



BAM2017

This paper is from the BAM2017Conference Proceedings

About BAM

The British Academy of Management (BAM) is the leading authority on the academic field of management in the UK, supporting and representing the community of scholars and engaging with international peers.

<http://www.bam.ac.uk/>

Full paper submission for **Track 8: Identity**

Title: Identities as organizational practices: the case of informal lunchroom meetings

Authors:

Sae Oshima (Aarhus University, oshima@mgmt.au.dk)

Birte Asmuß (Aarhus University, asmuss@mgmt.au.dk)

Summary:

Identity has been widely acknowledged as playing a central role in various organizational processes, yet there is still a need to better understand the dynamics and functions of identity work in modern organizations. The present paper is centered within this concern, and examines identity as intersubjective by nature and as a member's phenomenon. We do so by conducting a video-based investigation of an informal lunchroom meeting at a place of work, and analyze how divergent identities of a manager gets evoked and negotiated in constructing diverse alliances among colleagues. Our aims are to: 1) reveal the intersubjective, multimodal and embodied nature of identity work; 2) demonstrate identity work as organizational practices, used in order to accomplish specific actions; and 3) pose a question on the view on identity as a layered/leveled phenomenon.

Word count (excluding tables and references): 5150

Key words: identity work; ethnomethodology and conversation analysis; multimodal interaction; informal communication at work; organizational practice

1. INTRODUCTION

Identity is “a powerful, motivating force in organizations today” (Oliver 2015). As such, it has gained increasing attention within organization studies during the last decades (Alvesson, Ashcraft & Thomas 2008; Ravasi & Canato 2013), as seen in for instance special issues in *Human Relations* (2009: “Constructing identity in organizations”) and *Scandinavian Journal of Management* (2012: “Identities in Organizations: processes and outcomes”). While identity has been widely acknowledged for being central for organizations’ value creation (Oliver 2015) and for understanding organizational processes (Brown 2015), there is still a need to better understand the dynamics of identity (Alvesson & Willmott 2002). Identity dynamics relates to different organizational functions and tasks, such as controlling (Alvesson & Willmott 2002), building employee relationships (DeRue & Ashford 2010) and reproducing and translating institutional logics (Lok 2010), and the present paper places itself within this concern. Specifically, it examines how divergent identities come in contact with each other, and how they are interactively negotiated by means of organizational practices. We do so by conducting a video-based investigation of the multimodal, embodied and interactive nature of managerial identity work during an informal, lunchroom meeting at an organization. The paper’s aim is to uncover the intersubjective and multimodal nature of identity work, to demonstrate identity work as organizational practices that people use in order to accomplish specific actions (topic management, organizational alliances), and finally, to question the existing discourse of layered/leveled organizational identities.

2. IDENTITY AS ORGANIZATIONAL PRACTICE

In today’s organizations, identity is no longer a stable asset, but it is a resource and practice for achieving various organizational goals. One such perspective is seen in the layered view of identity. In this view, a distinction in different levels of identity is used ranging from the individual, and the collective to the organizational level (Oliver 2015). Concerning the individual level, the focus is on how the individual’s activities construct a concise picture of oneself, while collective identity relates to a level that is influenced by and influences groups (e.g. organizations). When it comes to the organizational level, both top-down (the organizational identity exists irrespective of individual members) and bottom-up (individual members shape the organizational identity) approaches are seen, which are frequently integrated in the organizational process (Oliver 2015, pp. 225-336). These divisions allow a reflection on how various identity levels differ from and impact one another in order “to create, maintain and change organizational identity” and consequently impact the organizational image (Hatch & Schultz 2002, p. 989). Yet, the question about how to best understand the individually grounded, dynamic and processual nature of identity as an organizational practice across various levels remains.

Identity as a layered phenomenon is deemed a challenge by others, who have proposed an alternative perspective of identity as ongoing dynamic constructions. These scholars advocate for a more constitutive and discursively grounded view on identity (Clarke, Brown & Hailey 2009; Costas & Fleming 2009). Consequently, there rises a larger focus on identities as being accomplished or “worked on” (Coupland & Brown 2012, p. 1) by the involved organizational members. The term “identity work”, which was originally coined by Snow & Anderson (1987) to uncover individuals’ solo work on identity, has now been proposed to describe the ongoing identity constructions in organizations in an attempt to bridge between different levels of analysis (Brown 2015; LeBaron, Glenn & Thompson 2009). Accordingly, managerial identity is no longer understood as an individual asset, but a co-constructed outcome and practice and a complex

interplay between a self-reflexive process and interaction with others (Clarke, Brown & Hailey 2009; Down & Reveley 2009; Wajcman 2004; Watson 2008). What underlies these studies is a view of the non-coherent, dynamic and individually grounded nature of managerial identities.

This perspective correlates to the conceptualization of identity work as an ongoing organizational practice, and thus corresponds to the recent turns to practice in the social sciences in general (Schatzki, Cetina & Savigny 2001) and various managerial and strategy related disciplines in specific (Nicolini 2013). The growing attention to, and increase in, practice-based studies within organization, management and strategy studies (Golsorkhi et al. 2015) has been described as “a reaction to a previous marginalization of the study of ‘work itself’” (Nicolini 2009, p. 1391). A focus on actual work practices necessitates empirically based micro-analyses of authentic organizational phenomena, and such analyses have provided significant insights into the local, intersubjective and turn-by-turn accomplishment of organizational, managerial and strategic work (Asmuß & Oshima 2012; Nielsen 2009; Svennevig 2008). The current paper - while being aware of the potential risk of “micro-isolationism” (Seidl & Whittington 2014) which is the lack of effort by micro-analytical studies to try to relate local findings to a larger organizational context and/or social and organizational phenomena, - responds to an emerging call for revisiting organizational phenomena as practices and investigate identity as locally accomplished recurrent organizational practices. In other words, we take the position that identity is not a state. Even individual identities cannot be performed by individuals alone, but instead worked on and accomplished as individuals communicate with others.

In response to this processual and level-bridging view on identity, there has also come a greater awareness on the researcher’s role for understanding the phenomenon at hand. Based on an assumption that the field of organizational identity for many years has been pre-occupied with how to conceptualize organizational identity, a number of scholars point to the need for critical reflection and a higher degree of transparency in regards to research methods to study organizational identity (Ravasi & Canato 2013) – especially when a reflexive accomplishment like identity “requires also that researchers be appropriately reflexive in their analyses” (Coupland & Brown 2012, p. 3, but see also Ybema et al. 2009). One way to accomplish this is the use of observation method. A vast majority of studies on identity so far has been built on interview data. Down and Reveley (2009) point to this dominance of interviews for studying identity and stress its risk of studying interview texts alone without being able to place them in context. Building upon Goffman (1990; 1967), they claim that acknowledging the situatedness of interaction is essential for understanding the situational influences on identity construction. Accordingly, they propose direct observational studies of those individuals the researcher wants to study (Down and Reveley 2009, p. 398). Using a complementary observational method will allow a study to highlight the context sensitivity of managerial actions (see also McInnes & Corlett 2012; Ybema, Vroemisse & van Marrewijk 2012).

In regards to the recent, abovementioned move of using observations in studying organizational identity, one field of specific relevance is that of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (EMCA). Identity has been studied by ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts for many years both in everyday and institutional settings (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998a; Heritage & Clayman 2010; LeBaron, Glenn & Thompson 2009). What underlines these studies is the fact that identity is more than a product or a process, but it serves a purpose and “is *used* in talk: something that is part and parcel of the routines of everyday life, brought off in the fine detail of everyday interaction” (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998b, p.1). As such, a great number of EMCA studies looked into how various social actions are accomplished through the evoking and negotiation of identities under a range of categories such as nationality (Nishizaka 1995; Mori 2003; Stephen & Housley 2002), gender (Hopper 2002; Kitzinger & Rickford 2007), family (Raudaskoski 2010), professional expertise (Ekström & Lundell 2011; Torras 2005), specific community (Cade 2012; Rautajoki

2009), and at times two persons exhibiting their belongingness, i.e. couple (De Stefani 2013; Mandelbaum 1987), just to name a few. These studies demonstrated not only people's strategic use of identities, but their competence in employing various verbal, vocal and embodied resources in doing so.

Naturally, many EMCA studies have also approached organizational issues by way of revealing the organizational members' moment-by-moment identity work, especially by studying one recurrent activity at work: meetings. For instance, meeting participants may mark their utterances with individual pronoun ("I") to highlight their official roles – thus not to distance their individual identities from the organization, but quite contrary, to embed their identities within the formal organization (Fasulo & Zucchermaglio 2002). Another study on business meeting participants explored the role of laughter at the time of complaining (Vöge 2010). The study points out that organizational seniority and superiority is not a given but must be displayed, negotiated and achieved, and evoking laughter can play a significant role in such identity work - and overall, human relations at work. Similarly, Djordjilovic (2012) argues that teams within an organization need to be "activated" through talk, nodding, and body and gaze orientation. Her analysis shows that meeting members draw upon their individual institutional roles for supporting each other and thus for team displays. What these studies commonly indicate is a fuzzy, or even non-existing, border between different levels of identity within organization. Rather, participants freely, but in a very sophisticated way, draw upon various "levels" of identities in organizing relevant organizational actions and activities.

The current paper, also placing itself within an EMCA tradition, aims to pursue this line of identity work: identity as intersubjective by nature and as a member's phenomenon. While many have focused on such identity work during formal meetings, we investigate informal meetings, namely lunchroom meetings at work. Here, participants do a number of different things such as eating lunch, socializing, doing being at work, doing not being at work, and doing taking a break from work, and in so doing, they orient to and make relevant a number of different identities. At the same time, lunchroom interaction is not as informal or unexpected as other informal occasions such as chatting with colleagues you run into on the corridor or at a copy machine. In that sense, lunchroom gatherings can have some shared features with a definition of meeting proposed by Boden (1994): "a planned gathering, ..., in which the participants have some perceived (if not guaranteed) role, have some forewarning (either longstanding or quite improvisational) of the event, which has itself some purpose or 'reason', a time, place, and, in some general sense, an organizational function" (p. 84). As such, we find this non-default organizational setting complex, diverse, and at times ambiguous, thus a valuable place for studying the emergence of identities by means of organizational practices.

3. DATA AND METHOD

Our data come from a medium-sized U.S. design company that has just – at the time of data collection – gone through a merger with another, bigger company. This change has affected the employees, who frequently complain about the many changes that have taken place. After successful contact with the company, the first author started recording interactions in a room that the employees (i.e. user experience designers and researchers) informally, regularly and voluntarily get together for lunch (as opposed to another, more official lunchroom equipped with a kitchen). The data was collected over 14 days, where the researcher set up the camera in the room right before lunchtime and left as the employees started entering the room. There was only one camera available for recording, and at times it failed to capture faces of certain participants and/or certain

angles of a participant. However, the participants often adjusted the position and angle of the camera themselves to maximize the visibility of their behaviour, and in general, the recordings sufficiently captured the participants' verbal, vocal and nonverbal practices. Because not everyone showed up every day, the amount of participants varied day by day, ranging from two to nine participants. The segment of focus in the current paper is taken from the ninth day of recording, where one of the managers, Manuel, made an unusual appearance at the lunchroom.

Our analysis focuses on how various identities of the manager get evoked and negotiated in constructing diverse alliances among the members through the use of multimodal resources, and we adopt the method of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis in analyzing this multimodal interaction (Heath 1997; Jarmon 1996; Mondada 2007; Stivers & Sidnell 2005; Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron 2011). Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974; Sidnell 2010) provide a methodological apparatus specifically well-fitted to understanding the "foundations of organizing" (Samra-Fredericks & Bargiela-Chiappini 2008, p. 665) and micro aspects of organizational practices (Nicolini 2013), as they rely on authentic talk-in-interaction and uncover the intersubjective nature of social practices. In the field of organization studies, this method is often referred to as microethnographic approach (Gylfe et al. 2016; LeBaron 2008) that enables us to capture the various modalities of social practices as locally accomplished in time and space. By means of microethnography, it becomes possible to investigate the fine-grained verbal, embodied and material practices that constitute strategic and organizational work (Gylfe et al. 2016) in general and identity work (Brown 2015) in specific.

With our focus on the participants' use of multimodal practices, we focus on "the systematic practices used by participants in interaction to achieve courses of collaborative action with each other" (Goodwin 2000, p. 160). In light of this, we rely on a fundamental tool of conversation analysis, the "next-turn-proof-procedure":

throughout the course of a conversation or other bout of talk-in-interaction, speakers display in their sequentially 'next' turns an understanding of what the 'prior' turn was about. That understanding may turn out to be what the prior speaker intended, or it may not; whichever is the case, that itself is something which gets displayed in the next turn in the sequence. We describe this as a *next-turn-proof-procedure*, and it is the most basic tool used in CA to ensure that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented to accomplishments of participants, rather than being based merely on the assumptions of the analyst [emphasis in original] (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008, p. 13).

This point also draws attention to another crucial element of microanalytic investigation, transcribing, which "provides the researcher with a way of noticing, even discovering, particular events, and helps focus analytic attention on their socio-interactional organization" (Heath & Luff 1993, p. 309). All data were transcribed according to conversation analytic transcription conventions that were developed by Gail Jefferson (1989). In order to document material and embodied actions, we use the system developed by Goodwin (2000). These selected descriptions of visible actions are provided and set within double parentheses.

4. ANALYSIS: IDENTITY WORK FOR DIVERGENT ALLIANCES

In order to pursue our research question, the current paper focuses on a specific occasion happening in one of the recorded lunch room meetings, where one of the managers, Manuel, unexpectedly¹ enters the lunchroom. At this lunch room meeting, there are 4 ordinary employees present (Ethan, Bjorn, Surya and Erich, who are all designers or researchers) plus the manager Manuel. While Manuel holds the senior position, namely manager, he only joined the company one year prior and is the newest member of the organization compared to the rest of the participants. As we see below in the analysis, various identities of Manuel get evoked within a short timeframe, contributing to the formation of varying alliances.

Here is how the episode proceeds: on this day, Ethan and Erich first talk about random stuff for about ten minutes. Then, the manager, Manuel, appears. They continue talking randomly for another ten minutes. When Ethan asks Manuel how his first year has been, Björn and Surya come in with their lunch, and they all start chatting about different lunch take-out options (see Figure 1). Our interest here is to investigate how varying identities of Manuel (and thus simultaneously those of the others) are evoked in this episode, and how these identity negotiations contribute to the building of varying alliances and organization of lunch room talk.



Figure 1

- 1 ETH: °just,° (0.2) °it's° a huge line of hipsters outside
└──────────┘
((SUR takes a bite))
- 2 (0.3)
- 3 MANU: °thhh°
- 4 (0.6) ((ETH starts pressing down the buttons on the drink lid))
- 5 MANU: °>I'm< not surprised.°
- 6 ETH: uh hh hh hh
- 7 (1.4) ((MANU takes a bite))

¹ The researcher later spoke with the employees, who all described the manager's appearance that day as unexpected and even odd.

8 SUR: so did Manuel give you any scoops (.) so far?
 ((SUR looks at MANU)) ((SUR looks at ETH)) ((SUR looks at MANU))
 ((ERI looks at SUR)) ((ETH and MANU look at SUR))
 ((MANU puts down his fork))
 ((SUR suspends chewing, but is talking with food in his mouth))

9 (0.4) ((SUR resumes chewing, smiling; MANU chews overtly))

As soon as their conversation about a specific food trailer closes down (lines 1-6), Surya launches a new topic (line 8): because he and Bjorn came to lunch later than the others, he asks if Manuel had given any inside information to the rest of the group. He does so jokingly, also smiling right after his utterance (line 9), which might show his orientation to this question as a sensitive one due to the current company situation (i.e. the company had just gone through a big merger and the employees have been complaining about the many changes that have taken place). Also, in this situation, Manuel is the only one who represents the company management, and they all know that Manuel holds some information that the rest do not have access to. Surya's question evokes this organizational asymmetry between Manuel and the rest of the employees present.

As seen in Surya's gaze (line 8), Ethan appears to be the expected next speaker. But this question can also be inviting Manuel to share some sensitive information, and in fact, Surya also looks at Manuel while producing his utterance. How do Manuel and Ethan work with this topic shift and the evoked identity of Manuel?

Manuel lets pass the opportunity to immediately build on this identity work initiated by Surya, and he does so with a combination of multiple practices. First, he displays his unavailability as an imminent speaker by way of eating: Manuel had taken a bite right before Surya produces his utterance (line 7), and starts making overt chewing movements immediately upon Surya's question (line 9). Noticeably, however, Manuel also puts down his fork (line 9), indicating that he is to suspend eating. With these practices, he presents himself as preparing himself to speak but as not yet able to do so due to his current involvement with the bite of his food. In other words, while he does not interrupt or reject the possibility of this topic to potentially develop (and thus his own identity as the superior), he neither contributes to the topic progression nor the formation of division between Manuel and the rest of the group.

On the other hand, Ethan has not been eating but only playing with his drink, and then, he answers Surya's question.

10 ETH: °um°, (0.2) hhhh hehehehe not at a:ll
 ((ETH shifts gaze from SUR to his drink; MANU looks toward ETH))
 ((MANU looks back at SUR and says something?))
 ((MANU wipes his mouth with napkin))
 ((SUR bends backwards and back, smiling))

11 (): .hhh=

12 SUR: =↑hh hh ↓hhhh=
 ((SUR bends backwards and back))

Ethan treats Surya's utterance as a yes/no question rather than an initiation of topic shift, and he answers by negating it (line 10). He, however, aligns with the way Surya formulated his "question" (i.e. jokingly) by accompanying his response with laughter. This is joined by Surya with laughter (line 12), confirming the comical (and delicate) nature of the given topic, as well as accepting Ethan's response. Thus, the status of inequality between Manuel and the rest of the group put forward by Surya has not been pursued by neither Manuel, Ethan, nor Surya himself.

While Ethan disorients to Surya's initiative of evoking an unequal relationship and the possible relevance of Manuel to reveal inside information, he builds on this question sequence and provides an account for his answer, which refocuses the topic of the conversation and the organizational identity of Manuel.

13 ETH: =I was jus' asking about, (1.3) your year here,
 | |
 ((ETH gazes toward MANU)) ((ETH gazes toward ERI?))

14 (1.3) ((SUR nods))

15 ETH: what it's been like,
 |
 ((MANU slightly nods))

16 MANU: mm-huh

17 (1.1) ((SUR takes a bite; MANU pushes his chair back and rebuilds the posture))

While Ethan's turn in lines 13-15 is designed as an account for his previous response in line 10, it functions to shift Manuel's organizational identity: from that of a manager to that of a relatively new member of the company compared to the rest of them (Manuel joined the company only a year ago). Accordingly, the relevance of Manuel to share inside information with the group has now decreased, bringing Manuel and the conversation to a less sensitive direction. Sequentially, this explanation should be directed to Surya, but Ethan makes room for Manuel to participate in this correspondence by looking at Manuel and directly addressing him ("your") in his turn (line 13). Accordingly, Manuel nods along with Ethan's utterance (line 15), and verbally confirms the content provided by Ethan (line 16). At this point, he also pushes his chair back and places himself away from the table (line 17), seemingly attending to the possible next speakership. Therefore, what Surya evoked at the beginning of the sequence – Manuel as the manager, and the possible division between the group and Manuel – has now transformed into Ethan and Manuel as co-tellers who inform Surya what has been talked about prior to his entrance to the lunchroom. This alliance of Ethan and Manuel progresses when Ethan displays certain knowledge of Manuel, as seen below.

18 ETH: you'↑re ↓from, (0.2) >right,< you're from Monterrey.
 | |
 ((MANU swallows half of his food)) ((MANU crosses his legs))

19 MANU: mm-huh,
 |
 ((MANU nods, chewing))

20 (1.4) ((MANU continues to nod and chew))

- 21 SUR: how long, (.) bu[t you've been here for long?
 |
 ((MANU looks up, as if he's about to speak))
 ┌──┐
 │ ((MANU swallows more food)) │
 └──┘
 ┌──┐
 │ ((SUR suspends chewing, but is talking with food in his mouth)) │
 └──┘
- 22 ETH: [um,
- 23 MANU: I've been here for twelve years.

Having seen that Manuel is slowly moving from not being available to being available as next speaker, Ethan now asks a question about Manuel, indicating that he holds some knowledge about Manuel (line 18). Ethan's move here further shifts the topic to a less delicate matter, an easier question for Manuel to answer topic-wise (instead of sharing company "scoops") and also format-wise (since this closed question allows him to easily confirm with the food in his mouth). But at the same time, this action now makes relevant an inquiry of Manuel's personal information, and in turn becomes a resource for Surya to further pursue this line of inquiry (which contributes to identifying Manuel as the new organizational member, thus a division between Manuel and the group). Note that Manuel's actions foreshow his imminent speakership: he swallows his food, and crosses his legs to further place himself away from the table (line 18), his utterance ends with a continued tone, indicating more to come (line 19), and he looks up as if he is about to continue his turn (line 21). However, he is still not yet done with his eating (chewing, lines 19-20), and Surya uses this room to build on Ethan's utterance to further make relevant this line of inquiry (line 21). His question not only pursues the current topic and indicates his limited knowledge about Manuel (thus a shorter collegiality), but also functions to publicly construct an alliance between himself and Ethan, thus an asymmetry between themselves and Manuel.

When Surya asks him the follow-up question, Manuel swallows again (line 21), and answers the question (line 23). Here, Surya's utterance was repaired from an open question to a closed one (line 21), thus Manuel could have simply answered with yes or no, which would have been a resource to indicate his occupation with food in his mouth. Instead, he produces a full statement in response, which indicates that he's now – compared to before – available as speaker, and that he is ready to contribute to the progression of the current topic.

Therefore, the identity that got evoked – Manuel as a relatively new organizational member – is now more clearly put forward along with the context that the group does not hold knowledge about Manuel. This identity work is pursued further when Manuel's answer is followed by Ethan's clarification question, as seen below.

- 24 ETH: oh. (0.3) here in Houston or just here?
 |
 ((ETH starts straightening/repositioning the straw))
- 25 (0.2) ((MANU swallows his food))
- 26 ETH: [°here in Texas.°
- 27 MANU: [here in Houston. (.) no, here in Houston.
- 28 (.)

29 ETH: hm

30 (0.3) ((ETH brings up his drink; MANU clears the mouth with his tongue))

31 MANU: yeah my [[↑]first yea_↓r,

32 SUR: [you worked at AAA² [didn't you?
 |
 ((ETH starts drinking))

33 MANU: [huh?

34 (0.5)

35 MANU: yeah I worked for AAA for seven years, (0.9) uh:m (.) in the
 consulting >department and the:n,< (0.9) I worked at a company
 called BBB³ which is a-, (0.6) integration, (0.6) big system
 integration company, ..

Ethan's turn in line 24 serves a number of purposes. First, he marks reciprocity of Manuel's answer, even though the official recipient of this answer is Surya, who asked the question. This demonstrates a shared questioner-role between Ethan and Surya. Second, Ethan marks his receipt with "oh", a change-of-state token (Heritage 1984). Together with the question that follows "oh", this turn foregrounds Ethan's limited knowledge about Manuel and thus adds to their epistemically incongruent relationship (Heritage 2012).

Manuel then makes a final swallow to empty his mouth (line 25), answers Ethan's question (line 27), clears his mouth (line 30), and moves on to provide a story about his first year at the company (line 31). But then, Surya interrupts Manuel's action by inserting another question that investigates Manuel's whereabouts before entering the current company (line 32), which seems to further highlight the relevance of Manuel as a new member to be inquired by the group. Manuel responds to this by providing a summary of his past experiences (line 35).

To summarize our observations, there were different identities and various alliances evoked in this episode. We saw that Surya initiated the delicate topic by evoking the formal organizational structure (Manuel as the manager). This was bypassed through Manuel's eating-related actions, who actively displayed his chewing actions and took 25 seconds to consume that single bite. In the meantime, Ethan progressed the conversation by treating Surya's action as a yes/no question, and by inviting Manuel to team up with him in providing the response. But Ethan's response here evoked another identity of Manuel in relation to the length of membership in the company, and while Manuel was occupied consuming his food, this aspect was taken up by Surya, and was further developed as an asymmetry between the group and Manuel through Surya and Ethan's shared questioner-ship. Thus, we can see that Manuel's eating-related actions first functioned as a resource to avoid a delicate and problematic question launched by Surya, and then later functioned as a resource for Surya to progress the conversation in favor of asymmetry between Manuel and the rest.

² An anonymized name of a company

³ An anonymized name of a company

5. DISCUSSION

The current study highlights the locally-grounded nature of identity work, and two points in relation to this nature were especially observable in our analysis. The first aspect is the multimodal nature of identity work. On a turn-by-turn basis, organizational members evoked, negotiated and settled identities, and they did so by making use of verbal, embodied and physical resources. The central lunchroom activity of eating was shown to become a resource for the organizational members when negotiating divergent identities: they made use of the eating related actions of taking a bite, chewing and swallowing in negotiating their willingness and ability to engage in a verbal identity building action. Acknowledging the locally-grounded, fine-grained multimodal nature of identity work is central for deepening our understanding of how identity work is accomplished and practiced in organizations. The second aspect is the intersubjective and sequential nature of identity work. Our study demonstrates that identity work is not a subjective matter placed in the individual organizational member, but that identities are intersubjective in nature. They are the ongoing accomplishments of various organizational members in jointly working to create mutual understanding. Capturing the intersubjectiveness of identity work highlights the fact that identity work is interdependent on, enabled and constrained by the local interactive moves of all the involved organizational members.

The current study goes beyond uncovering the local nature of identity work, as it also demonstrates identities as resources. Identity work is not only about creating identities, but it is also about accomplishing various social actions. For example, our analysis showed that identity work was closely related to topic progression. Different from formal meetings, where topic negotiation can be legitimized with reference to the agenda (Asmuß & Svennevig 2009), participants in lunchroom interactions do not have such resources for negotiating relevant topics. Instead here, the invoking of various identities (manager-employee, co-tellers, co-questioners, new/old employees) served as a major resource for the participants to ensure topic progression, and simultaneously, the work on topic progression enabled the emergence of various identities. In other words, organizational members oriented to identity work and topic work as being interdependent. In addition, identity work is also a resource for building various alliances. Our analysis demonstrated that divergent identities were not the cause of disagreements or disaffiliations, but they were the interactional stepping stones for structuring topic progression and for smoothly navigating within the overall activity of having lunch together while being at work. Building convergent identities with some of the present organizational members, while invoking divergent ones with others, was thus a resource for building various alliances that were closely related to and informed by the topics at hand. A resource and intersubjective view on identity work thus enables a deeper understanding of the complex and dynamic nature of who we are and what we seek to accomplish when being in organizations – and ultimately, reveals the micro-foundations of human relations at work.

On a final note, the current study questions the layeredness of identity work as proposed by divisions in organizational, collective and individual levels respectively. If identity work is a members' phenomenon that is based in the local, situated actions made by individual members (as shown in our analysis), then the distinction into different layers might not only be a distinction in terms of layer, but also a distinction in regards to whose concern we are dealing with. While the individual level concretely can be identified as a members' concern, whose concern are the collective and organizational levels? Are they also the members' affair, or the researcher's, or someone else's? Such questions call for a reflection on whose concern identity work is, and which perspective and phenomenon we are pursuing.

REFERENCES

- Antaki, C & Widdicombe, S 1998a, *Identities in talk*, London, Sage.
- Antaki, C & Widdicombe, S 1998b, "Identity as an achievement and as a tool", in C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk*, London, Sage.
- Asmuß, B & Oshima, S 2012, 'Negotiation of entitlement in proposal sequences', *Discourse Studies*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 67-86.
- Asmuß, B & Svennevig, J 2009, 'Meeting talk: An introduction', *Journal of Business Communication*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 3-22.
- Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (2002): Identity regulation as organizational control: producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39, 619-644.
- Alvesson, M, Ashcraft, KK & Thomas, R 2008, 'Identity matters: reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organization studies', *Organization*, vo. 15, pp. 5-28.
- Boden, D 1994, *The business of talk*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Brown, AD, 2015, 'Identities and identity work in organizations', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vo. 17, pp. 20-40.
- Cade, B, 2012, 'Talking the talk: The interactional construction of community and identity at conversation analytic data sessions in Japan', *Human Studies*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 583-605.
- Clarke, CA, Brown, AD & Hailey, VH, 2009, 'Working identities? Antagonistic discursive resources and managerial identity', *Human Relations*, vo. 63, no. 3, pp. 323-352.
- Costas, J & Fleming, P, 2009, 'Beyond dis-identification: A discursive approach to self-alienation in contemporary organizations', *Human Relations*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 353-378.
- Coupland, C & Brown, AD, 2012, 'Identities in action: Processes and outcomes', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 28, pp. 1-4.
- DeRue, DS & Ashford, SJ, 2010, 'Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations', *Academy of Management Review*, vo. 35, pp. 627-647.
- De Stefani, E, 2013, 'The collaborative organisation of next actions in a semiotically rich environment: Shopping as a couple', in P Haddington, L Mondada & M Nevile (eds.), *Interaction and mobility: language and the body in motion*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Djordjilovic, O, 2012, 'Displaying and developing team identity in workplace meetings: a multimodal perspective', *Discourse Studies*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 111-127.
- Down, S & Reveley, J, 2009, 'Between narration and interaction: Situating first-line supervisor identity work', *Human Relations*, vo. 62, no. 3, pp. 379-401.
- Erikson, E H, 1968, *Identity, youth and crisis*, New York, N.W. Norton.
- Ekström, M & Lundell, K, 2011, 'The joint construction of a journalistic expert identity in studio interactions between journalists on TV news', *Text & Talk*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 661-681.
- Fasulo, A & Zucchermaglio, C, 2002, 'My selves and I: identity markers in work meeting talk', *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 34, no. 9, pp. 1119-1144.
- Goffman, E, 1967, *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behaviour*, New York, Pantheon Books.
- Goffman, E, 1990, *The presentation of self in everyday life*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Golsorkhi, D, Rouleau, L, Seidl, D & Vaara, E, 2015, *Cambridge handbook of strategy as practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C, 2000, "Practice of seeing, visual analysis: An ethnomethodological approach", in T Leeuwen & J Carey (eds.), *Handbook of visual analysis*, London. Sage.

- Gylfe, P, Franck, H, LeBaron, C & Mantere, S, 2016, 'Video methods in strategy research: Focusing on embodied cognition', *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 133-148.
- Hatch, M.J & Schultz, M, 2002, 'The dynamics of organizational identity', *Human Relations*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 989-1018.
- Heath, C, 1997, "The analysis of activities in face to face interaction using video", in D Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*, London, Sage.
- Heath, C & Luff, P, 1993, "Explicating face-to-face interaction", in N Gilbert (ed.), *Researching social life*, London, Sage.
- Heritage, J, 2012, 'Epistemics in action: action formation and territories of knowledge', *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, vo. 45, no. 1, pp. 1-29.
- Heritage, J & Clayman, S, 2010, *Talk in action. Interactions, identities, and institutions*, Southern Gate, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hopper, R, 2002, *Gendering talk*, East Lansing, MI, Michigan State University Press.
- Hutchby, I & Wooffitt, R, 2008, *Conversation analysis: Second edition*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Jarmon, LH, 1996, *An ecology of embodied interaction: Turn-taking and interactional syntax in face-to-face encounters*, PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Jefferson, G, 1989, "Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a 'standard maximum' silence of approximately one second in conversation", in D Roger & P Bull (eds.), *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Kitzinger, C & Rickford, R, 2007, 'Becoming a 'bloke': the construction of gender in interaction', *Feminism & Psychology*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 214-223.
- LeBaron, C, 2008, "Microethnography", in D Wolfgang (ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- LeBaron, C, Glenn, PJ & Thompson, MP, 2009, "Identity work during boundary moments: managing positive identities through talk and embodied interaction", in LM Roberts & JE Dutton (eds.), *Exploring positive identities and organizations: building a theoretical and research foundation*, New York, Routledge.
- Lok, J, 2010, 'Institutional logics as identity projects', *Academy of Management Journal*, vo. 53, pp. 1305-1335.
- Mandelbaum, J, 1987, 'Couples sharing stories', *Communication Quarterly*, vol. 35, pp. 144-70
- Martin, B & Wajcman, J, 2004, 'Markets, contingency and preferences: Contemporary managers' narrative identities', *The Sociological Review*, 2004, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 240-64.
- McInnes, P & Corlett, S, 2012, 'Conversational identity work in everyday interaction', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 28, pp. 27-38.
- Mondada, L, 2007, 'Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers', *Discourse Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 194-225.
- Mori, J, 2003, 'The construction of interculturality: a study on initial encounters between Japanese and American students', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 143-184.
- Nicolini, D, 2013, *Practice theory, work and organization. An introduction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Nielsen, MF, 2009, 'Interpretative management in business meetings: understanding managers' interactional strategies through conversation analysis', *Journal of Business Communication*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 23-56.
- Nishizaka, A, 1995, 'The interactive constitution of interculturality: how to be a Japanese with words', *Human Studies*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 301-326.

- Oliver, D, 2015, "Identity work as a strategic practice", in D Golsorkhi, L Rouleau, D Seidl & E Vaara (eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice: Second Edition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ravasi, D & Canato, A, 2013, 'How do I know who you think you are? A review of research methods on organizational identity', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 15, pp. 185-204.
- Raudaskoski, P, 2010, "'Hi Father', 'Hi Mother': A multimodal analysis of a significant, identity changing phone call mediated on TV", *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 426-442.
- Rautajoki, H, 2009, "Staging public discussion: mobilizing political community in closing discussion programmes", in R Fitzgerald & W Housley (eds.), *Media, Policy and Interaction*, Farnham, Surrey, U.K., Ashgate.
- Sacks, H, Schegloff, E & Jefferson, G, 1974, 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation' *Language*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 696-735.
- Samra-Fredericks, D & Bargiela-Chiappini, F, 2008, 'Introduction to the symposium on the foundations of organizing: the contribution from Garfinkel, Goffman and Sacks', *Organization Studies*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 653-675.
- Schatzki, TR, Cetina, KK & Savigny EV, 2001, *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Psychology Press.
- Sidnell, J, 2010, *Conversation analysis: an introduction*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Snow, DA & Anderson, L, 1987, 'Identity work among the homeless: the verbal construction and avowal of personal identities', *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 92, no. 6, pp. 1336-1371.
- Stephen, H & William, H, 2002, *Language, interaction and national identity: Studies in the organisation of national identity in talk-in-interaction*, Aldershot, Ashgate
- Stivers, T & Sidnell, J, 2005, 'Introduction: multimodal interaction', *Semiotica*, vol. 156, no. 1-4, pp. 1-20.
- Streeck, J, Goodwin, C & LeBaron, C, 2011, *Embodied interaction: language and body in the material world*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Svennevig, J, 2008, 'Exploring leadership conversations', *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 21, pp. 529-536.
- Torras, MC, 2005, "Social identity and language choice in bilingual service talk", in K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying conversation analysis*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vöge, M, 2010, 'Local identity processes in business meetings displayed through laughter in complaint sequences', *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1556-1576.
- Watson, TJ, 2008, 'Managing identity: Identity work, personal predicaments and structural circumstances', *Organization*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 121-143.
- Ybema, S, Keenoy, T, Oswick, C, Beverungen, A, Ellis, N & Sabelis, I, 2009, 'Articulating identities', *Human Relations*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 299-322.
- Ybema, S, Vroumisse, M, & van Marrewijk, A, 2012, 'Constructing identity by deconstructing differences: Building partnerships across cultural and hierarchical divides', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 28, pp. 48-59.