Organizational Identity and Organizational Identification: Recap of Literature and Suggestions for Future Research

Hyun Sun Chung*

〈Contents〉

Abstract

Philosophers have discussed identity since ancient times. Identity studies originally used philosophical and psychological approaches to explore the fundamentals of identity. Tajfel (1974) introduced the concept of social identity, which later led Albert and Whetten (1985) to introduce organizational identity theory. Although identity theory helped people comprehend certain aspects of identity, some issues remain popular in organizational studies. A consensus exists regarding the importance of organizational identity, and a precise definition has been formulated. However, this topic has been researched and utilized by researchers from various disciplines with different perspectives, so it may require more coherent usage because the topic has been expanded continuously. Discourses on organizational identity and organizational identification are heterogeneous, and they do not seem to point toward a resolution. This paper presents converging conceptual patterns from existing research and provides suggestions for future research by organizing existing perspectives. It explores the theories of organizational identity and organizational identification from the

*Doctoral Student. College of Business Administration. Seoul National University.

perspective of organizational behavior. Although abundant research exists regarding organizational identity and organizational identification, elements of these concepts' core aspects remain unexplored. Through a review of empirical findings and conceptual debates, this paper provides an opportunity to initiate a new research agenda to fill this gap and expand concepts related to identity to achieve a broader and sounder understanding of organizational studies.

I. Introduction

Existing literature emphasizes the importance of organizational culture and its implications for outcomes of organizational studies, such as organizational commitment, satisfaction, and performance. As many studies have explained, organizational culture is one of the essential factors in organizations that provide members not only with a sense of belonging and unity but also encourages them to participate in organizational matters proactively and uphold positive attitudes. Empirical research shows that organizational culture has a significant relationship with individual and organizational performance and productivity and also motivates individuals (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Schein, 1992). To capture the influences of organizational culture fully, similar yet different theories need to be reviewed (i.e., organizational identity and organizational identification). Considering that organizational identity began receiving attention as a part of the organizational culture research trend in the 1980s, it is worthwhile to revisit the concept (Pullen & Linstead, 2005).

When Tajfel (1974) introduced the concept of social identity, which later led Albert and Whetten (1985) to introduce organizational identity theory, it helped to comprehend certain levels of understanding, yet issues of identity remain popular in organizational studies. Tajfel (1974) explained the concept of social identity as a person's knowledge of which individuals belong to certain social groups, which involves emotional and value significance due to that group membership. Albert and Whetten's (1985) study explained similar organizational identity concepts. They introduced as attributes the fact that members in organizations feel fundamental to the organization, uniquely descriptive of it and persisting within it over time, and the collective sense of how members feel and view organizations.

The existing social identity studies indicate that individuals tend to select specific groups or social categories that are congruent (i.e., individuals supporting particular social groups means they are supporting their social identities). Moreover, social identification leads to the outcome and performance of the group in which these individuals belong, which means that when individuals create a positive relationship with a specific group, they strongly identify with it and create and cultivate productive performance outcomes. The social identity research has shown a similar narrative to organizational identity theory. After Albert and Whetten's (1985) study was introduced, organizational scholars attempted to find answers regarding how to utilize such a concept to understand organizational phenomena in multiple dimensions by focusing on the formation of organizational identity, the relationship between organizational culture, management, and organizational identity, and its influence from the perspective of strategies. Studies indicate that the concept of organizational identity is vital since it can influence members of organizations in forming attitudes, taking actions, and understanding organizational management processes.

Since organizational identity can have impacts on various organizational studies, organizational identification needs to be reviewed simultaneously with organizational identity. Organizational identity can play vital roles in organizational identification, which is building relationships between individuals and the organization. Empirical studies illustrate that organizational identity is a precedent for organizational identification (i.e., how clearly individuals perceive/understand the organizational identity has a significant impact on forming organizational identification). Organizational identity can have both causal effects and enhancing mechanisms; thus, it needs to be reviewed with organizational identification for a sound understanding of the concepts.

Several studies indicate that organizational identity's influence can be significant, and the concept has been researched from divergent perspectives. However, there is neither a congruent nor coherent organized map to utilize the concept, which provokes the challenges of pursuing research in the field of organizational identity.

There are still debates as to whether organizational identity may be unable to measure the construct, or has some inconsistency. It is evident that organizational identity and organizational identification have been widely examined not only from business or

organizational management perspectives but also from the perspectives of sociology and administrative management, which are considered macro-level approaches. Extensive research and examination speak to the importance of the topic and its potential contribution to understanding implications.

The need to understand the mechanism of organizational identity becomes more important as organizational environments change. As rapidly changing environments, organizations become more dynamic and complicated, which results in organizational restructuring. This means that they become non-conventional by becoming flatter and work is based on needs, providing discretion to and empowerment of employees. Moreover, organizations are no longer considered life-long entities, which may weaken employees' organizational loyalty or commitment. Thus, organizations now more than ever need a function that can bring employees together and provide bonding mechanisms for them to internally identify with organizations so that, rather than infrastructure holding employees together, organizational identity can bond employees together voluntarily (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000).

Therefore, this paper aims to organize various perspectives of and approaches to organizational identity and organizational identification in addition to challenges and debates regarding this topic. Moreover, after analyzing divergent perspectives, the paper will propose suggestions for future research directions regarding the topics of organizational identity and organizational identification.

II. Organizational Identity

Individuals understand themselves with their identity, and those individuals with their own identity interact with others based on social categories or groups, which is the essence of how social identity is formed. As Tajfel (1972) explained, "a person's knowledge that he or she belongs to certain social groups ... involves emotional and value significance because of that group membership." Considering that organizations are one of the primary social groups that individuals are identified with, it is logical that theories regarding identity have evolved perspectives from personal to social to organizational.

Albert and Whetten's (1985) seminal work introduced the concept of organizational identity, which received attention from scholars and managers (Brown, 2006; Chenney, 1991; Corley, Harquail, Pratt, Glynn, Fiol, & Hatch, 2006). Albert and Whetten (1985) explained that there are a set of three unique criteria to define an organizational identity; that is, members of organizations perceive their organizations to be central, distinctive, and enduring. These three critical criteria distinguish organizational identity from other constructs. Centrality refers to the inclusion of features that are vital to organizations and indicates what is essential and important to organizations. The second criterion, distinctiveness, specifies how an organization differs from other organizations, which can be seen in organizational ideology, philosophy, or culture. Distinctiveness focuses on being different from other organizations and their characteristics. The third criterion, durability, refers to how organizational identity can endure. It represents how an organization is resilient and how it has a strong impact and influence on organizations and members of organizations. Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) also defined organizational identity as what individual members of organizations believe about their organizations. If these individual members recognize their organizations as being better in comparison to other organizations, they will have positive attitudes about their organizations, leading to stronger organizational identities. With the use of these three criteria and definitions of organizational identity, studies have aimed to find how the identity influences an organization and its members, which indicates that it is not only a collective measure, but it can also affect individuals at different levels. Therefore, this section will discuss the different perspectives of understanding organizational identity.

With regard to organizational identity as a root construct, it has been argued that it can be "versatile," meaning it "can be applied to almost any phenomenon" (Ashforth, 2016). As it is a versatile construct, it has been used with various approaches in existing research. Having expanded research regarding organizational identity, the concept of organizational identity has widened its criteria—organically suggested definitions were softened (Corley, Gioia, & Fabbri, 2000; Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Hatch & Schultz, 2002; Pratt & Foreman, 2000). Having softened up the definition, it has been examined to understand organizational behavior, strategy, marketing, decision making, and attitudes and reactions to organizations (Ashforth & Mael, 1996; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Dutton et al., 1994; Pratt, 1998; Reger,

Gustafson, Demarie & Mullane, 1994).

Researchers have attempted to create categories to map the different approaches to organizational identity in the research setting. Organizational identity has been viewed from cognitive or behavioral approaches or from functionalist, social constructionist, psychodynamic, and postmodernist perspectives (Corley & Gioia, 2004; He & Brown, 2013; Mujib, 2017). Although there have been efforts to expand the theoretical understanding of the concept, researchers are unable to grasp its application fully to integrate the concept into organizations (Mujib, 2017).

1. Three Dimensions of Organizational Identity

Thus, this section aims to organize three ideas to understand the concept of organizational identity. Rather than introducing new concepts or integrating existing categories to understand the concept of organizational identity, this paper aims to provide three clear dimensions to comprehend the concept.

One of the approaches is understanding organizational identity from the perspective of tangible artifacts in organizations. In this approach, researchers focus on organizational features and actions that include logos, symbols, locations of organizations, and speeches in organizations. Researchers emphasize analyzing palpable records and evidence to understand how members of organizations form, strengthen, and change organizational identity (Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Olins, 1989). Research has illustrated that the relationship between organizational image and reputation and branding can influence organizational identity (Dutton et al., 1994; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Glynn and Abzug (2002) argued that organizational name changes evoke cognitive interpretation and shape the attributes of new organizational names. In their study about how labels and meaning changes in organizations that form an organizational identity, Corley and Gioia (2004) also emphasized that changing labels and meanings with clear explanations provide a signal to members to accept and form an organizational identity. These studies explain the relationship between artifacts and organizational identity by focusing on how to utilize artifacts to form and manage organizational identity. This approach may have benefits of measuring organizational identity

with tangible dimensions, yet it has the potential to overlook processes of formation, reaction, or interactions of organizational identity.

The socially cognitive approach is another way to view organizational identity, and it binds with the original definition of organizational identity by relying on the definition of consensus that organizations are central, distinctive, and enduring. Similar to the logic of forming personal identity and social identity, organizational identity can also be viewed as social interaction and construct and seeks answers to "who the organization is" via organizational identity (Corley et al., 2006). Existing research has indicated how organizational identity influences various organizational functions such as organizational memory, press coverage, and dress codes (Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Anteby & Molnar, 2012; Kjaergaard & Ravasi, 2011). As Bridwell-Mitchell and Mezias (2012) explained, organizational identity in a socially cognitive approach aims to answer "who are we, as an organization" by collective efforts, and in the process of the relationship members of organizations may share the exposed organizational identity by using collective language (Elsbach & Glynn, 1996). Unlike the previous approach, a socially cognitive approach emphasizes the processes of relationship and collective beliefs, shared consensus, and summation of individual opinions to examine organizational identity. Perhaps, it may capture the perspective that is created during the processes of relational bonds among members of organizations or collective censuses among them, but it can be considered less stable, subjective, and ambiguous compared to the previous approach. It can be argued that the socially cognitive approach may enrich the understanding of organizational identity through energy, cognitive and emotional experiences, and opinions of people when they interact and exchange these things, and how they can be matched with the definition of centrality, distinctiveness, and endurance, yet it can also be less stable and more subjective because bias may be included in the analyzing processes (Harquail & King, 2010).

The third narrative approach is not necessarily a combined version of the two previous approaches, yet it suggests a different viewpoint of understanding organizational identity. Coupland and Brown (2004) argued that organizational identity could be created via dialogues between insiders and outsiders. Brown (2006) further explained that organizational identity could be found in inscribed narratives in organizations such as documents, written histories, reports, websites, letters, and e-mails. It is important to note that constructing

organizational identity is an ongoing process via continuous arguments and debates and that organizational identity is continually being created, modified, and changed. Similar to what Albert and Whetten (1985) suggested, Brown (2006) also provided a framework to understand organizational identity – reflexivity, voice, plurivocity, temporality, and fictionality. To briefly explain the framework, reflexivity refers to the process by which organizational members understand themselves to define organizational identity. Voice means that the narrative always has authors or an audience with a particular viewpoint so that messages are being shared intentionally. Plurivocity means that organizations may have multiple identities or the potential to be translated in different ways: "there is no single basic story subsisting beneath it, but, rather, an unlimited number of other narratives that can be constructed in response to it or perceived as related to it" (Smith, 1981, p. 217). Temporality is already an integral part of narrative since it refers to the concept of time, and fictionality means that even if narratives were constructed based on experiential and historical backgrounds, they still include a certain level of unprecise information. Dunne (1995) explained that the stories regarding organizations are somehow edited with hermeneutic uncertainty. Although its approach may put emphasis on narratives that include power and politics within organizations, fictionality actually emphasizes both processes and outcomes of narratives that are constructed by organizational members. So, it not only focuses on processes of constructing organizational identity but also on what has been made and why it has been created. It ends the debate over whether or not organizational identity should be changed; rather, it focuses on why certain organizational identity narratives have been created and why they prevail among other potential narratives.

2. Relationship between Organizational Identity and Organizational Culture

Hatch and Schultz (2002) explained that as organizational identity is being created with the exchange between insiders and outsiders, organizational culture, which is made up of insiders, and reputation and image, which are seen by outsiders, create an organizational identity as a result of exchange and interaction between insiders as well as insiders and outsiders that is communicated and exchanged in various ways (Sillince & Brown, 2009). Studies indicate the

similarities between organizational identity and culture and how organizational culture (e.g., values, beliefs, norms, customs, and artifacts) enhances organizational members to strengthen organizational identity, which further argues that the fundamental concepts between organizational identity and organizational culture are being shared.

III. Organizational Identification

The basic concept of organizational identification is that when organizational members view themselves with their organizational membership (i.e., when an individual sees the oneness of organizational identity and personal identity; Ashforth & Mael, 1989), that is the phase of organizational identification (Pratt, 1998). As Tajfel and Turner (1986) explained, when individuals consider a sense of belonging to organizations as a part of who they are, based on the social identity theory, it can be understood as organizational identification. Therefore, through organizational identification, members of organizations merge the organizational identity with their personal identities, and it creates strong oneness and a sense of belonging and membership (Meal & Ashforth, 1995; Ashforth & Meal, 1989).

Although organizational identification may seem to have similarities with organizational commitment, compliance, and internalization, since they happen in response to social influences, there are fine differences between them and organizational identification (Ashforth & Meal, 1989; Pratt, 1998, Herrbach, 2006). While these constructs value organizational goals and beliefs and confer them with a sense of attachment, they are considered to be generic because the emphasis is on the goals, beliefs, and values. However, organizational identification is exclusive to organizations; organizational identification occurs when organizational members merge their identities with the organizational identity and see it as one identity. Thus, it is not just mere congruence of values or goals; rather, it is the congruence of the organization's members and the organization itself. Empirical studies have indicated that organizational identification can influence positive employee and organizational outcomes such as performance, employee dynamics, and change aspects.

1. Organizational Identification and Employee/Organizational Performance

The impact of organizational identification on performance is one of the most dominant research topics since there are numerous empirical findings that indicate the positive relationship between organizational identification and employee and organizational performances, which include employee performance, creativity, customer loyalty, and financial performance. Kodama and Tokaji (2010) explained that organizational identification increases the desire to stay at an organization, which helps members of organizations to have appropriate work attitudes and behaviors, thereby employees engage in proactive attitudes not only to complete tasks but to strive for the betterment of the outcome. It leads to not only creativity but also even financial performance through enhancing customer satisfaction (Homburg, Wieseke, & Hoyer, 2009). As Ashforth, Harrison, and Corely (2008) explained, when members of organizations have stronger organizational identification, they show indications of working harder and better, and if they reflect themselves more in their organizations, then they even sacrifice their won benefits for organizational betterment.

2. Organizational Identification and Leadership

When analyzing employee dynamics with organizational identification, leadership is one of the factors that can influence employees' organizational identification formation. Considering that leadership may shape employees' viewpoints of organizational identity and their relationship to the organization, empirical results indicate that certain leadership styles (e.g., transformational and ethical leadership) have positive effects on forming organizational identification by empowering employees and hearing their voices. Leadership actions foster employees' identification with organizations (Carmeli, Atwater, & Levi, 2011; Walumbwa et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2010). Additionally, when leaders are ethical, organizational members consider them trustworthy and fair, which increases employee cooperation and organizational trust and creates a cordial environment to foster organizational identification (Walumbwa et al., 2011).

3. Organizational Identification and Social Exchange Theory

Moreover, from the employee dynamics viewpoint, the social exchange aspect also needs to be addressed with organizational identification. A fundamental understanding of organizational identification with the social exchange aspect is that members may feel obliged to reciprocate to the organization when they consider they have received certain benefits. For example, organizational members who have stronger organizational identification may engage in exemplary organizational behaviors when there is perceived procedural justice in organizations (Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam, 2007). Thus, one should consider how organizations could encourage members to employ proactive behaviors via effectively utilizing leadership styles and social exchange perspectives.

4. Organizational Identification and Organizational Change

Organizational identification can also be useful to examine organizations adopting change. Considering that organizations often face either planned or unexpected changes, organizational members and their organizational identification play vital roles in carrying out organizational changes. Organizational identification regarding change has been reviewed in various contexts. In one context, employees with strong organizational identification may react to change more sensitively. Procedural justice can be used to ensure that adopted changes are adequate. Empirical studies indicate that members of organizations with strong organizational identification may demand more information regarding changes and may feel negatively as a result of strong identified bonds between employee and organization (Bartels, Pruyn, De Jong, & Joustra, 2007; van Knippenberg, Martin, & Tyler, 2006). In addition to changes, when mergers and acquisitions happen between organizations, organizational identification may play a critical role in the processes since M&A may cause fundamental changes to employees' organizational identification (Ullrich, Wieseke, & Dick, 2005; van Knippenberg et al., 2006). The findings indicate that M&A may cause employee organizational identification issues, but as long as organizational identification is managed well in the post-merger phase, it still can be well-maintained and continue the benefits of having employees with organizational

identification as mentioned earlier in the section (Ullrich et al., 2005). Employees with stronger organizational identification will focus on change processes, while employees with weak organizational identification will focus on the outcome of change, such as job security or compensation (van Knippenberg et al., 2006). This result provides insights into the importance of cultivating strong organizational identification so that when change happens, an organization only needs to ensure that the change is being done properly, and there will be less resistance to change from employees.

5. Virtuous Circle of Organizational Identity and Organizational Identification

In the earlier section of the paper, I discussed aspects of organizational identity and organizational identification. Although they may stem from the concept of social identity, they may also influence each other. Organizational identity focuses on creating a shared and collective viewpoint of "who we are as an organization," whereas organizational identification focuses on recognizing a sense of belonging to or membership of an organization (Ashforth & Meal, 1989). Empirical findings indicate that when organizational members have an organizational identity, it significantly leads to organizational identification, and when there is strong organizational identification, it strengthens organizational identity (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Both constructs are reciprocal and affect and influence each other in a cycle. For example, empirical findings indicate that when the organizational identity has distinctiveness compared to other organizations, a good organizational reputation is created (Sluss, Klimchak, & Holmes, 2008; Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011).

According to Petriglieri (2015), since Facebook considers entrepreneurship a vital factor to the organization, it promotes employees who have an entrepreneurial identity. Facebook employees adopt an entrepreneurial identity and then form an organizational identification with the company. This can be viewed as a strategic approach to engage employees with organizational identification, since existing studies indicate that members with organizational identification value organizational interest and betterment rather than individual interest.

IV. Multiple Organizational Identities and Organizational Over-identification

Topics regarding organizational identity and organizational identification have been researched in various disciplines with different approaches, and the results broaden the understanding and perspectives of organizational phenomena. However, some aspects of organizational identity and organizational identification require more attention, and there is room for examination of the issues of multiple organizational identities and organizational over-identification.

1. Issues of Multiple Organizational Identities

The issues of multiple organizational identities have received relatively less attention in the organizational identity literature, unlike in the sociology and psychology fields that have conducted research regarding multiple individual identities (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). Considering Albert and Whetten's (1985) study initiated research regarding the field of organizational identity in the mid-1980s, it is surprising how issues of multiple organizational identities did not arise until the 2000s, and even until today, only a few studies have been published.

Pratt and Foreman (2000) referred to Pratt and Rafaeli's (1997) study and explained how nurses formed different organizational identities based on their shifts, even if the nurses worked at the same rehabilitation unit. While day shift nurses considered their organizational identity as a rehabilitation identity, night shift nurses viewed their organizational identity as an acute care identity. Day shift nurses focused on advocating for patients to be rehabilitated to a normal routine, whereas night shifts nurses were there in emergency situations; that is, even if working in the same unit, identity may be formed completely differently due to given primary roles. Although multiple organizational identities can enrich the understanding of organizations, Pratt and Corley (2007) pointed out that having multiple organizational identities can create conflict among identities, which can lead to an ambiguous organizational identity. Pratt and Rafaeli (1997) showed that despite the same affiliation and position,

the nurses' views on organizational identity were completely different. De Bernardis and Giustiniano (2015) explained that in organizational change processes, maintaining multiple identities can be beneficial rather than forcing people to merge into one new identity.

There are potential benefits and costs of multiple organizational identities. Benefits can include flexibility due to a wide range of conceptions of identities rather than being static and fixed. Whenever changes or situations require a response, multiple organizational identities can work to resolve the issue. On the other hand, having multiple organizational identities may create stress and overload that lead to conflicts, which can generate ambiguity of organizational identity in general (Hillman, Nicholson, & Shropshire, 2008; Pratt & Foreman, 2000). Thus, a further examination regarding multiple organizational identities in various contexts to obtain sound perspectives can be beneficial for understanding organizational phenomena.

2. Issues of Organizational Over-Identification

In addition to multiple organizational identities, organizational over-identification is a recently discussed construct in the field of organizational identity studies. Though studies regarding organizational identification with positive nuances have proliferated, relatively recent studies have indicated the potential negative aspect of organizational over-identification (Ashforth et al., 2008; Avanzi, van Dick, Fraccaroli, & Sarchielli, 2012; Haslam, 2004; Haslam & van Dick, 2011; van Dick & Haslam, 2012). Ashforth (2016) argued that despite the sheer volume of organizational identification research, the downside of organizational identification should also be examined to attain a better perspective of organizational identification. Ashforth (2016) further argued that the downside of organizational identification might be caused by over-identification processes.

Avanzi et al. (2012) defined over-identification as "an excessive form of identification." Ashforth (2016) further explained that over-identification has its limit before a tipping point is reached, which means that if organizational identification reaches a certain level, it may create negative consequences and will be contrary to existing research that indicates the benefits of having organizational identification for positive employee and organizational

performance. However, it does not mean that organizational identification does not have positive influences. These arguments still support the notion that organizational members with strong organizational identification are prone to work diligently, yet when organizational identification becomes too strong in a distorted way, it can create psychological and physical health issues.

Even though there are still unknown aspects of organizational over-identification, only a few published studies have compared potential combinations or boundaries in certain contexts that might cause organizational over-identification. Thus far, based on the empirical findings that are available, members of organizations with organizational over-identification can experience psychological and physical harm that can lead to negative employee/organizational performance in the long run.

V. Suggestions for Future Research

He and Brown (2013) acknowledged that despite the efforts to create one clear discourse on organizational identity, it is less appealing to have a homogenized definition since the concept is applied in various disciplines with numerous contexts. Whetten (2006) published research to clarify and strengthen the original concept of organizational identity in Albert and Whetten's (1985) study, yet it was not effectively shared across various boundaries and disciplines of organizational identity research. Foreman and Whetten (2012) argued that the concept of organizational identity needs to be reviewed in-depth with a clearer definition. Though it can be argued that vigorous debate over defining a unified conception of organizational identity might nurture robust research by expanding conceptual understanding, it is still necessary perhaps not to define but to organize converging patterns of organizational identity to properly utilize in research settings.

Further research on multiple organizational identities can also deepen the understanding of organizational performance from the perspective of adopting change. Existing research indicates that even if employees are affiliated with the same organization and position, depending on the primary task they can be directed to completely different forms of

organizational identity; thus, organizational identity at an aggregated level can be either flexible for responding to changing situations or conflicting due to the collapse of different types of organizational identities within organizations. Since one of the reasons for examining organizational identity was the changing organizational structure and culture, an organization can benefit from a non-conventional approach to improve organizational phenomena, and analyzing multiple organizational identities may be used strategically and effectively by organizations.

Moreover, although organizational identification research has continued to increase and many studies indicate how organizational identification helps employees to identify themselves in organizations, provides meaningful relationships, and offers a sense of belonging to organizations, research on specific underlying dynamics of how organizational identification actually influences employee behavior and organizational performance requires more examination (Ashforth, 2016; Blader, Patil, & Packer, 2017; Galvin, Lange, & Ashforth, 2015; Rogers & Ashforth, 2017). Therefore, looking at specific boundaries, contexts, and climates of how organizational identification affects employee behavior can be helpful in expanding the understanding of organizational identification dynamics.

Additionally, as discussed in the earlier section, organizational over-identification needs to be scrutinized as well. Although some scholars have discussed the issue of over-identification and its potential negative aspects, only a few studies have been conducted on organizational over-identification. Considering that the majority of studies have indicated the positive outcome of having organizational identification, research on organizational over-identification can provide a completely different outcome since empirical findings indicate there is a tipping point of organizational identification and once it is reached, organizational identification will no longer serve as a positive influence in organizations. If organizational identification has curvilinear effects, it will open up a new pathway for organizational identification studies to discover appropriate limits, proper moderation, and effective mediation of organizational identification in organizational processes.

Lastly, in existing studies, organizational identification is measured on a continuum from strong identification to weak identification. Even when studies categorize organizational identification, they still divide categories based on the degree of organizational identification

(Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004). As mentioned earlier, since there is a need to analyze specific dynamics between organizational identification, employee behavior, and organizational performance, in the future, a framework for organizational identification types can be formulated, which can be helpful for the comprehensive understanding of the mechanism between organizational identification and organizational performance .

Reference

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

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

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

Ashforth, B. E. (2016). Distinguished scholar invited essay: Exploring identity and identification in organizations: Time for some course corrections. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *23*(4), 361-373.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20-39.

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

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, *34*(3), 325-374.

Avanzi, L., van Dick, R., Fraccaroli, F., & Sarchielli, G. (2012). The downside of organizational identification: Relations between identification, workaholism and well-being. *Work & Stress*, *26*(3), 289-307.

Bartels, J., Pruyn, A., De Jong, M., & Joustra, I. (2007). Multiple organizational identification levels and the impact of perceived external prestige and communication climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*(2), 173-190.

Blader, S. L., Patil, S., & Packer, D. J. (2017). Organizational identification and workplace behavior: More than meets the eye. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *37*, 19-34.

Bridwell-Mitchell, E. N., & Mezias, S. J. (2012). The quest for cognitive legitimacy: Organizational identity crafting and internal stakeholder support. *Journal of Change Management*, *12*(2), 189-207.

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

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Carmeli, A., Atwater, L., & Levi, A. (2011). How leadership enhances employee's knowledge sharing at work: The intervening roles of relational and organizational identification. *Journal of Technology Transfer, 36,* 257-274.

Cheney, G. (1991). *Rhetoric in an organizational society: Managing multiple identities*. University of South Carolina Press.

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

Corley, K. G., Gioia, D. A., & Fabbri, T. (2000). *Organizational identity in transition over time*.

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

Coupland, C., & Brown, A. D. (2004). Constructing organizational identities on the web: A case study of Royal Dutch/Shell. *Journal of Management Studies*, *41*(8), 1325-1347.

De Bernardis, L., & Giustiniano, L. (2015). Evolution of multiple organisational identities after an M&A event: A case study from Europe. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 28*(3), 333-355.

Dunne, T. (1995). The social construction of international society. *European Journal of International Relations*, *1*(3), 367-389.

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

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

Elsbach, K. D., & Glynn, M. A. (1996). Believing your own 'PR': Embedding identification in

strategic reputation. *Advances in Strategic Management*, *13*, 65-90.

Foreman, P. O., Whetten, D. A., & Mackey, A. (2012). An identity-based view of reputation, image, and legitimacy: Clarifications and distinctions among related constructs. In *The Oxford handbook of corporate reputation*.

Galvin, B. M., Lange, D., & Ashforth, B. E. (2015). Narcissistic organizational identification: Seeing oneself as central to the organization's identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *40*(2), 163-181.

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

Glynn, M. A., & Abzug, R. (2002). Institutionalizing identity: Symbolic isomorphism and organizational names. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(1), 267-280.

Harquail, C. V., & Wilcox King, A. (2010). Construing organizational identity: The role of embodied cognition. *Organization Studies*, *31*(12), 1619-1648.

Haslam, S. A., & Van Dick, R. (2011). A social identity approach to workplace stress. *Social Psychology and Organizations*, 325-352.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of Marketing*, *31*(5/6), 356-365.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human Relations*, *55*(8), 989-1018.

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.

Herrbach, O. (2006). A matter of feeling? The affective tone of organizational commitment and identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(5), 629-643.

Hillman, A. J., Nicholson, G., & Shropshire, C. (2008). Directors' multiple identities, identification, and board monitoring and resource provision. *Organization Science, 19*(3), 441-456.

Homburg, C., Wieseke, J., & Hoyer, W. D. (2009). Social identity and the service-profit chain. *Journal of Marketing*, *73*(2), 38-54.

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

Kodama K., & Tokaji A. (2010). A conceptual review of the organizational identification:

Integration of organizational identification into organizational commitment. *Hiroshima University Management Research, 10*, 51－66.

Kreiner, G. E., & Ashforth, B. E. (2004). Evidence toward an expanded model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(1), 1-27.

Liu, W., Zhu, R., & Yang, Y. (2010). I warn you because I like you: Voice behavior, employee identifications, and transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(1), 189-202.

Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. (1995). Loyal from day one: Biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(2), 309-333.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13,* 103-123.

Mujib, H. (2017). Organizational identity: an ambiguous concept in practical terms. *Administrative Sciences*, *7*(3), 28.

Olins, W. (1990). *Corporate identity: Making business strategy visible through design*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Petriglieri, J. L. (2015). Co-creating relationship repair: Pathways to reconstructing destabilized organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *60*(3), 518-557.

Pratt, M. G. (1998). To be or not to be: Central questions in organizational identification. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Foundations for organizational science. Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations* (pp. 171-207). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Pratt, M. G., & Corley, K. (2007). Managing multiple organizational identities: On identity ambiguity, identity conflict, and members' reactions. *Identity and the Modern Organization*, 99-118.

Pratt, M. G., & Foreman, P. O. (2000). Classifying managerial responses to multiple organizational identities. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 18-42.

Pratt, M. G., & Rafaeli, A. (1997). Organizational dress as a symbol of multilayered social identities. *Academy of Management Journal*, *40*(4), 862-898.

Pullen, A., & Linstead, S. (2005). Introduction: Organizing identity. In A. Pullen, & S. Linstead (Eds.), *Organization and Identity* (pp. 1-17). Abingdon: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

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

Reger, R. K., Gustafson, L. T., Demarie, S. M., & Mullane, J. V. (1994). Reframing the organization: Why implementing total quality is easier said than done. *Academy of Management Review*, *19*(3), 565-584.

Rogers, K. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2017). Respect in organizations: Feeling valued as "We" and "Me". *Journal of Management*, *43*(5), 1578-1608.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

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

Sluss, D. M., Klimchak, M., & Holmes, J. J. (2008). Perceived organizational support as a mediator between relational exchange and organizational identification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*(3), 457-464.

Smith, B. H. (1981). Narrative versions, narrative theories. In W.J.T. Mitchell (Ed.), *On narrative.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), Psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information,13*(2), 65-93.

Tangirala, S., Green, S. G., & Ramanujam, R. (2007). In the shadow of the boss's boss: Effects of supervisors' upward exchange relationships on employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(2), 309.

Ullrich, J., Wieseke, J., & Dick, R. V. (2005). Continuity and change in mergers and acquisitions: A social identity case study of a German industrial merger. *Journal of Management Studies*, *42*(8), 1549-1569.

Van Dick, R., & Haslam, S. A. (2012). Stress and well-being in the workplace: Support for key propositions from the social identity approach.

Van Knippenberg, B., Martin, L., & Tyler, T. (2006). Process-orientation versus outcome-orientation during organizational change: the role of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(6), 685-704.

Walumbwa, F. O., & Hartnell, C. A. (2011). Understanding transformational leadership – employee performance links: The role of relational identification and self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*(1), 153-172.

Walumbwa, F. O., Mayer, D. M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K., & Christensen, A. L. (2011). Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader－member exchange, self-efficacy, and organizational identification. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *115*(2), 204-213.

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

조직정체성 및 조직동일시에 관한
문헌연구 및 제언

정 현 선*

정체성은 고대의 철학자부터 논의해오던 개념으로 철학적이거나 심리적인 접근을 통해 연구되어 왔다. Tajfel (1974)의 사회정체성 이론을 바탕으로 Albert와 Whetten (1985)은 조직정체성의 이론을 소개하였다. 지속적인 정체성과 관련된 연구는 정체성에 대한 풍부한 설명을 제공하였지만, 조직연구 분야에서는 아직 더 연구가 필요한 부분들이 존재한다. 기존에 발표된 연구들을 통해 조직정체성에 관한 연구의 중요성 및 근본적인 정의에 대한 이해는 충분히 설명되었지만, 여러 학문에서 연구되고 활용되고 있는 조직정체성과 조직동일시의 경우 개념이 계속 확대되고 있기 때문에, 앞으로의 보다 효과적인 연구를 위해서는 본 주제에 대한 명확한 정의와 활용이 중요하다. 본 논문에서는 기존의 조직정체성과 조직동일시의 관한 연구에서 제시한 내용을 수렴하여 정리하고, 앞으로의 연구방향에 대한 방향을 제시하였다. 현재까지 진행된 풍부한 조직정체성 및 조직동일시에 대한 연구에도 불구하고, 더 명확한 정의를 필요로 하는 부분들이 남아있다. 따라서 본 논문에서는 선행연구에 대한 분석을 바탕으로 조직정체성 및 조직동일시 연구과정에서 발생하는 차이를 줄이고, 조직연구 분야에서의 조직정체성과 조직동일시의 개념의 정교화를 통해 앞으로의 연구방향을 제시하고자 한다.

* 서울대학교 경영대학 박사과정