Myers, M.D., & Newman, M. (2007). The qualitative interview in IS research: Examining the craft. *Information and Organization*, 17(1), 2 – 26.
- Nelson, A.J., & Irwin, J. (2014). Defining what we do – all over again: Occupational identity, technological change, and the librarian/internet-search relationship. *Academy of Management Journal* 57(3), 892 – 928. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2012.0201

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Neufeld, D.J., Dong, L., & Higgins, C. (2014). Charismatic leadership and user acceptance of information technology. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 16(4), 494 – 510. DOI: 10.1057/palgrave.ejis.30000682
- Orlikowski, W.J. (1991). Integrated information environment or matrix of control? The contradictory implication of information technology. *Accounting, Management and Information Technology*, 1(1). 9 – 42.
- Orlikowski, W.J. & Gash, D.C. (1994). Technological frames: Making sense of information technology in organizations. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 12 (2), 174 – 202.
- Pentland, B.T. (1999). Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 711 - 724.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Phillips, N., & Oswick, C. (2012). Organizational discourse: Domains, debates and Directions. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 6(1), 435 – 481. DOI: 10.1080/19416520.2012.681558
- Piderit, S.K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 783 – 794.
- Pinto, L. (1999). Theory in Practice. In R. Shusterman (Ed.) *Bourdieu: A critical reader* (pp. 94 – 112). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Pratt, M., & Foreman, P. (2000). Classifying managerial responses to multiple organizational identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 18 - 33.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Reay, T., Goodrick, E., Waldorff, S.B., & Casebeer, A. (2017). Getting leopards to change their spots: Co-creating a new professional role identity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60 (3), 1043 – 10170. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2014.0802
- Reed-Danahay, D. (2005) *Locating Bourdieu*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Reissner, S.C. (2011). Patterns of stories of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 24(5), 593 - 609. DOI: 10.1108/095348111111158877
- Reissner, S.C., Pagan, V., & Smith, C. (2011). ‘Our iceberg is melting’: Story, metaphor and the management of organizational change. *Culture and Organization*, 17(5), 417 – 433. DOI: 10.108/14759551.2011.622908.
- Rosile, G.A., Boje, D.M., Carlon, D.M., Downs, A., & Saylor, R. (2013). Storytelling Diamond: An antenarrative integration of the six facets of storytelling in organizational research design. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(4), 557 – 580. DOI: 10.1177/1094428113482490
- Rouleau, L., & Balogun, J. (2011). Middle managers, strategic sensemaking, and discursive competence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(5), 953 – 983. DOI: 10/1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00941.x
- Safavi, M., & Omidvar, O. (2016). Resist or Comply: The power dynamics of organizational routines during mergers. *British Journal of Management*, 27, 550 – 566. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8551.12167
- Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Sallaz, J., & Zavisca, J.J. (2007). Bourdieu in American sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 21 – 41.

Samuel, C. (2013). Symbolic violence and collective identity: Pierre Bourdieu and the ethics of resistance. *Social Movement Studies* 12(4), 397 – 413. DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2013.823345

Sandburg, J., & Tsoukas, H. (2015). Making sense of the sensemaking perspective: Its constituents, limitations, and opportunities for further development. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 36, S6 - S32. DOI: 10.1002/job.1937

Schubert, J.D. (2014). Suffering/Symbolic Violence. In M. Grenfell (Ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (2nd ed.) (pp. 179 – 194). New York: NY. Routledge.

Shimoni, B. (2017). What is resistance to change? A habitus-oriented approach. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31(4), 257 – 270. DOI: 10.5465/amp.2016.0073

Sieweke, J. (2014). Pierre Bourdieu in management and organizational studies – A citation context analysis and discussion of contributions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30, 532 – 543.

Sonenshein, S. (2010). We're changing – or are we? Untangling the role of progressive, regressive, and stability narratives during strategic change implementation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 477 - 512.

Star Trek: First Contact (1996).

Stoica, M., Mircea, M., & Ghilic-Micu, B. (2013). Software Development: Agile vs. traditional. *Informatica Economica*, 17(4), 64 - 76, DOI: 10.12948/issn14531305/17.4.2013.06

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Strydom, P. (2006). Contemporary European cognitive social theory. In G. Delanty (Ed.), *Handbook of contemporary European social theory* (pp. 218 – 229). New York: Psychology Press.
- Swartz, D.L. (2008). Bringing Bourdieu's master concepts into organizational analysis. *Theory & Society*, 37, 45 - 52. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-007-9053-x
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information*, 14, 101 - 118. DOI: 10.1177/053901847401300204
- Taylor, C. (1990) To follow a rule. In R. Shusterman (Ed.) *Bourdieu: A critical reader* (pp. 29 - 44). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Taylor, J.R., & Robichaud, D. (2004). Finding the organization in communication: Discourse as action and sensemaking. *Organization*, 11(3), 395 – 413. DOI: 10.1177/1350508404041999
- Thomas, R., Sargent, L.D., & Hardy, C. (2011). Managing Organizational Change: Negotiating Meaning and Power-Resistance Relations. *Journal of Organization Science*, 22(1), 22 - 41. DOI=10.1287/orsc.1090.0520
- Thurlow, A. (2007). Meaningful Change: Making sense of the discourse of the language of change. (Doctoral thesis, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Canada.) Retrieved from Library & Archives Canada, <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/obj/thesescanada/vol2/002/NR29005.PDF>
- Thurlow, A. (2010). Critical Sensemaking. In A.J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Weibe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research, Vol. 1* (pp. 257 – 260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Thurlow, A., & Helms Mills, J. (2009). Change, talk and sensemaking. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 22(5), 459 – 479
- Unger, R.M. (1987). *Social Theory: Its Situation and Its Task*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Vaara, E., Sonenshein, S., & Boje, D. (2016). Narratives as sources of stability and change in organizations: Approaches and directions for future research. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 495 – 560. DOI: 10.1080/19416520.2016.1120963
- Vaara, E. & Tienari, J. (2011). On the narrative construction of multinational corporations: An antenarrative analysis of legitimation and resistance in a cross-border merger. *Organizational Science*, 22(2), 370 – 390. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0593
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249 - 283.
- Vaughan, D. (1996). *The Challenger launch decision: Risky technology, culture, and deviance at NASA*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Vaughan, D. (2008). Bourdieu and organizations: The empirical challenge. *Theory & Society*, 37, 65 – 81. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-007-9056-7
- Voronov, M., & Vince, R. (2012). Integrating emotions into the analysis of institutional work. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 58 - 81. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2010.0247.
- Wacquant, L. (2016). A concise genealogy and anatomy of habitus. *The Sociological Review*, 64(1), 64 – 72. DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.12356

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

- Weick, K.E. (1988). Enacted sensemaking in crisis situations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25(4), 305 – 317.
- Weick, K.E. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(4), 628 – 652.
- Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Weick, K.E. (1997). Book review: *The Challenger launch decision: Risky technology, culture, and deviance at NASA* by D. Vaughan. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(2), 395 – 401.
- Weick, K.E. (2001). *Making sense of the organization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Whittle, A., & Mueller, F. (2012). Bankers in the dock: Moral storytelling in action. *Human Relations*, 65(1), 111 – 139. DOI: 10.1177/0018726711423442
- Whittle, A., & Mueller, F. (2011) The language of interests: The contribution of discursive psychology. *Human Relations* 64 (3), 415 – 435. DOI: 10.1177/0018726710386395
- Wiedner, R., Barrett, M., & Oborn, E. (2017). The emergence of change in unexpected places: Resourcing across organizational practices in strategic change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3), 823 - 854. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2014.0474
- Wikipedia. Ron Dembo. Retrieved from www.wikipedia.org January 30, 2018.

Appendix A: Athabasca University Research Ethics Approval



CERTIFICATION OF ETHICAL APPROVAL

The Athabasca University Research Ethics Board (AUREB) has reviewed and approved the research project noted below. The AUREB is constituted and operates in accordance with the current version of the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS) and Athabasca University Policy and Procedures.

Ethics File No.: 22384

Principal Investigator:

Ms. Adri van Hilten, Graduate Student
Faculty of Business\Doctorate in Business Administration

Supervisor:

Dr. Kay Devine (Supervisor)

Project Title:

Picking up new tools

Effective Date: November 25, 2016

Expiry Date: November 24, 2017

Restrictions:

Any modification or amendment to the approved research must be submitted to the AUREB for approval. Ethical approval is valid *for a period of one year*. An annual request for renewal must be submitted and approved by the above expiry date if a project is ongoing beyond one year.

A Project Completion (Final) Report must be submitted when the research is complete (*i.e. all participant contact and data collection is concluded, no follow-up with participants is anticipated and findings have been made available/provided to participants (if applicable)*) or the research is terminated.

Approved by:

Date: November 25, 2016

Fathi Elloumi, Chair
Faculty of Business, Departmental Ethics Review Committee

Athabasca University Research Ethics Board
University Research Services, Research Centre
1 University Drive, Athabasca AB Canada T9S 3A3
E-mail rebsec@athabascau.ca
Telephone: 780.675.6718

Appendix B: Permission to Conduct Research in the Organization

[Redacted]

July 7, 2015

Ms. Adri van Hilten

Dear Adri:

In response to your request, this letter serves as confirmation that the [Redacted] lends you its support for research associated with your doctoral studies at Athabasca University.

This support includes access to staff for interviews, which may be conducted during regular working hours, using [Redacted] facilities (e.g. rooms or video conference facilities).

As you outlined to us, the research will involve 30 interviews of approximately 60 minutes with participants drawn from the [Redacted] population of employees across [Redacted]

A copy of the final paper will be provided to [Redacted] upon completion of the dissertation. We wish you well in your studies.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Appendix C: Interview Questions

Can you tell me about your experience with the new technology recently introduced; that is, with the recent introduction of espace.

For the purposes of probing, the following questions may be helpful:

- What do you think of the technology available to help you do your job?
- What do you think of the introduction of espace?
- How do you think it will affect you?
- Is this the same for your staff? Your manager? Why is that?
- Please tell me about what happened when you started using espace.
- How did you learn to work with espace?
- How would you describe the introduction of espace?
- Please tell me about a typical day when espace was being implemented.
- Could you tell me how your job or your role changed with the introduction of espace?
- Is there something you would have liked to see in change management process for our transition to espace?
- Is there something you would have done differently in the introduction, training or implementation phases of espace?
- How could the change management process (introducing, training or implementing) espace be improved?
- Was there something that could have been done in the change management process that would have made the change easier?
- Was there something done in the change management process that made the change more difficult?
- What is the most important lesson about change that you learned through the introduction of espace?
- After reflecting on this change process of moving to espace, is there something else you would like to add about its introduction or implementation

Appendix D: Letter of Information and Informed Consent

LETTER OF INFORMATION / INFORMED CONSENT FORM

January 31, 2017

Principal Investigator (Researcher):

Adri van Hilten adri_vanhilten@athabascau.ca or: adri.vanhilten@osfi-bsif.gc.ca

Supervisors:

Dr. K. Devine, Athabasca University kay_devine@athabascau.ca

Dr. A. Thurlow, Mount St. Vincent University amy.thurlow@msvu.ca

Picking up new tools

You are invited to take part in a research project entitled 'Picking up new tools'.

This form is part of the process of informed consent. The information presented should give you the basic idea of what this research is about and what your participation will involve, should you choose to participate. It also describes your right to withdraw from the project. In order to decide whether you wish to participate in this research project, you should understand enough about its risks, benefits and what it requires of you to be able to make an informed decision. This is the informed consent process. Take time to read this carefully as it is important that you understand the information given to you. Please contact the principal investigator, *Adri van Hilten* if you have any questions about the project or would like more information before you consent to participate.

It is entirely up to you whether or not you take part in this research. If you choose not to take part, or if you decide to withdraw from the research once it has started, there will be no negative consequences for you now, or in the future.

Introduction

My name is *Adri van Hilten* and I am a **Doctor of Business Administration ("DBA")** student at Athabasca University. As a requirement to complete my degree, I am conducting a research project about **how people make sense of change to their work tools, including technology, information systems and processes**. I am conducting this project under the supervision of **Dr. Kay Devine at Athabasca University in Alberta and Dr. Amy Thurlow at Mount St. Vincent University in Nova Scotia**.

Why are you being asked to take part in this research project?

You are being invited to participate in this project because **you will be a user of the new e-space tool being implemented at the office. Your name has been chosen randomly from our staff telephone directory of users in the sectors represented by industry groups and specialist groups. YOUR CHOICE TO PARTICIPATE OR NOT WILL NOT BE SHARED WITH ANYONE INTERNALLY OR EXTERNALLY.**

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

What is the purpose of this research project?

This research project is being undertaken for the purposes of my doctoral dissertation. It is expected to add to the research about how people make sense of change. As well, the ability to apply Pierre Bourdieu's social theory to change will be explored in my research.

What will you be asked to do?

You will be asked to participate in an in-person, one-on-one, single interview with me. With your consent (OPTIONAL AS INDICATED BELOW), the interview will be audio recorded. The interview is expected to last approximately 60 minutes. It will take place in our Toronto office, and will be arranged at a time convenient to your schedule. The interview will be transcribed into a word document. In the transcription process, I may ask you for clarification. Further, if within three weeks, you have additional thoughts to share please let me know and we can schedule a second meeting. Similarly if within three weeks, please let me know if you change your mind and no longer wish to participate and if you wish to have your interview deleted from the research (INCLUDING AUDIO FILES DELETED AND NOTES SHRED).

What are the risks and benefits?

During the course of the interview, which asks about your experience with change, you may experience some discomfort if your experience with change has been negative. If you do and would like to discuss it with a trained professional, please contact our EAP (contact info to be provided here), or the Office of Conflict Resolution (contact information to be provided here).

A summary of the research findings will be provided to you if you desired, and to the executive committee of our organization. As a result, there may be modifications to the change management practices at our organization. Otherwise, the only potential benefit to you is a feeling of altruism in sharing your experience in my scholarly pursuit.

Do you have to take part in this project?

Involvement in this project is entirely voluntary. If during the course of the interview, and within three weeks after the interview you may let me know that you no longer wish to participate and if you would like your interview to be removed from the research (INCLUDING AUDIO FILES DELETED AND NOTES SHRED). There will be no consequences to you if you choose to participate or withdrawal your participation.

How will your privacy and confidentiality be protected?

The ethical duty of confidentiality includes safeguarding participants' identities, personal information, and data from unauthorized access, use or disclosure. To protect your identity, THE INTERVIEW WILL IDENTIFY YOU BY YOUR INITIALS. THEREAFTER, THE INITIALS WILL BE REPLACED BY A pseudonym or alias (YOU MAY CHOOSE IT, OTHERWISE I'LL RANDOMLY SELECT IT FROM THE TOP 10 BABY NAMES ON GOOGLE). I will collect, and use as identifying data, your position in the organization (I.E. JOB TITLE, LEVEL, LOCATION AND DIVISION) AS WELL AS YEARS OF SERVICE. However, with the participation of up to 30 individuals, the number of people in the organization in total, and the non-uniqueNESS OF YOUR position in the organization (JOB TITLE, LEVEL, LOCATION AND DIVISION), AND YOUR YEARS OF SERVICE, the likelihood of THIS DATA being able to identify you is low.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

How will my anonymity be protected?

Anonymity refers to protecting participants' identifying characteristics, such as name or description of physical appearance. The use of a pseudonym or alias (you may choose it) will protect your name. I will collect, and use as identifying data, the following non-unique information: position in the organization, (I.E. JOB TITLE, LEVEL, LOCATION AND DIVISION) AS WELL AS YEARS OF SERVICE. No other identifying information will be collected.

How will the data collected be stored?

Interviews will be recorded on a personal audio recorder, with your consent (AS IDENTIFIED BELOW). You will be identified by a pseudonym or alias (which you may choose). The audio files will be transcribed into word documents. Internet applications will not be used during transcription. Data will be kept on my home computer during transcription, transferred to a USB stick with password protection, and kept in a locked drawer in my home.

Hard copies of the transcripts AND ANALYSIS will be kept in a locked drawer in my home and will be shred when I have passed the written and oral presentation of my dissertation (i.e. graduate from the doctoral program). Electronic copies of the data must be maintained for a minimum of five years according to our research policies. After 10 years, I will destroy the data by erasing the files. During the course of the research, my academic supervisors will have access to the data, to verify that the research has taken place, and to understand the conclusions drawn from the research.

THE DATA WILL BE SHARED BY ATTACHMENTS TO EMAILS BETWEEN OUR RESPECTIVE UNIVERSITY EMAIL ADDRESSES.

Specifically, interview transcripts will not be shared internally, nor externally with the exception of my academic supervisors, who also adhere to the Research Ethics Board policies. Data will not be shared through a database or repository available to others.

If I wish to use this data in the future (i.e. beyond this project), then further Research Ethics Board approval must be obtained. Future use of the data may be, for example, a comparative study of the introduction of the STTR system.

Who will receive the results of the research project?

A Research summary report will be provided to participants upon request (please contact me at ADRI_VANHILTEN@ATHABASCAU.CA OR ADRI.VANHILTEN@OSFI-BSIF.GC.CA) and to the organization's executive committee after the research is completed. Recall that any direct quotations in the research will be attributed to pseudonyms assigned during data collection.

The existence of the research will be listed in an abstract posted online at the Athabasca University Library's Digital Thesis and Project Room and the final research paper ("dissertation") will be publicly available through the digital theses collection at Library and Archives Canada, which may be found by various searches, including MY last name.

A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Who can you contact for more information or to indicate your interest in participating in the research project? Thank you for considering this invitation. If you have any questions or would like more information, please contact me, (the principal investigator) by e-mail at adri.vanhilten@osfi-bsif.gc.ca or adri_VANHILTEN@ATHABASCAU.CA, or my supervisor, *Dr. Amy Thurlow*, by email at amy.thurlow@msvu.ca. If you are ready to participate in this project, *please complete and sign the attached Consent Form and return it to me by return email in the next two weeks.*

Thank you.

Adri van Hilten

This project has been reviewed by the Athabasca University Research Ethics Board. Should you have any comments or concerns regarding your treatment as a participant in this project, please contact the Research Ethics Office by e-mail at rebsec@athabascau.ca or by telephone at 1-800-788-9041, ext. 6718.

Informed Consent: Your signature on this form means that:

- You have read the information about the research project.
- You have been able to ask questions about this project.
- You are satisfied with the answers to any questions you may have had.
- You understand what the research project is about and what you will be asked to do.
- YOU AGREE TO BE AUDIO-RECORDED (ALTERNATIVELY ONLY NOTES WILL BE TAKEN).
- You understand that you are free to withdraw OR END your participation in the research project without having to give a reason, and that doing so will not affect you now, or in the future.
- You understand that YOU MAY WITHDRAW FROM THIS RESEARCH DURING THE INTERVIEW, BY INDICATING SAME TO ME VERBALLY DURING THE INTERVIEW, OR BY EMAIL TO ME WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF THE INTERVIEW and you may ask to have your interview removed from the research.

YES NO

	YES	NO
I agree to be audio-recorded		
I agree to the use of a pseudonym so that my name will not be associated with the interview		
I agree to the use of direct quotations (attributed to the pseudonym)		
I am willing to be contacted following the interview if required to verify that my comments are accurately captured		



A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES

Your signature confirms:

- You understand that participating in the project is entirely voluntary and that you may end your participation at any time without any penalty or negative consequences.
- You have been given a copy of this Informed Consent form for your records;
- YOU AGREE TO NOTIFY ME BY EMAIL OF YOUR DECISION TO WITHDRAW BY EMAIL WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF THE INTERVIEW, OR VERBALLY DURING THE INTERVIEW; AND
- You have read what this research project is about and understood the risks and benefits. You have had time to think about participating in the project and had the opportunity to ask questions and have those questions answered to your satisfaction.
- You agree to participate in this research project.

Signature of Participant

Date

Principal Investigator's Signature:

I have explained this project to the best of my ability. I invited questions and responded to any that were asked. I believe that the participant fully understands what is involved in participating in the research project, any potential risks and that he or she has freely chosen to participate.

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date