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THESIS SUMMARY

Corporate identity cues – the information that amongst other things reflects the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of the organisation that comprise its corporate identity – help influence the psychological bond of identification that employees have with their organisations. Organisational identification in turn affects the job-specific in-role and additional voluntary extra-role behaviours that employees practice within and towards their organisations that can influence its success.

Corporate identity research has mostly addressed corporate identity cues as manifestations of the communications, behaviour and symbolism of the organisation. Despite being part of the many pieces of information that employees store in memory about their organisations which provide insights into their interpretations of and responses to the corporate identity (i.e., their member organisational associations), considerably less attention has been directed towards examining these cues from this perspective. Consequently, it is unclear which of these manifestations, or types, of corporate identity cues affect organisational identification and its subsequent influence on role behaviours, or whether these effects are constant across the organisation and under different conditions.

This study contributes to building understanding of the manifestations and effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its influence on role behaviours, by examining empirically this relationship at the aggregate and subgroup level. Its underlying premise is that to evaluate sufficiently the effects of corporate identity cues, these cues must also be considered from the member organisational associations perspective.

The findings of this mixed methods study show a significant relationship between corporate identity cues derived from member organisational associations, organisational identification and role behaviours, and that the cues that influence organisational identification vary according to organisational levels and conditions. This points to the strategic importance and value of examining periodically corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the thesis
In this opening chapter to the thesis, the broad context within which the research is set is outlined. The chapter commences with a brief introduction to corporate identity and its strategic importance to organisations and employees in section 1.2. Here, the gaps identified in current studies of corporate identity, particularly as they related to corporate identity cues, are introduced. This leads to a detailed outlining in section 1.3 of the main aim of the study. In section 1.4, the research objectives and approach are presented. This is followed by a presentation of the thesis’ structure in section 1.5.

1.2 Corporate identity cues in context
Although it remains a challenge to settle on a singular, agreed upon definition of corporate identity (Van Rekom, 1997; Balmer and Wilson, 1998; Balmer, 2001; Melewar, 2003), there is broad consensus that it is strategically important to organisations (Rughase, 2006; Kjærgaard, 2009; Melewar, 2003; Ravasi and Phillips, 2011). As such, it continues to be the subject of ongoing interest both in practice and in academia (Marwick and Fill, 1997; Balmer, 2001; Melewar, 2003). More recently, the challenge of seeking out a specific definition of corporate identity has in part been addressed through the emergence of the interdisciplinary (Hatch and Schultz, 1997; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997; Balmer and Greyser, 2003; Dowling and Otubanjo, 2011) perspective which has brought together the organisational behaviour, visual and graphic design and marketing schools. Yet this perspective too is fraught with multiple definitions. Where Van Riel and Balmer (1997, p.341) define corporate identity as representing ‘the way in which an organization’s identity is revealed through behaviour, communications as well as through symbolism to internal and external audiences.’, it is also understood to reflect what the firm is, means and does as well as how and where it operates (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002; Melewar, Karaosmanoglu and Patterson, 2005). In one of the three key developments noted in their appraisal of corporate identity, Van Riel and Balmer (1997, p.340) acknowledge a further shift and definition within the interdisciplinary perspective where corporate identity is viewed as ‘a multidisciplinary approach which draws heavily on organizational behaviour’; that is to say, those attributes of the organisation considered to be central, enduring and distinctive (CED) in the minds of its employees (Albert and Whetten, 1985). As will be explained later in this thesis, while the study presented here embraces the interdisciplinary approach reflected in Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) definition of corporate identity,
it is the interdisciplinary approach encapsulating the CED aspects of the organisation to which this study primarily subscribes.

At the same time, there has been ongoing interest across this interdisciplinary spectrum in uncovering what stakeholders actually understand and perceive about their organisations and how employees in particular react as a result (Brown et al, 2006). Of the numerous pieces of information that individuals gather and hold in memory about organisations in the form of corporate associations (Brown and Dacin, 1997), these cognitive, or mental, associations when held by organisational employees and tied to what they collectively consider to be CED about the organisation, i.e., their member organisational associations (Brown et al., 2006), are particularly important in helping to understand these perceptions. This is because while corporate identity largely represents the information that organisations transmit intentionally about themselves, corporate and member organisational associations additionally reflect constituents’ understandings and responses to this transmitted information (Dacin and Brown, 2002). This perspective becomes increasingly important when considering the effects, desired or otherwise, of the information that organisations transmit about their corporate identity.

Organisations use a range of visual (Melewar, Karaosmanoglu and Paterson, 2005) physical (Abratt 1989) and other packets of information (Melewar, 2003; Melewar and Karaosmanoglu, 2006), or cues (Marwick and Fill, 1997; Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000), to transmit the corporate identity. Manifested in the firm’s communications, behaviours and symbols (Marwick and Fill, 1997; Birkigt, Stadler and Funck, 2002; Fill, 2005) and reflected in models of corporate identity such as those from Melewar and Jenkins (2002) and Melewar (2003), these corporate identity cues permeate all areas of the organisation. This has led some researchers to view corporate identity as a collection of all such cues (Abratt, 1989) which in parallel act as points of reference to the corporate identity (Stuart, 2002) for organisational members (Rhee, Dutton and Bagozzi, 2006; Whetten, 2006). It is partly as a result of these corporate identity cues that both the organisation and its corporate identity become salient to organisational members (Scott and Lane, 2000); that audiences are able to discern one organisation from another (Fill, 2005); and individuals are triggered to process information to help make sense of and respond in their operating environments (Weick, 1995; Weber and Glynn, 2006). Here, the saliency of the organisation and its corporate identity are acutely important since both are crucial to building the psychological bond of identification that members have with their organisation (Pratt, 1998).

Organisational identification has been conceptualised as ‘the perception of oneness with or belonging to’ the organisation (Ashforth and Mael, 1989, p.34) and is characterised by the
psychological bond that results from organisational members taking on the specific attributes of their organisation as their own (Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail, 1994). Research has long since established a strong relationship between corporate identity and organisational identification (Dutton et al., 1994; Balmer and Stotvig, 1997; Bartel, 2001; Dukerich, Golden, Shortell, 2002; Cole and Bruch, 2006) and by extension, communications and organisational identification (Smidts, Pruyn and Van Riel, 2001). Indeed, it has been argued that the ‘maturity’ of the corporate identity domain requires that its potential effects on, or relationships with organisational identification and behaviour now be explored (Elstak, 2008, p.278). These relationships are significant not least of all because establishing and encouraging members’ sense of belonging and psychological bond with their organisation (i.e., their organisational identification) is known to promote organisation-supporting actions (Mael and Ashforth, 1992; Riketta, 2005; Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006). These actions often take the form of voluntary efforts towards colleagues and within the organisation in general that extend beyond the standard expectations of the job-role and that are known as extra-role behaviours (Van Knippenberg, 2000; Riketta, 2005; Kane, Magnusen and Perreuwé, 2012; Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016); behaviours which can influence the overall success of the firm (Pratt, 1998; Carmeli, Gilat, Waldman, 2007). Within the services context for example, it is understood that front-line or client-facing employees who identify with the goals of their organisations and have psychological attachments to them, are inclined to perform extra-role behaviours in supporting customers and colleagues alike (Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016). The service-profit chain literature (Heskett et al., 2008) similarly contends that the manner in which employees interact with and support each other in organisations (back-office, or non client-facing actions) influences indirectly employee productivity through employee satisfaction. This, according to Heskett et al (2008), can translate into external service results, satisfaction and loyalty for customers all of which subsequently contribute to firm performance.

The multi-departmental, group and heterogeneous nature of organisations (Balmer, 2001) alluded to in the previous paragraph suggests that those corporate identity cues that reflect the corporate identity together with their subsequent effects, are unlikely to be homogenous. The corporate identity cues that trigger employee sensemaking around strategy (i.e., mission, vision and values) are clearly different from those that signal behaviours (i.e., reciprocity and team member exchange) for example. Thus, depending on the organisational group, it is plausible that the degree of organisational identification experienced may stem from markedly different cues (Wiesenfeld, Raghuram and Garud, 1999). Accordingly, it has been argued that organisational subgroups must necessarily be provided with domain-relevant, yet seamless representations of the corporate identity (Gioia, 1998). This is supported by research that has demonstrated how corporate identity
cues such as subgroup-specific uniforms, can influence perceptions of corporate identity (Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997). Brown et al., (2006) assert that it is precisely examinations such as these conducted at the aggregate and subgroup levels of the firm that underpin studies of corporate image, reputation, and more pertinently to this study, corporate identity.

Although corporate identity is able to influence organisational identification and, indirectly, the organisationally pre-defined and expected job-specific actions known as in-role behaviours (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997) along with extra-role behaviours, it is nevertheless susceptible to the influences of external change (Gioia, Schultz and Corley, 2000a; Bartel, 2001). Research indicates for example that it is often during periods of substantive change or crisis that beliefs about the corporate identity strengthen (Hogg and Terry, 2000) and grow in salience for organisational members (Albert and Whetten, 1985), and that the corporate identity cues become a crucial point of reference for them (Dutton and Dukerich, 1991; Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail, 1994; Rughase, 2006; Whetten, 2006) as they attempt to make sense of organisational shifts. While these outcomes may be considered beneficial, at the same time a strong and established corporate identity may also curtail employee actions during such periods (Dutton and Dukerich, 1991; Pratt and Foreman, 2000; Fiol, 2001) to the extent that only the expected requirements of the job (i.e., the in-role or role-prescribed behaviours) are carried out (McNeely and Meglino, 1994). Thus, the effects of corporate identity cues may vary considerably.

**Summary of observations**

From the observations made so far, it is evident that it is not just the corporate identity, but its cues, including those drawn from member organisational associations, that are of strategic relevance to organisations and their members (Van Riel and Balmer 1997; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002). Despite acknowledgement of the importance of these associations, particularly in reflecting employee-level interpretations of and reactions to the corporate identity (Dacin and Brown, 2002), the literature has given considerably less attention to the use and role of member organisational associations in this context. It seems plausible however that member organisational associations that are CED could potentially act as corporate identity cues, thereby contributing to the saliency of the organisation, its corporate identity and ultimately the encouragement of identification with the firm. This suggests that corporate identity cues derived from member organisational associations could be vitally important strategic components in their own right.

Although research has demonstrated a link between corporate identity and organisational identification and, separately, between organisational identification and extra-role behaviour, its focus on the cues that reflect the corporate identity and the nature of their relationship with
organisational identification has been less pronounced. This is particularly the case in quantitative studies. Given the proven relationship between organisational identification and the ‘helpful behaviors of employees directed towards the organization or other individuals’ (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997, p.41), i.e., the employee in-role and extra-role behaviours for example, it is possible that a significant and important relationship might exist between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and role behaviours. Of the limited studies conducted on corporate identity cues, only one to the best of the researcher’s knowledge has examined the nature of this relationship, albeit with a focus on extra-role behaviour and the effects of one corporate identity cue.

This observation points to a shortcoming in some extant studies that have examined the effects of corporate identity cues. For despite the range of corporate identity cue manifestations discussed in the literature, most studies have tended to focus on the effects of a single corporate identity cue as transmitted by the organisation. Dimopoulou and Fill’s (2000) study of the sales force as a corporate identity cue and Lam, Liu and Loi’s (2016) examination of the effects of perceived organisational support on the organisational identification of nurses are good examples of this. The result of this single corporate identity cue focus is that at the psychological bond level, there is little clarity on how or which corporate identity cues affect organisational identification, or whether cues other than those transmitted purposely by the organisation may be active. Indeed, it is equally unclear whether the possible effects of these corporate identity cues remain constant amongst the subgroups comprising the organisation or the conditions under which they operate.

It may also be inferred from these observations that in discerning the corporate identity cues most and least conducive to supporting (or even increasing) organisational identification for instance, valuable and more precise insights may be revealed with regard to their effects on the member-level psychological and behavioural outcomes that ultimately contribute to the organisation’s performance. This is especially important in the services context where organisational identification provides a crucial psychological resource and source of support for those charged with promoting and selling the intangible ( Alvesson and Empson, 2008). In the organisation-internal context, examining these effects could also provide new understandings around the marketing initiatives (Leeflang, 2011) and capabilities (Verhoef and Leeflang, 2009) that contribute to what Leeflang terms “distinguished marketing”; i.e., the marketing direction, coordination and decision-making quality (Leeflang, 2011, p. 76). Examination of this relationship is thus worthwhile from an academic and practitioner perspective.
While this introduction so far has broadly outlined some of the limitations in the corporate identity literature as it relates to corporate identity cues, these limitations in turn present a considerable opportunity to contribute new knowledge to the domain.

1.3 Research aim and contribution

The underlying premise of this thesis is that in order to evaluate sufficiently the effects of corporate identity cues, these cues must also be considered from the perspective of employees’ member organisational associations. This is because member organisational associations represent a range of experiences and perceptions that employees hold in memory about their organisations, and furthermore encompass these employees’ understandings of and reactions to the corporate identity (Brown et al., 2006).

The main aim of and indeed the theoretical contribution made by this thesis is to build understanding around the range of corporate identity cues discerned from such member organisational associations, and the effects that these cues have on employees’ organisational identification and its subsequent influence on role behaviours:

- at the aggregate level of the organisation
- at the subgroup level of the organisation amongst client-facing and non-client facing employees and
- pre and post exposure to announcements of strategic change (i.e., the communications distributed throughout an organisation to transmit details of impending changes to its strategic direction).

The central aim and objectives of the present study mean that it must necessarily take into account the strategic, marketing, visual and external expressions of the organisation as well as organisational members’ perceptions and interpretations of and feelings towards these organisations. It is for this reason that the present study embraces the interdisciplinary perspective of corporate identity outlined by Melewar and Jenkins (2002) and others but within this, focuses specifically on the attributes of the organisation considered to be central, enduring and distinctive (CED) in the minds of its employees (Albert and Whetten, 1985). The study additionally draws on the conceptualisation of corporate identity cues put forward by Marwick and Fill (1997), Birkigt, Stadler and Funck (2002) and Fill (2005) that addresses them in terms of their communications, behavioural and symbolic manifestations, and which furthermore are reflected in the multi-dimensional models of corporate identity put forward by Birkigt and Stadler (1986, cited in Van Riel, 1995), Melewar and Jenkins (2002) and Melewar (2003).


1.4 Research objectives and approach

In order to achieve the aim of the research and address the research shortfalls identified in section 1.2, the research aim is further supported by six objectives focused on:

1. eliciting member organisational associations from a cross-section of company employees
2. identifying the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (i.e., CED member organisational associations) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity
3. establishing whether additional patterns beyond those that are CED are present in the elicited member organisational associations that reflect how they may be perceived in the working environment context
4. determining the CED member organisational associations, along with their corresponding patterns, that are linked to the present environment; trigger sensemaking; and influence future action and attention. In short, the identification of those associations that also act as cues to understand the corporate identity
5. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the aggregate level of the firm and,
6. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the subgroup level of the firm across:
   a. Client-facing (Front-Office) and non client-facing (Back-Office) employees
   b. Employees prior to and post exposure to strategic change announcements.

Given the aim and multiple objectives of the research, a two-phased exploratory sequential mixed methods study was deemed to be most appropriate. Data was gathered from selected Divisions of ConSeng Corporation (CSC), an established, internationally operating engineering consultancy headquartered in Europe with several thousand employees located around the world. During the data gathering phase, ConSeng Corporation announced major changes to both its strategy and organisational structure. The effects of the corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent effects on the two role behaviours both prior to and following the strategic change announcement are captured in the subgroup level analysis (objective 6b) carried out during the second phase of the study. A summary of each phase of the study as it relates to the aim and objectives is outlined in the following sections.
1.4.1 Phase I – Objectives 1-4: eliciting member organisational associations, corporate identity, corporate identity cues and underlying patterns

To address the first four objectives of this research, a qualitative research methodology was undertaken and semi-structured interviews conducted with 30 employees from the case organisation to elicit examples of member organisational associations. The interviews were transcribed and analysed. A priori theory in the form of Albert and Whetten’s (1985) conceptualisation of corporate identity was then introduced to derive the member organisational associations comprising the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of the corporate identity. A total of 32 CED member organisational associations comprising the case organisation’s corporate identity were identified. These CED member organisational associations were subsequently analysed for evidenced of additional patterns outside of these CED attributes. Three patterns were detected and used to categorise 25 of the elicited CED member organisational associations. Using the conceptualisations of sensemaking cues advanced by Weick (1995) and Weber and Glynn (2006), these 25 CED member organisational associations were further examined for evidence of their link to the present day environment and their effects on employees’ sense making, future actions and attention; that is to say, their use as cues to understanding the corporate identity.

The CED member organisational associations found to exhibit two or more sensemaking cue characteristics (in this case, 24 of the original 25 member organisational associations) were subsequently validated against the derived corporate identity and assessed against established models of corporate identity and conceptualisations of corporate identity cues to anchor them in the corporate identity domain.

It is on the basis of the outcomes from this phase of the study that three hypotheses were identified and six constructs selected from extant studies to represent the emergent CSC corporate identity cues in the theoretical model.

1.4.2 Phase II – Objective 5: the aggregate level effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours

In order to test empirically the effects of the six representative corporate identity cue constructs on organisational identification, in-role behaviour and extra-role behaviour, scales from extant studies were used to represent the latter three constructs and survey data gathered from 536 employees of the case organisation. The data was examined using partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM). The theoretical model was additionally examined for unobserved
heterogeneity, mediation and used to assess the hypotheses put forward in the research. Of the six corporate identity cue constructs examined, those related to the case organisation’s vision and the extent to which it was shared; the consistency with which the organisational implemented its image; and the degree of reciprocity were found to have a positive and significant influence on organisational identification. Organisational identification in turn was found to have a significant influence on extra-role behaviour. The quality of information exchange within teams was found to have no effect on organisational identification but a direct and significant effect on both in-role and extra-role behaviour. The case organisation’s corporate communications and dissemination of its mission and values had no significant effect on organisational identification or in-role and extra-role behaviours.

1.4.3 Phase II – Objective 6: the subgroup level effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours

To understand better how and which corporate identity cues affect organisational identification and role behaviour across the firm and under conditions of organisational change, two subgroups were defined. The first subgroup, FOBO, comprised client facing (Front-Office) and non client-facing (Back-Office) employees. The second subgroup, EXPOSURE, comprised employees not exposed (Pre-Exposure) to the organisations strategic change announcement, and those fully exposed (Post-Exposure) to the announcement. The data was subsequently examined using partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) and the attendant hypotheses tested. For client-facing (Front-Office) employees and those not exposed to the strategic announcement (Pre-Exposure), organisational identification was influenced by the same combination of corporate identity cues, albeit to differing degrees, as those identified at the aggregate level. In both cases, organisational identification only exhibited a positive and significant effect on extra-role behaviour. While organisational identification, driven by two corporate identity cues, was found to have no direct, significant effect on the in-role and extra-role behaviours of non client-facing (i.e., Back-Office) employees, it was found to affect positively and directly both of these role behaviours once strategic change had been announced (i.e., Post-Exposure). Indeed levels of in-role behaviour were found to exceed those of extra-role behaviour post announcement.
1.5 Overview of the thesis

The thesis comprises seven chapters. Each chapter is outlined in the following paragraphs.

In Chapter 2, the Literature Review, the theoretical foundations of the study are laid out. The chapter then goes on to examine key works and developments in the field of corporate identity.

Here, in addition to addressing the theoretical underpinnings of the study, attention is given to the delineation of: corporate identity cues, corporate associations and its relationship to member organisational associations, and the manner in which both are linked to the psychological bond of organisational identification. The antecedents, determinants and effects of organisational identification are subsequently discussed. The chapter then focuses on in-role and extra-role behaviours from three different perspectives. Hypotheses related to the empirical studies are introduced throughout the chapter which concludes with a presentation of the emergent conceptual model.

The Methodology supporting the research is then presented in Chapter 3 and the philosophical underpinnings, research paradigm and research context discussed. These discussions subsequently provide an introduction to the approach, methodology and design selected for the study. The methodological considerations, applications and measures for the qualitative (Phase I) and quantitative (Phase II) stages of the research are also outlined. The chapter closes with an ethical statement on the study and summary of the chapter itself.

Chapter 4 deals exclusively with the outcomes from Phase I of research by presenting the analytical process and results of the qualitative study. Specific attention is given to the process of eliciting the member organisational associations, deriving the corporate identity and identifying the corporate identity cues and cue types. The generic analysis approach applied in arriving at these outcomes is discussed in detail along with the process of verifying the outcomes of the analysis, and fitting of the emergent corporate identity cues and cue types against the derived corporate identity as well as established frameworks of corporate identity and corporate identity cues. The measures (constructs) selected to represent the emergent CSC corporate identity cues are introduced together with the revised conceptual model and additional hypotheses.

Phase II of the study is addressed in Chapters 5 and 6. Here, the results of testing empirically the conceptual model at the aggregate and subgroup levels of the firm respectively are presented. Chapter 5 opens with the results of reliability and validity testing of the conceptual model (Model 1) using PLS-SEM. The outcomes from mediation testing of the model are also presented with the
subsequently adjusted model. The results of the robustness and unobserved heterogeneity checks are presented in turn, along with those from the hypotheses.

In Chapter 6, the two subgroups selected for multigroup analysis, Front-Office/Back-Office (FOBO) and Pre-Exposure/Post-Exposure (EXPOSURE), are introduced. Front-Office in the context of this study refers to all employees who hold roles which bring them into regular contact with the case organisation’s external customers. Back-Office employees by contrast have no direct contact with customers. The results of invariance testing and partial least squares multigroup analysis (PLS-MGA) conducted on both subgroups are presented and then followed by the results of the hypotheses tested at this level. Both chapters close with a summary of their respective outcomes.

In Chapter 7, the final chapter of the thesis, a General Discussion on the thesis is put forward in which the key findings are presented for each of the three studies conducted as part of the overall research. The chapter commences with a brief review of the aim and objectives of the study as well as the approach taken in achieving both. This is followed by a discussion on the theoretical contributions and managerial implications of the study. The limitations of the study and potential directions for future research are then presented. The thesis closes with concluding remarks on the overall study.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

2.1  Introduction

In this chapter, the theoretical foundations of the research are first presented as a context for understanding the overall study, the constructs under examination (i.e., the corporate identity cues, organisational identification, and in-role and extra-role behaviour) and their interrelation. Section 2.2 therefore opens with a presentation of the main theory upon which the thesis is based. Here, the focus is on delineating the substance of the psychological bond between employee and organisation and the subsequent effects this has on employees as organisational (or group) members and their behaviours. Since the influence of corporate identity cues on employee actions forms the core area of investigation in this study, section 2.2.3 introduces Weick’s (1979, 1995) Sensemaking Theory as a background to understanding how organisational members respond to cues that aid sensemaking in the work environment and particularly with regard to the corporate identity. To this end, the role of corporate identity cues in making salient the organisation and ultimately in aiding identification and action is also briefly presented.

In section 2.3 of this chapter, a review of the literature specific to the constructs under examination in the present study, i.e., corporate identity, corporate identity cues, organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours, is presented. Following an introduction to corporate identity outlining the interdisciplinary perspective to which this study subscribes, the treatment and influence of corporate identity cues in the literature is then discussed in two distinct ways in section 2.4; firstly by introducing the broader corporate and member organisational associations within which corporate identity cues are often set, and secondly by exploring the effects of these cues as reflected in extant research. The chapter then turns to an examination of the literature on organisational identification (section 2.5), its effects and its subsequent influence on role behaviour. This leads to a brief review of the body of works addressing in-role and extra-role behaviours in section 2.6.

The chapter closes with a summary of key findings in the literature review, outlining of the research gap and presentation of the conceptual model and attendant hypotheses in section 2.7. Concluding comments on the chapter are then presented in section 2.8.
2.2 Theoretical foundations

2.2.1 Social identity theory (SIT)

In order to understand the contexts within which corporate identity cues might interrelate with the organisational identification and role behaviours of organisational members, it is useful to draw from theory that considers first how individuals view and construct themselves within wider contexts such as groups and organisations, and the psychological meaning that such groups and organisations in turn deliver. Social identity theory (SIT) addresses these points by viewing the characteristics of the groups to which individuals belong as necessary components of these individuals’ self-definitions, or self-concepts (Hogg and Terry, 2001). Moreover, as the following paragraphs illustrate, SIT also addresses the saliency of the group and the sources of this saliency.

Because the myriad groups to which one may be affiliated help define the individual and their self-concept (Hogg and Abrams, 1988), social identity has been conceptualised as ‘the individual’s knowledge that he belongs to certain social groups with some emotional and value significance to him of this group membership.’ (Tajfel, 1972 p.292). These memberships are stored in memory as social identities, the characteristics of which serve as a description and prescription of members’ behaviours, beliefs and ethos (Hogg and Terry, 2001). Accordingly, it is not just organisations that may be viewed as social identities, but also their departments and, as Adams et al. (2006) note, even professions.

According to SIT, each individual has an innate need to categorise him or herself and others into groups (Tajfel and Turner, 2004; Edwards, 2005). Groups in this context are typified by the sense of belonging to an identical social category that is jointly felt by multiple parties, and within which emotional and definitional values are consensually shared (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Such categorisations not only serve as a framework for the environments in which individuals are situated (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) but more importantly, describe and prescribe the features that these individuals, as members of their corresponding group(s), should hold (Hogg and Terry, 2001). As a result, individuals are also likely to source value or meaning from the memberships they hold (Jost and Elsbach, 2001). Here, meaning is derived primarily from developing an understanding of the self and the other in comparable relative terms (Ashforth and Mael, 1989) in much the same way that the concept of wealth carries distinct meaning when contrasted with poverty. Comparison is thus a pivotal element of social identity.

These comparisons are also contingent upon individuals’ personal and indeed favourable evaluations of themselves and, by extension, the group(s) with which they are affiliated and that align with their self-concepts (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Through these comparative efforts,
attempts are further made by groups to validate their unique qualities and stature (Turner and Haslam, 2001) such that evaluation of in-group (i.e., the group with which the individual holds membership) and out-group (i.e., the groups with which no membership is held) attributes leads to either ‘positively discrepant comparisons’ in which prestige is heightened; or ‘negatively discrepant comparisons’ resulting in low prestige (Tajfel and Turner, 1979, p.40; Trepte, 2006). The self-enhancement that subsequently arises from these comparisons (Hogg and Terry, 2001) ultimately leads to a bias or favouritism towards the in-group (Brewer, 1979; Hogg and Abrams, 1988). This bias is broadly considered to be of some merit since it encourages members to view their groups in complimentary terms, work towards a positive social identity (Turner and Haslam, 2001) and, enhance both personal and group self-esteem (Oakes and Turner, 1980).

It is these favourably evaluated and jointly held attributes of in-group members (Ashforth and Mael, 1989) alongside the descriptions and prescriptions of the group that activate individuals’ sense of oneness or belonging (i.e., the social identification) with the wider group, and ultimately contributes to making salient the group in the minds and through the self-regulatory actions of its members (Hogg and Terry, 2001). In this sense, the organisation as an example of a group, may be considered a social identity thus making organisational identification a very specific form of social identification (Ashforth and Mael, 1989).

It is worth noting that in contrast to individual-level identification which is generally manifested in the psychological bond with group outcomes (Ashforth and Mael, 1989), identification at the social level is further predicated on feeling the group’s fluctuations first hand (Foote, 1951). These feelings, once evaluated, then become part of the multiple sources of information, or corporate associations (Brown and Dacin, 1997) that individuals hold in memory about the organisation, some of which in turn may act as cues to the nature of the group or organisation.

2.2.2 Self-categorisation theory (SCT)

The way in which an individual’s interpersonal actions are transformed into group-defined behaviour is addressed through the cognitive process defined as self-categorisation theory (SCT) (Turner, 1985; Turner et al., 1987; Trepte, 2006). SCT refers to the drivers that encourage identification with groups, the discernment of the self and others in categories, and the corresponding group-level behaviours (Hogg and Reid, 2006). For these and other reasons which will be presented in the subsequent paragraph, SCT is viewed as an important subset of social identity theory (Trepte, 2006) and, perhaps more aptly, is also referred to as a ‘theory of intergroup behaviour’ (Turner et al., 1987, p.42) or relations (Tajfel and Turner, 1986).
By categorising the self and others into groups as outlined previously, the focus of attention is shifted from the individuals comprising the group, to the individuals as ‘embodiments’ of the group on the one hand, and the absorption of the self-concept into the characteristics of the group on the other (Hogg and Terry, 2000, p.123). Those attributes commonly held with other in-group members thus become the framework within which the individual group member will view him or herself (Knippenberg and Leeuwen, 2001). In fact, Knippenberg and Leeuwen posit that high levels of in-group identification result in group memberships subsequently regulating member views and actions; that is to say, membership drives the prescriptive and descriptive characteristics outlined by Hogg and Terry (2001). As a result, the behaviours and actions exercised at individual level differ fundamentally from those that are moulded by, practiced within and directed towards the group (Haslam et al., 2001). Trepte (2006) conceptualises these individual and social identities as reflecting two planes of self-categorisation whereby the salience of an identity influences the extent to which individual-level variance or group likeness is triggered.

In addition to its influence on behaviour, Haslam and Platow (2001) contend that SCT is further able to forecast organisational identification and other behavioural outcomes of a salient social identity. In support of their contention, these authors offer up the: shared and transposable standards, beliefs and objectives held with group members; commonly held views that drive agreement on group-specific concerns through joint influence; drive to align behaviours around the interests of the in-group; and, cooperative behaviours that benefit the welfare of the group above, if necessary, that of the individual, as examples of the theory’s predictive range. Indeed, the third point, behavioural alignment, is an often reported phenomenon in studies of corporate identity and organisational identification (see section 2.5).

Despite its eminent effects, social identity theory, together with SCT which it encompasses, is however not without criticism. In addition to its tendency to conflate the distinctly different notions of groups and categories for example, Rabbie and Horwitz (1988), argue that the theory does not adequately account for the fact that non-members may also hold viewpoints that are pro or contra to a range of groups with which they are not affiliated. Later studies have also called into question the improbable contexts (laboratories) within which the initial investigations were conducted and upon which the theory stands (Schiffmann and Wicklund, 1992).

### 2.2.3 Sensemaking theory

The role of sensemaking in organisations has been discussed extensively in the literature from both the strategic (Weick, 1988; Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2009) and corporate identity perspective (see for example: Thomas, Clark, and Gioia, 1993; Ravasi and Schultz, 2003, 2006).
Sensemaking theory is generally recognised as reflecting the continuous process of registering, comprehending and, together with others, collectively bringing meaning to various occurrences (Weick, 1979; Miles, 2012). In the context of the firm, it is in short the connection between the cognitive and active aspects within organisations and it is often related to the processes for responding to change within the operating environment (Jensen, Kjærgaard and Svejvig, 2009). For this reason, sensemaking is also considered retrospective in nature (Weick, 1995). That is to say, it is an activity that typically drives constituents involved with the identity of the organisation to draw on various cues in an effort to understand and bring understanding to their surroundings (Weick et al., 2009). These efforts frequently accompany and are often heightened during situations of change particularly where the modus operandi or the situation itself are unclear (Weick, Sutcliffe, and Obstfeld, 2005). By giving definition to what is often indiscernible (Waterman, 1993) and creating understanding for constituents (Starbuck and Milliken, 1988) sensemaking can paradoxically be a constraint in crisis situations (Weick, 1988), as well as a driver of performance (Thomas et al., 1993). For these reasons sensemaking is also viewed as the central point at which understanding itself is used either to prop up or to limit aspects of identity and the subsequent actions of employees for example (Weick et al., 2009).

According to Weick (1995) sensemaking comprises seven properties: [social] identity construction, retrospection, enactment, social action, continuity, cue extraction (or bracketing), and plausibility. Of these properties, two – cue extraction and enactment – are of specific relevance to the present study. Thus, in adopting the precedent set by Jensen et al. (2009) for extrapolating the ‘micro-level mechanisms at play’ (p.345), the following paragraphs focus exclusively on these two properties.

**Cue extraction**

Corporate identity, as section 2.3 will show, may be reflected in a number of ways throughout organisations. It is made real through the various stimuli – i.e., the beliefs, claims and triggers, or cues – that act as points of reference for constituents (Whetten, 2006). While some of these cues such as the organisation’s mission, vision and value statements aid moulding and validation of shared interpretations of the organisation (Harquail, 2006; Ran and Duimering, 2007), others such as rituals and practices that are organisation action based (Rhee, Dutton and Bagozzi, 2006), or symbolic as in the case of uniforms, help anchor interpretations and expressions of the organisation’s identity (Elsbach, 2004; Kenny et al., 2011; Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000). Cue extraction occurs when organisational members select a range of these cues to connect with, make sense of and ultimately, to construe a reality (Weick and Kiesler, 1979). Filtered through the perceptions that individuals hold of their organisations, these cues trigger the identities and expected roles that may be required under certain circumstances (Weick, 1995). They further
determine the actions and attention that are directed towards the situation (Weber and Glynn, 2006).

In this manner, employees are provided with a means of interpreting any environmental shifts experienced within the context of what they understand to be the corporate identity (Tripsas, 2008).

Jensen et al. (2009) have argued that extracted cues must necessarily differ from one individual to another. While no explanation is offered for this supposed variance, in the wider sensemaking and corporate associations context, it is understood that demographic (Jackson, 1992), experiential (Thomas et al., 1994) and member organisational associations (Brown et al., 2006) may play a role. This observation finds some support in studies of corporate identity disagreement and variation. In Glynn’s (2000) study of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra dispute for example, differences in professional position (management or artist) were seen to colour perceptions of the orchestra’s identity via the cues transmitted. Brown and Humphreys’ (2006) study of organisational identity similarly illustrated the role of place as a cue and the divergent views held by management and non-managerial staff on the conceptualisation of their educational establishment’s identity.

**Enactment**

In attaching cues to currently held frames of reference such as the corporate identity, understanding is not only generated, but used to help direct the actions and focus of the individual (Jensen et al., 2009); that is to say, their enactment. It has been posited that enactment becomes particularly important during times of flux where a salient corporate identity is essential for aligning constituent and organisational beliefs about the firm as it responds to environmental change (Gioia et al., 1994; Ravasi and Phillips, 2011). In fact, Rughase suggests that sensemaking (and indeed sensegiving) further ‘shapes intended action and interactions.’ (2006, p.32). While action is framed at the individual level in the context of issue interpretation, Rughase further makes clear that it is at organisational level that sensemaking is fully transformed into practice.

### 2.3 Corporate identity

The concept and construct of corporate identity is rooted in several disciplines spanning the organisational behaviour, visual and graphic identity, and marketing schools. While this has left the field devoid of an agreeable definition (Melewar and Harrold, 2000), it has brought in a more integrated view on research in the field which has been termed the interdisciplinary perspective (Hatch and Schultz, 1997; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997; Balmer and Wilson, 1998; Balmer, 2001; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002; Balmer and Greyser, 2003; Dowling and Otubanjo, 2011). As this study
subscribes to the interdisciplinary perspective that provides a context for understanding the corporate identity cues, the various disciplinary areas in which it is anchored are discussed briefly in the following sections.

2.3.1 The organisational behaviour perspective

In the context of organisational behaviour, corporate identity is commonly defined as beliefs about the organisation’s central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes (Albert and Whetten, 1985) that are collectively shared by top managers and stakeholders in an organisation (Scott and Lane, 2000). As such, the attendant literatures are concerned as much about the relationships amongst organisational employees as they are the bond that these employees have with their organisation (Hatch and Schultz, 1997) given top management’s role in transmitting the corporate identity in a way that may be understood and actioned by organisational members in the context of the organisation’s culture (Hatch and Schultz 2002). Rooted in social identity theory, this perspective is characterised by an interest in and much debate around what constitutes the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of a firm.

Centrality for instance is considered a pre-requisite for igniting organisations’ distinctive features (Whetten, 2006) that make it identifiable to those with an interest in the firm (Ashforth and Mael, 1996). Although initially conceived as the deep-seated ‘system of beliefs, values and norms...anchored in the organizational mission that informs sense-making and action.’ (Ashforth and Mael, 1996, p.24), the concept of centrality has been challenged due to the lack of consensus on what constitutes a central characteristic. This has lead researchers such as Corley et al., (2006) to examine centrality from the perspective of depth, degree of sharedness and structure, and to summise that it is shaped by a combination of deeply emotive factors that magnetise it’s supporting attributes. While Gioia, Patvardhan, Hamilton and Corley (2013) have focused on the ‘features of the organisation that are deemed to be so core to the organization’s sense of “who we are in social space” that they are deliberately preserved and almost never questioned’ (p.167), these authors simultaneously support Ashforth and Mael’s (1989) conceptualisation that equates centrality with the spirit of the organisation. At the same time, there has been sufficient discussion to suggest that over time, what is viewed currently as central, ultimately becomes enduring (Van Rekom and Whetten, 2007).

The notion of identity endurance was ostensibly taken to mean the constant, steady nature of organisations’ identities (Ashforth and Mael, 1996) in which engagement, reliance (Ashforth and Mael, 1996), permanence (Whetten and Mackey, 2002) and survival over time (Whetten, 2006) could be demonstrated. Endurance through this lens, is viewed as an outcome of the intensity and
extent of the experiences, processes and praxis that enhance the firm’s identity (Ashforth and Mael, 1996; Kimberly, 1987). Proponents of the social actor perspectives on corporate identity such as Whetten and Mackey (2002) however delineated endurance in terms of placating the need ‘to be the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow’ (p.396). Yet as extant works particularly by Gioia, Schultz and Corley (2000a), Corley et al., (2006) and Gioia et al., (2013) assert, this idea of permanency in the identity of an organisation is fraught with contradiction given that organisations operate within contexts of ongoing change. Although the more dynamic viewpoints adopted by these and other researchers such as Dutton and Dukerich (1991) and Gioia and Chittipeddi (1991) have come to represent the more accepted view of continuity in, as opposed to endurance of the firm’s identity, subsequent developments have led early advocates of identity endurance to revise its initial definition to now reflect the ‘legitimate identity claims [and]…organizational elements that have withstood the test of time.’(Whetten, 2006, p.224).

As noted previously, in social identity theory, comparison forms the basis for determining the elements considered distinctive about the organisation and its identity (Puusa, 2006). Constituent-level beliefs about the firm’s identity projected at the firm level trigger evaluations with peer organisations (Glynn and Abzug, 2002; Glynn and Marquis, 2005) and subsequently help delineate what truly stands out about the firm (Ashforth and Mael, 1996). Distinctiveness thus demarcates identity on the basis of similarities with and differences to others (Whetten and Mackey, 2002). Gioia et al., (2013) suggest that this facet of corporate identity is best illustrated via Brewer’s (1991) theory of optimal distinctiveness in which individuals or organisations strive to find equilibrium by acknowledging their distinctiveness while in parallel being recognised as part of a greater cohort such as a department, organisation or sector.

Although Van Rekom (1997) has latterly argued that distillation of the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of corporate identity into the singular facet of centrality might lead to more practicable applications of the construct, Albert and Whetten’s seminal definition remains the fundamental pillar upon which many studies of corporate identity have been anchored. Indeed, it is against this backdrop that the cognitive import of CED perceptions has been examined in relation to sensemaking and sensegiving (Gioia and Thomas, 1996; Ravasi and Schultz, 2006; Weick, Sutcliffe, and Obstfeld, 2009), and the levels at which identity beliefs may be considered collectively held (Scott and Lane, 2000; Whetten and Mackey, 2002; Corley et al., 2006). The construction of corporate identity nevertheless remains a joint enterprise between employees, managers and other stakeholders whereby senior or top management in particular is charged with transmitting the ethos of the firm to its members (Hatch and Schultz, 1997; Scott and Lane, 2000). This in turn has generated varied academic and practitioner approaches to explaining the development (Clark,

2.3.2 The visual and graphic design perspective

The visual and/or graphic design perspective on corporate identity has enjoyed significant attention in the literature fuelled in part by the basic need for organisations’ to have a distinct corporate identity, and the subsequent power this conveys on management to introduce swiftly uniformity and change (Balmer and Wilson, 1998). Indeed, it has been suggested that corporate identity emerged as a result of a fixation particularly with the visual elements of organisations’ external representation of themselves (Cornelissen, Haslam and Balmer, 2007).

This interest in the visual perspective can be traced back to the 1960s and the seminal work of Henrion and Parkin (1967) which emphasised the corporate associations that audiences could potentially establish with the firm through the appearance of its assets. Olins (1978) later provided a more explicit description that moved beyond the symbolic and towards ‘a visual system that allows the organisation to express moods and make a series of interrelated statements.’ (p.192).

Later conceptualisation of the visual/graphic perspective led Abratt (1989, p.68) to describe corporate identity as a ‘an assembly of visual cues’ that are physically and behaviourally manifested and which differentiate, reflect or embody the company to aid its recognition. From this point, the nature of the component parts that signal what the company represents to its audiences (Dowling, 1994) together with the management (Simões, Dibb and Fisk, 2005) and specific uses thereof (Balmer 1995) have become essential to corporate identity. Comprising the organisation name, logo, symbol(s) typography and colour (Melewar and Saunders, 1998; Dowling 2001), these components become especially significant at the client/customer interface where they are not only able to influence purchase decisions for example (Melewar, Basset and Simões, 2006), but also to attract the attention of service clients for whom the symbolic connotations of the organisation take on greater import (Stern, Zinkhan and Jaju, 2001). Inevitably, recognition and attraction are central in this perspective of corporate identity, where the alignment and consistency of visual cues must necessarily play a key role in communicating organisational strategy (Van Riel and Balmer, 1997; Abratt, 1989).

Despite the strategic significance of this perspective, the overwhelming focus on the visual and graphic design aspects has also been criticised for the retrospectively ‘deleterious influence’ it has exacted on the corporate identity domain as a result (Balmer, 2001). Where earlier conceptions of the field positioned: graphic design as the visual outcome of strategy change, symbols as points of
alignment, and duly encompassed the culture and communications of the firm (Balmer, 1995), the resultant restriction in the identity domain Balmer (2001) contends, has placed it on an equal footing with the behavioural and communicative facets of corporate identity. Through the continued development of the corporate identity field, recent years have however witnessed a shift in focus towards the more substantive properties and away from the visual and symbolic (Balmer, 2008).

2.3.3 The marketing perspective

The marketing perspective on corporate identity is somewhat complex compared to those outlined earlier, with definitions having variously argued its derivation from a branding and image perspective, as well as from within the construct itself.

According to Simões, et al., (2005), it is the combination of the branding and integrated communications domains that has informed the external projections of the corporate identity. Since branding as an integrated business process has ascended to an organisation-wide concern, these authors argue that the brand identity as defined by Aaker (2012) and Upshaw (1995), much like the corporation, has at its epicentre, a set of values, beliefs and a sense of spirit. Here, the identity signalled by the firm contributes to shaping the image that those external to the company hold about the company (Aaker, 2012). When viewed from an internal standpoint, the marketing perspective further suggests that behavioural alignment with the brand identity – i.e., the collection of terms, visuals, concepts and connections that comprise consumers’ beliefs about the brand (Upshaw, 1995) – is an important component of the organisation’s success (Baumgarth and Schmidt, 2010). Here, it is the communicative steps taken in achieving brand acceptance within the company that become essential for the firm’s employees (Webster and Keller, 2004); their brand-supporting actions (Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry 1985); and, as in the case of customer-facing staff, their in-role and extra-role brand-building behaviours (Morhart, Herzog and Tonczak, 2009).

One further distinguishing facet of the marketing perspective can paradoxically be drawn from the organisational behaviour school. Here, corporate identity and its body of works are considered to represent de facto the marketing perspective (Hatch and Schultz, 1997). For these authors, the specification of corporate identity as being explicitly marketing in its orientation rests on three decisive factors: the visual perspective outlined earlier, and its links with the strategic, long-term views of the organisation’s management; managerial involvement in transmitting the organisation’s identity beyond the organisation itself; and the inability to truly control the corporate identity on account of its cultural content. Cornelissen, Haslam and Balmer (2007) observed a similar divide which they categorised somewhat differently to that found in Hatch and Schultz’s.
(1997) work. Cornelissen et al., (2007) instead differentiated the internal, individual and cognitive concerns, from the marketing concerns which their observations suggested were focused more on symbolic and tangible attributes, a stance echoed in the definition of corporate identity offered by Brown et al., (2006).

This latter observations is also supported by a more recent study from Dowling and Otubanjo (2011, p.175) in which these marketing-perspective attributes are defined as the ‘organizational character’, or its corporate image. However, rather than holding apart the marketing and organisational behaviour perspectives, these authors demonstrate that organisational and corporate identity are not only related, but critical to determining the audience’s contact with an organisation. Indeed, they contend that the faithful reflection of the organisation’s character through its symbols, provides confirmation that the organisational identity supports effectively the corporate identity in providing ‘an honest signal of character.’(p.176).

Corporate image

The corporate image – also as signalled through the brand – is an additional key characteristic of the marketing perspective, and in fact is supported by Balmer’s (1998) treatment of the topic. Image in this sense is seen as a multifaceted concept, the interaction with which creates certain dispositions, feelings, opinions and behaviours amongst stakeholders (Bernstein, 1986). Of particular interest in this conceptualisation is the positioning of the receipt and interpretation of image-related signals relative to the image desired by management; a matter which Bernstein contends should be of concern to management and communications managers in particular as custodians of the company image.

The focus on corporate image and its net results, has also attracted interest from the field of corporate associations and organisational behaviour. The former for example considers the aggregation of all information that individuals hold in memory about an organisation to be of key relevance, since these associations by definition contain cues to the organisation’s image (Brown, 1997; Brown et al., 2006). In the case of the latter, the relationship between identity and image is viewed as interdependent (Hatch and Schultz, 1997) and reciprocal thereby framing the corporate identity as less enduring but more adaptive in effecting change according to Gioia, et al. (2000). This has led to the assertion that corporate identity is probably best understood as a link between the organisation’s internal and external contexts (Herrbach and Mignonac, 2004). That corporate identity has additionally been acknowledged as part of the image building process (Fill, 2005), further underpins the importance of image – irrespective of its rooting – in the marketing perspective.
2.3.4 The interdisciplinary perspective

In recognition of the multiple sources and disciplines that have contributed to shaping corporate identity, the past two decades have seen the emergence of what is termed the interdisciplinary perspective of corporate identity (Hatch and Schultz, 1997; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997; Balmer and Wilson, 1998; Balmer, 2001; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002; Balmer and Greyser, 2003; Dowling and Otubanjo, 2011). Seen through this lens, corporate identity has come to represent the manner in which a firm may reveal its identity to its audiences and stakeholders via a range of behaviours, communications and symbols (Birkigt and Stadler, 1986; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997). More specifically, it is also understood to reflect what the firm is, means and does as well as how and where it operates (Melewar, 2003; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002).

Academic and practitioner acknowledgement of corporate identity’s multidisciplinary heritage and management via the Strathclyde Statement of 1995 (Van Riel and Balmer, 1997) (Appendix 1), has led to a number of important developments according to Balmer and Wilson (1998). For example, these authors point to the strengthening of the scholarly link between the marketing and organisational behaviour studies along the lines outlined later in this chapter. The growing emphasis on the role of culture in understanding the organisation’s identity is also seen to be of critical importance, particularly as it relates to the combination of cultures active within the organisation that form what Olins (1978) refers to as the corporate personality. This is further reflected in the assertion that corporate identity is present not only the symbolic and physical manifestations of the organisation, but also in the principles, functions and behaviours of its members (Cornelissen, Haslam and Balmer, 2007). Accordingly, Van Riel and Balmer (1997, p.340) describe this interdisciplinary perspective of corporate identity as ‘a multidisciplinary approach which draws heavily on organizational behaviour.’ It is this perspective that is reflected in the seminal work of Albert and Whetten and Whetten (1985) and which conceptualises corporate identity in terms of the attributes of the organisation jointly considered by its employees to be central, enduring and distinctive.

As noted in the introduction to this thesis, the central aim and objectives of the present study mean that it must necessarily take into account the strategic, marketing, visual and external expressions of the organisation as well as organisational members’ perceptions, feelings and interpretations of these aspects; in short, the individual facets of the interdisciplinary perspective outlined in section 2.3 of this chapter. It is not possible for example to consider the range of member organisational associations or to employ them in this study without accepting that some of these associations might be formed through exposure to the visual, marketing and relational signals transmitted by the organisations to which they are linked. At the same time, research has also acknowledge that a
proportion of member organisational associations contain content that is also central, enduring and distinctive (CED) (Brown et al., 2006) thus capturing employees’ perceptions, thoughts and feelings (Hatch and Schultz, 1997).

It is for these reasons that the present study embraces the definition of corporate identity proposed by Melewar and Jenkins (2002) that defines corporate identity as a reflection of what the firm is, means and does, as well as how and where it operates (Melewar, 2003; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002). More specifically however, it subscribes to the interdisciplinary perspective which considers corporate identity in terms of those attributes of the organisation considered to be central, enduring and distinctive (CED) in the minds of its employees (Albert and Whetten, 1985). In so doing, the study is illustrative of the benefits – including the accessing of deeper levels of knowledge and discourse – of applying interdisciplinary approaches to research in corporate identity (Van Riel and Balmer, 1997). The study additionally draws on the conceptualisation of corporate identity cues put forward by Marwick and Fill (1997), Birkigt, Stadler and Funck (2002) and Fill, 2005 that addresses them in terms of their communications, behavioural and symbolic manifestations, and which furthermore are reflected in the multi-dimensional models of corporate identity put forward by Birkigt and Stadler (1986, cited in Van Riel, 1995), Melewar and Jenkins (2002) and Melewar (2003).

2.4 Corporate identity cues in organisations

Despite reference being made to corporate identity cues in the corporate identity literature, it is still difficult to locate a precise definition. Corporate identity cues have been referred to variously as a means of: consciously transmitting the characteristics of the organisation (Abratt, 1989); projecting (Marwick and Fill, 1997) and managing (Van Riel and Berens, 2001) the corporate identity and the way in which the organisation aspires to be seen; conveying the behaviours consistent with the organisation-internal practices and standards (Lam, Liu and Loi, 2016); and, linking the employee with the organisation (Wiesenfeld, Raghuram and Garud, 1999). These standpoints effectively describe what corporate identity cues do. Other standpoints however have viewed corporate identity itself either as one of many management cues (Vella and Melewar, 2008) in cultural terms, or as the creation of organisation-identifying cues that are aligned with symbolism, behaviour and communication corporate identity cue types described by Birkigt and Stadler (1986) (Fill, 2005). Whether considered individually or collectively, these standpoints provide limited insights into the effects or use of the conveyed or transmitted corporate identity cues on the employees that receive them.
Sensemaking cues, as introduced in section 2.2.3, are useful in helping to define this grey area since they are known to trigger the employee roles required under certain circumstances (Weick, 1995). Moreover they determine the actions taken and attention given as a result (Weber and Glynn, 2006). In short, sensemaking cues provide a means of interpreting the environment within the context of the corporate identity (Tripsas, 2008), and guiding the potential responses and actions.

This integrated and reasoned construal of corporate identity cues (i.e., the bringing together of these various perspectives) sits well with the interdisciplinary perspective of corporate identity to which this study subscribes. It also accommodates well the notion of corporate and member organisational associations introduced in Chapter 1 that considers both the transmission of, as well as employees’ interpretations of and responses to the corporate identity (Dacin and Brown, 2002).

Applying this construal in reviewing the literature in the corporate identity domain reveals that corporate identity cues have been implicitly linked to both psychological bonding (organisational identification) and other behavioural outcomes (table 2.1). For example, of the 62 sources listed in table 2.1, seventeen make direct or indirect reference to organisational identification as an outcome or effect of corporate identity cues, while eleven focus on member behaviours.

Despite the apparent importance of corporate identity cues in organisational identification and employee action and behaviours, few studies to date have examined exclusively the nature and effects of corporate identity cues on these important facets of organisational life. Notable exceptions to this include research that has: outlined the format (visual, communication), mode (planned and unplanned) and effects of corporate identity cues (Marwick and Fill, 1997); examined the attributes associated with the sales force as a corporate identity cue (Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000); and explored perceived organisational support as an intra-organisational identity cue together with its effects on organisational identification and extra-role behaviour (Lam, Liu and Loi, 2016). While the influence of these corporate identity cues in these studies was found to be significant with the study from Lam et al., (2016) providing additional insight into the effects of cues on organisational identification and role behaviour, the cues used in each instance were pre-defined. That is to say, none were derived from the broader set of corporate associations that are said to cognitively link individual experience to corporate identity and, that moreover, affect organisational identification (Brown et al., 2006).

This section of the literature review therefore looks at the nature and influence of corporate identity cues in organisations from two distinct but complimentary, and indeed related, perspectives; corporate associations and, the interdisciplinary mode of corporate identity as described in section 2.3.4. Here, corporate association are seen as representing all possible pieces
of information and connections that individuals hold in memory about a particular organisation including facets of its corporate identity (Brown et al. 2006), and the individual’s response to the associations themselves (Brown and Dacin, 1997). Defined in some instances reflecting what the firm is, means and does, as well as how and where it operates (Melewar, 2003; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002), corporate identity is also viewed as comprising those attributes of the organisation collectively perceived by its employees to be central, enduring and distinctive (CED, Albert and Whetten, 1985). As such, it is viewed here as ‘a multidisciplinary approach that draws heavily on organizational behaviour.’ (Balmer and Wilson, 1998 p.15).

The following section opens with a discussion on corporate and member organisational associations as the wider context within which corporate identity cues are considered. The effects of corporate identity cues in organisations is then explored from the interdisciplinary perspective outlined in section 2.3.4 and with respect to established models of corporate identity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Cues Identified</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abratt, 1989</td>
<td>Visual cues (physical and behavioural)</td>
<td>Recognition of the organisation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anteby and Molnár, 2013</td>
<td>Corporate Communications In-house magazines</td>
<td>Remembering to forget non-identity supporting attributes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Qualitative: Analysis of 309 company publications; archival data; employee interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartel, 2001</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Strengthening of organisational identification</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Mixed Methods: Survey - panel data; 50 interviews (employees);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartels, Douwes, de Jong and Pruyn, 2006</td>
<td>Social bonds Communications Communication climate</td>
<td>Contribution to organisational identification</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Questionnaire, quasi-experimental study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholmé and Melewar, 2016</td>
<td>Corporate auditory identity cues</td>
<td>Potential effects: improve business, provide competitive edge</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: 12 Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkigt and Stadler, 1986</td>
<td>Communications Behaviour Symbolism</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a text book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkigt, Stadler and Funck, 2002</td>
<td>Identity anchors Geographic location, Nationality Strategy Core Business Technology Knowledge base Organisation design Operating Philosophy Governance Structure</td>
<td>Steering interaction within and outside of the organisation (p.42) Promotion of harmonisation (p. 48) Embodiment of relationship between employee and employer (p.49) The behaviour of the firm is the most important, effective and most concrete instrument (p.59)</td>
<td>n/a text book</td>
<td>n/a text book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchiki and Kimberley, 2012</td>
<td>Relationships with stakeholders Identity statements</td>
<td>Shaping of members’ world view (p.21) Constraining of strategic options</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickson, 2005</td>
<td>Nostalgia Collective nostalgia</td>
<td>Individual-group identification facilitated by nostalgia (p.43) Preservation of self-esteem Reactions to threat</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Mixed methods: Survey and interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Cues Identified</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown and Humphreys, 2006</td>
<td>Place Nostalgia Acts of languaging</td>
<td>Perception of situations</td>
<td>Multiple Level: 75 staff members</td>
<td>Qualitative: 75 interviews, Ethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chreim, 2005</td>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>Sentiment of distinctiveness encourages identification and sets behavioural standards (p.5711); Martin et al., 1983</td>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: Annual reports, narratives, business press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark et al., 2010</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Local identification enables identity change (p.431)</td>
<td>Senior Management Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: longitudinal 11-month exploratory case study, 33 semi-structured interviews, observation, archival data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole and Bruch, 2006</td>
<td>Traditions, rituals, ceremonies reflective of organisational history Emphasis on core values, beliefs, behaviours representing mission and goals Stories and myths that underpin the organisational identity</td>
<td>Fosters organisational identification (p.600)</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Quantitative: Survey (10,948 responses/84% response rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corley, 2004</td>
<td>Upper Hierarchy/Top Managers Strategy, Purpose and External perceptions Lower Hierarchy/Operational Employees Values, beliefs, identity labels</td>
<td>Values and beliefs guide operational employee behaviours and demarcate appropriate course of action in certain contexts (p.1158) At upper hierarchical level, identity change is implemented via new labels and images</td>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: 38 interviews (managers), Archival documents, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corley and Gioia, 2004</td>
<td>Independence Technology leader Image Values Character</td>
<td>Change overload Identity change supporting behaviours emerge in latter stages of change process</td>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td>38 interviews (managers), Archival documents, participant observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000</td>
<td>The sales force</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical companies' perception of the sales force as a corporate identity cue</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>Mixed methods In-depth interviews with small number of doctors Focus group with local pharmaceutical marketing managers Survey of 50 doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukerich, Golden and Shortell, 2002</td>
<td>Stability, Trustworthiness, Integrity, Compassion</td>
<td>Strengthened corporate image</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Quantitative: Survey data; longitudinal &quot;Time 2&quot; data; statistical archival data; established scales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Cues Identified</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutton and Dukerich, 1991</td>
<td>Image Ethical, technical expertise, scandal-free, altruistic, first-class, high-quality, superior services, commitment to regional welfare, employee loyalty</td>
<td>Guidance and activation of interpretations</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: Case Study; 25 open-ended interviews (employees); reports memos and speeches; articles from newspapers and magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail, 1994</td>
<td>Organisation quality and prestige Perceived attractiveness of the organisation Attractiveness of construed external image</td>
<td>Strengthening of organisational identification through perceived and construed CED attributes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Literature review and prior studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001</td>
<td>Values Beliefs Reputation Experience Distinctiveness</td>
<td>Disidentification</td>
<td>Qualitative: Focus groups, archival data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsbach and Kramer, 1996</td>
<td>Rankings</td>
<td>Aids sensemaking around threat Reduces perceived threat</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: Interviews with 43 respondents from 8 schools; local news sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elstak, 2008</td>
<td>Attractiveness of perceived identity Projected organisational identity</td>
<td>Organisational identification</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Review/Analysis of lit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empson, 2004</td>
<td>Distinctiveness of practice High quality service Professional identity</td>
<td>Learning new ways of behaving Reinterpreting meanings [of professionalism]</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: longitudinal case study (27 months), 98 interviews, archival data and observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiol, 1991</td>
<td>Culture Contextual identities</td>
<td>Patterns of behaviour (p.208)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiol, 2001</td>
<td>Situational cues (shared interest)</td>
<td>Situated identification (perceived benefit in standing together for specified purpose)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiol, 2002</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Articulating, strengthening and weakening organisational identification (p.663)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman and Whetten, 2002</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Organisational identification</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Quantitative: Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gioia and Thomas, 1996</td>
<td>History, traditions, symbols, practices and philosophy</td>
<td>Interpretation of issues Confidence in proactivity</td>
<td>Senior Management Level</td>
<td>Mixed Methods: Case Study, 25 in-depth ethnographic-style interviews (university management and faculty members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gioia et al., 2000</td>
<td>Image (including reputation) Beliefs Values Mission</td>
<td>Representations and translation into action</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Cues Identified</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gioia et al., 2010</td>
<td>Confirming cues</td>
<td>Transitional identity</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>33 semi-structured interviews with faculty; non-participant observation, ethnography, participant observation; archival data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glynn, 2000</td>
<td>Membership Common vision Symbol and Structure Shared values</td>
<td>Interpretation of issues (strategic)</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: In-depth study. 13 semi-structured interviews (managers and artists), Archival sources about the organization and the industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glynn and Halgin, 2011</td>
<td>Culture in geographic Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden-Biddle and Rao, 1997</td>
<td>Mission Belief</td>
<td>Board member and top management role behaviours that maintain the corporate identity</td>
<td>Senior Management Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: Causal interviews, Observation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harquail, 2006</td>
<td>Symbols - Organizational Icon</td>
<td>Organisational identification Representation of new ideas Projection of possible behaviours</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Qualitative case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harquail, Wilcox King, 2010</td>
<td>Embodied cognition</td>
<td>Organisational identification</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch and Schultz, 2002</td>
<td>Culture Identity claims Business models Heritage Passion</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, Schultz and Skov, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple level</td>
<td>Qualitative: open-ended interviews with 76 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He and Balmer, 2007</td>
<td>Nomenclature, logo, slogans, colour, strapline, architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Review/Analysis of lit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys and Brown, 2002</td>
<td>Naming and titles</td>
<td>Identification narratives (organisational identification, dis-identification and neutral identification and schizo-identification)</td>
<td>Senior Management Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: Longitudinal case study; 42 semi-structured interviews; informal interviews and observations (over 15 years); archival and online data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs, Christe-Zeyse, Keegan and Pólos, 2008</td>
<td>Performance indicators Appraisal systems</td>
<td>Identity determines the 'range' of acceptable and unacceptable behaviours (p.244)</td>
<td>Non-managerial level</td>
<td>Qualitative: Two-step case study, interviews with 98 individuals, 50 qualitative interviews, analysis of reform processes, discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjaergaard, 2009</td>
<td>Creative chaos Flexibility Creative ideas Lack of formal procedures Organisational cognition</td>
<td>Influences strategy-making actions and guides behaviour</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: 18-month longitudinal study, participant observation, interviews and written materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Cues Identified</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kjærgaard et al., 2011</td>
<td>Media and media-refracted images</td>
<td>Sensemaking effect Self-enhancement effect Alignment around understandings of the organisation</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: Longitudinal case study; 232 interviews (employees at all levels), Archival sources, Direct observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam, Liu and Loi, 2015</td>
<td>Perceived organisational support</td>
<td>Organisational identification Extra-role behaviour</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Quantitative: Survey 363 usable questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margolis and Hansen, 2002</td>
<td>Organisational purpose, rational and philosophy</td>
<td>not clear</td>
<td>not clear</td>
<td>Qualitative: explorative study, 52 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martins, 2005</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Top managers likelihood to undertake organisational change</td>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>Quantitative: survey questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwick and Fill, 1997</td>
<td>Visual identity (design, graphics, symbols) Speech Behaviour Mannerisms</td>
<td>Inform stakeholders of company performance in relation to its attributes</td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td>Quantitative: survey of 50 external, 100 internal, 15 directors and senior managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melewar, 2003</td>
<td>Corporate communication Corporate design Corporate culture Behaviour Corporate structure Industry Identity Corporate Strategy</td>
<td>Uncontrollable communications - shaping of corporate identity Reputation - guiding purchase decisions Actions - demarcate the corporate identity Behaviours - reflect unique attributes of the organisation externally Philosophies, beliefs and objectives - organisational distinctiveness Imagery - comprises triggers and beliefs that determine members' behaviour</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melewar and Jenkins, 2002</td>
<td>Communication and visual identity Behavior Corporate culture Market conditions</td>
<td>Uncontrollable communications - shaping of corporate identity Reputation - guiding purchase decisions Actions - demarcate the corporate identity Behaviours - reflect unique attributes of the organisation externally Philosophies, beliefs and objectives - organisational distinctiveness Imagery - comprises triggers and beliefs that determine members' behaviour</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Cues Identified</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melewar and Storrie, 2001</td>
<td>Corporate communications and visual identity Behavior Corporate culture Market conditions Firm, product and services</td>
<td>Uncontrollable communications - shaping of corporate identity Reputation - guiding purchase decisions Actions - demarcate the corporate identity Behaviours - reflect unique attributes of the organisation externally Philosophies, beliefs and objectives - organisational distinctiveness Imagery - comprises triggers and beliefs that determine members' behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olins, 1978</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Remind group of its true purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt and Foreman, 2000</td>
<td>Values and shared values Mediating myths and beliefs</td>
<td>Reflecting and understanding identity complexities Saliency, view on situations and identity beliefs vary across the firm (Pratt, 1994; Martin 1992)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Qualitative: Action research, in depth case study, unstructured observation, formal/informal discussion, semi-structured interviews, free association, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997</td>
<td>Organizational dress Uniforms Uniform colour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran and Duimering, 2007</td>
<td>Mission statements (as identity claims) Language</td>
<td>Differentiation of an organisation's identity from the identity of others</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Qualitative: Review and analysis of 100 corporate mission statements from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravasi and Phillips, 2011</td>
<td>Top Managers Top Management communications Official Claims Identity beliefs</td>
<td>Articulation of identity beliefs supports strategy formation and deployment Identity claims and beliefs promote reaction to external change</td>
<td>Middle and Senior Management Level</td>
<td>Qualitative: 16 in-depth interviews, archival sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Cues Identified</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology and Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ravasi and Schultz, 2006</td>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construed external images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central and distinctive features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture shapes identity of the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cues aid sensemaking and situation interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-deciphering and reassessing organisational attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Level: 8 Top managers, 24 middle managers, 4 staff members/technicians, 4 retired executives (22 from HQ, 18 from international network)</td>
<td>Qualitative: Semi-structured interviews, Identity seminars, Archival data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousseau, 1998</td>
<td>Situational cues (shared interest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott and Lane, 2000</td>
<td>Identification cuing:</td>
<td>Management influence on members' organisational identification (image and attraction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>leads to increased:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily interactions</td>
<td>Drive to attain group goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational routines</td>
<td>interaction within the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iterative exchanges</td>
<td>Helpful, supporting behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paychecks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence on organigram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simões, Dibb and Fisk, 2005</td>
<td>Consistent image implementation</td>
<td>Mission and values dissemination encapsulates the firm’s reason for being and the communication thereof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission and values dissemination</td>
<td>Consistent image implementation influences members' construal of the firm's identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual identity implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple level; validation with managers</td>
<td>Mixed-methods: qualitative analysis of documents, in-depth interviews. Quantitative analysis via survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanis and Beukeboom, 2011</td>
<td>Email Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Font</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text Colour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledgement of employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Personal focus' content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voss, Cable and Voss, 2006</td>
<td>Organizational Value Dimensions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic creativity, innovation, independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial stability and security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reassessment of mission and opportunities relative to external changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced adaptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower organisational performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Management Level</td>
<td>Quantitative: Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4.1 Introduction to corporate and member organisational associations

2.4.1.1 Corporate associations

Corporate associations have been defined as all the perceptions, feelings assessments and experiences that individuals hold in memory about an organisation, associate with the organisation and construe about the corporate identity of the organisation (Dacin and Brown, 2002). Corporate associations are anchored in cognitive models of associative memory and learning (Brown and Dacin, 1997) where each specific piece of information, or cognitive unit, held (e.g., an experience or corporate identity cue such as company mission) may vary in strength depending on how it is exercised and connected with other units to form a network (Anderson, 1983). The formation of linkages between these cognitive units is a key pillar of associative learning (Mitchel, Houwer and Lovibond, 2009). Indeed these linkages create the associations (Glanfield, 2013). As a result, the activation of any network of associations initiates the retrieval of all related content (Anderson, 1983).

Corporate associations are pivotal to the outcomes of organisations (Scholder Ellen, Webb and Mohr, 2006) and thus have been closely tied to the concept of corporate image (Brown and Dacin, 1997); that is to say, ‘the immediate mental picture that audiences have of an organization.’ (Gray and Balmer, 1998, p.697). They have also been examined as a means of understanding social expectation, corporate personality traits and trust as drivers of corporate reputation (Berens and Van Riel, 2004); corporate image being the appraisals of the firm’s image and its attributes as they have evolved over time (Gray and Balmer, 1998). Brown (1998) has suggested that one reason for the pervading interest in image and reputation in the context of corporate associations is the difficult-to-imitate competitive advantage that it offers. Yet, it is precisely because of the overt focus on these two elements that Brown and Dacin (1997) advanced the use of the term corporate associations to reflect both image and reputation, while also capturing: ‘the cognitions, affects (ie, moods and emotions), evaluations (attaching specific cognitions and affects), summary evaluations, and/or patterns of associations (eg. Schemata, scripts) with respect to a particular company.’ (Brown, 1998, p.217).

Dacin and Brown (2002) view corporate image, reputation and, pertinent to this study, corporate identity, as representative of the information that organisations transmit intentionally about themselves. The inclusive nature of corporate associations on the other hand reflects constituents’ interpretations and responses to the information received – an action that is typical in sensemaking.
Constituents in this context, are understood to mean the multiple levels of the firm from management to employees, as well as those external to the firm including customers, competitors and public sector organisations (Spears, Dacin and Brown, 2006). Dacin and Brown’s (2002) conceptualisation of corporate associations implies that what the firm transmits and what is understood are not always necessarily aligned; an implication that lies somewhat in contrast to Birkigt and Stadler’s (1986) contention that the corporate identity as expressed through the company-projected image, matches that of the stakeholder-perceived image of the firm.

2.4.1.2 **Member organisational associations**

Brown et al. (2006) maintain that unlike other constituents, employees simultaneously represent and have a unique vantage point from which to appraise their organisations (Brown et al., 2006). These authors term the collection of information or associations that these employees hold about their organisations, *member organisational associations* and further contend that of all the associations that employees hold in memory about their organisations, only a limited selection are likely to be central, enduring and distinctive (CED) in employees’ perceptions of the firm. While these authors do not specify how the CED member organisational associations may be extrapolated from the overall member organisational associations, they affirm that the result is nevertheless an ‘organizationally relevant, but individually held’ identity (Brown et al., 2006, p.103). These associations are furthermore likely to strengthen dependent on their use (Anderson, 1983) ultimately forming a distinct representation and operational context of the firm for these organisational members.

Because member organisational associations by default encompass some of the CED aspects of corporate identity, they are similarly likely to influence the salience of the organisation and employees’ subsequent identification with it (Sen, Bhattacharya and Korschun, 2006). From this, it may be inferred that corporate identity cues may in fact be particularly *organisation-salient* member organisational associations. Examining corporate identity cues from the member organisational association perspective thus seems logical. Indeed, it is in line with extant research from Bhattacharya and Sen (2003) which has similarly examined the relationship between associations and identification with the firm albeit from the consumer perspective.

2.4.2 **Appraising corporate identity cues through models of corporate identity**

The interdisciplinary perspective of corporate identity has also introduced the notion of the corporate identity mix (Balmer and Wilson, 1998) which itself has at times been conceptualised in terms of the communications, behavioural and symbolic cues that comprise the corporate identity (Birkigt and Stadler, 1986; Birkigt, Stadler and Funck, 2002; Fill, 2005).
A number of mixes and models have been proposed in the literature that vary in terms of origin, direction and purpose. For instance, Birkigt and Stadler’s seminal earlier (1986) and later (Birkigt, Stadler and Funck, 2002) models of corporate identity with their origins in the management of corporate image, focus on communications, behaviour and symbolism as key attributes of corporate identity. In this conceptualisation, communication is reflected in the deliberately orchestrated actions that range from advertising and publicity to events and sponsorship. Behaviour, as expressed via employees at all levels of the firm, is viewed in terms of the actions that influence stakeholders’ impressions of the firm. Symbolism by contrast encompasses the variety of visual representations of the firm from its logos and organisational dress, to its styles and other visual elements such that recognition of the firm and articulation of its philosophy are enabled through these ‘visual cues’ (Van Riel and Berens, 2001, p.45). While Birkigt, Stadler and Funck (2002) contend that behaviour, with all its effects and consequences, is the most important and effective of the three components, others suggest that it is in their collective state, that these components help project the organisation’s image to its constituents along with its mission, vision and culture (Cornelissen, 2014).

Later representations of corporate identity models including Balmer and Soenen’s (1998) mix of soul, mind and voice while drawing heavily from the works of Birkigt and Stadler noted previously, are centred predominantly on the formation and management rather than the representation of corporate identity. In Balmer and Soenen’s (1998) conceptualisation for instance, the mind is underpinned by the philosophical basis of the organisation; that is, its vision, performance, history and products for example. The voice, much like Birkigt, Stadler and Funck’s (2002) and Melewar’s (2003) rendition of communications comprises, the myriad controllable and non-controllable aspects of communications, behaviours and symbolism. Indeed it is within this dimension that the entirety of the original Birkigt and Stadler (1986) model is accommodated. The soul by contrast is anchored in the associations, culture and values held by the organisation’s members.

Studies from Melewar and Storrie (2001) and Melewar (2003) by comparison have produced more expansive models aimed at drawing out the more prominent dimensions of corporate identity that invite empirical examination of construct’s composite parts (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002). In this sense, the four-construct model of corporate identity proposed by Melewar and Jenkins (2002) (figure 2.1) comprising the dimensions of: communications and visual identity; behaviour, corporate culture; and market conditions extend beyond the formation and management focus of Balmer and Soenen’s conceptualisation to consider the manifold influences of these dimensions on organisational members.
Figure 2.1 An overview of corporate identity and its constructs as defined by Melewar and Jenkins (2002)

Here, the behaviours exhibited at corporate, managerial and employee level are not only seen as conducive to shaping the identity and image of the firm (Melewar, 2003) but, as in the case of corporate communications, viewed as a set of strategic and vision-related assignments conferred upon and intended to be transmitted by the firm’s management (Melewar et al., 2005). Often rooted in the [in]consistencies of the organisation's standards, goals characteristics and performance as well as the manner (intentional or otherwise) in which these aspects are transmitted (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002), this dimension further illustrates the effects and consequences that Birkigt, Stadler and Funck (2002) posit as being intrinsic to the behaviours of and within the organisation. The significance of behaviour as a component and reflection of the corporate identity is also supported by more contemporary research that positions it as one of five characteristics of front line (i.e., client facing) employee corporate identity (Glanfield et al., 2017).
In contrast to the broad perspective of communications and voice noted earlier, later works have tended to view this dimension as both specific and multifaceted, encompassing management, controllable, uncontrollable/unplanned communications (Melewar, Karaosmanoglu and Patterson, 2005) as well as the visual aspects of the firm (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002; Melewar, Basset and Simões, 2006). This is particularly significant since the visual component in particular has often been characterised as a composition of cues (Abratt, 1998) that are manifested in the expressions of the organisation and its members (Marwick and Fill, 1997). This implies a close link to both the uncontrollable and controllable aspects of communications and, as Melewar and Storrie’s (2001) study of corporate identity in the service sector indicates, the appearance of the organisation’s members.

In addition to forming a central facet of Melewar and Jenkin’s (2002) model of corporate identity, the culture of the organisation is considered integral to the formation (Melewar, 2003) of its corporate identity and a key determinant of the subsequent actions (Harquail, Wilcox King, 2010) of its members. Comprising the goals, philosophies, nationality, imagery and history of the organisation, the culture underlies the behaviours of the firm and drives its corporate identity (Melewar, 2003). Despite its obvious importance, far from being a unique expression of the firm, the philosophies upon which the organisational cultures are built, often reflect the features that are shared by other organisations (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002) and across industries (Peyrefitte and David, 2006; Ingenhoff and Fuhrer, 2010). This commonality of philosophical groundings is evident in the constrictions to corporate identity changes that are often imposed through market conditions (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002) and industry identity (Melewar, 2003) that inform the corporate identity.

While several models in this expansive genre have additionally been proposed, with contributions from Stuart (1999) incorporating personality, strategy and reputation, as well as from Otubanjo (2013) in which the ostensibly commercial aspects of core competencies, corporate advertising and buyer value are emphasised, recent studies have focused on extending the more established models discussed earlier. Within this context, corporate auditory identity – the range of aural cues that support recognition and distinction of the organisation – has emerged as a relatively recent and equally important aspect of the corporate identity concept (Bartholmé and Melewar, 2016).
Despite these developments, it is arguably Birkigt and Stadler’s (1986) formulation that continues to underpin many studies of corporate identity. Indeed, later works in the field have sought to anchor this conceptualisation in sensemaking such that corporate identity has also come to be delineated through the resultant effects of these cues that differentiate, reflect and embody the company while aiding its recognition (Abratt, 1989; Fill, 2005).

Consistent with one of Van Riel and Balmer’s (1997, p.340) key observations in the development of corporate identity as a ‘multidisciplinary approach that draws heavily on organizational behaviour’ however, the literature presented in the rest of section 2.4 is reviewed primarily from this perspective; that is to say, from the viewpoint of the organisation’s CED attributes. However, the cue-enhanced conceptualisation of Birkigt and Stadler’s (1986) model together with Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) four sub-constructs representation illustrated in figure 2.1 are also referenced since the latter in particular encompasses a deeper, and indeed the interdisciplinary, conceptualisation of corporate identity related communications. Reference is also made to Melewar’s (2003) taxonomy of corporate identity.

Table 2.2 depicts the framework applied in reviewing the literature. It shows how those attributes and elements of the firm considered to be CED by its members connect with the communications, behavioural (including cultural) and symbolic aspects of the corporate identity taxonomy. In each quadrant a number of studies in which corporate identity cues related to the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of the firm are presented along with their manifestations through the communications, behaviours and symbolism of the firm.

Given the focus of this thesis, close attention is paid to delineating the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification.
Table 2.2 Integrated CED attributes and corporate identity models as a framework for examining corporate identity cues
2.4.3 Central cues to the corporate identity

In its purest manifestations, the characteristics of an organisation collectively held up by its members as key to its image (i.e. central), tend to be revealed via the mores, goods, services and praxes put forward by the organisation itself (Gioia et al., 2013b). This perspective draws in the historical and the legacy attributes as a means of evaluating what the organisation is as well as what it categorically is not, and to derive some sense of what lies at its core. Accordingly, centrality is also deemed a necessary pre-condition for revealing the distinctive features (Whetten, 2006) and spirit (Ashforth and Mael, 1989) of the firm which make it identifiable to interested parties (Ashforth and Mael, 1996). As such, it is often the ‘system of beliefs, values and norms...anchored in the organizational mission that informs sense-making and action’ and which additionally reflect what is core to the firm (Ashforth and Mael, 1996, p.24). In many organisations, this system is transmitted via the mission and vision, and enacted through the values and customs that symbolise the attributes of the firm’s identity. Accordingly, the mission represents the most conventional method of transmitting the organisation’s ambitions, beliefs and values (Melewar and Akel, 2005).

Commensurate with social identity theory, cues of this magnitude not only make salient the organisation as a social group, but also guide the attention and group-compliant actions of members, such that their sense of identification with (Hogg and Terry, 2001; Hogg and Reid, 2006) and behaviours towards the firm are influenced. Table 2.2 illustrates the corresponding cues, as revealed in the corporate identity literature and which span the communicative, behavioural and symbolic dimensions of corporate identity.

Research suggests that the range of central cues transmitted also extends beyond the philosophy (i.e., the mission, vision and values) of the firm to encompass physical productions such as corporate magazines (Anteby and Molnár, 2012); official claims (Ran and Duimering, 2007; Hatch, Schultz and Skov, 2015); and, ethical representations (Dukerich, Golden and Shortell, 2002) made by the organisation, all of which have differential outcomes. For example, it has been posited that cues related to the corporate communications of the firm may be integral to deactivating those historical and nostalgic aspects of the organisation’s identity deemed out of synch with its current stance (Anteby and Molnár, 2012). Official claims by contrast, while pivotal in constructing the identity of the organisation (Ran and Duimering, 2007), additionally heighten member reactions to shifts in the external environment (Ravasi and Philips, 2011) and shape identity orientation (Brickson, 2005).
The cues anchored in the philosophy of the firm are nevertheless significant since shared vision is directly fostered through shared identity (Wong, Tsovold and Liu, 2009). Moreover, values anchored in the mutual respect and support between organisational members flow from this shared vision (Wong et al., 2009).

**Cues to identification and actions**

Notions of what is shared, and indeed how it is shared with respect to the corporate philosophy as a cue, are equally important as studies have shown. For example, Cole and Bruch (2006) contend that in focusing attention on cues related to values, behaviours and customs consistent with the corporate identity, organisational identification may be enhanced. Indeed, this is a stance that is amply supported by literature that interlinks corporate values with behaviours and customs. Pratt and Foreman (2000) earlier advanced this line of thinking by positing that the signalling of shared values in particular, may promote organisation-unifying sentiment across the subgroups of the firm. Although this standpoint finds favour with later studies from Corley (2004) and Simões et al. (2005), other works by Elsbach and Bhattacharya (2001) for instance argued that concentrated use of shared value as a cue may in fact fuel members’ dis-identification with the firm.

Research into hierarchically-anchored identity beliefs also indicates that cues pointing to the value and beliefs embedded in the corporate identity can help guide behaviour and determine the actions of operational staff (Corley’s, 2004). In fact, it has been stated that the consistency of these behaviours may be further endorsed through simultaneous dissemination of the corporate mission together with values (Simões et al., 2005). This latter point is particularly critical since inconsistency in behaviour may produce deviations from the norm in terms of what is considered representative of the firm (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002).

Contentions such as these are representative of what Scott and Lane (2000) term identification cuing, a method that intersperses organisational communications with organisational image and entrenches employee interaction in organisational life to augment the sense of belonging. Identification cuing is evident in a number of corporate identity works including Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail’s (1994) seminal study on the Port of New York Authority that highlight the influence of quality and organisational prestige in member’s identification with their organisations. Contrastingly, other studies have highlighted the identification diluting effects of senior management identity disagreements (Voss, Cable and Voss, 2006). Identification cuing is also apparent in the role played by management in the identification process. Because corporate behaviour in particular reflects the set of strategic and vision-related assignments conferred upon and expected to be transmitted by the firm’s management (Melewar, Karaosmanoglu and Paterson,
2005), senior management become symbolic of the organisation’s identity and thus an influential ‘device’ – and, one might argue, a corporate identity cue – in determining members’ perceptions of the firm (Hatch and Schultz, 1997, p.363). Their heightened involvement with organisational members is consequently considered beneficial to the image and the identity of the firm (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002).

What is most notable about identification cuing however is that in addition to supporting the drive to attain group-level goals, it also encourages behaviours that are both helpful and supportive to the firm (Scott and Lane, 2000). Thus, it is not unusual that highly identified employees seemingly hold a stronger sense of reciprocity within their organisations (Bartel, 2001) or that levels of perceived organisational support (POS) correlate positively with organisational identification (Lam, Liu and Loi, 2016). Indeed, in this latter study conducted amongst the nursing staff of three hospitals in China, organisational identification was also found to mediate the relationship between POS and extra-role behaviour. Sub-section 2.5 explores in more detail the notion of organisational identification.

Exhibited at various levels of the firm, the effect of these central cues on employee behaviours and interactions have the unique ability to shape the corporate identity (Melewar, 2003) while in parallel reflecting the level of identification that members hold with their organisations (Topalian, 1984). Collectively, these observations lead to the hypothesis that, given their behaviour-aligning, action guiding and referential characteristics:

\[ H_1 \text{ Corporate identity cues that point to the mission, vision and values of the organisation (i.e., its philosophy) will positively influence employees’ identification with the organisation (OID)} \]

The history of the firm may also be viewed as a central attribute of the organisation since it is indicative of the firm’s dependability (Blombäck and Brunninger, 2009). Indeed, Moingeon and Ramanantsoa (1997, p.387) posit that corporate identity, is so closely bound to the organisation’s past, that it is both an outcome and trigger of history which can then lead to ‘inertia or...progress.’ In other words, cueing the history of the organisation may influence beliefs and actions. Melewar and Akel’s (2005) study of corporate identity within a higher education establishment would seem to bear this out partially in confirming the role of one university’s history in supporting its image and orientation.

While history may not necessarily cue members’ sense of belonging with the firm, as a corporate identity cue it nevertheless provides members with a sense of stability (Moingeon and
Ramanantsoa, 1997) that is often sought during strategic organisational change. Consequently, even though identity beliefs may be challenged during such times (Moingeon and Ramanantsoa, 1997; Rughase, 2006; Bouchikhi and Kimberly, 2012), they are simultaneously strengthened (Hogg and Terry, 2000) and often result in a heightened degree of identity salience (Albert and Whetten, 1985).

2.4.4 Enduring and continuity cues to the corporate identity

Given the shifting environmental contexts within which most organisations operate, it has been argued that corporate identity should be regarded as a fluctuating concept (Gioia, Schultz and Corley, 2000a; Corley et al, 2006; Ravasi and Schultz, 2006) which, far from being enduring, is more accommodating of and responsive to change through its ‘adaptive instability’ (Gioia, Schultz and Corley, 2000a, p.63). This implies that the range of cues supporting this facet of the corporate identity (see table 2.2) must be similarly adaptive in responding to market conditions (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002) while underpinning those attributes of the organisation which provide stability to its members. Although Gioia et al., (2013) neither agree wholly with the notion of an adaptively instable identity, nor advocate the denial of identity endurance, these authors suggest that it is more the perception of endurance as opposed to endurance itself that is key; perceptions which necessarily delimit the generalisability of what may be construed as continuity or endurance across organisations. As noted earlier however, it is on the basis of such perceptions and impulses that individuals will seek to shore up the social (i.e., the corporate) identity given that it is as an extension of their own self-concepts. In so doing, it may be argued that the impressions given off by the firm become managed to some extent (Dutton and Dukerich, 1991).

Cues pointing to the culture and approaches (Ravasi and Schultz, 2006), history (Moingeon and Ramanantsoa, 1997; Anteby and Molnár, 2012) and nostalgia (Brown and Humphreys, 2002) of the firm, thus become strong influencers of organisational identification. In this sense, the history is seen as both central to and representative of the organisations endurance. While history does not necessarily cue members’ sense of belonging with the firm as noted in the previous section, nostalgia for the past helps makes salient the firm’s philosophy to its members during times of flux, and furthermore facilitate organisational identification by making available the content from which both esteem and membership may be drawn (Brown and Humphreys, 2002). Short term cues have also been known to achieve similar effects in terms of encouraging organisational identification. In keeping with the notion of adaptive instability these so-called ‘situational’ cues not only promote the temporal sense of belonging also referred to as situational identification, but over time, bring ‘deep structure’ – i.e., lasting and varied – organisational identification (Rousseau, 1998, p.218) and
identity salience (Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail, 1994; Fiol, 2001). This suggests that to a certain degree, all corporate identity cues may in fact be considered situational in nature.

In addition to nostalgia, the traditions (Gioia and Thomas, 1996), prescribed and assessed behaviours (Jacobs et al., 2008), and identity orientations (Brickson, 2005) associated with organisation are also of significance since they are indicative of the corporate culture that is defined in most models of corporate identity. It is to be expected then that that corporate culture has conversely been viewed as a source of the very cues which members use to make sense of their organisations (Ravasi and Schultz, 2006) and determine subsequent actions (Harquail, Wilcox King, 2010) wherein the influence of these cues can lead to positive and negative outcomes.

Gioia and Thomas' (1996) research on sensemaking during change for instance found that cues of tradition provided a poor basis for organisational members to interpret issues deemed to be strategic, particularly where such definitions were uncommon to the present organisational culture. In researching the effects of an organisational change on employees within a German police force, Jacobs et al. (2008) additionally found that change initiatives – in this case, appraisal systems and performance indicators – violating the CED attributes of the organisation led to a destabilisation of the organisation’s culture. These authors argue that because the identity of the organisation determines the scope of behaviours that lie within and beyond the boundaries of the accepted culture, tensions rise when change initiatives introduce behaviours that do not comply with the culture. This is an important finding since organisational culture may be so prevalent as to alter the claims and collective beliefs about the corporate identity (Ravasi and Schultz, 2006). To some extent, the results of these studies may be taken as examples of the negative effects – i.e., culture misalignment – of certain corporate identity cues. By comparison, as the ‘nature of assumed relationship between an organization and its stakeholders’, identity orientations may be viewed as delivering a positive cultural cue effect since when communicated as identity claims (e.g., caring and sharing) towards organisation-external parties, these orientations have been found to be mirror those promoted towards organisational insiders (Brickson, 2005, p.598).

As these observations make clear, when anchored in the nostalgic and symbolic manifestations of the organisation, cues related to the corporate culture emanate from and permeate all members and operational levels of the firm (Hatch and Schultz, 2002) making them integral to the formation (Melewar, 2003) and actioning (Kiriakidou and Millward, 2000) of the corporate identity. At the same time, given that the culture of the organisations is likely to comprise a range of subcultures (Balmer and Wilson, 1998) linked to for example, gender, job role and status (Van Maanen, 1991), the effects of these cues are also likely to differ. This is consistent with the notion of the ideographic
organisation which argues that member identity beliefs vary according to subgroup affiliation (Albert and Whetten, 1985), and the ‘differentiation perspective’ (Melewar, 2003, p.205) outlined in Balmer’s (1995) delineation of the corporate personality that considers sub-group level affiliations and loyalties. In this sense, the culture-based cues that underpin what may be deemed enduring, or continuous, about the firm, are also closely tied to that which is distinctive about it.

2.4.5 Distinctive cues to the corporate identity

In social identity theory, comparison forms the basis for determining the distinctive elements of an organisation’s identity (Puusa, 2006). Constituent-level beliefs about the firm’s identity projected at the firm level additionally trigger evaluations with peer organisations (Glynn and Abzug, 2002; Glynn and Marquis, 2005) and subsequently help define what truly stands out about the firm (Ashforth and Mael, 1996). Gioia et al., (2013b) also emphasise the importance of member beliefs or perceptions despite them being beyond the realm of impartial substantiation. Delineation of an organisation’s distinctive attributes in line with Barney’s (1991) VRIN (valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and non-substitutable resources) framework for example while helpful, carries with it certain shortcomings.

Distinctiveness therefore demarcates identity on the basis of similarities with and differences to others (Whetten and Mackey, 2002). Gioia et al., (2013b) suggest that this facet of corporate identity is best illustrated via Brewer’s (1991) theory of optimal distinctiveness in which individuals or organisations strive to find equilibrium by being acknowledged for their distinctiveness while in parallel being recognised as part of a greater cohort such as a department, organisation or sector. This is demonstrated in attempts to emphasise the distinctive attributes of the organisation via corporate identity cues such as mission and values statements (Van Rekom, 1997) which while central to the firm, often contain themes commonly expressed by other organisations even across industries (Peyrefitte and David, 2006; Ingenhoff and Fuhrer, 2010) as noted previously.

Distinctiveness has also been articulated through a number of cues spanning the: attractiveness of the identity (Elstak, 2008), the organisation’s climate (Bartels et al., 2010), language (Fiol, 2002), rankings (Elsbach and Kramer, 1996; Martins, 2005); reputation (Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001) communications; culture (Olins, 1978, Fiol, 1991; Melewar, 2003; Hatch, Schultz and Skov, 2015) and role of top management (Ravasi and Philips, 2011) in terms of corporate behaviour. It has also been addressed via visual representations including image (Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail, 1994), organisational dress (Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997), written text (Tanis and Beukeboom, 2011) and even the sales force (Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000) in terms of the organisation’s symbolism.
The attractiveness of the corporate identity along with the mode and climate within which this is communicated are seen as particularly important corporate identity cues as all have been linked to organisational identification. For example, the attractiveness of the identity from an insider’s perspective reflects the extent to which these employees view the identity as desirable (Elstak, 2008). Self-categorisation theory suggests that such positive evaluations (i.e., desirability) of the group identity should lead to both salience and eventual identification with the group.

Yet, Elstak’s (2008) study also found that while identity attractiveness contributed to organisational identification, agreement with the official identity as promoted by managers via corporate communications was of greater influence. This, the author suggests, is reflective of the way in which employees rally to protect the identity during times of change. This is broadly in line with research that has established a positive correlation between the communication climate – that is, the satisfaction with, participation in and reliability of information related to the climate (Dennis, 1974) – and member identification at the subgroup and aggregate level of the firm pre and post change (Smidts, Van Riel and Pruyn, 2001; Bartels et al., 2006).

Within the context of communication, narrative and language are thus considered valuable corporate identity cues since they play a substantive role in making distinct the identity. Narratives help balance the need for identity continuity and change through the selective representation of occurrences in the life and future of the firm (Chreim, 2005) via which identification and group-compliant behaviour are promoted (Martin et al., 1983). In addition to providing a vehicle for distancing current notions of the organisation from those of the past (Anteby and Molnár, 2012; Chreim, 2005), Humphreys and Brown (2002) argue that dependent on the recipients and direction of the communication, narratives hold both conducive and hegemonic properties. This means that while some narratives provide a vital source of sensemaking that can determine the nature of employees’ identification with their organisations, managerial steering of the identification process may actually be perceived as an act of domination (Humphreys and Brown, 2002). Accordingly, the language used in narratives and wider communications becomes important not just in distinguishing the firm to fortify (or deplete) identification, but also to reflect ‘the strength of relationships between individuals and their social group.’ (Fiol, 2002, p.663).

It is worth underlining at this juncture, that cues of distinctiveness may be both positive and negative resulting in equally disparate outcomes. While cues such as rankings and media image serve as a source of sensemaking, a gauge of perceived threat (Elsbach and Kramer, 1996), willingness to undertake change (Martins, 2005) and alignment with organisational thought (Kjaergaard, Morsing and Ravasi, 2011), the organisational distinctiveness that they articulate may
also lead to disidentification. This is likely to occur when organisational members attempt to promote the positive while circumventing the negative distinctiveness (Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001) derived from externally derived portrayals of the firm for example. This again is consistent with social identity theory in which the drive for organisational members to seek favourable appraisal of their group or organisation through comparison is central. Positive appraisals, gained through distinctiveness for example, not only enhance the self-concept (Hogg and Terry, 2001), but encourage members to work towards a positive social (i.e., corporate) identity (Turner and Haslam, 2001). This in turn increases personal and group self-esteem (Oakes and Turner, 1980). Because such comparisons yield positive and negative discrepancies (Tajfel and Turner, 1979), the sense of disconnect between the individual and organisational values that fuel disidentification (Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001) is not an unusual outcome in this context.

From the discussion thus far, it may be inferred that corporate identity cues of distinctiveness represent some of the more controllable – i.e., management, marketing and organisational (Van Riel, 1995; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997) – aspects of communications described by Melewar (2003), but moreover serve to outline the potential image-building, reputation-enhancing and competitive benefits that may be derived from the corporate identity as a result (Melewar et al., 2005).

As noted in the previous section, many of the culture-based cues that underpin the enduring, or continuous, attributes of the firm also reflect that which is most distinctive about the firm. In addition to the influence that cues to the nostalgic and temporal attributes of the firm may have on organisational identification (Brown and Humphreys, 2002; Rousseau, 1998), other cues such as culture in its broader more abstract sense (Fiol, 1991; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002; Melewar, 2003) along with the unpredictable, adaptable and cognitive features that it provides (Kjærgaard, 2009) affect member behaviours. This is logical since the culture of the organisation determines firstly how the physical cues to the corporate identity are registered; secondly, how they are understood (Hatch and Schultz, 1997); and finally, how they are enacted (Weick, 1995). Indeed, where unpredictability and loose organisational procedures may be seen as a guide to behaviour during strategy making (Kjærgaard, 2009), emphasising the link between behaviour and beliefs about the organisation’s identity, allows its culture to draw together all attributes of the firm (Fiol, 1991). This suggests that culture and behaviour may be particularly resonant as distinctive corporate identity cues.

In contrast to the abstract nature of culture, organisational artefacts and symbols provide employees with tangible means of understanding their organisations (Hatch and Schultz, 1997). As ‘visual cues’ (Melewar and Karaosmanoglu, 2006, p.852), the company name, slogan, symbols,
typography, colour use and edifices are as integral to the corporate design or visual identity and thus the corporate identity (Dowling, 1994; Melewar and Saunders, 1998; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002), as they are to making salient the organisation to its audiences. As such, these cues, as part of what symbolises the organisation, help to prompt and instil shared beliefs about the organisation’s identity (Harquail, 2006).

The symbolism used to distinguish organisations, is not only transmitted via what might be termed material effects such as those noted previously, but also through interpersonal involvement with the sales force for example (Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000). Here, it is not just the sales force per se, but the knowledge, integrity and provision of meaningful data that these individuals hold that contribute to their overall salience as a corporate image-supporting cue (Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000). Similarly, in symbolising the firm, top management also act as a cue by helping propagate what is distinctive about the organisation and providing vital impulses to the sensemaking efforts of those within and outside of the firm (Ravasi and Philips, 2011). The manner in which management and staff interrelate with each other and engage with external parties is therefore an important and distinctive reflection of behaviour-related cues (Fill, 2005) since they represent the ‘moment of truth’, where the identity is exposed to the outside world (Stuart, 1998, p.357).

From an internal perspective, this has understandably led researchers to focus on the consistent implementation of such symbols. It is thought that this not only increases the clarity of the corporate identity, but moreover reduces uncertainty (Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000) and accentuates the role of the employee (Simoës et al., 2005). A number of studies have consequently examined corporate identity from the various perspectives and subgroups comprising the organisation. Pratt and Rafaeli’s (1997) research into the symbolic meaning attached to organisational dress in organisations for instance provides a unique insight into the effects of cues at the subgroup level of the firm. In this study, uniform was seen as an expression of the various values, perceptions and social identities held by staff with different shifts and roles as members of the same organisation. While these authors use this finding to challenge the notion of a monolithic identity in which a single agreed philosophy is believed to represent the entire organisation, Dimopoulou and Fill (2000) contend that such variation in the values expressed is likely to occur as a result of exposure to the cues since organisational subgroups are unlikely to sense and interact with cues at the same time. This leads to the creation of images of the firm that are ‘inherently multidimensional’ and thus unequal in their significance (Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000, p.9).

As discussed in section 2.2.3 which addressed Sensemaking Theory, some studies have illustrated how conflict and location as cues also permeate subgroup level understandings of the distinctive
and symbolic aspects of organisations. In Glynn’s (2000) study of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra dispute the alternative viewpoints of managerial and performing staff significantly impacted beliefs about the orchestra’s identity, providing in part justification for the eventual strike. Brown and Humphreys’ (2006) study of managerial and non-managerial staff’s conflicting views of a College’s location highlighted similarly problematic concerns between these groups in agreeing the symbolic aspects of the College’s identity. It has been suggested that icons as neutral cues or proxies for the corporate identity, can help resolve issues stemming from subgroup-level beliefs such as those described previously by clarifying, simplifying and enhancing meaning (Harquail, 2006). This, according to Harquail ensures that ‘organizational members [are reminded] of what collectively defines the organization’, that organisational identity salience is lifted, and that the personal identification of members secured (2006, p.5).

More recent studies have proposed that irrespective of level, the material aspects of identity distinctiveness can also be triggered by the consistent implementation of literary visual cues. While the use of logos, specific text styles and colour augment the registration of group membership, the application of personalised tones positively influence feelings of group belonging indicating that awareness and sentiment around group membership are triggered by notably different cues (Tanis and Beukeboom, 2011). Although such cues undoubtedly ‘prime the organizational identity’ (Tanis and Beukeboom, 2011 p.786), these findings support the contentions of Gioia et al. (2013) that what is deemed distinctive is a matter of personal [and primarily organisational insider] opinion.

Summary

In appraising corporate identity cues from the perspective of the CED attributes of the organisation and the communication, behavioural, symbolic and cultural manifestations on the one hand while in parallel considering the corporate and specifically the member organisational associations on the other, this section of the literature review has attempted to articulate the manifold ways in which corporate identity cues have been addressed in the literature. In so doing, this appraisal has also attempted to illustrate the interpretations and effects of the corporate identity through its cues. In line with the aims of the overall study, the following section of this chapter examines specifically the effects of corporate identity and corporate identity cues, on organisational identification and the subsequent influence this has on employee role behaviours.

2.5 Organisational identification

Setting aside the criticisms outlined in section 2.2.2, social identity theory remains a feature in studies of corporate identity and organisational identification (see table 2.1). In these studies, it is the organisation that becomes the social identity making organisational identification a very
specific form of social identification that is characterised by or defined as the individual’s ‘perception of oneness with or belonging to’ the organisation (Ashforth and Mael, 1989, p.34). Dutton et al. (1994, p.242) define organisational identification as a particular psychological bond that results from organisational members taking on the specific attributes of their organisation as their own; it is, to quote these researchers interpretation of Ashforth and Mael’s (1989) work, ‘a process of self-categorization.’

In line with theory, the individual’s self-concept is influenced by the manner in which the group, i.e., the departments, functions or other units comprising the firm (Hogg and Terry, 2000), is appraised (Ashforth and Mael, 1989) and the self-enhancement that this appraisal brings (Hogg and Terry, 2001). The need to preserve the enhanced self, and maintain positive self-concept, promotes individuals’ drive to make sense of their environments (Dutton and Dukerich, 1991; Weick, 1995, p20-23). In so doing, those attributes sensed as attractive (i.e., favourably evaluated) particularly by others, contribute to lifting the salience of the organisation (Hogg and Terry, 2001). When coupled with a salient organisation, the ease with which membership is drawn on further enriches members’ self-concepts resulting in an intensified sense of oneness and identification with the organisation (Scott and Lane, 2000). In short, the saliency of the organisation drives identification with the organisation (Pratt, 1998).

As noted in section 2.2.1, individuals may hold several social identities at any given time. Thus it is not unusual in some organisational contexts such as hospitals and schools for example, that the professional identity may exist alongside an individual’s identification with their organisation. Unlike organisational identification however, the professional identification is bound to expertise, aptitude and customs specific to the profession itself (Schein, 1978) and thus is reflective of the degree to which individuals define themselves in terms of the work they carry out (Mael and Ashforth, 1992). Hekman et al. (2009) posit that the coexistence of organisational identification and professional identification may in turn lead to conflict between the two. These authors suggest that both organisational identification and professional identification should be taken into account in studies where reciprocity is considered. While the professional identification provides a valuable perspective, the focus of this study is not on the examining the psychological between the individual and their profession as this would detract substantially from the main aim of the study as outlined earlier. Rather, the emphasis here is on the psychological bond between employee and employer and the effects this exerts on role behaviour. However, given the views expressed by Hekman et al. (2009), profession is considered as a control variable (see Chapter 3) in the present study.
Saliency

Through both corporate identity and social identity theory, the manner in which organisational members become identified with their firms has been a source of more focused articulation (Pratt, 1998). As outlined previously, self-categorisation is an essential part of the identification process within which individuals are alerted to their organisational membership(s) through various identity and image-related cues (Lam, Liu and Loi, 2016) coupled to the organisation (Haslam, Powell and Turner, 2000). These cues make salient the organisation to its members and, in parallel, fuel the sense of an overlay between the individual and the group identity (Scott and Lane, 2000; Lam, et al., 2016). Organisational identification is therefore typified in the use of company-specific attributes in describing one’s self concept (Dutton et al., 1994) which in turn increase the levels of identification (Elstak, 2008). It is for this reason that organisational identification is often articulated as a psychological bond (Dutton et al., 1994). Rousseau (1998, p.218) describes this process as the formation of an ‘us’ between employee and employer which results in identification either being ‘situated’ (i.e., specific to a discrete objective or context) or, over time, part of a ‘deep structure’ embedded in roles and contexts that lead to full organisational identification.

The corporate identity literature suggests that the cues active during the process of identification are typically reflective of those facets of the organisation that members collectively perceive as central, enduring and distinctive (Albert and Whetten, 1985; Scott and Lane, 2000), and which furthermore reveal the organisation’s identity via its communications, behaviours and symbolism (Birkigt and Stadler, 1986; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997). However, these [corporate identity] cues may also transmit the contributory efforts of members such as managers in meeting greater organisational objectives (Rousseau, 1998). Consequently, a range of corporate identity cues from the mission, vision and values (Foreman and Whetten, 2002; Glynn, 2000; Pratt and Foreman, 2000), to the history (Gioia and Thomas, 1996) communications (Antebay and Molnár, 2012), image (Dutton et al., 1994; Simões et al., 2005) and culture (Olins, 1978; Ravasi and Schultz, 2006; Hatch et al., 2015) of the firm have variously been deployed in bringing saliency to the corporate identity.

Given the substance of these corporate identity cues, studies have revealed a clear link between corporate identity and organisational identification (Dutton et al., 1994; Balmer and Stotvig, 1997; Bartel, 2001; Dukerich, Golden, Shortell, 2002; Cole and Bruch, 2006). Interest in this link, or relationship, has not only increased as a result, but also focused on the processes and consequences of these constructs (Cornelissen, Haslam, Balmer, 2007). In their qualitative study of corporate identity formation within a private bank for instance, Balmer and Stotvig (1997) found that organisational identification was not only part of the bank’s identity, but also embedded in its history. Quantitative research conducted by Dukerich, Golden, Shortell (2002) furthermore showed
that the organisational identification of medical physicians was driven by the attractiveness of their respective organisations’ identity as well as the image these physicians felt external parties held of their organisations (i.e., the construed external image).

This apparently strong link between corporate identity and organisational identification has led some researchers to define organisational identification as a specific outcome of corporate identity (He and Balmer 2007) and to train attention on its behavioural outcomes that characterise ‘actions which are relevant for the group,’ (Van Dick, 2001, p.270).

The results of these studies demonstrate that consistent with sensemaking theory, members’ psychological bonds with the firm are triggered with each occurrence, or cue, that prompts a recall of their organisational membership (Scott and Lane, 2000). Since management is often charged with communicating the firm’s strategic and vision-related actions (Melewar et al., 2005), this group more than any other is particularly predisposed to activating organisational identification through the management of the firm’s impressions (Scott and Lane, 2000) and by extension, its cues. Such actions may be considered beneficial since an [upward] adjustment in levels of organisational identification focuses employees on the subsistence of the firm, instilling in them a sense of collective fate that causes a rise in cooperative behaviours (Dutton and Dukerich, 1991).

**The effects of organisational identification**

It has been suggested that organisational identification strength influences the perceptions and behaviours of employees (Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail, 1994). This is critical to both the cohesion of virtual organisations (Wiesenfeld, Raghuram and Garud, 1999) as well as, organisational groups, the pursuit of group values and uniformity in group behaviours (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). Research has also shown that encouraging members’ sense of belonging or identification with their organisations promotes organisation-supporting actions (Mael and Ashforth, 1992; Riketta, 2005; Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006). Indeed front-line or client-facing employees who identify strongly with their organisations, are more inclined to perform extra-role behaviours above and beyond formal job requirements to aid their colleagues and clients (Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016). This suggests that certain employees may exhibit some degree of commitment to the firm.

It is understandable then that debate has ensued around what may be perceived as similarities between organisational identification and organisational commitment; that is to say, ‘the attitude towards the organization.’ (Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006, p.573). This has been exacerbated by the fact that both distinctions (Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006) and correlations (Gautam et al., 2004; Riketta and Van Dick, 2005) have been established between the two constructs. As stated so far, organisational identification is psychological in nature since it is anchored in the
perceived alignment between the individual self-concept and that of the group and is manifested in a sense of ‘belongingness’ (Mael and Ashforth, 1992, p.104). It is thus reflective of the self-definition of the individual (Ashforth and Mael, 1989).

The commitment between employee and employer by comparison, is considered attitudinal (Gautam et al., 2004) given that it is expressed through a readiness to assume and comply with organisational directions and mores (Pratt, 1998). Since the focus of the present study is on the effects of the psychological bond as opposed to the degree to which employees are prepared to adhere to or pursue the organisation’s strategy, organisational commitment was not considered beneficial to meeting the study’s aim and consequently was not included in the eventual theoretical model used in this study.

The relationship between organisational identification and extra-role behaviours – i.e., discretionary actions that exceed the specifics of the role (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997) and benefit the organisation (Organ, 1988) – nevertheless has been confirmed by several researchers including Van Knippenberg (2000); Riketta (2005); and Kane, Magnusen and Perrewé (2012). Indeed, it has been posited that measures of organisational identification are useful in explaining and partly forecasting work behaviours (Riketta, 2005). While Van Knippenberg’s (2000, p.365) study found that ‘High identifiers’ invested additional effort in tasks irrespective of their colleagues’ efforts, Riketta (2005) suggests that these high levels of extra-role effort might also be explained by the precision in the measurement items used in the organisational identification construct. It is also thought that social identity theory provides a more robust context for understanding the relationship between organisational identification and extra-role behaviours since the self-concepts of high identifiers are likely to be embedded in the accomplishment of the group rather than the specifics of a job description (Kane, Magnusen and Perrewé, 2012).

Despite its encouraging effects on extra-role behaviour (Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016), organisational identification may also constrict employee action (Pratt and Foreman, 2000; Dutton and Dukerich, 1991; Fiol, 2001). For instance, the correlations found between organisational identification and in-role behaviours – i.e. the behaviours that are formally prescribed, expected, assessed and compensated for (Dyne, Graham and Dienesch, 1994; Bettencourt and Brown, 1997; Crant, 2000) – indicate that organisational identification may indeed be a motivator (Riketta and Van Dick, 2005) as well as a predictor of in-role behaviour (Riketta, 2005). Research indicates nevertheless that highly identified employees deliver increased levels of work quality and performance via extra-role and in-role behaviours (Carmeli, Gilat and Waldman, 2007).
Based on these assertions it is hypothesised that:

\[ H_2 \text{ The higher the levels of organisational identification (OID), the higher the extra-role behaviour (ERB)} \]

\[ H_3 \text{ Organisational identification (OID) will have a significant positive effect on in-role behaviour (IRB)} \]

2.6 In-role and extra-role behaviour in organisations

Collectively, in-role and extra-role behaviours have been defined as employee actions that are generally of a positive and supportive nature that are exhibited within, towards and for the organisation (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; Organ, 1988; Bettencourt and Brown, 1997). In the context of social identity theory, this renders such behaviours conducive to fuelling the individual’s ‘perception of belongingness’ (Mael and Ashforth, 1992, p.104) to the organisation as well as the extra-role behaviours carried out as a result of feeling identified with the organisation (Kane, Magnusen and Perrewé, 2012). These behaviours often take the form of voluntary efforts towards colleagues and within the organisation in general that extend beyond the standard expectations of the job-role (Van Knippenberg, 2000; Riketta, 2005; Kane, Magnusen and Perrewé, 2012; Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016).

As noted previously, such behaviours are crucial because they can influence the overall success of the firm (Pratt, 1998; Carmeli, Gilat, Waldman, 2007). The service-profit chain literature (Heskett et al., 2008) contends for example that the manner in which employees interact with and support each other within organisations (back-office, or non client-facing actions) influences indirectly employee productivity through employee satisfaction. This, according to Heskett et al (2008), can translate into external service results, satisfaction and loyalty for customers all of which subsequently drive firm performance.

Given the collective definition of these behaviours, discerning the differences between in-role and extra-role behaviour has been a subject of much debate. For example, while it has been argued that in-role and extra-role behaviours are routinely acknowledged and differentiated at the level of employees and direct line supervisors (Williams and Anderson, 1991; Van Dyne and LePine, 1998), recent studies have contested that the line of demarcation between organisationally pre-defined (i.e., in-role or role-prescribed) and positive, voluntary (i.e., extra-role) behaviours may become blurred in situations where roles stretch beyond the boundaries of the firm (Bettencourt and Brown, 2003).
While these two perspectives represent parallel developments in thinking around role-behaviours, as will be outlined shortly, the source and essence of these behaviours may be traced back to three core areas first defined by Katz (1964) as central to the successful operation the organisation. Here, the full functioning of an organisation is contingent upon the drive within the employee to join and stay with the organisation; to conduct work reliably; and, without prompting, to contribute inventively towards the organisation in a way that extends above and beyond the stated remit (Katz, 1964; Van Dick et al., 2006). Research has since examined closely the latter component of Katz’s concept partly under the banner of citizenship behaviour and as a manifestation of extra-role behaviour (Van Dick et al., 2006). Notions of what constitutes this extra role behaviour, and indeed in-role behaviour, have further and largely been explored from two viewpoints; the organisation-internal, and the boundary spanning within which internal and external organisational perspectives are encompassed. The in-role/extra-role demarcation debate, broadly speaking is anchored in these two perspectives. These perspectives are outlined in the following sections.

2.6.1 Organisational citizenship behaviour

The organisational-internal perspective, referred to as organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), specifically concerns actions that are voluntary and which surpass the, expected or remunerated bounds of the job role; that is to say, they are representative of ‘individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization.’ (Organ, 1988, p.4). As such, OCBs have been acknowledged as directly descended from Katz’s (1964) third component (Van Dick et al., 2006) and thus illustrative of extra-role behaviour (Organ, 1988; Kane, Magnusen and Perrewé, 2012). It should be noted nonetheless that later reviews of OCB also recognised the bearing of in-role behaviours on OCB (Organ, 1997).

Contrastingly, OCB has been recognised as one specific type of extra-role behaviour (MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Ahearne, 1998) that is not only seen as positive and of considerable value to management (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998), but also a direct consequence of organisational identification with varying focii (Kane, Magnusen, Perrewé, 2012). Extra-role behaviour on the other hand has variously been defined as prosocial behaviour (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986), organisational spontaneity, spontaneous behaviour (George, 1991; George and Jones, 1997), contextual behaviour, performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993) and OCB; the latter having enjoyed comparatively wider attention (MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Ahearne, 1998) with many studies relying on the generic scales that have been produced as a result (Bell and Menguc, 2002).
2.6.2 Prosocial organisational behaviour

The internal-external organisational perspective by contrast, captures the beneficial actions of organisational members targeted at others such as the groups and organisations with whom they hold regular contact, i.e., the prosocial organisational behaviours (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986). Although prosocial organisational behaviour has also been described as voluntary, non-rewardable actions of a helpful nature to individuals and groups (Eisenberg and Fabes, 1991), this definition is only partially fitting. This is because as with OCBs, prosocial organisational behaviours incorporate the extra-role behavioural dimension characterised by discretionary, cooperative and positively beneficial acts towards the firm (Lee, 2001). Unlike OCBs, however these prosocial organisational behaviours also take into account the dysfunctional aspects of extra-role behaviour that may endanger the organisation, as well as the pre-specified, or role-prescribed behaviours that demarcate the minimum standard requirements of the role (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) and which constitute ‘the glue which holds collective endeavors together’ (Organ, 1977, p.50).

These two facets though not fully reflected in Lee’s (2001) definition, are of the utmost significance since together with the target of the behaviours (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) they help distinguish in-role from extra-role behaviours. One further differentiating factor is that in-role behaviours form the foundations for continued performance within the specified role (Katz, 1964) and moreover may be subject to disciplinary measures should the level of performance not be met (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998). Such behaviours, as Puffer (1987), and Brief and Motowidlo (1986) assert, are simply expected on the basis of the standards, agreements and role descriptions within the firm. Furthermore, the targets of the behaviour, [dys]functionality component, and in-role and extra-role facets are themselves representative of three distinct types of prosocial behaviour (Eren et al., 2014).

In addition to in-role and extra-role behaviours, prosocial organisational behaviour also addresses specifically the helpful interaction between employees in the form of cooperation (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; Bettencourt and Brown, 1997). Although the organisation-focused in-role and extra-role behaviours outlined earlier in this chapter are almost always functional, those directed towards organisational members may also be dysfunctional (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986). Thus, this dimension speaks specifically to the nature (i.e., operational, personal, emotional) of the aid given (Eren et al., 2014) which Bettencourt and Brown (1997) suggest may be considered extra-role behaviour in the service context.
2.6.3 Prosocial service behaviour

As an extension to the internal-external perspective, in-role and extra-role behaviours have also been examined in the literature through the interactive role of individuals and organisations in service contexts. Defined as ‘helpful behaviors of employees directed towards the organization or other individuals’, prosocial service behaviour (PSB) differs from OCB and prosocial organisational behaviour in that it may be directed towards colleagues as well as customers or clients (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997, p.41). Whereas in-role behaviours are attached to the specifics of the job, evaluations of performance as well as prescriptions and directives for dealing with clients for example, extra-role behaviours may further be expressed through spontaneous initiatives that extend beyond what is expected (Schepers et al., 2012). Conceptually, there is marginal difference between the in-role and extra-role behaviours expressed through PSB and those of prosocial organisational behaviour. The broadly accepted measures of PSB however draw heavily on the theoretical individualisms of in-role and extra-role behaviour outlined by Organ (1988) to conceptualise the client-side dimension (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997).

Research shows that these in-role and extra-role behaviours are influenced directly by management strategy (Ackfeldt and Wong, 2006) and indirectly via internal communications (Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016). This is highly significant given the role of management in embodying and signalling the identity and strategy of the firm, in encouraging identification amongst employees (Scott and Lane, 2000; Ravasi and Philips, 2011) as well as the performance outcomes derived from identification (Carmeli, Gilat and Waldman’s (2007). For instance, in one study conducted amongst 241 staff across 16 hotels in Turkey, extra-role behaviour was found to deliver increased customer satisfaction (Eren et al., 2014), while in a separate study, it was also found to positively endorse service quality (Tsaur et al., 2014). In addition to substantiating the claimed relationship between prosocial organisational behaviour and organisational effectiveness (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; George and Bettenhausen, 1990), these results also highlight the immense value posited to be delivered to service organisations as a result of these behaviours (Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016).

Given the nature of the case organisation from which data was gathered – i.e., engineering consulting professional services – the PSB definition of in-role and extra-role behaviour described here was adopted for the present study.
2.7 Summary of findings

In this chapter, the theoretical foundations of corporate identity and organisational identification have been presented. In so doing, a context for understanding corporate identity from the interdisciplinary perspective, and in particular, the corporate identity cues which support it has been established. This foundation has also provided a useful framework for understanding the relationship between corporate identity cues and organisational identification, and separately, between organisational identification and role behaviours.

This chapter has illustrated that consistent with social identity theory, corporate identity broadly demarcates the attributes that help define it as a legitimate social identity to its members. Furthermore, it has outlined that it is the favourable evaluation of the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of the firm which when jointly held by in-group or organisational members, comprise and help strengthen the corporate identity in the minds of its members (Albert and Whetten, 1985).

The studies reviewed also suggest that the communicative, behavioural and symbolic cues generated by the organisation to help make salient and recognisable its corporate identity (Birkigt and Stadler, 1986; Marwick and Fill, 1997; Fill, 2005) can form part of the many experiences and memories that comprise the so-called corporate associations that individuals store in memory about organisations, as well as the member organisational associations that employees hold about their employing organisation (Brown et al., 2006). Those member organisational associations that align with the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of the firm as transmitted through its corporate identity cues, are understood to create organisationally-linked but individually-important representations of the firm for its members (Brown et al., 2006). Such corporate identity cues may thus be considered particularly active member organisational associations that differentiate and embody the company, and in so doing, aid its recognition (Abratt, 1989).

The literature further points to a number of corporate identity cues active within organisations ranging from the mission and values of the firm, to the behaviour, culture and image transmitted, many of which have been demonstrably linked to driving up the salience of the firm and its corporate identity. Indeed, research indicates that in addition to being a corporate identity cue, the culture of the firm is also the source and stimulant of other cues, particularly during times of change. These cues may be transmitted (intentionally or otherwise) from or to the various levels and subgroups that comprise the firm. Because social identity theory posits that individuals allocate themselves and others into discrete groups (i.e., departments, teams, etc), this process of self-categorisation not only leads to comparisons between groups in an effort to validate their unique
qualities and stature (Turner and Haslam, 2001), but additionally may alter the effects of these corporate identity cues on the groups themselves. It may thus be inferred from the literature that the effects of corporate identity cues differ along the dimensions of change and location in the firm.

From the literature it may also be discerned that some corporate identity cues are active in influencing the psychological bond between employee and employer. Indeed, for this bond of organisational identification to take effect, the corporate identity must first be perceived as salient by organisational members (Pratt, 1998; Hogg and Terry, 2001). Sensemaking theory provides an alternative lens through which to appraise this process and its outcomes since it posits that the extraction and cognitive processing of cues from the immediate [working] environment enables organisational members to make sense of their situations and adjust their role-based actions accordingly (Weick, 1995; Weber and Glynn, 2006). This suggests that employees may additionally be able to leverage such corporate identity cues from their member organisational associations (Brown et al., 2006). Triggered by these corporate identity cues, organisational identification, further delineates those actions considered to be aligned with the group (Hogg and Reid, 2006).

Understandably, organisational identification is viewed as a valuable quantity in organisations since it has been proven to promote organisation-supporting actions (Dukerich, Golden, Shortell, 2002; Riketta, 2005; Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006) such as extra-role (Van Knippenberg, 2000; Riketta, 2005; Kane, Magnusen and Perrewé, 2012) and in-role behaviours (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997). Beyond generally influencing the success of the firm (Pratt, 1998; Carmeli, Gilat, Waldman, 2007), the literature shows that the extra-role behaviours specifically related to prosocial service behaviour drive satisfaction (Eren et al., 2014) and positively endorse service quality (Tsaur et al., 2014).

2.7.1 The research gap

Based on the review of the literature, it is clear that corporate identity cues play a vital and strategic role in organisations given that they directly affect the psychological bond of organisational identification that leads to the behavioural and eventual performance outcomes outlined prior. However, there appear to be some gaps in the literature suggesting that current understandings of the relationship between corporate identity (via its attendant corporate identity cues) and organisational identification may be incomplete. These gaps concern:

1. the need to understand employees’ interpretations of and reactions to the corporate identity and its attendant cues
2. the nature of the relationship between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviour and more specifically,
3. the lack of clarity around which and how corporate identity cues affect organisational identification and its subsequent effects on role behaviours and,
4. the limited insights into the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and role behaviours across the firm and during change.

Many of the studies noted here and presented earlier in which corporate identity cues are present reflect what Dacin and Brown (2002, p.254) term ‘one half of the story’. In other words, they put forward a perspective that emphasises the points that organisations would like to endorse among their stakeholders. Considering how employees understand and react to the corporate identity represents the remaining half of the story and is fundamental to the substance of corporate and member organisational associations. While the presence of the corporate identity is implicit in studies of corporate associations, the ‘other half of the story’ (Dacin and Brown, 2002, p.254) is often left untold in the corporate identity literature. This means that while the interpretations, reactions and resultant outcomes of corporate identity such as organisational identification for example are well documented in the corporate identity literature, those based on the corporate identity cues stored alongside the mental associations that employees have with their organisations have not necessarily been given the same degree of attention. In examining the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and role behaviours, these member organisational associations may yield potentially new and unique insights particularly where these cues take effect at the psychological and behavioural level.

Considering the effects of corporate identity cues as described previously, whether drawn from member organisational associations or not, inevitably leads to acknowledging the presence of relationships beyond those already established in the literature between corporate identity and organisational identification, and separately, between organisational identification and role behaviour. One such relationship posited to exist in this study, is that between the corporate identity cues that represent the corporate identity, organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviour. Despite advances made in the field, studies exploring the relationship between these three constructs remain scarce. Indeed, the only study to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, to have investigated quantitatively this relationship, focused on a single corporate identity cue (perceived organisational support) and exclusively on extra-role behaviour as an outcome (see Lam et al., 2016).
The study from Lam et al., is encouraging however because it makes more plausible the theoretical link between all three constructs and invites much-needed investigation especially in light of the influence of extra-role behaviour on organisational performance. The fact that this study only incorporates a single corporate identity cue however leads to consideration of a further gap in the literature.

Although this review, including the studies noted in table 2.1, points to a range of different corporate identity cues active within organisations from organisational dress (Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997) to text colour and style (Tanis and Beukeboom, 2011), some of which have been related to organisational identification, many studies have tended to focus on a single corporate identity cue (for example, the sales force as in Dimopoulou and Fill’s 2000 study) or, at the more abstract level, the different types of corporate identity (i.e., perceived, construed) as in Elstak’s (2007) work. Other studies still, have adopted the sub-constructs of corporate identity to investigate corporate identity concerns and developments within franchise (Melewar and Storrie, 2001) and banking contexts (Melewar and Bains, 2002). Here, although the sub-constructs are not treated as corporate identity cues specifically, there is evidence to suggest that such cues were not only present to varying degrees within these environments, but that they had some influence on the organisational outcomes and member actions. Thus, while research has yielded several possible corporate identity cues, many of which may be unique to and active within individual organisations, it is not entirely clear from current studies, which of the various corporate identity cues actually affect employees’ identification with and their subsequent behaviours within and toward the firm.

Somewhat related to this point is the need to understand whether the potential effects remain constant across the firm and/or under various conditions. The literature so far suggests that interpretations of the corporate identity differ between some subgroups, such as managerial and non-managerial employees, that comprise the firm as evidenced in studies by Glynn (2000) and Brown and Humphreys (2006). There is also ample research pointing to the fact that environmental change directly influences the continuity of the corporate identity (Gioia, Schultz and Corley, 2000) such that references to the firm’s history by raising the sense of nostalgia, give saliency to the organisation’s philosophy during such times and a sense of stability to its employees (Brown and Humphreys, 2002). While Ravasi and Schultz’s (2006) study of one organisation during environmental change additionally demonstrated the power of the firm’s culture in altering its claims, short term situational cues can fuel temporary organisational identification. Collectively, these assertions indicate firstly that different corporate identity cues are likely to affect different subgroups in diverse ways; and secondly, the use and effects of corporate identity cues are likely to alter under conditions of change.
Understanding the [combination of] corporate identity cues that are most or least effective under the circumstances outlined here could prove invaluable to organisations with disparate subgroups as well as those contending with environmental and strategic change where alignment around the organisational direction is essential.

To the best of this researcher’s knowledge, no studies to date have examined in this way the effects of corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations on employees’ identification with and subsequent behaviours exhibited within and towards the organisation. It is precisely these gaps in the research as detailed previously that the present study aims to address.

2.7.2 The conceptual model

Based on the aim and objectives of the study as presented in Chapter 1 and the Literature Review presented in the current chapter, the following conceptual model (figure 2.2), incorporating the hypotheses outlined earlier in this chapter, was developed. This conceptual model was subsequently adopted in the present study to examine the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification, and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours. The following chapter focuses on the philosophical underpinnings and methodology deployed in fulfilling the study’s aim and objectives.

Figure 2.2 The conceptual model and hypotheses
2.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, the theoretical underpinnings of the study and indeed much of the literature in the field of corporate identity were outlined. Additionally, the various schools of thought on corporate identity, including the interdisciplinary perspective to which this study subscribes, were presented as a conduit to understanding the role of corporate identity cues. The chapter subsequently presented an overview of corporate identity cues in organisational and theoretical contexts and introduced the notions of corporate associations and member organisational associations and their role in corporate identity as well as in organisational identification. From this, three hypotheses were defined. Organisational identification was then described and its effects on actions and behaviours discussed. This was followed by a review of the in-role and extra-role behaviours in the context of organisational citizenship behaviours, prosocial organisational behaviours and prosocial service behaviours. Finally, a summary of the key findings from the literature review was put forward in which the research gaps and conceptual model reflecting the attendant hypotheses were presented.
Chapter 3  Methodology

3.1  Introduction
In this chapter, the philosophical assumptions and corresponding methodologies applied in meeting the aim and objectives of the study are presented. The chapter opens with a brief outline in section 3.2 of the context within which the methodology was selected. The philosophical underpinnings and paradigms associated with social research and adopted in the present study are then introduced in section 3.2. The research context, i.e. the case organisation and its operational environment, is then outlined in section 3.4 and is followed by a description of the research approach (section 3.5) and the mixed methods research methodology applied in the study (section 3.6). An overview of the considerations made with regard to overall research design is then presented in section 3.7. The strategy, design and analyses selected for the qualitative study (Phase I) are then put forward and the framework utilised in eliciting the member organisational associations from a selection of the case organisation’s employees as well as the case organisation’s corporate identity and corporate identity cues is described (section 3.8). The chapter then turns to a discussion in section 3.9 of the quantitative study conducted in Phase II of the research and the methods and procedures used to examine empirically the effects of the corporate identity cues. The latter sections of the chapter (sections 3.10 – 3.18) focus on analysis using structural equation modelling (SEM) with an emphasis on partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) as the method of analysis selected for the present study. The chapter then concludes with a statement on the research quality and specific ethical considerations of the research (section 3.19), and a summary of the key points of the chapter itself in section 3.20.

3.2  Context
As noted in Chapter 1, the main aim of this thesis is to build understanding around the range of corporate identity cues discerned from member organisational associations, and the effects that these cues have on employees’ organisational identification and its subsequent influence on role behaviours:

- at the aggregate level of the organisation
- at the subgroup level of the organisation amongst client-facing and non-client facing employees
- pre and post exposure to strategic change conditions (i.e., announcements)
In order to achieve this aim and address the research gaps introduced in section 1.2, the research aim is further supported by six objectives focused on:

1. eliciting member organisational associations from a cross-section of company employees
2. identifying the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (i.e., CED member organisational associations) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity
3. establishing whether additional patterns beyond those that are CED are present in the elicited member organisational associations that reflect how they may be perceived in the working environment context
4. determining the CED member organisational associations, along with their corresponding patterns, that are linked to the present environment; trigger sensemaking; and influence future action and attention. In short, the identification of those associations that also act as cues to the corporate identity
5. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the aggregate level of the firm and,
6. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the subgroup level of the firm across:
   a. Client-facing (Front-Office) and non client-facing (Back-Office) employees
   b. Employees prior to and post exposure to strategic change announcements.

In order to address the stated aim and objectives, research was conducted at the aggregate and subgroup level in a single international organisation, and drew on insights gathered from the organisation’s employees. As stakeholders (Jones, 1995) in the firm, employees – along with other groups – hold ‘expectations of gain from the organization’s successful operation.’(Scott and Lane, 2000, p.44). Unlike other stakeholder groups however, these organisational members simultaneously represent their respective organisations and have a unique vantage point from which to appraise them. Brown et al. (2006) argue that it is these points in particular that set organisational members apart from other stakeholder groups and thus warrant more isolated attention in studies such as that presented here. This in turn has implications for the philosophical stance and the methodology adopted in the study.

Against this backdrop, the choice of methodology is clearly integral to the research presented here since gaining access to employees’ perspectives, and more specifically their member organisational
associations, is essential for revealing and understanding the effects of corporate identity cues and cue types within the case organisation. Accordingly, understanding the research paradigm in which the methodology has been anchored, and indeed upon which the study is predicated, is essential. It is to a discussion of the philosophical underpinnings and research paradigms that this chapter now turns.

3.3 Philosophical underpinnings and research paradigms

The philosophical considerations of any study are anchored in the choice of research paradigm. These paradigms outline the manner in which socially-focused occurrences are investigated, subsequently giving rise to how they are understood and explicated (Saunders et al., 2012). Thus, philosophies about what constitutes reality (ontology); is recognised as knowledge by the researcher (epistemology); and what the researcher considers the role of values to be (axiology), all contribute to defining the research paradigm itself. This in turn has implications for the research method(s) selected (Lee and Lings, 2008) and research approach applied. It also implies that philosophical views and research paradigms are equally important in determining the overall design of the research itself (Crotty, 1998; Creswell, 2003).

In the paragraphs that follow, ontology, epistemology and axiology are briefly explored and the research itself anchored to the appropriate philosophical stance. The section then closes with a discussion on research paradigms including the paradigm within which this study has been set.

3.3.1 Ontology

Objectivism and subjectivism are two facets of ontology that can be used to describe the nature of reality. Saunders et al. (2012) offer a helpful clarification of these two perspectives.

Objectivism

Here for example, the focus of the objectivist perspective is ostensibly on the independence of the firm from social-actor stimuli. Thus emphasis is placed on the nature of the organisation, its management, the operation-supporting structures and the broad acceptance of commonality in the way organisations operate.

Subjectivism

The subjectivist focus by comparison assumes that organisational members’ connotations of their roles and actions takes precedence. This viewpoint is enhanced in the social-constructivist stance often adopted within subjectivism which argues that reality is constructed through the social contact and exchanges of individuals.
In the context of the identity of organisations, meaning is therefore considered subjective, socially constructed (Gioia, 1998) and accordingly defined as a mental image carried by organisational members (Dutton et al., 1994). Subjectivism, and in particular social-constructivism, thus provide a sound basis for understanding firstly how individual-level differences contribute to organisational existence (Saunders et al., 2012), and secondly the means by which employees make sense of and attach meaning to their organisations (Balmer, 2001).

As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, the main aim of the present study and the objectives by which it is reached are necessarily grounded in the perceptions of the case organisation’s corporate identity as elicited from the experiences and member organisational associations of its employees. Since these experiences and associations provide the source from which the case organisation’s corporate identity cues are derived, a key focus of the study’s aim, objectives 1-4 which comprise the qualitative phase (Phase I) of this study subscribe to the subjectivist ontology within which a social-constructivist stance is assumed.

3.3.2 Epistemology

Epistemologically, three distinct modes of belief can be divined in studies of organisational and business research – positivism, realism and interpretivism. Each mode is also manifested in the choice of research methodology and approach adopted.

**Positivism**

Positivism is typified in the application of natural science practices and quantitative methodologies (Bryman, 2012) such as surveys and structural equation modelling as a means of analysis. Primarily deductive in nature, positivism subscribes to the objectivist ontology that positions corporate identity as a reality that is independent of members’ cognitions, and which provides members with a shared environmental, sensemaking structure (Weick, 1995). Positivism is predicated on the actual observations of phenomena and seeks out ‘the causes…[that]…probably determine effects or outcomes.’ (Creswell, 2003, p.7). This gives rise to the application of hypothesis testing prevalent in some quantitative studies and thus the acceptance of reality being objective. Creswell’s use of the word ‘probably’ brings to light the difficulty in hosting causality within positivist epistemology. Indeed as Lee and Lings (2008) note, the practical impossibility of observing actual causation runs somewhat counter to the positivist belief that only that which can be observed may be considered to exist. This is particularly the case in research incorporating latent variables, for example. Positivism thus calls into question the ontological assumption of a controlled, structured world in which such observations occur (Blaikie, 1993).
Realism

Feigl’s (1950) notion of realism, or logical empiricism (Feigl, 1943), subscribes to the same positivist belief of an objective and measurable world and thus the use of similar quantitative practices, measures and methodologies. This ostensibly deductive approach to research as expounded by Blaikie (2010), described by both Saunders et al. (2012) and Bryman (2012) and discussed further in Section 3.5, is thus typical in studies adopting this philosophical belief. Realism nevertheless differs markedly from positivism in two distinct ways. Firstly, realism departs from the positivist concept of an object or occurrence’s existence being defined by its observability; it therefore acknowledges the existence of phenomena outside of that which can be immediately verified. Secondly, it accepts that observations of the world may contain inaccuracies (Lee and Lings, 2008).

These points of differentiation highlight to two streams of realism: direct realism which reasons that observations of the world are error-free such that what is absorbed sensorially is in fact correct; and critical realism as expounded by Saunders et al. (2012) which asserts that what is sensed are the feelings evoked by the object, item or occurrence under observation rather than the object, item or occurrence itself. A good example of the latter can be found in the distinction made by Cole and Bruch (2006) in their research into the effects of an organisation’s corporate identity, corporate identity strength and organisational commitment on turnover intention. These authors contend that it is the perception rather than the reality of the corporate identity that is measured when appraising corporate identity strength. In the same way, for the study presented here, it might reasonably be argued that what is perceived by organisational employees may not always be the case organisation’s corporate identity or its corporate identity cues as such. Rather, it is the effects or sensations transmitted by the cues – such as the psychological bond with the organisation for example – that represent the corporate identity. These contentions also point indirectly to the importance of taking measures of identity perceptions from multiple individuals when assessing an organisation’s corporate identity strength.

The subtle difference between these two strains of realism is important to the substance of research and perhaps more so to critical realist studies which incorporate the use of latent variables. In the context of this study for example, it can be argued that corporate identity cues while not always observable, remain real because of the subsequent actions they trigger and which, through engagement with the social actors involved, reveal how actions occur (see for example: Gioia et al., 2013; Ravasi and Canato, 2013). This not only makes critical realism an important philosophical perspective in the study of organisations and management (Fleetwood and Ackroyd, 2005), but makes it particularly conducive to exploring and extending theory through mixed methods. In
acknowledgment of these benefits, objectives 5 and 6 which support the quantitative phase (Phase II) of the study, and indeed the study overall, therefore adhere to the critical realist epistemology.

**Interpretivism**

Acknowledging and accommodating the disparity between individuals and things (Bryman, 2012) is critical to understanding the nature of interpretivism. Interpretivism is often viewed as the converse of positivism with the discernment of human conduct at its core (Bryman, 2012). Here the vital aspect is the understanding of variation between individuals (Guba and Lincoln, 1994) and how this is mediated through their perceptions (Scotland, 2012) either of social roles, or the meaning ascribed to them (Saunders et al., 2012). Indeed, a key tenet of interpretivism is also the role of the researcher in the world of the social actors being studied; a factor which Saunders et al. (2012) suggest is particularly apt for organisational research. This degree of researcher involvement is evident in the array of studies and theory-building approaches adopted by researchers in the corporate identity domain (see for example: Dutton and Dukerich (1991); Corley (2004); Ravasi and Schultz (2006); Jacobs et al. (2008); Kjærgaard (2009); Anteby and Molnár (2012)). As a consequence, research in the interpretivist vein is often allied with the subjectivist ontology, and leans heavily, though not exclusively, on qualitative methods such as interviews, observations and focus groups to allow for individual-level meanings to emerge from the data.

The qualitative element (Phase I) of this research, and in particular the first objective which focuses on the elicitation of the member organisational associations, adopts this interpretivist epistemology. Here, it is through the attendant focus on selected employees, their interactions with and within the case organisation and the close involvement of the researcher in this setting that the corporate identity, corporate identity cues and corporate identity cue types are revealed.

### 3.3.3 Axiology

As an experienced practitioner in the fields of both marketing strategy and marketing communications, it is inevitable that this researcher holds certain assumptions or beliefs about the nature of the relationships between the constructs in the conceptual model. However, this is very different to researching the relationships. Indeed, since this relationship until now has been characterised by a distinct lack of empirical examination, the researcher’s perspective can be considered free of bias from extant studies and reasonably objective in addressing the research aim and objectives.
3.3.4 Research paradigm

With the philosophical underpinnings addressed, it is useful to consider them, and indeed this study, in terms of the research paradigm. Social theory and research may be examined from four perspectives, or paradigms – the radical humanist, radical structuralist, interpretive and functionalist as advanced by Burrell and Morgan (1982) (figure 3.1).

![Image](source: Adapted from Burrell and Morgan (1982) and Saunders et al. (2012)]

In these authors’ conceptualisation, each paradigm operates across two dimensions: the subjectivist-objectivist dimension, and the radical change-regulation dimension as illustrated in figure 3.1. Saunders et al. (2012) offer a helpful clarification between the constituent parts of these two dimensions. Here for example, the focus of the objectivist perspective is ostensibly on the social-actor independent nature of the organisation, facets of its management, the structures in place to support operations and on the broad acceptance of commonality in the way organisations operate. The subjectivist focus by comparison assumes that organisational members’ connotations of their roles and actions takes precedence. These dimensions are commensurate with the ontological perspectives presented in section 3.3.1. The radical change-regulation dimension however is characterised by its consideration of the manner in which organisations ought to operate and how this might be utilised in: effecting primary transformation (radical change); elucidating how organisations are run; and identifying the improvements that can be made (regulation).

The radical humanist paradigm

Central to the radical humanist paradigm is the idea of freedom from the dominance and limitations of ‘ideological superstructures’ that inhibit personal growth (Burrell and Morgan, 1982, p.32). Thus, awareness in thought is paramount in this paradigm which, given its concern with individual-level meanings, adheres to the subjectivist ontology. Research within this paradigm as noted before,
commonly – though not exclusively (Lee and Lings, 2008) – involves the use of qualitative research methods such as interviews and focus groups as demonstrated in Ravasi and Schultz’s (2006) study of organisational responses to the identity threats.

The radical structuralist paradigm
Relationships of power and inter-organisational conflict, the hallmarks of the radical structuralism paradigm, are seen as the drivers for ensuing radical change in society and within entities (Saunders et al., 2012). Here it is the structure of the relationship and its challenges as opposed to the awareness of the individual that provide the focal point (Burrell and Morgan, 1982). Consequently, this paradigm embraces an objectivist ontology. It is not uncommon however for interpretivist or positivist epistemologies to be pursued given the radical structuralist interest in human relationships in the context of real-life developments. The post-modernist slant of this paradigm has led however to the concept of corporate identity being questioned with some researchers, as Soenen and Moingeon (2002) note, viewing it as nothing more than a linguistically contrived fiction.

The interpretive paradigm
Returning to Burrell and Morgan’s (1982) paradigms, the interpretive paradigm is one of the most frequently adopted in studies of corporate identity as researchers seek to understand the essence of the organisation itself as well as the manner in which it is revealed and interpreted. Accordingly, this paradigm is bound to the epistemological stance of interpretivism discussed in section 3.3.2. As reported in the works of some of the researchers noted in the previous paragraph, this interpretive paradigm is often infused with positivist and realist thinking, particularly where organisational identification and its corresponding scales are examined. This becomes more pronounced as identity is joined with other constructs pertaining to organisational life and with their own positivist scales to develop theories, investigate antecedents and test various effects. While it would be expedient to assume the interpretivist or pragmatist paradigm for this study, it is clear that this would detract from the pathos and logos of the study itself, and ultimately exclude consideration of the intended contributions to managerial and theoretical practice.

The functionalist paradigm
The functionalist paradigm described by Burrell and Morgan (1982) is perhaps the most commonly applied in identity research (Gioia, 1998). Here, the application of methods (both quantitative and qualitative) and methodologies to authenticate knowledge provides a degree of generalisability that is frequently employed in managerial research (Kelemen and Rumens, 2008). The positivistic epistemology is particularly sympathetic to this paradigm since it assumes a logical reason behind, and therefore resolution of, organisation-specific issues. Within this paradigm, corporate identity,
as seen from the interdisciplinary perspective, is treated as ‘social fact’ that can then be further revealed, demarcated and measured (Balmer, 2001, p.258; Gioia, 1998). The objectivist ontology and regulatory leanings of this paradigm are particularly appropriate for studies of corporate identity since these studies are often concerned with understanding what the organisation actually is (Balmer, 1998), means and represents.

The present study with its attendant aim and objectives is thus positioned as functionalist. This is because as an example of social research conducted within the functionalist paradigm, what lies at the core of this study is the elicitation of corporate identity cues from a range of member organisational associations, and the empirical testing of their effects on organisational identification and role behaviours. In so doing, it is anticipated that conclusions can be drawn about the combination and effects of these corporate identity cues across the organisation and during change.

The pragmatist paradigm

Although not addressed in Burrell and Morgan’s four paradigms, pragmatism is also worthy of mention in concluding the overall discussion of research paradigms. As studies of organisations’ identities have advanced, research has accommodated this progress by reflecting a ‘plurality of ontological and epistemological stances’ (Ravasi and Canato, 2013, p.4) in which mixed methods studies have come to the fore. Accordingly, positivism, realism and interpretivism can be evidenced in the quantitative evaluations applied to qualitatively founded data in the organisational (see for example, Bartel, 2001; Dukerich et al., 2002) and corporate identity domains (see also Simões et al., 2005). While the pragmatist ontology recognises that a range of perspectives and realities may exist, epistemologically the paradigm allows for both qualitative and quantitative data to be gathered and mixed according to its appropriacy in addressing the research question (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011). Indeed, as these authors note, research conducted in this paradigm may lead to multiple theoretical perspectives and paradigms being applied in studies adopting mixed method designs.
3.4 Research context

3.4.1 The case organisation

As part of the access negotiated, the researcher agreed to anonymise the organisation within which the present study was conducted. Thus, its name, subgroups and employee job titles have all been anonymised in this thesis and no direct reference is made to its specific projects, services or communications.

The research was conducted within ConSeng Corporation, also referred to as CSC, an internationally operating engineering consultancy headquartered in Europe. The company was formed through a series of strategic partnerships and acquisitions during the current and previous two decades, a formation which is reflected as much in the company’s current operational structure as it is in its market approach. The century-old organisation employs several thousand primarily engineering staff, has core operations on three continents, and has presence via its projects and other interests in over 100 countries worldwide. In addition to being ranked amongst the Top 50 global design firms\(^1\), the organisation is also affiliated with a number of professional bodies, committees and institutes.

Strategically, the company is steered by its Board of Directors, led by the Chief Executive. It comprises eight Divisions serving national, international and multi-national clients in an array of industries from energy, infrastructure and transport, to water, agriculture and the environment. Each Division is led by a Divisional Director, and comprises a number of smaller specialist Business Teams – some representative of regions or countries – each of which is managed by a Head of Team. The Divisional Directors together with functional Group Heads from Finance, IT, Human Resources, Communications and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the Board of Directors, constitute the Senior Management Team which is headed by the Chief Executive.

ConSeng Corporation is a privately held company with many of its employees also being shareholders. These shareholders own a number of certificates held by/distributed to those meeting the criteria for purchase and ownership. The current decade has seen ConSeng, as it was formerly known, complete its most ambitious strategic acquisition to date by fusing with Tech Corp to become CSC. The merger represents a substantial part of CSC’s strategic focus on long-term growth and balanced global operations.

\(^1\) http://www.enr.com/toplists/2015_Top_500_Design_Firms4
3.4.2 The engineering consulting industry

There are a number of reasons that make engineering consulting firms such as CSC an ideal environment within which to address the research questions underpinning this study.

Recent years for example, have seen the engineering consulting industry come under increasing pressure as market growth has contracted and macroeconomic flux has continued. The industry accordingly has witnessed a proliferation in consolidation activity as a result of developments with some of its largest players announcing or completing mergers or acquisitions within the past three years.

Over the same period, and perhaps as a result of these strategic developments, the adjustment of corporate identities has become increasingly visible; one peer organisation’s shift from identifying itself as the leading pure play global engineering and consultancy firm globally3, to the leading global Design & Consultancy firm for natural and built assets4 being a case in point. This points to the first and perhaps most important aspect in selecting a consultancy within this industry – the access to organisations pre and post announcements to change. It is unsurprising but also fortunate that during the quantitative data collection phase (Phase II) of this study, the case organisation announced large-scale changes to its structure and operations as part of its move to a more focused international business strategy.

The effects of such strategic change on the corporate identity of organisations have been extensively documented in the corporate identity domain (see for example: Balmer and Greyser, 2002; Corley, 2004; Nag et al., 2007; Leitch and Davenport, 2011) making it one of the most frequently studied phenomena (see table 2.1). This is understandable since it is precisely during and in the aftermath of strategic change that identity work – the actions taken by organisational members to build, display and maintain identities in balance with the self-concept (Snow and Anderson, 1987) – is stimulated (Alvesson and Empson, 2008). Within the organisational context, as Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep (2006) note, this type of identity work often takes the form of identity management at the aggregate (see for example Ashforth and Johnson, 2001) and individual level (see for example Pratt and Foreman, 2000); a practice which this study suggests is linked to the corporate identity cues and cue types that underpin the corporate identity of the firm.

---
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Against this backdrop, the engineering consulting industry and firms such as CSC present an ideal environment within which to understand the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and role behaviours during change.

One further characteristic of firms within this industry is the high degree of collaboration that is often required externally with the client, internally with the subgroups comprising the organisation (e.g. finance, marketing and human resources management), internationally when consulting for multi-national clients (MNC), and strategically in partnership with other engineering consultancies. This suggests that employees of engineering consultancies must routinely absorb and apply a range of corporate identity cues, including those of their clients, while in parallel holding some sense of identification with their own organisation. Researchers such as Alvesson and Empson (2008) have pointed out that some consultants, in the absence of having any tangible product offering, are routinely subjected to questioning, scepticism (O’Shea and Madigan, 1998) and viewed as outsiders (Kipping and Armbrüster, 2002). They contend that under such circumstances it becomes important for these employees to have a sense of their organisations’ corporate identity as a form of support. Because, employees of engineering consultancies typically occupy either client facing (Front-Office) or non-client facing (Back-Office) positions, it can be assumed that variation may occur in terms of the degree of exposure to, relationship with and effects of the firm’s corporate identity. Since engineering consultancies also serve a wide range of industries and often operate on an international basis, they provide a suitable context to examine and compare the effects of corporate identity cues on the sense of belonging (organisational identification) and the subsequent effects on role behaviour at the subgroup level.

Thus, in conducting the research within a single organisation within the engineering consulting industry, it is anticipated that further clarity will be gained regarding the range and effects of corporate identity cues on the organisational identification and role behaviours during change and across different levels of the organisation. Given that the research was conducted within a single internationally operating organisation however, the results may not be generalisable.

3.5 Research approach

As noted in section 3.3.4, the choice of research paradigm has implications for both the approach, design and strategy of the research itself. Where understanding the nature of causally inferred relationships in any model is at the forefront of many studies, the research approach (deductive or inductive) taken has a direct impact on the methods applied in achieving this understanding. This
section discusses the research approach and provides the setting for the research methodology outlined in the following section.

The approach to conducting research is enshrined largely in two streams of reasoning – inductive and deductive (Trochim, 2006). These streams have more simply been described as reasoning from the general to the specific, i.e., from theory to practice (deduction); and from the specific to the general, i.e., from practice to theory (induction) (Dooley, 2002).

The distinction between the two approaches was defined as early as the nineteenth century by Peirce (1878) who considered inductive reasoning to be reliant upon the generalisation of fact developed from a discrete number of instances and from which the same fact may be applied to an entire group or population. Wholly inductive studies are seldom seen in research given that researchers and practitioners are frequently exposed to causal concepts (Lehmann, Gupta, Steckel, 1997). Notable exceptions to this in the field of corporate identity include works examining the enabling and constraining qualities of corporate identity (Leitch and Davenport, 2011) and Balmer and Wilson’s (1998) study connecting the corporate and organisational behaviour schools.

The results of applying existing theory to multiple cases by comparison are seen as the hallmark of deductive thought. Thus whereas Peirce viewed induction as founded on a case or cases extrapolated to rules, the opposite also held true for deduction. Ketokivi and Mantere (2010) further expanded the definition of deduction by suggesting that reasoning in this vein could only be considered sound on the basis of conclusions first being reached via rational examination, and the assumption that all supporting principles should be true.

The inductive approach lies in stark contrast to the rigorous testing applied to existent theory (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007) in the deductive approach and which is subsequently evident in a good degree of management research. It is not uncommon for instance for positivist (and therefore quantitative) methods, such as the structural equation modelling of survey data, to be applied in testing or validating causal inference (Malhotra and Birks, 2003). Conversely, the more interpretivist (qualitative) focused practices supported by interviews or focus groups for example, are often prevalent in inductive studies.

At the same time however, overlaps in approach have been acknowledged with Bryman (2012) arguing that relating the implications and findings of research to the theory upon which they are based, necessarily invokes the process of induction. Bryman’s observations find additional favour in Eisenhardt and Graebner’s (2007, p.25) treatise which asserts that ‘...inductive and deductive logics are mirrors of one another, with inductive theory building from cases producing new theory
from data and deductive theory testing completing the cycle by using data to test theory.’ Lehmann, Gupta and Steckel (1997, p.144) similarly view the process as ‘never ending’. Working with two research approaches, even after a main approach has been declared, is therefore not unusual (see for example, Marwick and Fill’s (1997) study from the corporate identity perspective; and Bartel (2001) and Dukerich, Golden and Shortell’s (2002) study from the organisational behaviour standpoint) and if anything, belies the fact that neither approach follows a consistent, identifiable pattern.

The study presented in this thesis uses both inductive and deductive approaches to address its overall aim.

### 3.6 Research methodology – mixed methods

Before commencing discussion on the research methodology, it is useful to reiterate the aim and objectives of this study. The main aim of this study is to build understanding around the range of corporate identity cues discerned from member organisational associations, and the effects that these cues have on employees’ organisational identification and its subsequent influence on role behaviours:

- at the aggregate level of the organisation
- at the subgroup level of the organisation amongst client-facing and non-client facing employees
- pre and post exposure to strategic change conditions (i.e., announcements)

This aim is further supported by six core objectives focused on:

1. eliciting member organisational associations from a cross-section of company employees
2. identifying the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (i.e., CED member organisational associations) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity
3. establishing whether additional patterns beyond those that are CED are present in the elicited member organisational associations that reflect how they may be perceived in the working environment context
4. determining the CED member organisational associations, along with their corresponding patterns, that are linked to the present environment; trigger sensemaking; and influence
future action and attention. In short, the identification of those associations that also act as cues to understand the corporate identity

5. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the aggregate level of the firm and,

6. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the subgroup level of the firm across:
   a. Client-facing (Front-Office) and non client-facing (Back-Office) employees
   b. Employees prior to and post exposure to strategic change announcements.

As may be inferred from the above, effectively addressing the aim and objective of the study requires the application of both qualitative and quantitative research methods.

It has been suggested that while qualitative research is adept at facilitating separation of the symptomatic from the problematic, quantitative research is highly effective in pursuing the understanding and meaning produced from qualitatively-driven studies (Zikmund and Babin, 2007). This not only implies that, quantitative should follow qualitative research in addressing marketing-related issues Malhotra (2010), but that these so-called exploratory sequential (Creswell and Plano Clarke, 2011) mixed methods designs are beneficial in investigating certain phenomena (Cresswell and Plano Clarke, 2003). It has also been posited that in addition to offsetting the shortcomings of one or the other method (Jick, 1979; Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011), mixed methods research aids the ‘reduction of inappropriate certainty’ (Robson, 1993, p.290). This in turn raises the likelihood of unanticipated results (Bryman, 2006) thus promoting output of exceptional standards (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007).

Quantitative survey methods have nevertheless continued to be deployed in numerous studies of organisations’ identities (see table 2.1) despite their positivist epistemology seeming to run counter to the dominant interpretive paradigm within which studies of corporate identity are often located. Neither the ontological assumptions corresponding with the interpretive worldview nor use of the corresponding qualitative research methods have dissipated in the interim however.

This has led some researchers such as Ravasi and Canato (2013) to contend that the sole use of quantitative methods such as surveys is self-delimiting since their inability to illustrate fully the nuances of corporate identity at aggregate level is restricted. Others such as Elstak (2007; 2008) however have questioned the degree of emphasis placed on qualitative methods, calling instead
for the development of theory to continue alongside measurement of identity. Yet, even Elstak’s standpoint would seem to preserve the status quo and advocate the use of mixed methods since identity studies during the past three decades have seen the introduction of the organisational identification scale (Mael, 1988; Mael and Ashforth, 1992); the 255-item Rotterdam Organizational Identification scale (Van Riel et al., 1997); and more recently, the three-dimensional CIM measure (Simões, et al., 2005), all of which have helped to further existing theory.

Thus while it has become common to blend qualitative and quantitative research (McDaniel Jr and Gates, 1996) to the extent that the practice is considered ‘unremarkable’ (Bryman, 2006, p.97), it is nevertheless important to view the two methods as complementary (Zikmund and Babin, 2007) rather than adversarial (Jick, 1979) or confirmatory given the ontological assumptions in which each is rooted. This attention to ontological routing may explain in part Ravasi and Canato’s (2013) observation of the low number of organisation-specific identity studies adopting this approach. For although mixed methods may now be observed in a several studies of corporate identity, these authors argue that it remains confined to the development of measures and the testing of qualitative outcomes.

One interesting aspect of exploratory sequential mixed methods research is its emphasis on either the quantitative or the qualitative element, rendering the remaining element auxiliary in function (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011). Here, research focused around the qualitative aspect is viewed as guided by theory-building (theory-development variant), the results of which can be tested empirically with greater sample sizes. The instrument-development variant by contrast favours the quantitative phase such that the qualitatively derived insights might contribute to a comprehensive survey instrument for example and facilitate testing of a conceptual model.

On the basis of the information presented so far, together with the aim and objectives of the study, the application of a mixed methods research design is considered appropriate for this study for several reasons. Firstly, since access to the case organisation was granted partly under condition that it remain anonymous, the exploratory sequential mixed method approach offers a means by which the firm’s corporate identity cues, as elicited from its employees’ member organisational associations, can be objectively assessed. Secondly, because part of the negotiated access further required that no direct reference be made to company-specific projects, services or communications (news, tools or platforms) that would identify the case organisation, the constructs selected to represent the firm’s corporate identity cues (see section 3.9.3) form an equally important element of this study. This is because they also approximate parts of the corporate identity transmitted by and within the organisation itself. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly,
in this study, exploratory sequential mixed methods offer the possibility to address, if not test, both halves of the ‘story’ – i.e., the organisation transmitted corporate identity, and the employees’ construal and responses to the corporate identity as reflected in their member organisational associations (Brown and Dacin, 2002, p.254) – that underpin the study’s aims.

Accordingly, a two-phased, exploratory sequential (i.e. instrument development variant) design was adopted to first elicit from member organisational associations, the corporate identity cues, corporate identity, and the groups (or types) of corporate identity cues in the case organisation (Phase I Qualitative Study), and then to examine empirically their effects on organisational identification and subsequent role behaviours (Phase II Quantitative Study). This process is illustrated in figure 3.2 and is referred to throughout the chapter.

As the qualitative and quantitative methodologies are deployed in discrete phases within the study, the overall methodology is furthermore classed as partially integrated (Nastasi et al., 2010).

![Figure 3.2 Two-phased exploratory sequential mixed methods research design as applied in the present study](image-url)
3.7 Research design

The choice of research design generally defines the structure within and specifics with which a study or studies will be carried out (Malhotra, 2010). By contrast, the research question, aims and the information available within the domain being studied, determine the appropriacy of either qualitative, quantitative or combined (mixed methods) design. With this in mind, it is useful to begin this section by briefly reiterating the aim of the study which is:

to build understanding around the range of corporate identity cues elicited from member organisational associations, and the effects that these cues have on employees’ organisational identification and role behaviours:

- at the aggregate level of the organisation
- at the subgroup level of the organisation amongst client-facing and non-client facing employees
- pre and post exposure to strategic change conditions (i.e., announcements).

This aim highlights the fact that the study is dependent on the generation of primary data to first elicit and subsequently examine the effects of corporate identity cues. Accordingly, an exploratory sequential, mixed methods design was adopted in which qualitative research methods were used to elicit the corporate identity cues (Phase I), and quantitative methods deployed to establish examine the effects of these cues (Phase II).

One of the key concerns in conducting research within a consulting environment, is the focus on non-order related time invested; in other words, the amount of time during the working day that is directed towards purposes other than generating revenue from client projects. This had a direct influence on the amount of respondent time available for each phase of the study and thus became a critical point of consideration in selecting the sampling strategy, data-gathering method and the analyses employed. These constraints have been acknowledged, and furthermore were mitigated via the choice of sampling strategy.

The following subsections of this chapter discuss the qualitative and quantitative research phases of this mixed methods study along with the sampling and analytical practices applied.

3.7.1 Qualitative research studies

Although qualitative studies are frequently viewed through the philosophical lens of interpretivism (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005) they are often associated and compatible with realist philosophy
(Saunders et al., 2012) making this type of research design particularly supportive of the demands in Phase I of this study. As the terminology suggests, construing the substance and essence of data arising from qualitative research lies squarely with the researcher who on the basis of theoretical knowledge and other qualitative research data collection methods (i.e., grounded research, ethnography, extended metaphor analysis) commonly applied in the identity field, builds description-rich insights on the phenomena at hand. McDaniel Jr and Gates (1996) further emphasise this point by asserting the pre-eminence of qualitative research in uncovering deep-seated drivers and sentiments.

The inherent ‘revelatory potential’ (Gioia, Corley and Hamilton, 2013a, p.1) of qualitative research is not only firmly acknowledged (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) but well established in for example the corporate identity domain, making it conducive to extricating evidence of identity cues. In their analysis of organisational identity research methods for example, Ravasi and Canato (2006) found that purely qualitative research designs were adopted in 28 of the 33 studies they examined (23 of these employing interviews for data gathering), many of which are considered seminal if not ground-breaking works. These studies further highlight the diverse range of data gathering methods deployed.

This diversity in qualitative research methods is also evident within the corporate identity domain in which the use of interviews (Bernstein, 1986) employing means-end techniques (Van Riel and Balmer, 1997), ethnographic practices (Balmer, 1996) and other analyses feature prominently. The sheer array of practices deployed comfortably support the observations of Hair, Bush and Ortinau (2006) for whom qualitative research is linked as much to the methods used in studies of a more exploratory nature, as it is to the research design. These authors further contend that despite the associated small sample sizes and weak generalisability in this type of research design, the ability of qualitative research to unearth good tentative insights into research issues is in no way reduced.

Central to this thinking, would appear to be the sampling strategy applied (i.e., probability or non-probability) and the degree of analysis sought. Grounded Theory for example requires that theoretical sampling, a non-probability technique, be utilised to facilitate the elaboration of categories and relationships. Here, sample sizes of 25-30 (Creswell, 2007) and 20-35 (Saunders et al., 2012) have been suggested for general studies and Grounded Theory respectively, with Saunders et al (2012) additionally recommending a sample size of between 5 and 25 for semi-structured and in-depth interviews. Referring once again to the organisational identity literature, these figures find support in studies reporting sample sizes of 25 (Gioia and Thomas, 1996); 30 (Zaheer, Schomaker and Genc, 2003; Tripsas, 2008); 33 (Clark et al., 2010); and 34 (Nag et al., 2007).
3.7.2 Quantitative research studies

Whereas qualitative research centres on the discovery, exploration and interpretation of concepts in close proximity to the subjects/respondents, quantitative research studies primarily stress the importance of measurement and testing within descriptive or causal frameworks (Zikmund and Babin, 2007). Phase II of this study is quantitative in nature.

Depending on the positivistic procedure(s) applied, quantitative frameworks are seen as particularly sympathetic to the use of survey (descriptive) and/or experimental (causal) methods (Saunders, 2012). This is helpful in descriptive studies where focus is directed towards accessing the truthful portrayal of occurrences, features, qualities and variables within a group or environment. But it is equally beneficial in causal studies where the primary area of concern is in understanding the cause and effect relations that lead to the occurrence of certain phenomena (Hair, Bush and Ortinau, 2006). Thus, as with qualitative studies, it is the aim, objectives and the question(s) driving the research that determine the research design (descriptive or causal) to be pursued within a quantitative study.

Taking these factors and the research objectives into account while also respecting the practices commonly applied in studies of corporate identity, organisational identification (Mael, 1988; Mael and Ashforth 1992) and role behaviours (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997; Ackfeldt and Wong, 2006; Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016), Phase II of this study adopted the survey method as the principle means of data gathering. Indeed, this was deemed necessary to facilitate comparison of the results with those of extant studies. Acknowledging once again the limitation on data access in the case organisation, a multi-item online survey addressing the demographic, operational and conceptual aspects of the study was developed, piloted and subsequently distributed to respondents.

As noted in the previous sub-section, sampling techniques or strategies can be categorised as either probabilistic (random) or non-probabilistic (non-random). Although access to the large populations associated with quantitative research data collection lends itself well to probabilistic sampling strategies, this does not preclude the use of the more researcher-determined, non-random techniques. Indeed, along with the research objective, it is conceivable that the source from which the data is drawn may impose parameters that influence directly the choice of sampling technique.

In line with many deductive studies adopting the survey method, analysis of quantitative data deals primarily with understanding and explaining relationships arising from the constructs under examination. Because the complexity of relationships in conceptual models often requires concurrent examination of constructs however, more advanced statistical means in the form of multivariate analyses are employed (Hair et al., 2017). Of these, covariance based structural
equation modelling (CB-SEM) is widely used within the social sciences. However, partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) is considered most apposite for studies with: multiple construct and indicator (complex) models, small sample sizes, a focus on developing theory and/or ascertaining the key driver constructs (Hair et al., 2014; 2017). The study presented here, with its objective of appraising the conceptual model at both aggregate and subgroup level, was thus analysed using PLS-SEM. The results of this analysis are presented in Chapter 5.

3.8 Phase I – qualitative study

In addition to eliciting examples of member organisational associations from the case organisation’s employees, phase I of this study focuses on three further objectives aimed at: identifying the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity; establishing whether additional patterns beyond those deemed CED are present in the data; and determining the CED member organisational associations – along with any corresponding patterns – that are linked to the present-day environment, and guide employees’ sensemaking, attention and future actions (i.e., act as cues to the corporate identity). The following sections outline the research strategy, design and analyses applied in addressing these objectives.

3.8.1 Strategy, design and analysis

Members’ beliefs about what constitutes the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of their organisation’s corporate identity are broadly considered to be socially-constructed (Ashforth and Mael, 1996). Yet the reference-giving qualities of the corporate identity via the corporate identity cues that drive them (Van Rekom, 1997; He, 2012; Cornelissen, 2014) and even during change (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Dutton et al., 1994; Gupta, 2016) are also indicative of agreement with objectivist ontology. That is to say, members make sense of their environment from within what they jointly reference as the framework of their organisation’s identity (Weick, 1995). These ontological perspectives suggest that the corporate identity cues that support and point to the corporate identity are thus likely to be revealed through the day-to-day experiences and in the operational environments of organisational members.

Appreciating both context and encounter in this way is a hallmark of the inductive enquiry (Saunders, et al., 2012). As a structured and rigorous means of developing concepts qualitatively, the Gioia Methodology (Gioia et al., 2013a) is inductive in nature and has been adopted in seminal studies of corporate identity (see for example, Gioia and Chittipeddi, 1991). With the elicitation of
member organisational associations and corporate identity cues central to this study, it is thus beneficial that a rigorous and structured inductive approach be applied.

In line with the Gioia Methodology, and the widespread application of interview-based research in the identity field, semi-structured interviews were selected as the principal means of gathering the ‘rich and detailed information’ (Rubin and Rubin, 2012, p.29) from employees corporate associations. A total of 30 interviews (including two pilots) were conducted at the case organisation, CSC, over a 6-week period spanning January and February 2015. The guiding questions (probes), duration and overall pattern of the interviews were standardised for all interviewees.

Although the absence of a truly uniform process of analysing qualitative data has been noted (Saunders et al., 2012), research suggests that analysis adheres to one of three paths; the specifics of deductive reasoning typical of the Grounded Theory (GT) methodology espoused by Strauss and Corbin (1998), the more moderate forms of Grounded Theory promoted by Charmaz (2006), or the more generic and inductively-driven analyses put forward by Saunders (2012).

As a method (as opposed to methodology) grounded theory in its strictest sense subjects the data to increasingly restrictive levels of distillation. The coding, or analysis of the data, applied at each level is designed to encourage a specific labelling and comparison task that achieves a clear purpose from the data (Locke, 2001) while excluding the incorporation of existing theory to build the coding and category terms (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). The process starts with the initial (or open) coding of the raw data in which loose themes and concepts of interest are identified. The second level of analysis then groups the open-coded data into tighter categories of similarity in a process referred to as axial coding. In the final stage, selective coding of the data take place. Here the axial-coded content is analysed and further reduced resulting in the emergence of a small number of core categories which are subsequently integrated to form the grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Corbin and Strauss, 2008).

Slightly less prescriptive, though by no means lacking in rigour, are the variations of the grounded theory method and other generic analyses that follow similarly iterative processes of distillation and comparison. The cycles of analysis in these methods are often fewer than those used in the traditional grounded theory approach. Charmaz’s (2006) two-stage approach to grounded theory coding that utilises initial and focused coding (the latter being analogous to the process of selective coding described earlier) only, is a good example of this.

More corporate identity-focused however is the Gioia Methodology (Gioia et al., 2013a). Here, 1st-order categories represent the loosest level of analysis with almost no attention to forming
categories. Because the focus at this stage is on remaining faithful to the verbatim accounts and phrases of informants, the quantity of terms created is often high (Gioia et al., 2013a). Inspection of these 1st-order categories for patterns of commonality and divergence reduces them to a more manageable number of so-called 1st-order terms. 1st-order terms have been defined as ‘the empirical facts of an investigation’ (Burke, 2010, p100). This stage typically leads to the formation of further questions that in turn are used to bring focus to subsequent interviews. Gioia et al (2013a, p.6) note that this so-called 2nd-order analysis is a particularly critical part of the process as the researcher must question ‘whether the emerging themes suggest concepts that might help us describe and explain the phenomena we are observing.’ Thus the researcher must process the data mentally on two planes – that of the informant, and that of the theoretical – by rhetorically questioning what is presented by the data. The 2nd-order themes associated with this phase of analysis have been defined as ‘the theories an analyst uses to organize and explain…facts.’ arising from the 1st-order categories (Van Maanen, 1979, p.540).

With the 2nd-order themes established, the final stage of the analysis determines whether the themes can be further distilled into 2nd-order aggregate dimensions. These dimensions may be defined as the total output of data at the highest level of abstraction (i.e., the most descriptive category or emergent theory/aspect of theory) (Gioia et al., 2013a). Once all phases of the analysis have been exhausted, the 1st-order terms, 2nd-order themes and 2nd-order aggregate dimensions are assembled in a data structure (figure 3.3) that summarise the results of each analytical stage. The Gioia Methodology as described here illustrates the inductive approach to research that accommodates the critical realist ontology that is also adopted in this study.
Unlike the grounded theory method and Gioia Methodology, the generic approach allows a further dimension of flexibility in the analysis to be introduced so that initial categories for example may be drawn directly from: the literature domain (concept-driven); the data itself (data-driven); or a combination of the two sources (Saunders et al., 2012). This is particularly beneficial when the objective of the research is to establish discrete categories for the data as part of a reduction and meaning-finding process – as in the case of the present study – as opposed to explicitly establishing new theory (Saunders et al., 2012). Placing the objectives of the research central to the categorisation process in this manner inevitably results in the creation of labels that are highly specific to the subject under examination. This means however that studies with alternative research goals may arrive at wholly dissimilar categories when sourcing the same data (Dey, 1993).

Taking into account the limitations of the grounded theory method of data analysis (i.e., the focus on building theory), the analytical strengths of the Gioia Methodology, and the need to elicit patterns in the data inductively rather than to develop new theory, an approach combining both established and generic practices was applied in this study. Borrowing from the terminologies and some procedures of the Gioia Methodology, the resulting generic approach adopted in this study accommodates a priori theory as a means to clarify the emergent data within the corporate identity and corporate identity cue contexts. This approach in parallel also allows for the natural emergence of patterns in the data. The details and results of this generic approach are presented in section 3.8.5 and in Chapter 4.

---

**Figure 3.3** Diagrammatic representation of the qualitative data structure  
*Adapted from Gioia et al., 2013*
3.8.2 Sampling strategy

Given the noted constraints on data collection within the case organisation, non-probability sampling was deemed the most appropriate technique for this study. More specifically, the purposive *maximum variation* sampling strategy (Patton, 2005) commonly used to achieve a representative view in mixed methods studies (Teddlie and Yu, 2007) was selected as it allowed the researcher to apply knowledge of the business to define a geographically and operationally diverse sample.

Following Patton (2005), the characteristics required in the sample were defined ahead of making the actual selection. In this instance, a nine-category framework was developed (table 3.1). Of these categories, three – Mode of Tenure, Role and Hierarchical Position – together with overall demography have been posited in the literature to affect sensemaking and associations with the organisation (Thomas et al., 1994; Dacin and Brown, 2002; Brown et al., 2006). The remaining six categories of Gender, Nationality, Geographic Location, Length of Tenure, Department/Work Group, Geographic Location and Original/Start Company (i.e., the company that the employee was originally hired by) are related specifically to the operational characteristics of the case organisation and the informants. In addition to adhering to Locke’s (2001) principle of comparison which calls for diversity in defining the sample population, these categories were felt to be suitably representative of the characteristics within the wider company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>10 Male; 12 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>25 Dutch; 3 British; 1 Indian; 1 Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>26 The Netherlands; 3 United Kingdom; 1 Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Tenure</td>
<td>30 Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Tenure*</td>
<td>Average = 19.4 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Position</td>
<td>Senior Manager with Personnel Responsible = 3; Non-Managers = 4; Middle Management = 8; Other = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Work Group</td>
<td>Division 1 = 21; Division 2 = 7; Cross-Functional = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Consultant = 5; Engineer = 8; Business Development = 5; Administrator = 3; Marketing/Communications = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original/Start Company</td>
<td>ConSeng = 23; Tech Corp. = 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = based on available data only

Table 3.1 Sample selection framework
3.8.3 Data collection

Data for this phase of the research was obtained from a combination of primary (semi-structured interviews) and secondary (theory-related literature) data sources; a practice recognised for its strengthening effects on mixed methods research (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011; Jick, 1979; Robson, 2002) and considered to be of key importance to the qualitative element (Saunders et al., 2012) of this study.

The pilot and semi-structured interviews took place over a six-week period spanning January and February 2015 with analysis completed during the following four months and concluding in June 2015. Data collection, and analysis were conducted entirely by the researcher, with research trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) assessed by three experienced former researchers independent of the case organisation, the researcher and the University.

3.8.4 Semi-structured interviews

In acknowledging the group levels of the firm as the juncture at which identity beliefs are generated (Isabella, 1990), interviews present a suitable means by which to expose identity-related cues. A literal extraction of the corporate identity cues (i.e., asking each interviewee what they perceived as central, enduring and distinctive about the organisation and which signals from the company supported this) though possible, would be inappropriate if not inhibitive to accessing informants’ understanding and experiences of as well as their responses to the corporate identity; that is to say, their member organisational associations. Indeed asking interviewees to comment directly on the issue under investigation as opposed to soliciting experiences and associations of it, is seen as a weak foundation upon which to build research (Silverman, 2007) which in the case of this study, may additionally drive informants towards evaluating internal and external communications tools or channels. Instead, a more nuanced approach was pursued and an interview schedule comprising the interview structure, thematic areas and core questions crafted (Appendix 3).

Interview schedule and interviews

Given the limitations in available informant time and access, the need to establish good rapport to encourage open responses throughout the interview session was essential. The interview structure ensured that a clear and identical pattern could be followed in all interviews and that the time allotted for each would be roughly equal. Interviews were thus divided into welcome, introduction, interview and closing stages and lasted approximately 30-45 minutes.

On the basis of the corporate identity literature reviewed, a total of four thematic areas with supporting questions were defined with the express purpose of: securing a Respondent (informant)
history; extracting instances of Member organisational associations, affiliation and recognition; eliciting instances of Guidance, sensemaking and action; and finding examples of Organisational identification and meaning through associations to substantiate the effects of the aforementioned instances. By way of example, one of the questions aimed at eliciting instances of member organisation associations, affiliation and recognition was: ‘When asked who you work for or what you do, what do you say?’ The guidance, sensemaking and action theme was addressed with two questions, the first being: ‘What helps and guides you in your daily work?’, and the second: ‘How do you know what is/is not appropriate?’ Organisational identification and meaning were addressed by asking informants what it meant to them personally to work for ConSeng Corporation. A number of prompts were also drafted as a means to steer the interviewee where required.

Having established the sample and interview schedule, the interview was then piloted with two informants from the sample identified. Pilot testing is an essential step in pre-interview planning (Turner III, 2010) that enables potential issues in the interview structure to be identified and redressed in advance of full-scale deployment (Kvale, 2007). Fundamental to this is ensuring that the interview makes sense (face validity) and that the key themes are adequately covered (Kvale, 2007). Van Teijlingen and Hundley (2001) contend that piloting also offers the opportunity to assess the appropriacy of the data collecting method and protocol (interview schedule) itself.

Unlike quantitative studies, qualitative studies tend to work with smaller sample sizes. This makes Fink’s (2009) minimum pilot sample size requirement of 10 somewhat ambitious in a qualitative environment. What is key however, is that the sample meets partially or fully the conditions for inclusion placed on the overall study (Chenail, 2011) as was the case with the two informants selected (table 3.1).

**Data quality**

As with all data collection methods, issues of reliability and bias are prone to affect information acquired through interview. Saunders et al., (2012) define reliability, bias, generalisability and validity as four such areas for concern. Here these authors note the problematic nature of reliability in the absence of interview standardisation which can lead to bias at multiple levels. Interviewer bias promoted through possession of a specific world view or failing to establish confidence and integrity; interviewee (response) bias fuelled by social inhibitions; and participation bias triggered by the time investment required, are thus all likely to impinge upon the quality of the data if not controlled for. This is further compounded by weaknesses in the extrapolation of findings from limited samples (generalisability) or meaningful data from informant insights (validity).
In this study, the researcher has attempted to mitigate these issues by taking a number of actions. Firstly, reliability of the interviews was improved by piloting and standardising the interview schedule in advance of discussions. Secondly, the effects of interviewer bias were curtailed substantially by the researcher acting in a doctoral candidate as opposed to collegial capacity. Thirdly, interviewee bias was addressed by providing informants with confidentiality and data security assurances ahead of each interview, as well as with their interview transcriptions for verification and approval post interview. Additionally, informants were provided with Participant Information and Informed Consent forms 1-2 weeks prior to interview, and suitably private locations were reserved for each interview session as a means of reducing participation bias. Finally, generalisability and validity were achieved by drawing a sample highly representative of the company’s demographics.

### 3.8.5 Data analysis

As noted in the introduction to this thesis, member organisational associations commonly incorporate notions of the firm and the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of its corporate identity (Brown et al., 2006). Eliciting these member organisational associations first hand through interviews with informants is therefore an important step in generating data that can then be analysed and used to derive the organisation’s corporate identity and its attendant corporate identity cues. It is also worth reiterating at this point that the aim of this study is not to create or build new theory but to build understand around the effects of corporate identity cues and therefore extend theory.

Given the absence of a universally accepted approach or prescription for analysing qualitative data (Saunders et al., 2012), but also recognising the need to anchor the study in the corporate identity literature, both deductive and inductive approaches were employed in the data analysis. Specifically, a generic approach drawing on some aspects of the Gioia Methodology was adopted for this purpose. With this in mind and to provide clear documentation of how the generic approach process was applied, where certain terminologies and aspects associated with the original Gioia Methodology have been used, these have been noted clearly in the thesis. NVivo 10 qualitative data analysis software was used to aid the coding and categorising of data within this generic approach.

Figure 3.4 illustrates the generic analysis approach as applied in this study. Here, it can be observed that analysis was conducted along two separate streams as depicted vertically in the left-hand and right-hand segments of figure 3.4. In the first stream (left-hand segment), the analytical steps taken in eliciting the member organisational associations and CED member organisational associations
comprising the case organisation’s corporate identity are illustrated. This stream corresponds with the first two objectives that support the main aim of the study. In the second stream illustrated in the right-hand segment of figure 3.4, the analytical and subjective steps taken in deriving the case organisation’s corporate identity cues, and in discerning the underlying non-CED patterns in the data that form the groups to which these cues belong (i.e. the corporate identity cue types) is outlined. This stream corresponds with objectives 3 and 4 of this study.

The 1st-order categories, 1st-order terms, 2nd-order themes and 2nd-order aggregate dimensions are marked in the extreme left side of the diagram.

**Figure 3.4** Diagrammatic representation of the generic qualitative data analysis process
Analysis of the data commenced with loose examination of the interview transcripts to extract data indicative of perceptions, beliefs, directions, actions, guidance, culture and other areas of interest to the overall study, to extract the initial 1st-order categories. These categories were then grouped according to any similarities and differences identified to develop the 1st-order terms. Analysis was then carried out along two streams as illustrated in figure 3.4.

Here, the member organisational associations, CED-specific member organisational associations and the corporate identity of the case organisation were first elicited (left-hand segment of figure 3.4); the corresponding corporate identity cues subsequently validated (right-hand segment of figure 3.4) and anchored (lower segment of figure 3.4). These two streams of the analysis are outlined further below.

**Eliciting the [CED] member organisational associations comprising the CSC corporate identity**

The initial focus (i.e., the first stream on analysis depicted in the left-hand segment of figure 3.4) of the process was on addressing the first two objectives of the study; namely the elicitation of the member organisational associations, and the identification of the CED-specific member organisational associations comprising the corporate identity. This is illustrated in the left-hand segment of figure 3.4. Here, the 1st-order terms were examined for commonalities and grouped where similarities were identified to create the 2nd-order themes; these 2nd-order themes represent the member organisational associations. These 2nd-order themes were then analysed deductively for characteristics reflective of the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of corporate identity; in other words, the CED attributes were introduced a priori. The use of existing theory in this way, particularly where it forms the basis of the research, has also been suggested by Yin (2009). The 2nd-order themes that did not exhibit any CED characteristics were excluded from the rest of the analysis.

In deriving 2nd-order themes from the 1st-order terms, it is common within the Gioia Methodology that attention is directed towards determining the existence of linkages between the themes presented, extant theory and whether the latter illuminate the former. This inductive approach means that themes lacking substantial theoretical or conceptual foundation are scrutinised to find potentially emergent theory or theories. The generic approach to analysis applied in this study however treats all themes equally given the study’s non-theory building purpose. Additionally, while theoretical sampling is commonly deployed during development of 2nd-order themes in the original Gioia Methodology, this practice was bypassed using the generic analysis applied to the present study since all informant interviews were conducted prior to analysis.
The 2nd-order themes identified as exhibiting central, enduring or distinctive characteristic were grouped under the corresponding a priori 2nd-order ‘CED’ aggregate dimensions. It is on the basis of this final categorisation that the CSC corporate identity was derived. The use of a priori categorisation in this way is generally accommodated within generic analyses (Saunders et al., 2012).

**Deriving the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types**

In the second stream of the analysis depicted in the right-hand segment of figure 3.4, focus was placed on addressing objectives 3 and 4 of the study; namely the identification of any additional but non-CED patterns in the data (the data in this case being the 2nd-order themes with their 1st-order terms); and the derivation from this data, of the CSC corporate identity cues and patterns underlying them which are referred to as CSC corporate identity cue types in this study.

Here, the original 2nd-order themes generated from the first stream of analysis were subjected to three additional rounds of examination. In the first round, the 2nd order themes were examined for similarities and differences to detect additional patterns in the data beyond the a priori CED attributes. In the second round, and drawing on the definition of sensemaking cues advanced by Weick (1995) and Weber and Glynn (2006), these 2nd-order themes, once categorised subjectively according to the patterns detected in the data, were then assessed for evidence of their use by employees as a link to the present environment; to trigger their sensemaking; and to influence their action and attention. In short, their use in situ as sense making cues to the corporate identity. The 2nd-order themes exhibiting two or more of the defined cue characteristics were defined as identity cues, and the corresponding patterns defined as identity cue types. In the third round, the identity cues and cue types were cross-matched with the CED data to better understand the relationship of the identity cues and cue types to the CED attributes of the derived corporate identity, and to validate the CSC corporate identity cues and CSC corporate identity cue types respectively.

The appropriacy, or theoretical fit, of the emergent CSC corporate identity cues and CSC corporate identity cue types was then validated against two extant models of corporate identity and corporate identity cues to anchor them in the domain. This final procedure is illustrated at the base of figure 3.4.
3.8.6 Confidentiality

The confidentiality of the sources and data remained paramount throughout data gathering, analysis and storage.

Accordingly, all CSC members involved in the study, including the relevant Heads of Division and function, were sent Participant Information Sheets broadly outlining the aims and objectives of this phase of the study (see Appendix 4). Those participating in the semi-structured interviews were further required to complete an Informed Consent Form prior to interview. Secondary data in the form of company-specific literature was drawn only from information already in the public domain as of 28 February 2015 so as to inhibit the introduction of confidential and potentially sensitive company-internal materials into the study.

As an additional measure, all names and identifiable features related to the company were anonymised, and all Informed Consent forms along with collected data stored in a secure facility known only to the researcher. Ahead of each interview, respondents, or ‘informants’ as they are termed in the Gioia Methodology (Gioia et al., 2013a, p.20), were specifically reassured of the confidentiality of the discussion; asked to confirm receipt and comprehension of the Participant Information and Informed Consent forms; and, provide a signed Informed Consent form.

3.9 Phase II – quantitative study

Phase II of the study addresses the final two objectives supporting the overall research aim. Accordingly, the focus here is on examining empirically the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours at the aggregate and subgroup levels of the firm. The following sections outline the research strategy, design and analyses to be applied in meeting these objectives.

3.9.1 Strategy, design and analysis

Given the aim of the study as outlined in Chapter 1, an exploratory sequential mixed method design was considered to be the most appropriate manner in which to meet its supporting objectives and thus, the research gaps identified. In this study, the aggregate and subgroup levels of the firm were taken as the unit of analysis. More specifically, in this particular phase of the study, quantitative analysis was conducted at two levels: the aggregate level; and, the subgroup level where the effects of the firm’s corporate identity cues on organisational identification and role behaviours were examined within Front-Office/Back-Office (FOBO) and Pre/Post-Exposure (EXPOSURE) subgroups.

This was considered conducive to gaining a more complete understanding of the results across the subgroups of the organisation and, separately, under conditions of strategic change. The corporate
identity cues derived from the qualitative phase (Phase I) of this study therefore constituted an essential part of the relationship that was quantitatively analysed through partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) as outlined in Chapter 5.

As noted in section 3.6, this phase of the study offers a means by which the firm’s corporate identity cues, as elicited from its employees’ member organisational associations, can be objectively assessed. Also, because part of the negotiated access to the case organisation further required that no direct reference be made to company-specific projects, services or communications (news, tools or platforms) that would identify it, the constructs selected to represent the firm’s corporate identity cues (see section 3.9.3) form an important element of this study since they approximate parts of the corporate identity transmitted by and within the organisation itself. This allows for effective addressing of the research aim.

In the following sub-sections of this chapter, the sampling strategy, data collection and data analysis methodologies are described and an ethical statement on the study presented.

3.9.2 Sampling strategy

Conducting research within a consultancy context can present challenges which in turn affect the choice of sampling strategy. The consultancy fee-earning structure at CSC for example provides limited capacity for non-commercial, or non-client project related activities such as completing questionnaires, which typically accrue costs in the form of lost time and revenue for the organisation. This was a consideration in negotiating access to the organisation’s population and a key determinant in the selection of a non-probability sampling method for this phase of the study as opposed to adopting a random [stratified sampling] strategy which would have encompassed the wider organisation.

For the main study, access to the organisation’s four largest, most geographically dispersed and sector diverse Divisions was thus negotiated. Access to these Divisions was considered both pragmatic and effective as its members are also highly active in cross-divisional and international projects. Each Divisional Director identified a number of employees from their respective businesses to participate in the survey. A sample population was created as a result, necessitating the application of a non-probabilistic sampling technique. Here, the self-selection sampling strategy, a derivative of volunteer sampling, was subsequently applied. Specifically, all eligible employees in the sample were given the opportunity to decide personally whether or not to participate in the study (Saunders et al., 2012). The 1,700 employees identified for this study were therefore invited via personal email from the researcher and the respective Divisional Directors to participate in the
research and a charitable donation of €1 for each fully completed survey was offered to maximise the response rate.

3.9.3 Measures

In order to test empirically the theorised relationship between corporate identity cues, organisational identification (OID) and in-role (IRB) and extra-role (ERB) behaviours, scale items were adopted from the literature in corporate identity, marketing and organisational behaviour to represent the constructs comprising the conceptual model (figure 2.1) presented in Chapter 2. More specifically, on the basis of the case organisation’s corporate identity cues and additional supporting findings that emerged from the Phase I qualitative study, a total of six different scales were selected to represent these corporate identity cues. The basis of this selection is detailed in Chapter 5.

The corporate identity cues were measured using the: 7-item measure of Mission and Values Dissemination and the 6-item measure of Consistent Image Implementation developed by Simoës et al., (2005) which reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (α) of 0.81 and 0.79 respectively in their original study; the 3-item measure of Shared Vision developed by Wong et al. (2009) (α 0.64); the 3-item measure of Corporate Communications adapted by Swoboda et al., (α 0.85) from the original Kelly and Stephenson (1967) scale; the 6-item measure of Reciprocity conceived by Arnett et al. (2003) (α 0.91) derived from the original Eisenberger, Fasolo and Davis-LaMastro (1990) scale; and finally, Love and Forret’s (2008) 10-item measure of Team Member Exchange (α 0.80) adapted from the Team Member Exchange Quality Scale originally developed by Seers et al., (1995).

Organisational identification was measured using the 6-item scale developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) which reported an alpha coefficient of 0.87 in its original study. Ackfeldt and Wong’s (2006) 7-point in-role behaviour (α 0.78) and extra-role behaviour (α 0.78) scales adapted from Bettencourt and Brown’s (1997) original scales were used to measure in-role and extra-role behaviour.

All items were measured on 7-point Likert scales (strongly disagree=1; to strongly agree=7), with negatively-worded items reverse coded. A comprehensive listing of the definitions and items of each construct, as well as their source and role in the research is presented in Appendix 5.
Control Variables

Research has shown that corporate identity (Witting, 2006), sensemaking (Thomas, Shankster and Matthieu, 1994) organisational identification (Mael and Ashforth, 1992; Hameed Roques and Arain, 2013) and certain behaviours in the workplace (Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982) such as extra-role behaviour (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998) are all influenced to some extent by other variables. These variables include tenure, gender and profession. It is even possible that these variables, and tenure in particular, moderate the effects of corporate identity cues such as culture on extra-role organisational citizenship behaviour as evidenced in Delle and Kumassey’s (2013) study conducted within the banking industry. Moderating effects such as these occur when the level of one x-variable (e.g., tenure) determines the effects of a second x-variable such as culture on the y-variable (e.g., extra-role behaviour); here the latter x-variable may be described as moderating the effect of the initial x-variable on the y-variable (Leefflang et al., 2015).

Tenure, particularly over the long-term, is not only associated with strong psychological bonds with the organisation, but is also seen as closely affiliated with the corporate identity (Dutton et al., 1994; Witting, 2006). Indeed, a lengthy tenure would seemingly result in a stronger sense of oneness with the firm as the employee bond continues to develop (Barker and Tompkins, 1994; Dutton et al., 1994). Through their work, Thomas et al., (1994) have suggested that apart from tenure, other demographics related to individuals’ backgrounds, are likely to effect the manner in which individuals make sense of their immediate environments. These assertions are supported by studies in the field of corporate associations where employee role and hierarchical position in particular have been found to effect sensemaking (Dacin and Brown, 2002; Brown et al., 2006).

When viewed within the context of self-categorization theory, profession (particularly when self-selected as in the case of this study) may also be seen as a social category within which similarities or dissimilarities are likely to determine behaviour (Haslam and Platow, 2001; Trepte, 2006). As noted in the Literature Review, Hekman et al. (2009) have also suggested that where organisational identification and reciprocal actions form part of a study, the professional identity should be taken into account. These observations therefore make profession a particularly important factor to consider and control for in the present study.

Gender too has been noted for the varying degrees of significance it exacts on interpersonal relationships as documented in the literature (Brown and Gilligan, 1992). Although not always a major focal point in studies of corporate identity and organisational identification, gender has been incorporated as a control variable in works from Pate, Beaumont and Pryce (2009) in their study of
multiple identities in organisations as well as Van Dick, et al., (2008) in their research on work group and organisational identification effects on job satisfaction and extra-role behaviour.

In his study of the organisational culture at Disneyland, Van Maanen (1991) discerned a number of sub-groups and points of identification within the organisation represented by job type, job rank, uniform, mode of employment (i.e., permanent, temporary) and, to a lesser extent, gender. While Van Maanen’s study was qualitative in nature, the sub-groups identified point indirectly to the importance of considering the type of job, in addition to gender, in studies that interface with the identity of organisations.

Accordingly, the effects of tenure, profession and gender were controlled for in the final model developed in this study. While gender was modelled as a discrete, dichotomous variable and coded accordingly – that is to say with a choice of two responses – tenure and profession were modelled as categorical variables. Specifically, four categories of service were defined for tenure: from 0 up to 10 years (short); from 10 years up to 20 years (medium); from 20 years up to 30 years (long); and above 30 years (very long). A further four categories were then defined for profession: Consultant (1), Engineer (2); Engineering Consultant/Consultant Engineer (3); and Other (4). In this instance, Other represents those employees who neither categorise themselves as engineers, consultants nor engineering consultants/consultant engineers.

3.9.4 Data collection preparations

Having selected the scales for use and developed the survey instrument (Appendix 5), the instrument was subsequently translated into Dutch and Bahasa Indonesian, then back-translated and adjusted for equivalence in line with the recommendations of Brislin (1970, 1986). Noting recent criticisms of this procedure (Fourie and Feinhauer, 2005; Colina, et al., 2016) and taking into account the limited resources available for this study, the instrument was subjected to further review by two tri-linguals fluent in the Dutch, English and Bahasa Indonesian languages. The first reviewed the English to Dutch and English to Bahasa Indonesian translations; the second compared the Dutch and Bahasa versions before comparing both with the original English language source text. No substantial issues were detected with either translation. The survey was subsequently published in English, Dutch and Bahasa Indonesian.

Survey responses were gathered via the Qualtrics online survey platform. Prior to commencing full data collection, the survey instrument was uploaded into Qualtrics and subjected to two separate rounds of testing. The first round was focused chiefly on evaluation of the instrument’s functionality, the second primarily on assessing the instrument for comprehension/ease of understanding,
completion time required, and for cross-validation of adjustments made to the functionality following the first pre-test.

A convenience sample of n=8 (four employees within the case organisation and four volunteers external to the organisation) was selected to participate in the functionality test. Here, each volunteer was requested to complete the survey online with a focus on the functionality of the instrument. Feedback provided by each participant in brief one-to-one sessions or via email revealed three functionality issues relating to the consent option, question flow and access. The instrument was adjusted and each issue subsequently resolved. The instrument was then tested for overall comprehension.

Having selected a second convenience sample (n=8, excluding those participating in the initial functionality test but including one Bahasa Indonesian and one Dutch native speaker), each was briefed to complete the survey online, vetting it specifically for ease of comprehension, flow, duration and functionality. Feedback indicated a minor semantic issue with terminology used (inadvertent use of CEO instead of Chairman of the Board) and was detected by one of the native English speakers who also registered some confusion regarding the different types of responses required and interfaces available (i.e., mix of factual/demographic and opinion-specific questions; scale anchors and formats). No issues with the overall functionality were found and the average survey completion time was six minutes. While the terminology issue was corrected, no changes were made to the mix of question types and anchors as these were explicitly implemented ex-ante to reduce common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Chang et al., 2010). With no further functionality issues identified, the survey instrument was accepted as fully functional.

### 3.9.5 Common method variance (CMV)

Common method variance (CMV), also referred to as common method bias, is defined as ‘systematic error variance shared among variables measured with and introduced as a function of the same method and/or source’ (Richardson, Simmering and Sturman, 2009, p.4). CMV is a prime cause of measurement error which in turn can compromise the validity of findings as they relate to the connections amongst measures (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

In referring to the use of self-report surveys as one potential source of CMV, Richardson, Simmering and Sturman (2009) highlight the conflicting academic opinions surrounding this assertion that have variously regarded CMV as: an issue to be controlled (Podsakoff et al., 2003); an overstated, overgeneralisation of reality (Crampton and Wagner, 1994; Spector, 2006); and, a hazard to validity (Doty and Glick, 1998). Chang et al. (2010) concede that self-report response patterns such as straight lining – the selection of identical responses for a significant number of survey questions
(Schonlau and Toepoel, 2015) – can ultimately lead to Type I and Type II errors, that influence CMV and have recommend the use of ex ante and ex post procedures to counter such effects.

Specifically, Chang et al. (2010) note a range of ex ante solutions from the derivation of content for the independent and dependent variables from separate sources, and assuring respondent confidentiality, to varying the use and type of scale endpoints along with the order in which the corresponding questions appear in the survey for example. In terms of ex post methods, the authors advocate the application of statistical methods such as Harman’s single-factor test and the specification of more complex models in which construct relationships are unlikely to be cognitively recognisable to respondents. The single-factor test is underpinned by exploratory factor analysis in which CMV is confirmed through the surfacing of a single factor as the cause for a substantial amount of measurement item covariance (Sharma et al, 2009). Podsakoff et al., (2003, p.889) counter however that this method offers nothing that can ‘...statistically control for (or partial out) method effects.’ Other commonly employed ex post statistical solutions such as the marker variable (MV) technique while able to partial out CMV effects (Lindell and Whitney, 2001), have in some cases proven unsound in their application and furthermore yielded disparate conclusions depending on the criteria used in MV correlation selection (Sharma et al., 2010).

With convergent and discriminant validity testing viewed as ineffectual in the detection of common method bias (Kock, 2015), recent advances in the field of partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) – the method of data analysis applied in this study and described in section 3.12 – have led to the emergence of Kock and Lynn’s (2012) full collinearity test. The test allows for vertical (predictor-predictor) and lateral (predictor-criterion) collinearity to be scrutinised concurrently and a variance inflation factor (VIF) to be produced for each construct. Kock (2015) has suggested that potential common method bias in the model along with pathological collinearity may be reflected in VIF values above 3.3. Consequently models returning a VIF of ≤ 3.3 ‘...can be considered free of common method bias.’ (p.7).

Given that SmartPLS 3.2.3 (Ringle, Wende and Becker, 2015), the data analysis software used in this study, is able to generate by default VIF values as part of the collinearity evaluations, and taking into account the fact that the full collinearity test proposed by Kock and Lynn (2012) and advanced by Kock (2015) has been examined specifically within the PLS-SEM context, this ex ante solutions was considered most suitable for the data presented here.
3.10 Data analysis – structural equation modelling (SEM)

Structural equation modelling (SEM) is a second generation multivariate analysis technique used in the analysis of relationships between variables (Hair et al., 2014; 2014b; 2017) which unlike its first generation predecessors, is able to accommodate both observed and unobserved data (Byrne, 1998). This makes SEM one of the most prevalent techniques in use throughout the research arena (Tomarken and Waller, 2005). Kelloway (2015) and others provide further reasons for the popularity which are also of relevance to the study presented here. Kelloway contends for example that the use of measures to approximate the constructs and the ability to examine the relationship between them are particularly beneficial; benefits which Hair et al., (2014, p.639) further conclude ‘provides a better way of empirically examining a theoretical model…in one analysis.’

Every structural equation model consists of a measurement and a structural model; the former reflective of items or indicators used, the latter representing the unobservable or latent variables (Leeflang et al., 2000). This allows for hypothesised and non-observable relationships to be assessed and estimated (Williams, Vandenberg and Edwards, 2009) based on survey-sourced data. Thus, through the representation of ‘causal processes that give rise to the phenomena of interest’, predictivity is inherently embedded in the technique and moreover, can be combined with the measurement and relational benefits noted previously (Kelloway, 2015, p.3). This makes SEM amenable to the testing of multi-equation, multi-dependent relationship theories (Binz Astrachan, Patel and Wanzenried, 2014; Hair et al., 2014b) also in situations where the processes for theory-testing are less advanced (Bentler, 1980). Indeed, where mediator variables – i.e. variables that essentially explain the presence of a relationship between an independent and dependent variable (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Hair et al., 2017) – are involved, the reliability-addressing capability of structural modelling methods as noted by Berger (2015) and advocated by Baron and Kenny (1986) are recommendable. Finally, while SEM is regarded as confirmatory in nature it is apt to accommodating some exploratory attributes (Byrne, 1998).

It is on the basis of these assertions that SEM was selected for the analysis of data derived from the survey instrument in this study.

3.10.1 Covariance-based and variance-based structural equation modelling

SEM can further be approached from the covariance-based (CB-SEM) or the variance based partial least squares (PLS-SEM) perspective, each of which differ on a conceptual level.
Hair et al., (2014; 2017) outline specifically that in CB-SEM, all variables are treated as common factors which in turn describe how the corresponding indicators co-vary. By contrast, constructs are characterised as ‘weighted composites of indicator variables’ in PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2017, p.15) and consequently enable consideration of measurement error. This distinction between the two approaches is important because, as these authors and others (see for example: Henseler et al., 2014; Rigdon et al., 2014) assert, the assumption in CB-SEM that a mutually shared, or common factor accounts for the covariation in the indicators, is subsequently relaxed in PLS-SEM. It is also important to note however that as proxies (Wooldridge, 2009) or approximate representations (Rigdon, 2012), these common factors and composites are neither equal to nor indistinguishable from the conceptual constructs within the model and therefore, in non-statistical terms, may be said to share a fundamental likeness (Rigdon, 2016).

3.10.2 Reflective and formative measures
Accurate specification of constructs’ measurement items as either reflective or formative, or Mode A or Mode B respectively in PLS-SEM terms, is an essential part of structural equation modelling. Reflectively measured constructs differ from those that are formatively measured in that the construct is said to cause the measurement items, or indicators, which in turn are manifestations of the construct itself (Edwards and Bagozzi, 2000; Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer, 2001). In formative, or causal, indicators (Bollen and Bauldry, 2011), causality is directed from the measurement items toward the construct (Edwards and Bagozzi, 2000) and indeed determines the construct (Bollen and Lennox, 1991). With no shared underlying construct, item correlation is not necessary, however the omission of any single item leads to distortions in the essence of the construct (Hair et al., 2017). Figure 3.5 illustrates both model types. Misspecification of measurement items can therefore lead to problems in the results produced and by extension, any conclusions drawn (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2006).
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**Figure 3.5** Comparative illustration of reflective (Mode A) and formative (Mode B) measurement models
*Source: Adapted from Albers and Hildebrand (2006) and Hair et al. (2014)*
In CB-SEM, measurement indicators are almost always pre-classified as reflective (Chin, 2010) as is the case with the LISREL CB-SEM program (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2009), even though in some cases the construct under study requires formative measurement. While it is possible for CB-SEM to accommodate formative indicators, the process by which specification and estimation is achieved is somewhat arduous in the case of LISREL (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2000), even requiring that the program be tricked, as is the case with MPlus (Kelloway, 2015). In PLS-SEM, the process of setting formative indicators is more accessible to the extent that ‘the PLS path modelling algorithm allows the unrestricted computation of cause–effect relationship models that employ both reflective and formative measurement models’ according to Henseler, Ringle and Sincovics (2009, p.288) who reference the work of Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer (2001). The conceptual models presented and tested in Berger’s (2015) study on buyer-supplier relationship governance, Baumgarth and Schmidt’s study on internal brand equity (2010), and Baumgarth’s (2008; 2009) works on brand orientation in musea and the business-to-business sector illustrate this particular aspect of PLS-SEM and the overall versatility of the method.

3.11 Determining the use of PLS-SEM

There has been much debate and discussion regarding the use and indeed the conditions under which CB-SEM as opposed to PLS-SEM – and vice versa – should be used.

Noting the contentious conclusions reached by Rönkkö and Evermann (2013) regarding the use of PLS-SEM and recommendations from Antonakis, et al (2010) and Rönkkö, et al., (2015) that researchers refrain from using it, Rigdon (2016, p.3), elucidates both the ‘Flawed arguments in favour of PLS path modeling’ (p.3) and the ‘Flawed arguments against the use of PLS modelling’ that have fuelled misunderstandings around PLS-SEM and its application. In addressing concerns around sample size, data distribution and measurement model mode for example, Rigdon’s work not only contributes to that of previous studies demarcating the conditions under which CB-SEM or PLS-SEM should be used, but as in the case of the exploratory perspective, clarifies more precisely what these conditions are.

These so-called rules of thumb for selecting either the PLS-SEM or CB-SEM approach have been discussed extensively in the PLS literature (see for example: Chin, 2010; Hair et al., 2011; Binz Astrachan et al., 2014; Rigdon, 2016). From these works, it can be summed that CB-SEM is generally recommended for the testing, confirmation or comparison of theories. It is also suited to situations where covariation in error terms is required for instance and where non-recursive models are being tested.
Of importance to this study however, and as noted by Hair et al (2014), for research in which the identification of the drivers and relationships between constructs is critical, the goal may invariably be the extension (or further development) of theory as opposed to its testing and confirmation. In such cases, PLS-SEM is significantly more accommodating than CB-SEM since it estimates the relationships in path models that amplify endogenous variables’ path coefficients, i.e., their $R^2$ values. This furthermore satisfies the predictive element of PLS that supports theory-building for example (Hair, et al., 2014). These authors, along with Chin (2010) in particular, have suggested that complex – construct and item-rich – models such as that defined in the present study might also benefit from the component-based aspect of PLS-SEM particularly when verisimilitude (likeness to truth) is important to the study. The following subsections review these rules of thumb.

3.11.1 Theory testing and theory building

As might be expected, each approach also has advantages and disadvantages.

While the common factor scores remain unknown and thus unused in model estimation (Hair et al., 2017), CB-SEM is able to produce the Goodness of Fit indices that are essential in assessing the aptness of the model and testing theory. Sarstedt et al. (2014) posit however that iterative adjustments made to the model in a bid to enhance the fit, as is the case with CB-SEM, tend to diverge somewhat from the real model and ultimately appear quite basic.

Indeed, even the propriety of the $X^2$ test statistic Rigdon (2016) argues does not fully address the validity of the model, describe precisely what it indicates or have the veneration of the SEM world. Furthermore, given its suitability to theory testing, CB-SEM generally tends to overlook predictive aspects (Hair et al., 2011).

Despite PLS-SEM having no specific Goodness of Fit indices, contemporary research from Bentler and Huang (2014), Henseler et al. (2014) has begun to address this deficiency with the latter researchers’ introduction of standard root mean square residual (SRMR) to validate the model through assessment of deltas between the observed and model-implied correlations.

One additional significant benefit of PLS-SEM is that it is particularly well suited to the exploration and identification of relationships (Reinartz et al; 2009) such as those in the present study; explaining central target constructs (Chin, 2010; Klarner et al., 2013) and thus the development of theory (Reinartz et al., 2009; Hair et al., 2011, 2014, 2017).

3.11.2 Consistency in parameter estimation accuracy

Although the usability of PLS-SEM as an SEM method has occasionally been the subject of debate by Rönkkö and Evermann (2013) and other researchers, Hair et al. (2017) and Rigdon (2016) have
responded to concerns centering on the consistency of PLS-SEM parameter estimates – a critical element of SEM calculations, and indeed the very use of PLS-SEM respectively.

In addressing the contentions of Rönkkö and Evermann, Henseler et al., (2014, p.187), assert that the resultant claims of bias in PLS estimates have stemmed largely from reading of the estimates as ‘effects between common factors instead of effects between composite factors.’ Hair et al., (2017), additionally cite extant research from Reinartz, et al (2009) prior to concluding that virtually no differences are to be found between PLS-SEM and CB-SEM parameter estimates assuming that constructs are measured via four or more indicators each achieving loadings above the 0.70 threshold. Indeed in their comparative study of the performance of both approaches via Monte Carlo simulation, Reinartz, et al. (2009) found that the PLS-SEM parameter estimates yielded higher levels of accuracy in smaller samples (i.e. sn=250 in these authors’ study).

3.11.3 Non-normal data distribution and small sample size

Non-normal distribution of data and small sample size have also been used to rationalise the choice of PLS-SEM. Indeed, in an analysis of 65 studies utilising PLS-SEM, Ringle, et al., (2012) found that in addition to its ability to cope with reflective and formative measurement models individually and in tandem, the overriding justifications given for applying PLS-SEM were the need to analyse small samples and the presence of non-normal data. This latter point is of key importance since the development of PLS-SEM was in part driven by a reaction to the normal data distribution requirements of maximum likelihood (ML) estimation widely used in CB-SEM. PLS-SEM by contrast employs so-called soft distributional assumptions (Lohmöller, 1989) which allow for the use of non-parametric and, more importantly, prediction-oriented measures such as $R^2$ in endogenous variables (Chin, 2010).

Research has also found that in samples of ≤200, non-convergence becomes an issue in CB-SEM necessitating an inordinate number of observations to address it (Boomsma and Hoogland, 2001). While low sample size is consequently susceptible to problems in CB-SEM and can indeed result in failed analyses using ML estimation, limited samples are not sufficient justification for the use Rigdon (2016) or abuse (Hair et al., 2017) of PLS-SEM. This is not to say that PLS-SEM cannot cope with small sample sizes. Henseler, Ringle and Sincovics (2009) for example refer to Monte Carlo simulations conducted by Chin and Newstead, (1999) in which indicator suitability data on samples as low as 20 was successful. The critical deciding-factor must therefore hinge on the relevance and interest of the sample (Rigdon, 2016) and furthermore, adhere to the minimum sample size conditions laid out by Cohen (1992) for the reasoning to be sound (Hair et al., 2014; 2017).
3.11.4 Model complexity and exploratory studies

It has been argued that in terms of methodology, PLS-SEM also offers greater expediency over CB-SEM where ‘improper or non-convergent results are likely’ (Henseler et al., 2009, p.288).

As a component-based method, this further allows for problem-free estimation of paths within highly complex models comprising multiple latent variable constructs and high numbers of indicators (Wold, 1985) where relationships between variables can be examined (Binz Astrachan et al., 2014). While such relationships are arguably open to examination in CB-SEM, typically this is only possible in the context of established theory or theories. PLS-SEM by contrast is far more favourable in terms of its theory-building capacity as noted previously.

Although it has been posited that PLS-SEM is especially suited to exploratory research (see for example 2011; Ringle, Sarstedt and Straub, 2012) and to the development of theory within an exploratory research setting (Hair et al., 2017, p.4), Rigdon (2016) suggests there are fundamental philosophical issues associated with positioning SEM in this way. The contention put forward is that in assuming a realist stance, such positioning could lead to a compromise in the validity of the construct proxies used as well as any subsequent claim of a contribution having been made.

3.12 Application of PLS-SEM in the present study

Figure 3.6 shows a simplified version of the conceptual model underpinning this study in which a relationship is theorised to exist between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours.

Figure 3.6 Simplified conceptual model showing the theorised relationship between the case organisation specific corporate identity cues, organisational identification and role behaviours

For a number of reasons, PLS-SEM was deemed most appropriate for addressing the study’s aim and objectives within the context of this conceptual model. These reasons are summarised and presented in the following paragraphs.

Model complexity

First and foremost, the complete conceptual model is highly complex (see Chapter 5) and comprises nine reflectively measured constructs and 39 indicators excluding the mediator variables.
Small subgroup sample sizes
Secondly, the subgroups identified for the PLS multigroup analysis (i.e., Front-Office/Back-Office and Pre-Exposure/Post-Exposure) are equally complex and, in some cases, yield small sample sizes.

Identification of corporate identity cues as drivers
Thirdly, on the basis of the conceptual model illustrated, the research objectives described in Chapter 1, and the theoretical gaps identified in Chapter 2, the corporate identity cues and organisational identification constructs are positioned as drivers. That is to say, the corporate identity cues are posited to influence organisational identification and, indirectly, the in-role and extra-role behaviour constructs, while organisational identification in turn is posited to affect directly these role behaviours. Understanding these driver-influenced effects in the conceptual model is also as integral to the study, as the identification of the [combination of] corporate identity cues. This is because as exogenous variables, the corporate identity cues in the PLS-SEM context aim to predict the endogenous variables of organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviour in the model.

Theory-extending objectives
Fourthly, with the availability of primary data and a scarcity of extant literature on the relationships presented in the conceptual mode but no single, specific overarching theory established for the present study – a situation Wold (1985, p.589) describes as, ‘data-rich and theory-primitive’ – the research outlined here is deliberately positioned as theory-extending. In other words, it aims to contribute to the bodies of knowledge in social and corporate identity, organisational identification and role behaviours rather than build specifically new theory.

Taking these four considerations into account, and consistent with the recommendations of Chin (2010), Binz Astrachan et al. (2014), and Rigdon (2016), PLS-SEM was determined to be the analytical method most appropriate to fulfilling the objectives of this quantitative phase (Phase II) of the research. To this end, the study was conducted using SmartPLS 3.2.3 (Ringle, et al., 2015). Since PLS-SEM also yields favourable R² values for endogenous latent constructs – a key focus of extending theory in PLS-SEM – with broad applicability across various models, the model’s parameters were estimated using the path weighting scheme as recommended by Hair et al. (2014, 2017).

It is pertinent at this point to reiterate that analysis of the data was conducted at the aggregate (company-wide) and subgroup level. Accordingly, the following sub-sections detail the methodologies applied in analysing: the measurement and structural models; measurement model invariance and the subgroups (multigroup analysis).
3.13 Assessing the measurement model

3.13.1 Model reliability

Assessing the reliability and validity of a model’s measurement items in terms of their ability to provide accurate measures of the underlying latent variable requires inspection of several measures and criteria. In PLS-SEM, internal consistency reliability – i.e., the similarity of item scores measuring the latent variable – is assessed on the basis of composite reliability as opposed to Cronbach’s alpha. This is often accompanied by or prefaced with examination of the outer loadings. Here loadings of 0.70 and above are considered acceptable, while those up to and including 0.40 are omitted (Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2011; Hair et al., 2014; 2017).

Although Cronbach’s alpha is considered the staple measure of internal consistency, in accepting all construct items as similarly reliable (Henseler, Ringle and Sincovics, 2009) and itself being influenced by the quantity of items comprising any given scale, resultant readings of internal consistency reliability are prone to misjudgement (Hair et al., 2014). It is for this reason that composite reliability, an internal consistency measure that reflects the range of indicator variable loadings, is recommended in the assessment of PLS path model reliability (Henseler et al., 2009; Hair et al., 2014). In this study however, both composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha are reported and the accepted thresholds of ≥0.70 (Nunnally, 1994) adapted.

3.13.2 Model validity

In terms of validity, measures of convergent and discriminant validity are employed in PLS-SEM (Hair, et al., 2017). Here, it is the examination of the constructs’ outer loadings and average variance extracted (AVE) that are of importance. AVE provides a measure of how much variance is caught by the latent variable relative to the amount occurring as a result of measurement error (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Values above 0.70 and 0.50 respectively are set as the minimum thresholds, thus providing an indication of the degree to which individual items correlate with each other in measuring a specific construct (Hair, et al., 2014) that is to say, their convergent validity.

In assessing discriminant validity – i.e., the extent to which the items are indicative of a given construct and that the constructs themselves uniquely differ from each other (Hair, et al., 2010, 2014; 2017) – examination of the items’ cross loadings, use of the Fornell-Larcker criterion (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) criterion and incorporation of the more recently developed heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) can be applied. While cross-loadings rely on indicators loading higher on their corresponding constructs than on any other, the Fornell-Larcker criterion is dependent on the
square root of any given construct’s AVE being above that of the uppermost correlation found with other constructs (Hair, et al., 2017).

Extant research however has revealed inadequacies in both the cross loading and the Fornell-Larcker measures (Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2015) with these authors pointing specifically to: the measures’ inability to dependably identify discriminant validity under conditions of full construct correlation as in the application of cross loadings; and minor deviations in indicator loadings for given constructs, as in the case of the Fornell-Larcker criterion. Henseler et al. (2015) and Hair et al., (2017) instead suggest examination of the estimated correlation between specific constructs – i.e., the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) – which looks at the average of indicator correlations from the full array of constructs relative to the average of those associated with individual constructs. Henseler et al. (2015) further set out three evaluative measures of HTMT ratio ranging from the most generous criterion of HTMT.90, to the highly conservative HTMT.85 criterion as well as the more statistically-grounded HTMT_inference that incorporates the use of confidence intervals within which values of 1 are considered symptomatic of poor discriminant validity. For the purposes of this research, discriminant validity was assessed using all three measures; cross-loadings, the Fornell-Larcker criterion together with the HTMT.90 and HTMT.85 ratios.

3.14 Assessing the structural model

Given the theory-extending nature of the study, it is essential that the theoretical model demonstrate both significance and predictive power – the two principal standards for assessing the structural model (Henseler et al., 2011). Together with its focus on maximising the explained variance in the endogenous latent variables, PLS-SEM provides a firm foundation for comprehensive assessment of the relationship between the constructs in the model.

As illustrated in the left-hand side of figure 3.7, the evaluation of structural models typically comprises six sequentially-running assessments for: collinearity; significance and relevance of relationships; coefficient of determination (R²); $f^2$ effects size; predictive relevance (Q²); and $q^2$ effects size (Henseler et al., 2011; Hair et al., 2014, 2017). These six criteria are detailed in the following sections of this chapter. The relationships between the model’s constructs are assessed on the basis of the corresponding path coefficients ($\beta$) and their significance as reflected in the t-values returned. For the present study, a significance level of t-value $\geq 1.96 \ (p<0.05)$ was set.

Given that analysis of mediating effects is a central part of this study, and that the significance of structural model relationships (i.e., Step 2 of the structural model assessment procedure outlined in the left side of figure 3.8) is necessarily connected to this, a slight deviation was made to the process.
In this case, significance testing was only conducted once all other steps, including the ex post analysis of the data for common method variance and cross-validation of the parameter estimates had been completed. These adjustments are illustrated in the right hand side of figure 3.7 with significance testing positioned as Step 6.

![Figure 3.7](image)

**Figure 3.7** Structural model assessment procedure in PLS-SEM (left) and adjusted procedure as applied in the present study (right)

*Source: adapted from Hair et al. (2017)*

### 3.14.1 Assessing the structural model for (multi)collinearity

Commencing the process by evaluating the model for collinearity – i.e. high levels of correlation amongst variables – ensures that any subsequent path coefficient estimations are not adversely affected (Hair et al., 2017). The measure of interest here is the tolerance or variance inflation factor (VIF) which should not exceed a value of 5 (Hair et al., 2014).

VIF values may further be used, as in this study, to test for common method bias; that is variance occurring as a result of the measurement method employed as opposed to the variables represented by the latent variables (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Here, models exhibiting VIF values of \( \leq 3.3 \) are viewed as free of common method bias (Kock, 2014; 2015).
Collinearity assessment is followed by significance testing which in SmartPLS is achieved via the bootstrapping procedure as outlined in section 3.15. Bootstrapping results may also be indicative of the relevance of specific relationships and the degree to which the exogenous and endogenous variables are linked (Hair et al., 2017). In this study, a subsample size of 5,000 was applied in all bootstrapped models. Furthermore, in line with most empirical studies, an empirical t-value of ≥1.96 (p-values <0.05) for path coefficients was taken as an indication of significance at the 5% significance level (p-value <0.05; two-tailed test).

3.14.2 Assessing the ($R^2$) level – coefficient of determination

Assessment of the model’s descriptive ability is derived from the coefficient of determination, or $R^2$ value (Hair et al., 2014). $R^2$ may be interpreted as the variance in any given endogenous construct that is explained by the contribution made by other constructs to which it is related in the structural model; as such, it is intrinsic to appraising the extent of variance when measuring the $f^2$ effect size (Hair et al., 2014).

While upper $R^2$ values (on a scale of 0 to 1) in PLS-SEM are said to reflect greater precision in the model’s predictive ability (Hair et al., 2017), it should be noted that opinions differ substantially across domains in the interpretation of $R^2$ values. Hair et al. (2014) thus duly caution that the choice of $R^2$ levels applied should take into consideration the field of research and the nature of the model being estimated. As this study refers to some aspects of organisational behaviour in addition to its corporate identity focus, results will be considered and reported on their own merits.

An adjusted form of the coefficient of determination, commonly annotated as $R^2_{adj}$ where $n$ represents sample size and $k$ represents the exogenous constructs, is defined as

\[
R^2_{adj} = 1 - (1 - R^2) \cdot \frac{n - 1}{n - k - 1}
\]  

(Equation 3.1)

and may also be applied in preventing an unfair leaning towards more complicated models (Hair et al., 2017). According to these authors, the addition of spurious exogenous constructs purely for the intention of increasing the $R^2$ value is thus penalised since the $R^2_{adj}$ decreases the $R^2$ value according to the total explanatory constructs and sample size. This makes $R^2_{adj}$ practicable for the comparison of PLS-SEM results (Hair et al., 2017) outcomes such as convergent validity (Sarstedt, Wilczynski and Melewar, 2013) from models of differing sample sizes and/or exogenous constructs (Hair et al., 2017). It is for this reason that $R^2_{adj}$ values are additionally reported where appropriate in this study.
3.14.3 Assessing the $f^2$ effect size

The $f^2$ effect size also incorporates a measure of the $R^2$. The result is a measurement of the contribution of each exogenous variable to the $R^2$ value in any given endogenous variable (Hair et al., 2014). Here, path estimations are conducted first by excluding and then by including each exogenous variable in a stepwise manner:

$$f^2 = \frac{R^2_{\text{included}} - R^2_{\text{excluded}}}{1 - R^2_{\text{included}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 3.2)

The $R^2$ values of the related endogenous variable(s) are then inspected for changes related to the variables excluded. As with the brief discussion on $R^2$ values in the previous subsection, the values returned in this study have been considered on their own merits; that is to say, on the basis of the data collected.

Generally, models capable of forecasting the indicators of endogenous constructs – that is to say, data not already applied in estimating the model – are said to exhibit predictive relevance (Hair, et al., 2011; 2014) when the path model is effectively able forecast values from the original data set (Hair et al., 2017).

3.14.4 Assessing predictive relevance ($Q^2$)

The Stone-Geisser $Q^2$ value provides a reading of the model’s predictive relevance by precluding the $dth$ data point in the data set and then re-calculating this missing information on the basis of estimates of the data itself (Hair et al., 2014). This so-called blindfolding procedure returns $Q^2$ values considered indicative of the model’s predictive relevance for a given endogenous variable only if these values are greater than zero. Hair et al., (2011; 2014; 2017) recommend application of the cross-validated redundancy method over the cross-validated communality method in deriving the $Q^2$ values, given that the former incorporates estimates from the outer and inner models in forecasting the excluded data as opposed to data from the outer model estimates alone as is the case with the latter method.

3.14.5 Assessing the $q^2$ effect size

The extent to which each exogenous latent variable influences the overall $Q^2$ value can be assessed through the $q^2$ effect size (Hair et al., 2014). Following a construct inclusion/exclusion process similar to that used in discerning the $f^2$ effect size, the generated $q^2$ effect sizes are then used to interpret the predictive relevance for a given endogenous variable. In the research presented here,
the $q^2$ effect sizes have been considered on their own merits rather than by the classifications laid out by Hair et al. (2014).

### 3.14.6 Cross-validation of parameter estimate stability

Cross-validation analysis is an essential part of structural equation modelling since it presents one way in which the degree of confidence in the final model may be expressed (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2000). Cross-validation therefore requires that the model demonstrates functionality in other (Yi and Nassen, 1992), preferably randomly drawn samples. Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt (2011) have recommended that 70 per cent of the original sample be used to estimate the model, and the remaining 30 per cent, the *holdout sample*, used for cross-validation of the initial estimate. The holdout sample is then subjected to the standard processes of analysis for which the common thresholds for validity and stability must additionally be met.

### 3.15 Assessing the significance and relevance of structural model relationships

In examining the model’s path coefficients, the relationship between the exogenous latent variables (i.e. the corporate identity cues) and the endogenous latent variable (i.e., organisational identification) is first examined. Following estimation of the path model using the PLS-SEM algorithm in SmartPLS, the path coefficients generated for each of the structural model relationships are assessed providing an indication of the strength of the effects between constructs in the model (Hair et al., 2014). PLS-SEM further relies on bootstrapping, a non-parametric procedure, to test and determine path coefficient significance (Hair et al., 2014). This involves extraction and replacement of a large number of sub-samples from the original sample data generated. The recommended subsample size of 5,000 (Hair et al., 2014) was adopted for this purpose in the present study. Path coefficient significance was then assessed using the t-values generated as a result of the bootstrapping routine. As noted previously, a significance threshold of $t \geq 1.96$ (p<0.05) was applied to this study, with path coefficients returning values above this level accepted as significant.

#### 3.15.1 Mediating effects

Indirect effects – i.e., outcomes mediated by intervening constructs and thus described as mediating or mediated effects (Baron and Kenny, 1986) – play a critical role in structural equation modelling as these mediating constructs, or variables, not only transfer the effects of one construct to another (MacKinnon, Fairchild and Fritz, 2007) but help clarify the nature and process by which causal effects arise (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). Relationships that link one construct to another
directly – i.e., direct effects (Hair et al., 2014) – are equally important in understanding mediating effects.

Figure 3.8 illustrates the direct and indirect effects of the independent variable ‘X’ on the dependent variable ‘Y’, the latter incorporating the mediation variable ‘M’, within a basic mediator model.

A variable can be said to act as a mediator if: shifts in the independent variable similarly and significantly affect the posited mediator variable (path a); significant changes in the dependent variable are attributable to changes in the mediator (path b); and significant changes result between the dependent and independent variable (path c') through the control of paths a and b (Baron and Kenny, 1986). Thus mediation analysis essentially seeks to test and quantify the mediating effects in the model.

3.15.2 Mediation analysis

The analysis of mediating effects commences with initial confirmation of a significant direct effect between the exogenous and endogenous variable under examination. Assuming that this effect excluding the mediator variable is significant, the indirect effect on the endogenous variable, including the mediator variable is then assessed and subjected to significance testing.

Unlike CB-SEM, the Sobel test (1982) cannot be applied in PLS-SEM for this purpose as it utilise unstandardised path coefficients and furthermore is reliant on certain distributional assumptions (i.e. normal distribution of data) that conflict with the nature of PLS-SEM as described previously.
Hair et al. (2014) recommend circumventing the test’s inherent deficiencies and following instead the guidance from Preacher and Hayes (2008) which advocates bootstrapping of the indirect effects’ sampling distribution to determine significance.

If significance cannot be established for the three paths ($a$, $b$ and $c^1$) or the indirect effect at this stage, it may be assumed that no mediating effect is present (Hair et al., 2017). If the indirect effect (along with the direct effect) on all paths returns significant readings, the extent of the mediation effect is then examined to determine the amount of variance accounted for (VAF) by the mediating variable.

VAF is defined as the degree to which variance in a dependent variable can be explained directly by an independent variable (Hair et al., 2014). The VAF in this instance provides a percentage measure of the mediation; that is to say, the degree of direct effect absorbed by the mediator variable. On the basis of this evaluation, mediation is subsequently classified as: full (>80%), partial (>20% but ≤80%) or exhibiting [almost] no mediation (<20%) (Hair et al., 2014). This process of mediation analysis and the accompanying VAF classifications are outlined in figure 3.9. For a more in-depth analysis of mediation effects, refer to Pieters (2017, forthcoming).

**Figure 3.9** Path diagram illustrating the process of mediation analysis in PLS-SEM

*Source: adapted from Hair et al. (2014)*
3.16 Heterogeneity and unobserved heterogeneity

Researchers have highlighted the fact that data sourced for empirical studies is rarely homogenous in nature (Jedidi, Jagpal and De Sarbo, 1997; Ansari, Jedidi and Jagpal, 2000). In other words, the respondents from whom the data is sourced will often have their own insights and perspectives on the constructs under examination (Ansari, et al., 2000). These individual insights and perspectives render the data heterogeneous. It is possible then that even in cases where heterogeneity is purposely introduced and observable, for instance through the inclusion of demographic and group-directed questions in survey instruments, further patterns of heterogeneity may remain unseen or ‘unobserved’ (Hair et al., 2016, p.64).

In addition to inspecting the structural model as described earlier, it is essential that it is free of or at least treated for unobserved heterogeneity so that Type I and II data errors of inference (Hair et al., 2012; Becker et al., 2013) may be avoided. In fact, neglecting to examine the data for unobserved heterogeneity could compromise results and produce erroneous outcomes (Ringle, Sarstedt and Gudergan, 2011; Becker, Ringle and Volckner, 2013; Hair, et al., 2016). Accordingly Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt (2016) emphasise the importance of examining the data for heterogeneity when conducting research such as that presented here which involves both invariance testing and multigroup analysis.

In PLS-SEM, this examination is carried out using the latent class technique finite mixture PLS (FIMIX-PLS) to disaggregate the distribution of the ‘mixture of group specific density functions’, the results of which are subsequently applied in regression frameworks to estimate each group’s path coefficients (Hair et al., 2016, p.66).

In the present study, the four-step FIMIX-PLS approach for identifying and treating unobserved heterogeneity (figure 3.10) advanced by Hair et al. (2016), Matthews et al. (2016) and Hair et al., (2017) was applied to the data. These steps are outlined below.

![Image](Illustration removed for copyright restrictions)

**Figure 3.10** Application of FIMIX-PLS process
*Source: Hair et al. (2016)*
3.16.1 Running the FIMIX-PLS procedure

Based on the path model generated by running the PLS-SEM procedure, the upper bound for the span of segment solutions must be determined and calculation of the minimum sample size required to obtain a Statistical Power of 80% (based on guidance from Cohen, 1992). This upper bound is determined by taking the maximum number of arrows pointing at a variable (Hair et al., 2014). In assuming a significance level of 5% with a minimum $R^2$ of 0.25, and in accordance with the recommended PLS-SEM sample size to achieve a statistical power of 80% (Hair et al., 2014), the minimum sample size required to provide reliable estimates of the model is then derived.

Following Matthews et al. (2016), dividing the total sample by the minimum sample size then produces a figure which must be reduced down to a whole integer to create the theoretical upper bound (i.e., the number of segments). Based on this information, the FIMIX-PLS procedure can then be run for a minimum of two segments and the maximum as determined by this upper bound. The number of pre-defined segments for which the segmentation returns a corresponding value, indicates the size of each segment relative to the whole sample (Matthews et al., 2016).

3.16.2 Determining the number of segments

Determining the number of segments to be preserved requires inspection of the fit indices generated as a result of running the FIMIX-PLS procedure in Step 1. With exception to the EN, or normed entropy statistic, the ideal segment solution (i.e., the number of segments to be retained) is indicated by the segment returning the lowest figure for each information criteria (Matthews et al., 2016).

In their extensive evaluation of fit indices, Sarstedt et al. (2011), conclude that with their inherent advantages and disadvantages, values returned from a combination of information criteria should be considered when determining the segments to be preserved. For example, these authors note that where the modified Akaike’s information criterion with factor 3 (AIC$^3$) and consistent AIC (CAIC) point to the same number of segments, it is likely that the correct number of segments has been indicated. It is similarly suggested that the modified Akaike’s information criterion with factor 4 (AIC$^4$) paired with the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) also exhibits good performance. These authors further recommend that the Entropy Statistic Normed (EN) should be used in parallel to these criteria. The EN statistic is a measure of partition reliability (i.e., the probability of any given observation belonging to a specific segment) that ranges from 0 to 1 with higher measures suggesting superior partition quality (Hair et al., 2016). Measures exceeding 0.50 generally mean that the data can be cleanly grouped into the specified number of segments (Ringle, Wende and Will, 2010). In this study, the AIC$^4$, BIC and EN criteria were selected based on the results (see
Chapter 5) from this Step 2 of the FIMIX-PLS procedure. The relative and absolute segment size should also be examined to substantiate and confirm the segment solution respectively (Matthews et al., 2016).

3.16.3 Explaining the latent segment structure

Step 3 of the FIMIX-PLS process involves explanation of the latent segment structure. For this, ex post analysis (Hahn et al., 2002) of the data is carried out and each observation from the full data manually allocated to one of the pre-defined segments according to maximum segment membership probabilities. In other words, where an observation has a significantly higher percentage probability of belonging to one segment rather another, the observation is allocated to the segment for which it has the higher membership probability (Matthews et al., 2016).

This partitioned data can then be imposed on the original data set so that comparisons can be made between the FIMIX-PLS partitions and other explanatory variables that are either known to the researcher or can be discerned from the data. Using variables with multiple categories such as hierarchical position (i.e., senior manager, middle manager, non-manager) for example, the most suitable FIMIX-PLS group for those respondents identifying themselves as middle-managers may be determined. Counting the number respondents from each FIMIX-PLS group that are represented in each hierarchical position category and dividing this figure by the total sample size, gives an indication of how well the FIMIX-PLS partition and that produced via the explanatory variable actually match (Matthews et al., 2016). It is for these reasons of comparison that Sarstedt, Ringle and Gudergan (2016) advocate the consideration of such multi-category variables during the design phase of the research. An overlap of 60 per cent or more is considered satisfactory indication of a match between the partition and the explanatory variable (Hair et al., 2016).

3.16.4 Estimating the segment specific models

The final step of the FIMIX-PLS procedure involves estimation of what Hair et al. (2016, p.72) term the ‘the segment-specific models’ for the explanatory variables deemed to have exhibited a satisfactory overlap with the partitions created as a result of Step 3. As with the estimation of any path model in PLS-SEM, the structural and measurement model requirements for reliability, validity and significance must be met before interpretation of the results can take place.
3.17 Measurement invariance of composite models - MICOM

As noted previously, the data also required analysis at the subgroup level where effects in the theorised relationship were examined within Front-office/Back-office (FOBO) and Pre-/Post Strategic Announcement Exposure subgroups. For this purpose multiple groups of multigroup data were generated.

Assessing such multigroup data for measurement invariance is an essential part of multigroup analyses (MGA) (Hair et al., 2017). The omission of measurement invariance testing prior to MGA could lead to differences in construct relationships being attributed to variations in how the constructs are interpreted by subgroups as opposed to any real difference in the construct relationships themselves which in turn can increase the potential for measurement error to occur (Hult et al., 2008). Given the group-level focus of this study, confirming measurement invariance is therefore a necessary precondition for producing accurate, meaningful multigroup analyses (Vandenberg and Lance, 2000).

Invariance testing in PLS-SEM requires that the latent constructs comprising the model be treated as composites – rather than common factors as is standard with CB-SEM (Hair et al., 2017) – thus placating the need for indicator covariance to be attributable to a single underlying cause (Henseler et al., 2016, p.408). Ensuring that the indicators subsequently and unambiguously reflect discrepancies in the latent variable relationships (as opposed to [mis]construal of the questions) at the group level is therefore of critical importance in invariance testing (Garson, 2016; Henseler et al., 2016).

Applying the non-parametric measurement invariance of composite models (MICOM) method put forward by Henseler et al., (2016) facilitates testing of model invariance on three levels: configural invariance (uniform specification, treatment and calculation settings of model composites); compositional invariance (identical development of composite scores); and equality of mean values and variances that are broadly in alignment to those advanced by Vandenberg and Lance (2000) and Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) within the CB-SEM domain (figure 3.11).

Here, calculation of compositional invariance within the MICOM procedure is reliant upon permutation, that is, the arbitrary consignment of observations to the [two] groups being tested (Edgington and Onghena, 2007) and the model estimated for every permutation (Hair et al., 2017). Here, the resultant output is accordingly examined to determine whether correlations amongst the scores for the composites differ significantly from one.
Figure 3.11  MICOM procedure for assessing measurement invariance of composites
Source: Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2016

The original correlation must lie in excess of the 5% quantile reflecting the distribution of correlations found in the pooled data permutations and return permutation p-values of >0.05 in order for non-significance and thus invariance to be substantiated (Garson, 2016).

Assessment of the permutation p-value is also required in Step 3 (equality of mean values and variances), whereby findings of non-significance in this and the preceding step result in full measurement invariance being achieved. Henseler et al (2016) point out however that findings of non-significance for step 1 and step 2 (configural and compositional invariance) only are indicative of partial measurement invariance.

The authors further recommend that MICOM be halted after Step 2 and multigroup analysis be carried out to assess the equality of the structural model. Completion of the MICOM procedure is then only pursued depending on the presence and extent of variant or invariant effects disclosed by the multigroup analysis.

Given that only the coefficients of the subgroup models will be compared in the present study, only the first two steps of the procedure (step 1 configural invariance; step 2 compositional invariance) will be applied.
3.18 Multigroup analysis

Various approaches to analysing multigroup data including t tests (see for example, Eberl, 2010) and permutation-based procedures such as MICOM (also applied in invariance testing as outlined in the previous sub-section) have been used for the analysis of data in PLS-SEM.

These methods are commonly used in the contrasting of two groups. Being parametric in nature, t tests require that the data, in addition to exhibiting measurement invariance and satisfactory goodness of fit, be reasonably normal in its distribution (Chin, 2000; Eberl, 2010). However this requirement runs somewhat counter to one of the key tenets of PLS-SEM of supporting non-normal data distribution (Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2011; Hair et al., 2014; 2017). The MICOM procedure, while relaxing distributional assumptions, presents a non-parametric alternative to permutation as described in section 3.17 that may be considered a more liberal approach albeit susceptible to Type 1 errors (Sarstedt, Henseler and Ringle in Sarstedt, Schwaiger and Taylor, 2011) in assessing individual group-based parameter estimates.

The one-tailed partial least square multi-group analysis (PLS-MGA) procedure by comparison extends the permutation approach by contrasting the bootstrap results between two groups and tallying the number of times group 1 estimates exceed those of group two (Hair et al., 2017). Here, resulting probability values of ≤0.05 and ≥0.95 denote significant differences and the null hypothesis can be rejected. Although PLS-MGA currently only supports one-tailed hypotheses, the procedure was considered appropriate and was thus applied in this study.

The multiple groups selected for analysis in this study were defined using the following discrete grouping moderator variables: Front-office/Back-office position (FOBO) and Pre Strategic Announcement Exposure and Post Strategic Announcement Exposure (EXPOSURE). Both FOBO and EXPOSURE were modelled as discrete, dichotomous variables and coded accordingly; that is to say, with a choice of two responses. Here, for example the FOBO Front-Office sample comprises those survey respondents who identified themselves as holding roles that bring them into regular contact with the case organisation’s external customers. This would include for example, though not be limited to, business development managers, project managers, some marketing and sales employees as well as those embedded in or supporting projects operating on the clients’ premises. The FOBO Back-Office employees by contrast comprise those respondents who identified themselves as having no direct contact with the organisation’s customers; i.e., those working in internal support roles and functions incorporating administrative work.

As the focus of this study lies in gaining understanding of the effects of identity cues on organisational identification and the subsequent effects of organisational identification on the role
behaviours of client-facing and non-client facing employees (FOBO subgroup) as well as groups exposed or not exposed to strategic intervention communications (EXPOSURE subgroup), analyses will be restricted to these subgroups only. Furthermore, based on the hypotheses presented in the Literature Review (Chapter 2) the precedent set by extant research in the field (see Eberl (2010); Chin and Dibbern (2010); Sarstedt, Henseler and Ringle (2011)), and the nature of the grouping moderator variables selected, it is expected that moderating influences are likely to be detected at both the aggregate and subgroup levels as a result.

It is also possible, and indeed helpful when comparing the outcomes from PLS-SEM multigroup analyses, to understand the implications from a managerial perspective (Hair et al., 2017). By contrasting the total effects – i.e., the sum of the direct effects (the path that directly links two constructs); and the indirect effects (constructs that are linked via one or more additional constructs) – with the average value from the corresponding latent variable score, an importance and performance map analysis (IPMA) can be conducted on constructs of specific interest (Ringle and Sarstedt, 2016). From this, it is possible to consider the focus, priority or importance placed on addressing particular organisational concerns, for example.

3.19 Research quality

3.19.1 Ethical statement and ethics approval

As the researcher of this study and an employees of the case organisation, my ethical responsibilities to both Aston University and CSC have been of paramount importance in this study. While the research, its associated process and outputs have been in full compliance with Aston University’s research code of conduct, it has also been necessary to ensure in parallel compliance with the values of the case organisation itself. Thus approval to conduct the research was sought and granted from the case organisation’s Human Resources Management departments as well as the Directors of the Business Divisions participating in the study. More specifically, each participant, including those involved in the pilot studies, was provide with basic background information on the research (see Participant Information Sheet in Appendix 4) and required to give informed consent prior to involvement in the research itself (Appendix 4a). Confidentiality was assured for all those participating in and supporting the research. Moreover all members, company names and organisational descriptors (for example, departments, hierarchical group names, and acquired companies) have been anonymised throughout the thesis. I have also refrained from divulging any findings (intermittent or otherwise) from the research within the case organisation. Ethics approval for the study was granted by Aston University in October 2014 (see Appendix 4b).
3.20 Conclusion

In addition to providing a review of the paradigmatic and philosophical underpinnings of the research, this chapter of the study has laid out specifically details of the research approach and context within which this exploratory sequential, mixed methods study has been conducted. In so doing, the functionalist, critical realist assumptions of the study further provide justification for choice of approach and method. These and subsequent assumptions made with regard to the methods and design have been as much informed by the research question and aims central to the study, as it has by the theoretical domain within which the research itself is located. To this end, both qualitative and quantitative research methods have been employed for the elicitation and analysis of the primary data. Although data collection is dominated by the application of two distinct methods – semi-structured interviews for the qualitative study (Phase I), and surveys for the quantitative study (Phase II) – the output is arguably strengthened through the complementary analytical advantages afforded by each.
Chapter 4  Phase I – Revealing the Cues to Corporate Identity

4.1  Introduction

In this chapter, the analysis and results of Phase I of the research are presented. Phase I focuses on the first four objectives that support the overall aim of the study, namely:

1. eliciting member organisational associations from a cross-section of company employees
2. identifying the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (i.e., CED member organisational associations) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity
3. establishing whether additional patterns beyond those that are CED are present in the elicited member organisational associations that reflect how these associations may be perceived in the working environment context and,
4. determining the CED member organisational associations, along with their corresponding patterns, that are linked to the present environment; trigger sensemaking; and influence future action and attention. In short, the identification of those associations that also act as cues to the corporate identity

This phase of the study also incorporates validation of the emergent corporate identity cues and corresponding patterns against the derived and extant frameworks of corporate identity.

The chapter opens with a brief overview of the data collection process (section 4.2) and the outcomes of the sampling strategy (section 4.3). It then goes on to describe the analysis of the data (section 4.4) which was conducted using a generic approach, and the protocols used in establishing data trustworthiness (section 4.5). The results of the data analysis are then presented in four parts.

In Part one (section 4.6), the results of the analysis applied in eliciting the member organisational associations that are CED, as well as the case organisation’s corporate identity are presented. This part of the analysis addresses the first two objectives of the overall study. In Part two (section 4.7), the results of analysing the CED categorised member organisational associations for underlying patterns are detailed. The outcomes of assessing this data for its use as cues (i.e. guiding employees’ attention, actions and behaviour) are also outlined. These analyses represent the third and fourth objectives respectively of this qualitative study. Part three (section 4.8) of the study then details the results of the cross-matching, or validation, of the underlying patterns in the data and the identified cues against the derived corporate identity. Finally, in Part four (section 4.9), the emergent findings are assessed and fitted, against established models of corporate identity to
anchor them in the domain. In section 4.10, the refined conceptual model, additional hypotheses, and the constructs selected from extant studies to represent the cues derived from the study are presented. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the study’s findings in section 4.11.

Since this phase of the study was conducted entirely by the researcher, the interpretations presented are by definition subjective and as such may impact the results. The researcher has however taken several measures to address the subjectivity. Firstly significant effort was invested in establishing trustworthiness in the data and the analytical process adopted as described later in section 4.5. Here, the research data was independently audited and the coding structure examined by three independent former researchers for reliability. Secondly, informants (i.e., employees participating in this phase of the study) were invited to examine, and adjust where appropriate, the transcriptions from their specific interviews. Finally, the careful examination and review of domain-relevant literature to identify extant constructs most closely reflective of the case organisational corporate identity cues provided additional validation of the emergent corporate identity cues. In parallel, the elicited member organisational associations from these interviews and the subsequent corporate identity cues were also scrutinised closely in the selection of the representative constructs (i.e., rigorously tested scales) from extant research (see section 4.10.1). Where appropriate, these measures are referred to in the study and detailed in the relevant sections outlined prior.

4.2 Data collection

Data for this phase of the research was obtained from a combination of primary (semi-structured interviews) and secondary (domain-relevant literature) data sources; a practice recognised for the strengthening effects on mixed methods research (Robson, 2002; Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011), and more specifically for qualitative studies (Saunders et al., 2012).

Semi-structured interviews, including one pilot, were conducted over a two-month period from January to February 2015 with 30 employees representing a cross-section of the case organisation’s employees. The output was subsequently analysed using a generic qualitative analysis procedure. Data collection, and analysis were conducted entirely by the researcher. In recognising and subsequently addressing the obvious subjective nature of this approach, research data trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) was subsequently assessed by three experienced former researchers independent of the case organisation, the researcher and Aston University. The process and results of this assessment are detailed in section 4.5.
The interviews
Having established the sample and interview schedule, the first pilot was conducted in English, the official company language, and in accordance with the interview schedule developed and described earlier. A copy of the interview schedule may also be found in Appendix 3. No issues were detected with the structuring or the themes of the interview schedule. The questions were understood and responded to adequately, and the interview ran for just under 38 minutes. The second pilot was due to be conducted under identical conditions, with a substantially looser and more open approach to the interview questions applied. However, the results of the first pilot indicated a degree of stability in the interview schedule that was encouraging of its broader deployment. As a precautionary measure, the identical conditions and schedule were applied to the following four interviews. The face validity and structure of the interview schedule was confirmed in each interview. On this basis, the interviews were then conducted with the remaining sample.

With the consent of all informants, each interview was audio recorded then transcribed verbatim. Informants were provided with transcriptions of their respective interviews within five working days of the interview and asked to review, clarify where appropriate, and subsequently authorise the document for further analysis. All thirty informants complied with the request. As no disparities were evidenced between the pilot and remaining interviews, the pilot was included as part of the overall sample resulting in a total of 30 interviews being analysed in the study.

4.3 Sampling strategy
Application of the sampling strategy yielded a sample size of 30 in alignment with both the recommendations of Creswell (2007) and Saunders et al. (2012) as well as data reported in several studies in the identity domain (see table 2.1).

It should be noted however that for reasons of restricted access within parts of the case organisation, no members of CSC’s senior management team were included in the sample. Although this may be viewed as a shortcoming, it was also considered beneficial since any senior management interest and participation could then be directed towards the survey, thus leading to potentially more representative results. A total sample of 30 informants, two of whom participated in the piloting stage, subsequently took part in the study. The diversity of the sample – which included employees of British, Dutch, Indian and Turkish nationality – suggests that the organisation was also well represented along demographic, service and operational lines.
It should additionally be noted however that also due to reasons of restricted access, temporary and contract employees could not be included in the sample. The sample therefore comprises permanent CSC employees only. An overview of the participating employee (also referred to as informants) profiles is presented in Appendix 2.

4.4 Data analysis

Analysis of the primary qualitative data gathered was conducted in four parts.

In part one, informants’ member organisational associations were examined. Comprising both organisation-transmitted signals related to the firm as well as the attributes considered to be central, enduring and distinctive (CED) about the firm, this part of the analysis provided the basis for deriving the case organisation’s corporate identity. In part two of the analysis, the focus was on analysing the data for additional underlying patterns. Here, analysis was further extended to assess the data for specific characteristics of cues and evidence of its use as cues in line with the definitions advanced by Weick (1995) and Weber and Glynn (2006). The third part of the analysis focuses on the underlying patterns identified in the data, the content characterised and evidently used as cues by organisational members, and how both align – or cross-match – with the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of the corporate identity. This validating process was followed by a fourth and final round of analysis in which the emergent underlying patterns and cues were assessed against established models of corporate identity and corporate identity cues in order to substantiate their appropriacy within and anchor them in the corporate identity domain.

It is worth iterating at this juncture that with the overall study weighted principally on the quantitative component (Phase II), the results reported in this qualitative phase of the study focus heavily on the emergent corporate identity cues that were also employed in the selection of representative constructs (i.e., scales) from extent research for the quantitative investigation. Emphasising this particular level of focus in the research is not unusual since ‘explaining each emergent theme and/or dimension...[to]...“zoom in” on the key emergent new concepts...and hold them up for examination as the core ideas’ (bold type added by the researcher) is concomitant with the level of rigour applied in the Gioia Methodology (Gioia, et al., 2013a, p.23); a method of qualitative data analysis used frequently in studies of corporate identity.
4.4.1 Overview of the qualitative analysis methodology

It is prudent at this point to restate that while a generic qualitative analysis approach was applied in this study, elements and terminologies of the Gioia Methodology were additionally employed. As described in Chapter 3, this generic approach allowed for the data to be examined along two streams. Figure 4.1 shows how the member organisational associations, CED-specific member organisational associations and the corporate identity of the case organisation were elicited (left-hand segment of figure 4.1); and the corresponding corporate identity cues subsequently validated (right-hand segment of figure 4.1) and anchored (lower segment of figures 4.1). These two streams are outlined in the subsections below which describe how the [CED] member organisational associations were elicited, and separately, how the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types were derived.

As also noted in Chapter 3, the Methodology section of this thesis, the overall categorisation, coding and analysis of the data was conducted using NVivo 10 software. NVivo was considered particularly appropriate since it allows for the initial categories, 1st-order terms, 2nd-order themes and 2nd-order dimensions to be be coded directly in the imported verbatim transcriptions and audio recordings of informant interviews in the form of nodes. It is on this basis that these nodes can be further named, explored and categorised to reflect the the 1st-order terms as well as the corresponding 2nd-order themes and dimensions in the data.

Eliciting the [CED] member organisational associations comprising the CSC corporate identity

The left-hand segment of figure 4.1 shows the process adopted in eliciting the member organisational associations and CED member organisational associations comprising the case organisation’s corporate identity. This corresponds with the first two objectives of the overall study. In this first stream of analysis, a total of 109 1st-order terms was extracted. Distillation of these 1st-order terms produced 32 individual 2nd-order themes reflecting the member organisational associations of the 30 informants. Categorisation of these 2nd-order themes in accordance with the three a priori 2nd-order central, enduring and distinctive (CED) aggregate dimensions resulted in the derived CSC corporate identity.

Deriving the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types

The right-hand segment of the diagram traces the process of data analysis adopted in deriving the case organisation’s corporate identity cues, and in discerning the underlying non-CED patterns in the data which in turn form the groups to which these cues belong (i.e. the corporate identity cue types). As can be observed in figure 4.1, the 32 original 2nd-order themes from the first stream of analysis were used in this process. Rather than introducing a priori theory, these 2nd-order themes...
were analysed for other naturally occurring patterns beyond the central, enduring and distinctive dimensions. In this instance, three patterns, or conceptual areas, relating to strategy, communication and relationships within the case organisation were detected in the data. Of the 32 original 2nd-order themes, a total of 25 could be categorised successfully into one of these three patterns or conceptual areas and carried forward for further analysis. Inspection of the 1st order terms and in vivo text for the remaining seven themes showed that none of these themes could be classified into any of the three conceptual areas. For example examination of these aspects of the 2nd-order themes *Honesty, Use and Misuse of the company name* and *Sleeping giant with experience*, revealed no commonly shared pattern and no clear link to any of the three conceptual areas.

As noted earlier, this categorisation may however be considered subjective since it was conducted solely by the researcher.

In the following step, this time in line with the a priori characterisation of cues laid out by Weick (1995) and Weber and Glynn (2006), these 25 2nd-order themes along with their corresponding in vivo transcriptions were examined for evidence of their use as cues by informants. Here, 24 of the 25 2nd-order themes were found to be used specifically as cues by informants. It is at this stage that the 24 remaining 2nd-order themes are referred to as *identity cues* and the patterns, or conceptual areas, into which they were categorised referred to as *identity cue types*.

To further validate these identity cues and identity cue types as specific to the case organisation’s corporate identity, the data was cross-matched with the content from the 2nd-order ‘CED’ aggregate dimensions derived in the first stream of analysis. In confirming their alignment with the case organisation’s corporate identity, it is only at this stage that the 24 identity cues were formerly classified as and termed *CSC corporate identity cues* in this study. Similarly, it is only at this stage that the three identity cue types, once cross-matched with CED attributes of the case organisation, were formerly referred to as *CSC corporate identity cue types*.

In the final stage, the emergent *CSC corporate identity cues* and *CSC corporate identity cue types* were assessed against established frameworks of corporate identity and corporate identity cues to anchor them in the corporate identity domain.
Figure 4.1 Overview of the generic qualitative data analysis process and its outcomes
4.5 Data trustworthiness

As noted in Chapter 3 and in the previous subsection, a generic analysis approach was applied to allow for the inclusion of procedures developed specifically to address the objectives in this phase of the study. Pursuing such an approach, as with all qualitative or naturalistically based studies, demands that validity, reliability and overall veracity in the study be established.

The emphasis on verifying accuracy, integrity and conviction in the data means that validity is given primacy over reliability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Here, the focus is on the analytical process as defined and applied in the research. Of the manifold techniques available for assessing validity, many are used in tandem and can involve the informant, additional sources of information or independent third party assessors (Cresswell and Plano Clarke, 2011). In this study, two methods of validity assessment were employed – member-checking and external audit.

The member-checking procedure involved each informant being provided with the verbatim transcription of their interview and asked to verify the content for accuracy and clarity. Informants were also invited to make any adjustments they felt were warranted such as misheard and thus misinterpreted words in the transcription. The researcher then reviewed the amendments with the informant before finalising the transcription and sharing with the informant the authorised version for use in the study. This resulted in only minor adjustments being accepted along these lines as the few informant responses received were related to typing errors and general queries regarding the study. Although member-checking inevitably brings an additional degree of transparency to the process at the researcher-informant level, the researcher was particularly careful to maintain confidentiality throughout culminating in full anonymisation of the information and all case-organisation-identifying terms used.

Following Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) guidance for establishing trustworthiness as presented in Shah and Corley (2006) and the former’s six parameters for audit examination, an inventory was developed against which the independent audit could be conducted. A former researcher from International Institute of Social Studies in The Hague, the Netherlands was invited to carry out the audit on the basis of their knowledge of qualitative research methodologies and also having no exposure to or involvement in the study itself. Once fully available, the auditor was given access to all electronic and hard copy data relating to the study together with the Methodology, Data Analysis and Results sections comprising this chapter and a briefing of the study from the researcher.
In line with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985, pp.319-320) framework, the auditor was asked to assess specifically the study’s:

- **Raw data** (including documents, field notes and other measures)
- **Data reduction and analysis products** (including additional field notes, theoretical and coding information)
- **Data reconstruction and synthesis products** (including categories structure, themes, linkages, definitions and final report)
- **Process notes** (including methodological notes, processes, designs and reasoning)
- **Materials relating to intentions and dispositions** (including inquiry proposal, personal notes and expectations)
- **Instrument development information** (including interview schedule/protocols, pilot forms)

A de-brief with the auditor one week after commencing the audit revealed no issues.

Having completed the validity assessment, the reliability, i.e., the coding structure compliance (Creswell and Plano Clarke, 2011), of the study was examined. In acknowledging the opinions of Gioia et al., (2013a) with regard to bolstering ‘confidence in...assertions and findings.’(p.8), three inter-coder reliability assessments were conducted. Furthermore, in view of the adjusted analytical process adopted in this study, assessment was conducted at three levels in the data. Three independent assessors (all of whom are former researchers) with differing professional backgrounds (engineer, journalist and policy communications officer) were selected for this phase. In line with studies of organisational identity, the Q-sort technique (cf. Burke, 2010); cf. Corley, 2002) was applied.

In three sequential levels of assessment, each assessor was required to match a total of 39 items with the corresponding codes from the data. These 39 items comprised 15 in vivo quotes from the raw data along with their corresponding 1st-order terms. Each 1st-order term was numbered and the assessor required to set a specific 1st-order term number against its corresponding in vivo quote. This constituted the first level of assessment. For the second level of assessment, 12 of the original 39 items were represented by 1st-order terms and their corresponding 2nd-order themes. Again, each of the 2nd-order themes was numbered and the assessors asked to match the 2nd-order theme number to its corresponding 1st-order term. In the third and final level of assessment, the same process was applied with the 12 remaining 2nd-order aggregate themes. In this instance however, the assessor was required to match the 2nd-order aggregate themes with one of the three 2nd-order underlying non-CED patterns identified in the data (these patterns are described in section 4.7).
Though obviously excluded from the final data structure, two orphans were included in the second and third level of assessment, to determine whether the corresponding definitions applied were also appropriate.

For ease of administration and post-assessment evaluation, a Microsoft Excel table was created for each assessor to complete by setting the number defined for each 1st-order term, 2nd-order theme and 2nd-order pattern against the respective in vivo quotes, 1st-order terms and 2nd-order themes in the table.

Evaluation of the Excel tables revealed an inter-coder reliability rate of 72%, 74% and 79% among the three assessors (Table 4.1). Although these ratings per level, as opposed to assessor, do not all reach the upper bounds of 94% – in fact one misses the lower boundary of 70% considered to be ‘acceptable…[and]…‘exceptional’ respectively (Fahy, 2001, p.1) – it has been argued that a relaxation of such cut-off points is appropriate in research of a more explorative nature (Hruschka et al., 2004; Krippendorff 2004) such as that presented here.

When compared with extant studies from Clark et al., (2010) and Gioia et al., (2010) in which intercoder agreement levels of 87 per cent (using 2 external coders) and 90.6 per cent (using three external coders) respectively were achieved, the findings presented here indicate a reasonable degree of confidence in the analytical process and coding applied in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor</th>
<th>Level 1 1st-order Items to Quotes</th>
<th>Level 2 2nd-order Themes to Items</th>
<th>Level 3 2nd-order Pre-Aggregate Patterns to 2nd-order Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF 001</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF 002</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF 003</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Intercoder reliability rates for the generic qualitative analysis process

With the trustworthiness of the data established, a more detailed description of the 1st-order terms, 2nd-order themes and 2nd-order aggregate dimensions to emerge as a result of the analysis is provided in the following sub-sections of this chapter commencing with Part one – eliciting the [CED] member organisational associations comprising the CSC corporate identity.
4.6 Part one – eliciting the [CED] member organisational associations comprising the CSC corporate identity

Part one of this analysis addresses the first two objectives of this qualitative study. That is to say, the focus of this part of the study is on: the elicitation of member organisational associations from a cross-section of company employees; and, identification of the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (i.e., CED member organisational associations) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity. Based on the transcribed data from the interviews conducted with 30 employees of the case organisation, these analyses may be viewed as a [re]construction of employees’ every-day experiences and interpretations of the company’s corporate identity and to some extent reflect their responses to the corporate identity.

4.6.1 1st-order terms

Initial examination and sorting of the raw interview transcriptions produced 664 different 1st-order categories ranging from the cultural and image-specific, to the behavioural and strategy-specific, some almost identical. Distillation of the 664 1st-order categories on the basis of similarities and differences reduced the data down to 109 unique 1st-order terms. In order to maintain a clear sense of informant-perceived contexts, experiences and indeed the member organisational associations, the descriptors applied to each term were crafted as closely as possible to the original in vivo interview output. These 109 unique 1st-order terms form the single source from which the case organisation’s corporate identity, corporate identity cues and corporate identity cue types were derived.

4.6.2 2nd-order themes

To arrive at the 2nd-order themes, the 1st-order terms were examined for further similarities. The 1st-order terms that exhibited close commonalities were grouped together. This process was applied until no further groupings could be achieved. A total of 32 different 2nd-order themes were derived. These 2nd-order themes are also referred to as member organisational associations from this point since they reflect ‘the cognitions, affects (ie, moods and emotions), evaluations (attaching specific cognitions and affects), summary evaluations, and/or patterns of associations (eg. Schemata, scripts) with respect to a particular company’ that comprise corporate and member organisational associations (Brown, 1998, p.217). This satisfies the first objective of this study; namely to elicit a range of member organisational associations from employees of the case organisation.
4.6.3 2nd-order aggregate dimensions

The 2nd-order aggregate dimensions were taken directly from theory and thus imposed a priori. For this purpose, the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of the organisation (Albert and Whetten, 1985) that comprise its corporate identity were applied. The 32 different 2nd-order themes (with their corresponding 1st-order terms) were examined for characteristics specific to each of these attributes and categorised accordingly. Again, as noted earlier in this chapter, this process of categorisation is inherently subjective since it was conducted solely by the researcher.

While definitions of what may truly be considered central, enduring (or indicative of continuity) and distinctive about the identity of organisations have evolved during the past three decades, at the organisational level of analysis, these attributes have remained relatively firm as outlined in sections 2.3.1 and 2.4.3 of the Literature Review presented in Chapter 2. Interpretation of employees’ member organisational associations and perceptions of the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of their organisations nonetheless requires an acute understanding of the operating context, i.e., the organisation itself. Hence the approach adopted here with the researcher employed by the organisation, and the subjectivity acknowledged, may be considered beneficial to achieving the objectives of this phase of the study.

On the basis of these CED considerations and the supporting literature outlined in Chapter 2, each of the 32 unique 2nd-order themes (i.e., the member organisational associations) was categorised under the CED attribute that was felt to best represent it. That is to say, these 2nd-order themes were classified broadly as either: central based on their reflection of: ‘values, labels, products, services or practices’; enduring/indicative of continuity despite evolving over time but nevertheless retaining a superficial constancy; or distinctive in terms of members’ perceptions of the attributes that set CSC apart from other organisations (Gioia et al., 2013b p.125). The results of categorising the 2nd-order themes in this way are presented in table 4.2.

Since these 2nd-order themes are derived from the member organisational associations elicited and have been identified as CED, they are also referred to as CED member organisational associations from this point.

In some cases, the 2nd-order themes (i.e., the CED member organisational associations) though superficially similar, were labelled separately as it was felt that unifying them would dissolve potential nuances connected to contextual and experiential phenomena. For example, while the 2nd-order theme ‘The people – what the company is’ refers to the nature of the business and how that is reflected in the way employees are treated, the theme, ‘The people – employee feelings’ is more indicative of what employees have access to and why they remain with the firm. Similarly,
while ‘Impressions of historical change’ captures employee sentiment around CSC’s progression over time, ‘History’ is concerned largely with the company’s actual history of change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Enduring</th>
<th>Distinctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom and Flexibility</td>
<td>Brand, image and attraction factors</td>
<td>Diversity - in what we do, know and are capable of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People - what the company is</td>
<td>Range of capabilities</td>
<td>Quality - in people and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image and recognised status</td>
<td>In-company knowledge</td>
<td>Sleeping giant with experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise and offerings at different levels</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Status (and pride)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Client relationships</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable, societal and environmental focus</td>
<td>The People - how employees feel</td>
<td>Size, speed and agility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational atmosphere</td>
<td>Approach to business</td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Experience and track record</td>
<td>Current organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Management words and deeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Vision</td>
<td>Growth and size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International business</td>
<td>Use and misuse of company name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2**  
**The 32 CED member organisational associations**  
(i.e., the 32 original 2nd-order themes categorised according to the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of the organisation introduced a priori)

Since one of the objectives within this phase of the research is to elicit the CED-specific member organisational associations that comprise the case organisation’s corporate identity, the 2nd-order aggregate dimension may also be referred to as the 2nd-order CED aggregate dimension. Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 depict the results from this phase of the analysis in the form of a data structure for the central, enduring and distinctive CED aggregate dimensions respectively. The data structures illustrate the 2nd-order themes (member organisational associations) and their attendant 1st-order terms that have been aligned with the corresponding 2nd-order CED aggregate dimension. Collectively, these data structures represent the corporate identity of the case organisation.

This fulfils the second objective of this study; namely to identify the member organisational associations that reflect the CED attributes of the case organisation and comprise its corporate identity. In the following sections, the corporate identity derived as a result of this analysis is described.

**4.6.4 The CSC corporate identity**

In line with many inductively-driven studies, this subsection starts with a broad discussion of the findings from the analyses conducted. Here however, the findings are first viewed in the context of CSC’s identity as explored through the member organisational associations of its employees; that is to say, those attributes of the organisation which in the minds of its members are considered to
be central, enduring and distinctive (CED). For clarity, the 2nd-order themes and aggregate dimensions appear in italics.

4.6.4.1 Central aspects of the CSC identity

As illustrated in the aggregate data structure (table 4.3) the 2nd-order aggregate Central dimension comprises ten 2nd-order themes. In addition to the staples of what the firm is (i.e., its values, culture, history, image and identity), the themes considered central to the identity of the firm also reflect a degree of specificity in terms of what the firm delivers (expertise and offerings internationally), practices (charitable and societal focii) and offers (freedom and flexibility to members). Pivotal to all of these reflections is the people-centricity of CSC; that is to say, the central importance of the organisation’s members in almost all aspects of firm, and indeed in what characterises the firm itself. While this may seem an obvious statement, it is key to understanding how these themes might be interpreted and guide actions.
### Table 4.3 Data structure for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension ‘Central’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes (CED member organisational associations)</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (2nd-order CED aggregate dimension)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain in connection with the company via role</td>
<td>Freedom and Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being part of a company that achieves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness in company and personal interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague understanding of use and point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy of values - no influence or guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart in AirPlan Ltd more than CSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly felt and applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly but framework necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessary for personal guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving people attention</td>
<td>Freedom and Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being appreciated for being oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People focus; people-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International focus</td>
<td>Freedom and Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International work opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being ‘recognised’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Champions League’ company - nationality, nice people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good positioning; evaluation against certain values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence and longevity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of offerings and skills</td>
<td>Expertise and offerings at different levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity and changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate identity changes and challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change reflected in people and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmentation and restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is a specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cultural dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal contributions</td>
<td>Charitable, societal and environmental focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy-free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative aspects and complacency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities and awareness of different company atmospheres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, societal, open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressions of historical change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The people and values that make the company

*The People – what the company is* for example highlights instances in which the people-centric nature of the business together with the business’ accommodation of members’ contributions appear extremely relaxed. The resulting sense of *informality* (informant 001) and familiarity (informant 31) about the organisation (informant 001) was manifested both commercially in the perceived degree of *Freedom and flexibility* CSC offered to clients; and socially in CSCs inclination to place employees ahead of profit (informant 31).
This revealed an interesting juxtaposition in CSC’s identity whereby, the people-centric nature of the Organisational atmosphere appeared so relaxed as to be considered strategy-free (informant 007), yet so socially-focused as to be central to the success of the organisation.

Accordingly, CSC’s Values and vision although seen by some as a constant (informants 002 and 012), seemed to operate only as a passive attribute, carrying little weight or guidance (informants 013, 015, 025, 033) in the daily work of members (informants 027 and 12). This was not the case however with CSC’s Identity as interpreted by its members. Identity in this instance was understood as an active agent, to be learned about (informant 005), seen in the offices and ways of working together (informant 011), integrated with other identities (informant 006), reaffirmed in Divisions’ choices of structural and market focus (informant 012 and 021), and recognised in the individual specialisms of the organisation’s members (informant 010).

The importance of history
The centrality of CSC’s History – along with its multiple changes through acquisitions and mergers (informants 014, 024, 029) and paradoxical lack of strategy – is also linked to this people-centric aspect. History was not only a source of pride to members (informant 014), but also a trigger that prepared members for potential strategic shifts (informant 024) and the drawbacks that might follow (informant 025). In other words, CSC’s History acted as a verifier of the present operational environment and the degree of corresponding personal action required. Stemming from its History, CSC’s well-established capabilities in engineering and consulting as acknowledged by two-thirds of informants, together with its independence (informants 002, 011, 014) seemed to exact a unique influence from the external and internal perspective of the firm. In parallel to supporting CSC’s Image and Recognised status for example, the independent status of the company influenced members’ identification with what they perceived as one of the best consultant engineering firms in the field (informants 010 and 022). The organisation’s expanding international focus (informants 005, 008, 010, 014, 018) similarly fed into the identification narrative by affording members a broader scope for networking, career and personal development opportunities (informants 005 and 010).

The people, products and caring for society
With the people-centricity of CSC prominent in these member-perspectives, it is unsurprising that CSC’s Expertise and offerings at different levels and subsequent links with broader societal concerns were seen as central to the firm’s meaning. What proved to be most central in terms of the Expertise for example was the diversity in skills and services offered by CSC (informants 002, 009 and 018) and consequently, the firm’s activity across multiple industries (informants 009).
In addition to forming the central facet of the organisation’s mission and values, CSC’s long-held commitment to meeting its societal and sustainability obligations in partnership with its members was embedded in company-internal performance levers such as staff development programs, as well as through client projects and the corresponding environmental sustainability standards to which they conform.

The centrality of the people and indeed their understanding of the identity of CSC in this endeavour is unequivocal with the firm’s Charitable, societal and environmental focus (informants 007, 009, 010, 021, 023) providing the bond – if not the justification for the bond – between member and organisation.
4.6.4.2 Endurance and continuity in the CSC identity

While the organisation’s people-centricity and indeed the members themselves provide a strong indication of CSC’s corporate identity, its continuity (or endurance) is characterised most clearly in organisational and individual-level acts. In this case, the combination of temporal comparisons made within and beyond the organisation’s borders, employee feelings, and the firm’s general approach to business. As the second of the three 2nd-order dimensions (see table 4.4), the *enduring* attributes of CSC’s corporate identity are supported by nine 2nd-order themes delineating the reality and effects of these acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes (CED member organisational associations)</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (2nd-order CED aggregate dimension)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track record</td>
<td>Experience and track record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track record in Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the same thing more frequently</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Brand, image and attraction factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we do and offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique approach to new projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td>Approach to business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The networks built over the years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent consultancy niche</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guys that get the work done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechCorp reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The growing company</td>
<td>Growth and size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasting relationships</td>
<td>Client relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about the work; pride in the results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People stayed the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not] feeling part of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding the ‘right’ knowledge</td>
<td>The people - how employees feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of knowledge</td>
<td>In-company knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Data structure for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension ‘Enduring’

Attraction factors and constant growth

The bounds of the firm’s *Brand, image and attraction factors* (informants 001 and 012) in particular are a good measure of CSC’s enduring attributes, temporally expressed as they were in a sense of nostalgia, the comparative experiences made before and after joining the organisation, as well as through the experiences of transferring to different business fields within the organisation. Here for example, the quality and advantages associated with CSC were not only seen as strong (informant 012) but also strengthening (informant 001) over time.
As a reflection of identity continuity (given the firm’s merger and acquisition developments) as opposed to its endurance, CSC’s *Growth and size* was similarly affected by comparisons between the past and present. Specifically it is the reflections of work pressure, identity displacement and wholesale evolution within the company that shape this aspect of the firm’s corporate identity as seen through the eyes of its employees and, to some extent, the degree of inter-collegial contact, happiness and attitudes experienced (informant 001, 002, 004, 006, 009).

**The right people linked to the right knowledge**

Somewhat related to this in terms of comparatives, is the recognition of the external effects of *in-company knowledge*. Beyond providing credibility in client interactions (informant 002), knowledge was seen as a means of substantiating the endurance of the firm and the longevity of its *Client relationships* (informant 011 and 002). More significantly, it was not just the access to the knowledge that was seen as critical, but also access to the *right people* with that knowledge. This may explain why the sense of knowledge fragmentation and dissipation was felt so acutely in the wake of CSC’s multiple and continued merger and acquisition (M&A) activity (informant 008). It might also explain why in contrast, the ongoing effects of such *Changes* were perceived by some informants as an indicator of opportunity and renewal, bringing new possibilities for “Doing the same things but doing them more and more in the Netherlands and more globally.” (informant 012 and 014).

**Feelings of group connectivity and distance**

Against this backdrop, *The People* and specifically how employees feel can also be considered an indirect expression of identity endurance. In fact, the interviews suggest that these feelings reside in parallel but related camps – one centred on group dynamic and benefits; the other on individuality and its accommodation – much as would be expected in employees attempting to achieve what Brewer (1991) has termed optimal distinctiveness. In the first camp for example, emphasis is clearly on the combined power of connection with like-minded or similarly experienced clusters of colleagues (informant 001) and leveraging the group-strength to refine market development opportunities (informant 003). Here, group-strength was demonstrated in the informal educational and advisory environment that facilitated the sharing of personal feedback (informant 008), and in the generally staff-supportive behaviours (informant 010). In the second camp, CSC’s accommodation of individuality highlighted the perhaps unwitting role of organisational members themselves as symbols of the firm’s endurance. There was a strong belief
for example that while the organisation had changed, the individuals themselves had not. Yet this notion of *The People and how employees feel* as one facet of the enduring identity was also tempered with the negativity of the perceived ongoing and growing distance between the senior management and the shop floor. This feeling of *disconnectivity* seems all the more incongruous in light of the people-centric nature of the firm described previously, and the potent *Sense of belonging* outlined in the following sub-section.

**Approaches to business and reflections on the impact**

Although certain aspects of CSC’s *Approach to business* and its *Experience and track record* are reflected through the *Freedom and Flexibility* described previously as central to the organisation’s identity, from an endurance perspective these themes were also expressed in their continued practice. Here, the large scale projects and investments reinforced in the company’s corporate communications deliverables such as its annual reports which were seen to stretch beyond the remit of the projects themselves, to the praxis of the company and across CSC’s geographic bounds (informant 002 and 012). CSC’s *Reputation*, and in particular the reliability associated with it also feature as enduring aspects of the firm’s identity. In fact, the analysis suggests that reliability may be a contributory factor in the longevity of CSC’s reputation given that it was seen to reinforce the professionalism of the organisation, the premium pricing of its services (informant 012), the lengthy client relationships (informant 011) and awareness of the brand in the market place (informants 021 and 030).

**4.6.4.3 Distinctiveness and the CSC identity**

Whereas the 2nd-order themes supporting the central attributes of CSC’s corporate identity are bound in the people-centric nature of the organisation, and identity endurance characterised by the combination of organisation and individual-level acts over time, the distinctiveness of CSC’s corporate identity is dominated by the firm’s culture as perceived at the time of interview. This is further reflected in the six 2nd-order themes comprising this final dimension of the data structure (see table 4.5).
Table 4.5 Data structure for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension ‘Distinctive’

Getting things done and belonging in a diverse culture

Articulated in members’ perceptions of CSC’s operating style, beliefs about differences within the organisation, and actions towards each other within the organisation, the Current organisational culture not only illustrated the frequently quoted definition of how we do or solve things here (Bower, 1966; Jacobs et al., 2008), but also the definitive manner with which things were not done. The perceived poor internal organising capabilities of the firm for example, although acknowledged as a sign of weakness, were neither exposed to clients (informant 02) nor included in the organisation’s official internal communications (informant 01). In parallel, this culture also lent itself well to fostering lateral connections in the organisation with a Chairman seen as approachable and accessible (information 014), and a working atmosphere likened to that typical of the voluntary sector (informant 06).

Integral to the current culture is also CSC’s ongoing progression towards increased employee autonomy (informant 020), operational professionalism and societal commitment (informant 007). The element of independency in particular appeared to be significant since it was also detected in sentiments surrounding the enduring nature of the corporate identity in which the lingering differences (informants 006 and 015) and working preferences (informant 003) within the organisation were voiced.
Additional effects of the current culture could also be detected at the inter-collegial level through the increased exchanges between CSC’s various cultures, offices and more pertinently, the Sense of belonging to and overlap with the organisation itself (informants 008 and 009). Indeed, this sense of belonging was also described by one informant as a privilege (informant 017).

But there is also a strong sense of members having agency in their identification with CSC and indeed its roots, as one Business Development Director noted, “Well, being Dutch, I’m happy that it is a Dutch company. Not many Dutch companies left.” (informant 014).

The irony of this comment of course, is that CSC at the time of and in the years preceding the interviews had been vigorously promoting its international focus particularly in the wake of its most recent merger.

**Quality and entrepreneurialism – linking the internal and external worlds**

From the Current organisational culture and indeed the Sense of belonging described, one can infer the significance of people and projects, and more specifically, the Quality in people and projects as further articulation of CSC’s distinctive corporate identity. For example, quality was demonstrably extended beyond projects to encompass client management practices and the emphasis placed on maintaining high standards in conduct during delivery of client projects (informant, 015). The quality of the client relationship in addition to the satisfaction of the client were seen as integral to this (informant 010). CSC’s Entrepreneurial spirit also provides interesting insights into the Quality of the people. In stark contrast to the vast majority of its competitors for instance, CSC’s foundation (non-stock exchange listed) status allowed for part of its profits to be invested in staff-initiated developments which in turn fuelled members’ entrepreneurialism.

**From pride and status to condescension and control – the highs and lows of a distinctive culture**

In addition to its Current organisational culture, CSC’s Status (and pride) as an independent, staff-owned organisation formed perhaps the single most compelling indicator of its distinction from its competitors. In addition to being highly valued for the agility this afforded CSC in responding to project and market demands, Status, was seen as a quality emanating from the firm’s independence from stakeholders, suppliers and other parties (informant 009) which by extension supported its niche position in the market (informant 021).

The distinctive attributes described thus far have largely mirrored the positive aspects of CSC’s corporate identity. With organisational members acting in effect as a conductor for much of the organisation’s identity, it is perhaps logical that certain members also channelled the negative, although simultaneously distinctive, aspects of the identity. This is evident in the Management words and deeds theme where feelings of being controlled, condescended to and of how
communications should work all converged and were seen as symptomatic of senior management and the functional groups of the business (i.e. human resources management, finance, etc) being out of touch with workings on the shop floor and with clients. The perceived chasm this opened up seemed to imply that in arising specifically from the firms increasing size, the issue was unique to and becoming increasingly distinctive of CSC’s corporate identity.
4.7 Part two - identifying additional patterns and deriving the cues to the CSC corporate identity

Part two of the analysis addresses objectives 3 and 4 of this qualitative study. This part of the study thus focuses on: establishing whether additional patterns beyond those that are CED are present in the elicited member organisational associations that reflect how these associations may be perceived in the working environment context; and, determining the CED member organisational associations, along with their corresponding patterns, that are linked to the present environment; trigger sensemaking; and, influence future action and attention. In other words, the identification of the CED member organisational associations that also act as cues to the corporate identity.

For clarity, the 1st-order terms and 2nd-order themes appear in italics.

4.7.1 1st-order terms

The 109 original 1st-order terms generated directly from analysis of the interview transcripts were used as the principle source of data. To this end, no further modifications were made to the data.

4.7.2 2nd-order themes

As noted previously, the 32 original 2nd-order themes generated in part one of the analysis (i.e., the CED member organisational associations) were also used in this second part of the analysis. Thus, no new themes were derived from the original 109 1st-order items. Instead, the 32 elicited 2nd-order themes/CED member organisational associations were examined for evidence of additional patterns or grouping in the data beyond the CED attributes that reflect how they may be perceived in the working environment context. Given that the research is set within a fully operating international organisation, this was considered particularly relevant in grounding the CED member organisational associations in organisational reality.

Careful review of these 2nd-order themes revealed a distinct patterning in the data around conceptual areas relating to strategy, voice or communications, and relationships within the case organisation. For example, Management words and deeds, Vision and values and Approach to business were clearly related to notions of strategy, while Image, History and Reputation pointed to what appeared to be the deliberately selected and communicated aspects of the firm. The people, Sense of belonging and Entrepreneurial spirit by comparison reflect the meaning, importance and results of relationships in and around the organisation. Of the 32 original 2nd-order themes (i.e., the member organisational associations) generated, seven could not be attributed to any of these three conceptual areas and furthermore did not contain any meaningful information that could further substantiate these emergent patterns in the data. For example, examination of the 1st-order terms
and in vivo texts related to the 2nd-order themes *Honesty, Use and Misuse of the company name* and *Sleeping giant with experience*, revealed no commonly shared pattern and, as noted before, no clear link to any of the three conceptual areas. These themes were thus treated as *orphans* and excluded from further analysis.

The 25 remaining 2nd-order themes can thus be considered representative of the most salient CED member organisational associations that reflect the corporate identity as well as the strategy-related, voice/communications and relationships transmitted within the firm. The 2nd-order themes, together with their 1st-order terms and corresponding conceptual areas, may be found in table 4.6a (strategy-related conceptual area); table 4.6b (voice/communication conceptual area); and table 4.6c (relationships conceptual area). This part of the analysis fulfils the third objective of this study by detecting and confirming three non-CED patterns (i.e., conceptual areas) in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (Identity Cue Type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior management messages</td>
<td>Management words and deeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting messages and signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management comprehension of shop-floor issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management attitudes, communication and staff perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague understanding of use and point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy of values - no influence or guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart in AirPlan Ltd more than CSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly felt and applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly but framework necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessary for personal guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague understanding of use and point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy of values - no influence or guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart in AirPlan Ltd more than CSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly felt and applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly but framework necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessary for personal guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we do and offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique approach to new projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The networks built over the years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International work opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the same thing more frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of offerings and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track record in Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects - impressive, innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of our people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on quality delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client management and clients' perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality - in people and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6a Eight of the twenty-five 2nd-order themes representing the most salient member organisational associations within the *strategy-related* conceptual area/pattern
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (Identity Cue Type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant change</td>
<td>Identity and changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressions of historical change</td>
<td>Corporate identity changes and challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity and changes</td>
<td>Change reflected in people and projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmentation and restriction</td>
<td>Everyone is a specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cultural dimension</td>
<td>Being 'recognised'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Champions League&quot; company - nationality, nice people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good positioning; evaluation against certain values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence and longevity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Image and recognised status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Brand, image and attraction factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal contributions</td>
<td>Charitable, societal and environmental focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability focus</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent consultancy niche</td>
<td>Independent engineering position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guys that get the work done</td>
<td>One of the best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechCorp reputation</td>
<td>Status (and pride)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.6b** Seven of the twenty-five 2nd-order themes representing the most salient member organisational associations within the voice/communication conceptual area/pattern
Table 4.6c Ten of the twenty-five 2nd-order themes representing the most salient member organisational associations within the relationships conceptual area/pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (Identity Cue Type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial structure (not stock listed) and fragility</td>
<td>Member Organisational Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our characteristics - progressive, forward thinking, open-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganisation and incompatibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we do business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes some stay and others leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist communities, expertise and membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy-free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative aspects and complacency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities and awareness of different company atmospheres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, societal, open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about the work; pride in the results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People stayed the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not] feeling part of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving people attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being appreciated for being oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People focus; people-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of connection with company origins; lack of visual representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain in connection with the company via role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being part of a company that achieves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness in company and personal interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still small enough to listen to and change with client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for good ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop and develop own projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in company and its initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasting relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The growing company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding the ‘right’ knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.2.1 Identifying the member organisational associations that act as cues

Having established the 25 2nd-order themes, analysis was subsequently directed towards identifying the CED-specific member organisational associations – along with their corresponding patterns – comprising the corporate identity, and which also guide employees’ attention, actions and/or behaviour; that is to say, their use as cues to and that aid sensemaking of the corporate identity. Focusing on gathering examples of sensemaking cue use by informants and their effects in situ, serves as a means of capturing what Brown and Dacin (2002, p.254) term, ‘the other half of the story…the interpretations and responses.’ to aspects of the corporate identity. In fact, this is the essence of corporate associations (Brown and Dacin, 2002). In so doing, it is likely that additional examples of the case organisation’s communications, behaviours, symbolism, culture and external
conditions – i.e., manifestations of corporate identity cues (Birkigt and Stadler, 1986; Birkigt, Stadler and Funck, 2002; Melewar and Jenkins, 2002; Fill, 2005) – may also be revealed.

Here, identification of the examples was facilitated through the application of two seminal definitions of sensemaking cues; that advanced by Weick’s (1995) theory of sensemaking, and that of Weber and Glynn (2006) relating to the influence on actions. The following sensemaking cue characteristics derived from these definitions were applied in assessing each of the twenty-five 2nd-order themes:

- relationship to the present-day environment
- capacity to trigger sensemaking activity
- indirect influence on future action and attention (Weber and Glynn, 2006)

Through careful review of the 1st-order and in vivo data, each 2nd-order theme was examined rigorously for evidence of its relationship to the present-day environment (RTP) and capacity to trigger sensemaking activity (SMT) Weick (1995); and its indirect influence on future action and attention (IAA) (Weber and Glynn, 2006). Those themes exhibiting two or more of the cue characteristics defined were subsequently categorised as identity cues since they were connected to the member organisational associations containing the CED related attributes comprising the corporate identity.

It might reasonably be argued that evidence of relationships to the present can be detected in all of the 2nd-order themes, or identity cues in this case, since informants recalled and retold their experiences in the present. This would of course position all themes as identity cues which might lead to inaccurate conclusions. To mitigate this undesirable effect, while in parallel enhancing articulation of the identity cues, only those attributes clearly exhibiting two or more of the sensemaking cue definitions described, were classified as identity cues. This resulted in a slight reduction in the number of identity cues from 25 down to 24. In this instance, one of the 25 original 2nd-order themes, Experience and track record, could only be aligned with the RTP cue characteristic.

As an additional measure, specific examples of these attributes being used as identity cues were sought in the data. Here, the original in vivo content was examined again to draw additional corroboratory support for the final 24 identity cues selected. These final twenty-four identity cues may thus be considered the most salient within the case organisation as expressed through informants’ member organisational associations.
These 24 identity cues were subsequently grouped according to the three emergent patterns (i.e., the conceptual areas) that emerged from analysing the 25 original 2nd-order themes for evidence of underlying patterns as described previously in section 4.7.2. Since each of these patterns represent groupings or types of identity cues that share some commonality (i.e., a connection with the strategy-related, voice/communication or relationships signalled within the firm) and are also anchored in the member organisational associations containing the CED related attributes of the corporate identity, they are also referred to here as identity cue types. A summary of this analysis is presented in table 4.7a for the identity cues categorised under the strategy-related conceptual area; table 4.7b for the identity cues categorised under the voice/communication conceptual area; and table 4.7c for the identity cues categorised under the relationships conceptual area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Area - Strategy-Related</th>
<th>Identity Cue Use and Effects</th>
<th>Cue Manifestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach to business</td>
<td>Doing and delivering good work</td>
<td>RTP SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Doing more things globally</td>
<td>RTP IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing personally</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise and offerings at different levels</td>
<td>Put oneself in the clients' shoes</td>
<td>RTP IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International business</td>
<td>Positive, comfortable feelings</td>
<td>RTP SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchanging ideas</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing of working attitude</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management words and deeds</td>
<td>Questioning the status quo</td>
<td>RTP SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inhibiting change</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowering motivation</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unifying</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality - in people and projects</td>
<td>Maintaining high standards</td>
<td>RTP IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing the client and the project</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Vision</td>
<td>No day to day effect of values</td>
<td>RTP IAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RTP = relationship to the present SMT = sensemaking trigger IAA = indirect influence on attention and action

Table 4.7a Seven of the twenty-four 2nd-order themes categorised according to the *strategy-related* conceptual area/pattern and defined as identity cues
### Conceptual Area - Voice/Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Area - Voice/Communication</th>
<th>Identity Cue Use and Effects</th>
<th>Cue Manifestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand, image and attraction factors</td>
<td>Seeing new advantages</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable, societal and environmental focus</td>
<td>Contributions to others; supporting others</td>
<td>RTP, IAA, SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Stoking feelings of pride</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing for the future</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Do things differently to accommodate and learn about different country cultures</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing integration</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declining freedom within job</td>
<td>IAA, SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worry - about losing identity</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generate own internal network</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image and recognised status</td>
<td>Identification - with the best in class of engineering and consulting firms</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing reliable services</td>
<td>SMT, IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (and pride)</td>
<td>Reason for working at CSC</td>
<td>RTP, IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Guaranteeing of quality and trust</td>
<td>RTP, IAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RTP = relationship to the present**  
**SMT = sensemaking trigger**  
**IAA = indirect influence on attention and action**

**Table 4.7b** Seven of the twenty-four 2nd-order themes categorised according to the voice/communication conceptual area/pattern and defined as identity cues

### Conceptual Area - Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Area - Relationships</th>
<th>Identity Cue Use and Effects</th>
<th>Cue Manifestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client relationships</td>
<td>Clients connecting after many years</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current organisational culture</td>
<td>Concealment of unflattering facts - disorganisation</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approachability of management</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater independence to define own work</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimal working atmosphere</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial spirit</td>
<td>Being independent; self-starting</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being supported by the company explore</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom and Flexibility</td>
<td>Showcase own potential</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating permissive space for clients</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster openness</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and size</td>
<td>Having less time to talk with others</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative assessments</td>
<td>IAA, SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-company knowledge</td>
<td>Difficulty finding right knowledge and people</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational atmosphere</td>
<td>Should perform better</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surviving without strategy</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Self-discovery</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showing respect for each other</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling proud</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connecting with others</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People - how employees feel</td>
<td>Understanding the company’s stance</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting feedback from others</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting guidance from others</td>
<td>SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People - what the company is</td>
<td>Putting people ahead of profit</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People more emotionally invested in the company</td>
<td>IAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RTP = relationship to the present**  
**SMT = sensemaking trigger**  
**IAA = indirect influence on attention and action**

**Table 4.7c** Ten of the twenty-four 2nd-order themes categorised according to the relationships conceptual area/pattern and defined as identity cues
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4.7.3 2nd-order aggregate dimensions – revealing the CSC identity cues and cue types

The 24 emergent identity cues were examined a second time firstly to determine the appropriacy of their allocation to the three conceptual areas (i.e., strategy-related, voice/communications and relationship) that cast them as or identity cue types, and secondly, to define these types more specifically. To this end, each identity cue, its corresponding 1st-order term(s) and original in vivo transcript was carefully re-examined. While the terminology of the Gioia Methodology (i.e., 1st-order terms, 2nd-order themes and 2nd-order aggregate dimensions) is used throughout the rest of this chapter, for clarity and where appropriate, the terms identity cues and identity cue types are also used.

Accordingly, those identity cues classified as belonging to the conceptual area or identity cue type of strategy for example, can be seen as closely related to the organisation’s beliefs, claims and efforts; in short, the components used in fostering alignment around strategy. At the 2nd-order aggregate dimension level, the seven corresponding identity cues that make up this identity cue type are referred to as strategy component cues (SCC). These strategy component cues comprise the strategy component identity cue type.

By contrast, the seven identity cues comprising the conceptual area of voice/communication appear to be more indicative of the firm’s long-lasting, emotive traits transmitted purposely and consistently by and within CSC. At the 2nd-order aggregate dimension level, the identity cues that make up this identity cue type are consequently referred to as organisational voice cues (OVC). These organisational voice cues comprise the organisational voice identity cue type.

Finally, the ten remaining identity cues categorised under the conceptual area of relationship evidently mirror what might be described as the inter-collegial bonds, exchanges and supportive actions amongst employees and with clients that additionally are transmitted voluntarily and involuntarily throughout the organisation. At the 2nd-order aggregate dimension level, these identity cues are thus referred to as relational signalling cues (RSC) and comprise the relational signalling identity cue type.

The strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling identity cues together with their respective identity cue types form specific data structures, each of which is presented and described in section 4.7.4.
4.7.3.1 The emergent identity cues and identity cue types

In the following sections of the thesis, the manner in which the 24 emergent identity cues were used and expressed within the case organisation is described. Attention is given to delineating the effects of these identity cues where data is available. Collectively, these outputs address the fourth objective of this study by delineating the identity cues derived from member organisational associations that guide employees’ sensemaking with respect to actions, attention and the corporate identity.

4.7.3.2 The strategy component identity cues and cue type

The strategy component identity cue type and its corresponding cues represent what the company believes, claims and does in fostering alignment with its philosophy and strategy.

With the focus on the philosophical and strategic substance of the organisation, the interviews conducted chart the manner in which the seven identity cues comprising the aggregate dimension strategy component identity cue type, were perceived, interpreted and ultimately treated by informants. From the registering of Management words and deeds, and loose promotion of the firm’s mission, vision and values, to the Expertise and Quality-laden projects and employees intrinsic to CSC’s operations, the informant responses reveal an aspect of the firm’s corporate identity which, in the absence of a clearly articulated strategy, has survived the effects of multiple changes and challenges.

The range of informant responses reported here and shown in the accompanying data structure (table 4.8) illustrate the extent to which these seven identity cues (2nd-order themes) supported by their corresponding member organisational associations (1st-order terms) representing the 2nd-order aggregate dimension strategy component identity cue type, also influence action, attention and sensemaking.
### Table 4.8 Data structure for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension ‘Strategy Component Identity Cue Type’ comprising seven identity cues (2nd-order themes) and corresponding member organisational associations (1st-order terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes Identity Cues (derived from member organisational associations)</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (Identity Cue Type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior management messages</td>
<td>Management words and deeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting messages and signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management comprehension of shop-floor issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management attitudes, communication and staff perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningless</td>
<td>Values and Vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague understanding of use and point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy of values - no influence or guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart in AirPlan Ltd more than CSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly felt and applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessary for personal guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we do and offer</td>
<td>Approach to business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique approach to new projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The networks built over the years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International focus</td>
<td>International business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International work opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the same thing more frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of offerings and skills</td>
<td>Expertise and offerings at different levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects - impressive, innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of our people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on quality delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client management and clients' perceptions</td>
<td>Quality - in people and projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Survival in the absence of articulated strategic direction

The apparent strategy paradox (success in the absence of formal strategy) coupled with the management-instigated transmissions, seemed to be a source of consternation for some informants that illustrated a steadily growing gap between management stance and shop floor reality. This is reflected in the 1st-order terms that define the identity cue, *Management words and deeds*. Attendant feelings of being controlled, condescended to and of how communications should work all converge in this cue and provide some insight into the resultant effects. For example, the cascading of corporate goals down to Division and Business Area level with input that was subsequently never used; the issuance of instructions on what should be done but with limited encouragement; and the perceived lack of *real* strategic guidance from the Board or functional areas of this business were all seen as emblematic of a growing aloofness. As one informant put it:

“...they never have been, in my view, in contact with clients, knowing what happens at clients...or knowing what we face every day...through the years they have grown too far distance (sic) with the working floor...”

*Manager, Asset Management (Informant 009)*
This incongruence in words and deeds, together with the sense of distance expressed by a number of informants (informants 008, 009, 010, 012, 013, 032 and 033) was further reflected in the shift towards more emotive language with senior management and management groups being described as “emperors” and “...kingdoms...”(informant 033). Operations at these upper levels of management were portrayed as a mystery (informant 009) that offered little insight into what the company was doing, and instead fuelled the perceptions of control and condescension. This triggered cynical characterisations of a Board so far removed from its employees that it may have been unaware of the differences between business expectation and shopfloor reality.

That the organisation has survived in spite of an absence of strategy, a factor so essential to many organisations, is of genuine interest from an identity cue perspective because it suggests that the absence of clear strategy may itself be an identity cue since it still influenced the sensemaking and actions of some in the organisation. CSC’s Approach to business is a good example of this. What emerges through this identity cue and its 1st-order terms is how the perceived uniqueness in project management together with the firm’s long-standing networks, offerings and even its pricing enabled CSC’s performance in an apparently strategy-free environment. The high standard of work and premium pricing delivered were cited by one engineer as one such example of this in which, “...the work that we do, we do it good, not necessarily cheap...” (informant 012). CSC’s openness to partnering with other companies, an approach not widely embraced by competitors in the field, on the basis of its well-established networks was further seen as adding a degree of strength to the approach according to one business development manager (informant 002). But perhaps the most compelling aspect of the Approach, and by extension CSC’s operation within this environment, is its inherent resilience as expressed through the attitude of its members:

“...it is a real entrepreneurial process with a lot of little and large obstacles and there could have been various mountains to climb, but the project continues and I think that shows, at least a little bit...that we are serious about the practice.”

Junior Consultant, New Economies (informant 027)

Values and vision on the sidelines

With management, their words and actions often entrenched in the firm’s mission and vision (Mullane, 2006; Sauntson and Morish, 2010), it is inevitable that elements of this identity cue are closely associated with that of Values and vision. Accordingly, the interviews revealed that while some informants found a degree of constancy in the firm’s Values and vision (informants 002 and 012), others at the technical advisory level for example interpreted them as meaningless or vague
as reflected in the 1st-order terms, and not “...directly [helpful]...” (informant 012) given the limited weight or influence delivered to them in their daily work (informants 013, 015, 025, 033).

Indeed, almost all informants had to be prompted to describe the role of the organisation’s values when asked the question: ‘What helps and guides you in your daily work?’ In fact, the Vision and values of the company similarly were only registered as a point of guidance by one informant (informants 027). Yet there was also acknowledgment from one marketing researcher that, “we’re still here even though we’re not...we don’t have a good strategy” (informant 007), and a consultant engineer who reflected on the emotional effect of operating in a value, vision and essentially strategy-free organisation:

“I think we should perform better and probably end up with better scores like financial, so that makes me sad, sometimes like even insecure; because yes, it is a social company but people have to do what they have to do.”

Medior Consultant Engineer (Informant 006)

Personal developments and benefits
At the operational level, CSC’s expanding International business focus as construed by some members (informants 005, 008, 010, 014, 018) provides arguably the most exacting views of both the strategy and the corporate identity of the firm in terms of the overseas, work, networking and career development opportunities presented (see table 4.9 for representative data on this identity cue). Amongst some of the longest serving informants, the internationalisation not only triggered positive feelings, but also the impetus to apply different ways of thinking to those generally used in a local company and increase insights into overseas interactions.

For others, the expedited career progression resulting from working overseas signalled Changes in certain areas of their roles as their seniority working directly in the client firm for example meant that they were no longer involved in projects. Although the effects of these Changes, were largely viewed as opportunities to extend the frequency and geographic scope of expertise (informants 010 and 012), they were also recognised as a source of empowerment that activated members’ assessment of themselves in relation to the company and ultimately their bond with it. As one business development director noted, “Because of all the changes, you were in a position to also change and so it is not the same company. If it would have still been the same company, I am not sure whether I would still be working there.” (informant 014). At the same time however, some of the effects of Changes through M&A activity were viewed as counter-productive to progress where each merger resulted in the feeling of taking two steps back in terms of operational progress according to one strategist (informant 025).
The 1st-order terms of breadth of offerings, skills and expertise supporting CSC’s *Expertise and offerings at different levels*, by comparison reflect the sense of happiness with the company that facilitated its people-centric actions. As a cue to its corporate identity, CSC’s *Expertise and offerings at different levels* as reflected in the diversity of its services (informants 002 and 005), Dutch heritage (informant 005) and market position (informant 010) respectively served as a descriptor for the firm, a source of personal pride in the firm and an expression of its attributes compared to those of its competitors. CSC is, in the words of one informant (010), “…the best in class of engineering and consultancy firms...not focusing on making profit only, but also on the development of people.”
Table 4.9 Excerpt of representative data on 1st-order terms and 2nd-order themes (Identity Cues) for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension, ‘Strategy Component Cues’
As discussed in the previous sub-chapter, CSC’s Quality as expressed through its people and projects, was perceived as one of the most persuasive examples of the firm’s distinctiveness in the consulting engineering industry. Consequently, as an identity cue, it is equally powerful in its demonstrations beyond project boundaries and encompassing of client management practices. Through this identity cue, distinct emphasis was placed on trying to maintain the company’s high standards (informant, 015); outline the importance of managing both client and project firstly as a route to assuring project success; and, build clients’ confidence in CSC’s project management capabilities (informant 017). One senior project manager summarised the significance of this corporate identity cue thusly, “…the most important things are the connection with the clients, that they are positive about our services.” (informant 010).

Summary
Through the strategy component cue dimension, it is evident that the use and effects of the attendant identity cues variously functioned as a guide, trigger and as a valuable service to organisational members in their sensemaking activities. At the same time, the dimension also reveals how, in the apparent absence of drawing from the central pillars of mission, vision and values, the case organisation was able to maintain operations through a seemingly informal, unwritten yet apparently effective set of directions and principles. These directions and principles, perhaps as proxies of the firm’s official philosophy, seemed to be reflected through the identity cues which encompassed CSC’s management, its approaches, expertise and employees. What is noteworthy here however are the effects of the Expertise and offerings at different levels and Quality identity cues. Here, the sense of pride that employees have in their association with CSC and how these cues were subsequently used in maintaining strong client connections and satisfaction levels, provides an illustration of the direct and indirect reach of these strategy component identity cues.

These findings are reasonably consistent with Chun’s (2005) recognition of the mission, vision and ethos of the firm as strategic-level cues that help bind the company direction – or lack thereof as in the case of this study – to the image portrayed (i.e., those elements reflective of the quality, expertise, and business approach identified here). These identity cues themselves also reveal deep parallels with the Mission and Values Dissemination (MVD) construct defined by Simões et al., (2005) in which managerial participation in the creation and distribution of such information is complimented by the manner in which employees are embodied in the company itself. They are also demonstrative of the informal, once again as in the case of this study, yet unifying effects of shared vision described by Kouzes and Posner (2009) which provide the foundations for supporting the ambitions and effective operation of the firm (Wong, Tjosvold and Liu, 2009).
4.7.3.3 The organisational voice identity cues and cue type

The organisational voice identity cues and identity cue type relate to the long-lasting reflections that were purposely transmitted and re-transmitted by and within the company and received by its employees.

Specifically, it is the identity cues anchored in the history, image and reputation of the firm and the sentiments they prompt that are key. This identity cue type helps provide a sense of what the company is and what it should mean to employees by emphasising its outwardly-focused *products*, whether in the form of projects, societal engagements or the independent nature of the firm and its people; in short, its image. The deliberate transmission of this sense by the firm – and its eventual interpretation by employees – is typical in many ways of the corporate communication efforts seen in many firms. The employees’ perceptions of these efforts as acquired through the interviews, highlight the importance of authenticity and consistency in these identity cues for organisational members.

The range of informant responses reported here and shown in the accompanying data structure (table 4.10), illustrate the extent to which these seven identity cues (2nd-order themes) supported by their corresponding member organisational associations (1st-order terms) that represent the 2nd-order aggregate dimension *organisational voice identity cue type*, influenced informants’ action, attention and sensemaking.

The communicated history as the voice of the organisation’s direction

CSC’s state of apparent constant change together with informants’ impressions of historical change are key as 1st-order terms in helping articulate the role of the company’s *History* as an identity cue. It is paradoxical that despite multiple M&A activities (informants 014, 024, 029) within an apparently strategy-free environment, informants were able to extract feelings of pride (informant 014) and indeed guidance. The fact that CSC had once been involved in almost every major international project directly related to its expertise meant that crucially, it was able to make adjustments in order to weather various crises (informant 010). CSC’s ongoing M&A developments for example were taken as preparatory indicators of the direction the company was likely to take such that in the words of one environmental engineer “…at least you know when new changes are going to happen.” (informant 024). The sense of *History* was also expressed through the company’s artefacts, offices, expansion and leadership. For instance, the lack of project-related imagery and materials in some offices was seen as indicative of a gradual loosening of the firm’s connections with its past and position as one of the oldest consultant engineering firms in the World (informant 011). Similarly, the company’s size and offices were viewed as disruptive of the once strong
camaraderie and inter-collegial exchange that had helped establish the firm’s history “...because the company is bigger, there is (sic) more floors with the other people involved of course.” (informant 013). More revealing, was the implied break with history through the change of CSC’s leadership where the differences were immediately apparent (informant 029). Yet despite these varied perceptions of the company’s history, these examples show that organisational members still continued to reference elements of the company’s history and past to verify current circumstances and personal feelings (see table 4.10 for representative data on this identity cue).

The Identity of CSC as reflected in the changes to the company’s appearance, beliefs, projects, people and working styles provides a good outline of the 1st-order terms that drive this identity cue. Although changes to the corporate identity as a result of the two most recent mergers triggered only a passing acknowledgement from informants, there was a distinct sense that on a personal level, the company had not fully dealt with the effects of bringing together organisations of different character. These effects seemed broadly to be anchored in the working styles of the individual firms. For instance, there was the recognition that in being part of a larger company, everyone was a specialist (informant 010), a comment which by itself seemed innocuous. But the apparent encouragement of individuality did not have a positive effect on the business as a whole. Indeed, it appeared to be more illustrative of the various working locations, approaches, and ultimately the character of the firm itself which would need to change:

“...I think both due to the merger, two equally-sized companies merging together which creates, of course...a little bit new way a new identity and changes in offices and way of working all together make (sic) that we are in a period of...big changes with respect to what is our identity.”

Consultant (Informant 011)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes Identity Cues (derived from member organisational associations)</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (Identity Cue Type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant change</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressions of historical change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity and changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate identity changes and challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change reflected in people and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmentation and restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is a specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cultural dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being 'recognised'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Voice Identity Cue Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td>The long-lasting reflections that were purposely transmitted and re-transmitted by and within the company and received by its employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Champions League' company - nationality, nice people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good positioning; evaluation against certain values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence and longevity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>Image and recognised status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charitable, societal and environmental focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent consultancy niche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guys that get the work done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechCorp reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent engineering position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the best</td>
<td></td>
<td>Status (and pride)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10  Data structure for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension ‘Organisational Voice Identity Cue Type’ comprising seven identity cues (2nd-order themes) and corresponding member organisational associations (1st-order terms)

In this sense, the employees of the respective organisations were seen as carriers of their respective organisations’ identities, an observation which brought with it the retrospective conclusion from one medior consultant engineer that the identities were incompatible even though the company was still trying to integrate its various businesses. This need to change led other informants to describe the situation in terms of identity loss (informant 011). These assertions did not seem to impact negatively on the Image and recognised status of CSC, as the firm’s structure. Instead, its trusted reputation and independent status formed an identity cue that was based on its reliability and commitment to supporting clients over the long term (informant 011) as illustrated in the representative data presented in table 4.11. Beyond creating a sense of being one of the better consultant engineering firms (informant 010), this identity cue clearly fuelled a sense of shared esteem (informant 022). Such claims were undoubtedly influenced by the firm’s valued independent status which itself carried implications for current and future action:

“...we are not owned by external shareholders. I mean we are who we are and we can basically decide by ourselves what to do...it existed 130 years, maybe we could do slightly better but we’re doing okay.”

*Director of Business Development (Informant 014)*
Effects of communicating images of the organisation

The firm’s *Brand, image and attraction factors* as noted previously were expressed mainly in terms of the differences registered before and after significant changes in the firm. The aspects of the brand seen as attractive from outside the firm did not appear to conflict with the same aspects viewed from inside the firm. In this sense, CSC’s *Brand, image and attraction factors* seemed to operate as an invitation and cue to conform. This is articulated for instance in the 1st-order terms and comments of one oil and gas engineer who found little difference in the high quality image of the firm experienced prior to joining CSC and the image experienced as an employee of the firm (informant 012). A similar effect was also observed within the firm at sub-group level. Here, what were interpreted as department-specific *benefits* by one team assistant (informant 001) working within a certain group, remained clearly visible and were perceived as stronger by this informant even after they had transferred to a different part of the business.

These examples of the brand image and its attraction factors also seemed to evoke deeply emotive reactions towards the firm such that some informants felt particularly drawn to its *Charitable, societal and environmental focus* (informants 007, 009, 010, 021, 023). This identity cue is particularly interesting because of its apparent ability to influence strongly held opinions and certain behaviours. One marketing professional for instance expressed contempt for promoting the organisation’s services. Yet, the organisation’s support for community rebuilding after one particular natural disaster, Hurricane Katrina, triggered the same informant to re-evaluate their position. For this informant, this identity cue was described as part of their life (informant 007). Indeed, “taking care of the society” (informant 010) through such “good causes” (informant 021), was seen as a way to bring together like-minded employees and encourage interactions above and beyond what would ordinarily be expected in employees’ daily roles (informant 023).

Reputation, status and the feeling of belonging

Accordingly, ConSeng Corporation’s *Reputation* was presented in many informant interviews as symbolic of what was professional, trusted and assuring about the firm; an identity cue for all audiences that was expressed not only in the professionalism of the firm’s members but also in the pricing of project work (informant 012), longevity of client relationships (informant 011), the perceived recognition of the brand in the market place (informants 021 and 030) and the firm’s dependability. In this sense, CSC’s reputation was used partly as a guarantee of its quality. Yet it would be inaccurate to assume that only the positive attributes presented so far played a contributable role here, for the firm’s reputation also represented a clear rejection of what the company definitively is not.
This is illustrated for instance in the assertion that CSC “...make choices, show that they are reliable...and not just as a company who hit and run in projects...” (informant 011) and that despite being “not necessarily cheap...we’ll do it [the project] ” (informant 012).

As discussed previously, the Status (and pride) of CSC as an independent (informants 002, 009, 014, 021), staff-owned organisation was viewed as a distinguishing and competitive factor by some of the informants. Effectively a dual-layered structure, status according to one asset management expert, represented “…independency of stakeholders [and being] independent of contractor...” (informant 009). Indeed, this independent status, appeared to reach much of the organisation, partly through the company’s encouragement of Entrepreneurialism, Freedom and flexibility within the workplace. This identity cue was applied in numerous ways. For some, it provided the justification to maintain the status quo, “…we are who we are and we can basically decide by ourselves what to do...maybe we could do slightly better but we’re doing ok.” (informant 014). But together with the organisation’s core competencies, it took on a more commercial meaning underpinning the company’s niche approach to business in Europe (informant 021) for example. This also influenced the sense of identification with the firm:

“I like to be a member of a professional, reliable, independent organisation. These are characteristics which are important to me. Um....so these are reasons why I work at CSC at the moment.

Oil & Gas Engineer (Informant 021)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Data</th>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...at least you know when new changes are going to happen.&quot; (Informant 024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...every time [we have a merger], we seem to be taking some steps and then a merger seems to take us two steps back...&quot; (Informant 025).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...one of the uh...strongest things is that you can say okay we access the modern world more than 130 years showing that we do what we say and say what we do and by doing that uh uh being a professional independent company, that’s the reason why we exist for such a long...long time...[but] we become a kind of a more anonymous company...&quot; (Informant 011)</td>
<td>Constant change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And everybody knew each other and we worked together more. We also did different projects where you had to work more together, so that’s different now here. That...because the company is bigger, there is more floors with the other people involved of course.&quot; (Informant 013)</td>
<td>Impressions of historical change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Well to be honest, I saw some differences, now we have &lt;&lt;CEO CSC&gt;&gt; as a CEO, which is a former ConsuLE CEO. When...the former CEO of Conseng Corporation was there, we saw some differences.&quot; (Informant 029)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...I only can look back for 6 years exactly. Quite shortly in fact and I have seen a lot of changes in the culture of the company during those years, so I think of course you see the thing that belongs to a large company.&quot; (Informant 003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;... we were trying to merge and integrate to the rest of the company, the two identities did not really match. And it is still the same, we still try to integrate after 5 to 6 years.” (Informant 006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...I am quite worried at the moment, I must honestly say. Uh...that we are losing identity or changing identity.&quot; (Informant 011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...That was the first change that...so there was also a corporate identity change with that with a new slogan and a new branding, new colours, no more grey, but some bright colours, and then there was the second one which was the merger.&quot; (Informant 012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...So I don’t think being part of a big company is a problem but...what I also experienced is that they would be afraid that they will be part ... and don’t have their own identity and this is what they were used to having and being.&quot; (Informant 028)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...let’s say independent, quite old company which people somehow innately trust.&quot; (Informant 002)</td>
<td>Being ’recognised’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...we are not owned by external shareholders. I mean we are who we are and we can basically decide by ourselves what to do and some people say that it is not good because there is not enough challenge and there’s not enough pressure, but it existed 130 years, maybe we could do slightly better but we’re doing okay.&quot; (Informant 014)</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...the best in class of engineering and consultancy firms...&quot; (Informant 010) and</td>
<td>Trustworthy image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...one of the greatest...around the world.&quot; (Informant 022)</td>
<td>&quot;Champions League&quot; company - nationality, nice people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...reliable...services not only on the short term but on the long term.&quot; Bio-based economy consultant (Informant 011)</td>
<td>Good positioning; evaluation against certain values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 Excerpt of representative data on 1st-order terms and 2nd-order themes (Identity Cues) for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension, ‘Organisational Voice Cues’
Summary
As noted in the opening to this section, the organisational voice corporate identity cues and cue type are reflective of the lasting reflections of CSC that were purposely (re)transmitted by and within the company and received by its employees. Anchored in the history, image and reputation of the firm and the resultant sentiments this triggered, these identity cues represent the most prominent feature of this identity cue type. Accordingly, these identity cues not only provided a sense of what the company is, but also what it should mean to employees by emphasising the outwardly-focused accomplishments through projects, societal engagements as well as in the independence of the firm and its people.

As also noted in the opening to this section, the deliberate transmission of these identity cues – and their eventual interpretation by employees – is typical in many ways of the corporate communication efforts of many firms. Indeed it is through this synchronised structure of internal and external communications that the stakeholder impressions upon which a firm relies are developed and sustained (Cornelissen, 2014). Manifested in the identity cues described here, the antecedent relationship between corporate communications and corporate reputation (Van Riel and Fombrun, 2007; Swoboda et al., 2013) is self-evident. But of more importance to CSC’s employees is the authenticity and consistency of the signal transmitted. This is in line with the contention of Simões et al (2005) who assert that it is through steady and constant transmission of the firm’s image that the employees’ role in the organisation is accentuated and their construal of the corporate identity influenced.

4.7.3.4 The relational signalling identity cues and cue type
These relational signalling identity cues and cue type reflect the spirit, nature and quality of exchange and inter-collegial support exhibited between and towards members of the organisation.

With emphasis on the culture, behaviour and atmosphere, in contrast to the identity cues found within the strategy component and organisational voice identity cues and cue types, the relational signalling identity cues appear to be the least controlled. That is to say, that even with the firm’s implicit promotion of reciprocal behaviours and team work along with the freedom and flexibility this confers, the Sense of Belonging created was not specifically articulated in the firm’s mission, vision or values. The result is an employee-focused set of identity cues that embody the spirit and corporate identity of CSC but that are not explicitly imposed by the organisation. These identity cues signal the inter-collegial exchanges which characterise the corporate identity and culture of CSC, but do not appear to be controlled in the same way as corporate communications or strategy for instance. In this sense, the relational signalling identity cues are realised through the connective
and interactive collegial activities of the firm’s members. This is consistent with research that has found that employee practices are affected by relational cultures within organisations (Hofstede et al., 1990).

The range of informant responses reported here and shown in the accompanying data structure (table 4.12) illustrate the extent to which these seven identity cues (2nd-order themes) supported by their corresponding member organisational associations (1st-order terms) representing the 2nd-order aggregate dimension *relational signalling identity cue type*, further influenced informants’ actions, attention and sensemaking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes Identity Cues (derived from member organisational associations)</th>
<th>2nd-Order Aggregate Dimension (Identity Cue Type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial structure (not stock listed) and fragility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our characteristics - progressive, forward thinking, open-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganisation and incompatibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we do business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes some stay and others leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist communities, expertise and membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy-free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative aspects and complacency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities and awareness of different company atmospheres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, societal, open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about the work; pride in the results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People stayed the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not] feeling part of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving people attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being appreciated for being oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People focus; people-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of connection with company origins; lack of visual representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain in connection with the company via role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being part of a company that achieves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness in company and personal interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still small enough to listen to and change with client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for good ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop and develop own projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in company and its initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasting relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The growing company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding the 'right' knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 4.12 | Data structure for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension ‘Relational Signalling Identity Cue Type’ comprising ten identity cues (2nd-order themes) and corresponding member organisational associations (1st-order terms) |
The diverse effects of cultural informality

ConSeng Corporation’s Current organisational culture (i.e. as perceived at the time of interview) as a reflection of the firm’s connections with its members was perhaps clearly identifiable in informants’ thoughts around the firm itself. Encompassing a range of views from CSC’s operating style, to its internal differences and intra-collegial, the current organisational culture proved to be the most comprehensive and pervasive of all the identity cues elicited.

Here for example, the organisation’s poor internal organising capabilities, held up as a sign of weakness to be concealed from clients (informant 02) were omitted from the organisation’s internal communications, signalling the desire for an agreed and unified position to be taken with staff “…because we want to position ourselves as top players…and…show how professional we are…” (informant01). Similarly, the looser, lateral connections between employees within the organisation which one informant likened to working for a voluntary organisation (informant 06), where access to the company chairman was welcomed (information 014; see also the representative data in table 4.13) meant that:

“…the broad connections and the informal way of acting towards each other…the Executive Board [are] also just around…you don’t have to look up to everyone…”

Marketing Assistant (Informant 023)

Somewhat contrastingly, the culture seemed to support CSC’s ongoing progression towards becoming more professional and societally obliged (informant 007) and away from its informal roots. The effects of this progression, were summed up by an administrative staff member who observed a clear distinction between being told what to do as opposed to independently deciding what to do (informant 020). While these developments contributed to the sense of independency felt across the firm, it simultaneously fuelled similar sentiments within the firm around the apparent lingering differences between acquired companies. For instance, while the observation was made that the company was still trying to identify and retain its positive attributes, from different parts of the organisation (informant 015), this was mixed with the criticism that things still had not changed (informant 006). In some cases, these differences were even expressed as preferences for the cultural approaches taken in specific areas of the business:

“I liked this culture, not for the means (sic) that I like the people but I like the way of working that belongs to the culture that they have in the way of thinking…”

Business Development Manager (Informant 003)
A culture of exchange and oneness

Additional effects of the current culture identity cue at inter-collegial level were also evidenced in the perceived increase in exchanges between CSC’s cultures and offices; increases described by one business developer (informant 014) as a way to “…be able to work as optimal (sic) as possible.” But, with this sense of optimal working – whether from those returning to work for the company, bringing with them additional new knowledge and a familiarity with the CSC’s culture (informant 010), or in the directions set by project managers for engineers (informant 006) – came the acknowledgement that the genetics of the newly merged firm meant that trust had still not been established amongst some members (informant 018). When pressed further, this informant qualified the feelings of mistrust as a side-effect of CSC’s ongoing integration of “…a lot of different atmospheres and behaviours…” (informant 018). It is at this point that the influence of the Current organisational culture on the firm’s Atmosphere and informants’ Sense of belonging to the firm itself becomes more tangible. Unsurprisingly, almost all the 1st-order terms affiliated with the Organisational Atmosphere identity cue, relate to the organisation’s people-centricity but only to the extent that it was conducive to the success of the organisation. The link between Organisational Atmosphere and strategy is also apparent in the way that informants considered not only its immediate personal benefits (or not), but the mid to long-term impact on the business. With identity cues to what might be termed the traditional components of strategy apparently reduced in the firm’s Atmosphere but the firm maintaining successful operations, this naturally leads to questions around the psychological influence of CSC’s relational signalling on the informants themselves; that is to say, the Sense of Belonging to or identification with the firm experienced by its members.

Throughout the interviews, this Sense of Belonging and identification was reflected in diverse ways. For example, it was articulated as a reciprocal feeling or overlap where “…it is so close to your ‘self’, it is very difficult to say when it is a feeling of the company and when it’s your own feeling…” (informant 008). It was also experienced as a personal relationship in which “…I really felt part of the organisation and the organisation was also you yourself…” (informant 009). The feelings of identification with the firm were expressed so emphatically in some cases that while one informant (informant 008) equated them with having access to “…an area where you can make mistakes and discover yourself…”, another still referred to their original employer (the last major acquisition by ConSeng) as “…also my company.” (informant 009; italics added by researcher). Organisational identification was also conveyed as a privilege extended to those selected by CSC to work overseas on assignment in the sense that “…if you are going abroad, it is also for yourself and not only for the company…but if you are off, they want to have you there…”. (informant 017).
The sense of belonging was also reaffirmed in daily interactions, providing a certain reassurance “...the way that people on the work floor work together, respect each other...I just feel comfortable here, you know...almost just like at home.” (informant 015); pride “…a lot more than half of my life I work with this company...I’m proud of it, of what we’ve become, what we do internationally.” (informant 018); and accomplishment “…it’s quite nice to be part of a company who achieves...”

The effects of connectivity, sharing, appreciation and feedback
This sense of connection, particularly through the consistent appearance of the firm and irrespective of its strength, appears to be important because a lack of connection, even with the artefacts that signify the organisation, could be interpreted as a loss of or detachment from the firm’s distinguishing features. This is illustrated in the comments of one informant who described a feeling of loss entering one of CSC’s newly acquired offices in which no items reflecting the company or its accomplishments were visible: “…you feel like that (sic) you are losing the connection to all these...uh...colleagues, all these experiences the company has...so we become a kind of anonymous company.” (informant 011). Thus some connection to what uniquely illustrates, describes and defines the company was seen as essential to some members’ identification with CSC. In the words of one business development manager, “…being not part of a community, you will burn like a camel [cigarette].” (informant 030).

The People in terms of what the company is, as well as how employees feel, provide even deeper insights into the reach of the firm’s relational signals at individual level and as an identity cue. With the identity cue The People – what the company is, the focus on appreciation, attentiveness and the members themselves is key. Here, it is not just the fact that informants felt that being themselves (informant 001) was possible, but that it was also appreciated as a personal achievement that others could support. The assertion that CSC was attentive to the needs of its employees was something that was apparently intentional and could be felt (informant 031). It is to be expected then that some informants described the company as being built on its people (informant 002) and that these people remained committed to CSC, which they often viewed as an extension of their own sentiments about society; a point emphasised in the firm’s philosophy (informant 007).

A substantial part of what the company is, also related to its focus on people as opposed to its strategic performance alone (informants 017 and 021). As one secretary stated, “…I don’t think your work is only about numbers. It’s also about if you get along with people...it’s how you feel when you’re in your office.” (informant 017), factors which were then used to explain the enjoyment of working for the company. For example, CSC’s traditional investment of part its
revenues in its employees was seen as a good thing (informant 021) despite the firm’s low profit margins compared to its peers. That the company position was reflected in feelings of constancy, connection and opportunity (i.e., in the identity cue The People – how employees feel) by many informants, was equally unsurprising despite these feelings often being very mixed. For instance, although the people and operations seemed for many to remain the same even during times of change (informants 017 and 025), the reality was quite different as collegial connections were being developed (informants 003, 010, 012 and 031), paths to channel the business’ market efforts discussed (informant 003); and efforts to address the perceived distance between shop floor and management were addressed (informant 010). Additional representational data on this identity cue can be found in table 4.13.

With the increase in information and inter-collegial exchange (informant 013), feedback was consequently seen as an important factor in gauging informants’ fit with the organisational culture. Feedback however appeared to be something that was expected rather than offered. While one informant expressed the hope that they would be informed in the event of acting inappropriately (informant 017), another felt that feedback was something to be actively sought:

“...if you collect the right people around you...um...oh...you get enough feedback and I think...um...that is something that you need to look for...oh...yourself but if you are able to find the people you can learn from around you you will definitely get the feedback from the group and by that I would say you know if you are doing the right thing or not because there...there is the social environment...um...that I think plays a strong role”

*Senior Asset Management Leader (Informant 008)*

The increased possibilities to access various internal networks around the company is also apparent in this identity cue. In some cases, this created opportunities to work with motivated and interesting colleagues (informant 028), to feel appreciated (informant 024); and generally to grow:

“Each time that I had a feeling like okay I’m done within this particular job, there’s always been an opportunity for me to grow and I always have people around me that...uh...supported me with that, that made it possible to do that.”

*Business Team Secretary (Informant 020)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Data</th>
<th>1st-Order Terms</th>
<th>2nd-Order Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...working for a club, like voluntary working ...[with] a lot of different atmospheres and behaviours...&quot; (Informant 006)</td>
<td>Financial structure (not stock listed) and fragility</td>
<td>Identity Cues (derived from member organisational associations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...the broad connections and the informal way of acting towards each other...the Executive Board [are] also just around ... you don’t have to look up to everyone ...&quot; Communications Assistant (Informant 023)</td>
<td>Our characteristics - progressive, forward thinking, open-minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I liked this culture, not for the means that I like the people but I like the way of working that belongs to the culture that they have in the way of thinking...&quot; Business Development Manager (Informant 003)</td>
<td>Disorganisation and incompatibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...I really felt part of the organisation and the organisation was also you yourself...&quot; (Informant 009)</td>
<td>How we do business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...more than half of my life I work with this company...I’m proud of it, of what we’ve become, what we do internationally...it’s quite nice to be part of a company who achieves that.&quot; (Informant 018)</td>
<td>Specialising communities, expertise and membership</td>
<td>Current organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...I think we’re lucky and so are our competitors. It’s part of...not having a strategy um...selective professionalism...I think it’s also part of who engineers are...&quot; (Informant 007)</td>
<td>Organisational atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...we’re still here even though we’re not...we don’t have a good strategy.&quot; (Informant 007)</td>
<td>Relaxated atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...there were times when you feel like a number really...equally, it’s a big enough company but also small enough that you are somebody...&quot; (Informant 024)</td>
<td>Strategy-free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Each time I had a feeling like okay I’m done within this particular job, there’s always been an opportunity for me to grow and I always have people around me that support me with that.&quot; (Informant 020)</td>
<td>Negative aspects and complacency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I like to develop and learn more and also to, yeah, just to develop more ...and also the...how do you say...the confidence they give you, they have in you.&quot; (Informant 023)</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...open and people-minded...it feels like a family’ (Informant 031)</td>
<td>Similarities and awareness of different company atmospheres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;...people have more investments by the company... It is being put back into people, put back into the company. So...I think it is a good thing.&quot; (Informant 021)</td>
<td>Social, societal, open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13  Excerpt of representative data on 1st-order terms and 2nd-order themes (Identity Cues) for the 2nd-order aggregate dimension, ‘Relational Signalling Cues’
As noted previously in the section addressing *Endurance and continuity in the CSC identity* (4.6.4.2), *Client relationships* as an identity cue, rather than promoting any discernible action from the member side, primarily served as an example of the firm’s longevity and appeal (informants 011 and 033) to its clients with many still approaching the firm decades after the fulfilment of projects (informant 033). A far more potent and closely related identity cue was found in the *Freedom and Flexibility* offered and the *Entrepreneurial spirit* encouraged throughout the firm. In some cases *Freedom and flexibility* seemed to be interpreted as an internal-external boundary crossing and permissive space within which clients determined the nature of engagement with the firm. The potential drawbacks were acknowledged in such a way that members also reconsidered their own roles in managing their clients and projects. In other cases, *Freedom and flexibility* were viewed as potentially difficult but attainable routes to convincing management of new ideas; a possibility unheard of in peer organisations. (informant 006).

**Independence, knowledge, growth and the personal connection**

Closely related to the *Freedom and flexibility* identity cue is that of CSC’s *Entrepreneurial spirit*. Here, CSC’s independent status and investment in people to make impact (informant 001) though propagated and supported by management (informant 012), was equally reliant upon individuals taking the initiative and demonstrating their self-starting abilities (informants 001, 006, 009 and 012). That of course meant establishing a good network, integrating oneself at multiple levels in the company (informant 031) and having access to *In-company knowledge*.

Through many of the interviews it became clear that members’ access to *In-company knowledge* together with the firm’s *Growth and size* were inextricably linked as identity cues and often reflected in the comparisons that informants then made between the company’s pre-merger and post-merger state. Within these reflections, there was also a sense of loss in terms of close inter-collegial contact, happiness and the proactive mentality of the group (informant 002) as colleagues became busier (informant 004) as a result of CSCs strategic developments. Although the physical changes taking place within CSC did not appear to destabilise the company’s approach or culture, at a personal level, some members perceived this lack of impact as a problem. In other words, while the company had grown through merger and acquisition, its operational and cultural awareness had not, thus leading to a number of resignations at the company (informant 001). More profoundly, for some members, the challenge to blend the pre and post-merger identities proved to be overwhelming and often lead to reduced team capacity (informant 006).
The impact that the firm’s Growth and size along with other factors had on the ability to access In-
company knowledge was also cited by some employees (informants 002, 008 and 011).

Beyond providing credibility in client interactions (informant 002), knowledge as an identity cue was seen as a way to substantiate the firm’s longevity; it was, as informant 011 commented, “...showing that we do what we say, and say what we do and by doing that...being a professional, independent company, that’s the reason why we exist for such a long time.” One informant illustrated this impact by describing the experience of receiving calls from clients several decades after the completion of projects (informant 002). Thus the access to knowledge was in some ways perceived and subsequently linked to what individual members pledged to do. This may explain why as a result of the company’s years of M&A activity, some members perceived the constant changes and resultant barriers as a source of knowledge fragmentation. Here it was not only access to knowledge itself that was disrupted by M&A activity, but also the relationship to those that held the knowledge:

“...there were less boundaries and a (sic) knowledge was more floating through the company...while now, I think knowledge is more closing and... it’s becoming more difficult to find the right knowledge and the right person than before [when] it was more liquid.”

Senior Asset Manager (Informant 008)

Summary

The relational signalling identity cue type and its attendant cues provide some of the deepest insights into what it meant for the firm’s informants to: be part of, operate in, contribute to and be recognised within CSC. These identity cues heavily emphasise the centrality of CSC’s employees in the company and the effects that they themselves and their interpersonal networks have on colleagues and clients alike. In some cases this was manifested in a sense of reciprocity and community, both laterally with colleagues and clients and, to some extent, vertically towards management. Freedom and flexibility and the Entrepreneurial spirit, as with many of the identity cues to emerge, not only helped to emphasise the sense of community within the organisation, but also pointed to the aspirations of its members and their desires to move the company forward. Understandably, it is particularly within this identity cue type, that the influence of identity cues on members’ sense of belonging to and behaviours towards or within the firm are most evident. In this sense, these relational signalling identity cues appeared to be some of the least controlled in so far as they were anchored in the culture, behaviour and atmosphere as opposed to the corporate-defined directions at CSC.
Thus, although the organisation’s support of reciprocal and team working behaviours was often mentioned in the context of employee efforts, the attention, freedom and flexibility conferred on employees to continue such efforts was not explicitly or officially stated; it was simply accepted as part of the organisation’s culture.

These observations are consistent with the view of culture as contributory element of corporate identity (Abratt, 1989; Reger, et al., 1994) and the notion of reciprocity which describes the perceived level of care and or value from the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990). Similarly parallels can also be observed between the collaborative, social and connective collegial behaviours encouraged by the firm’s atmosphere and typified in examples of team member exchange; that is to say, the quality of exchange between colleagues (Seers, 1989). Many of the corporate identity cues described here for example illustrate instances of interactivity amongst colleagues, with management and towards the organisation itself; instances which have been linked in the team member exchange literature to work engagement (Liao, Yang, Wand, Drown and Shi, 2013) and performance (Seers, 1989; Liden, Wayne and Sparrowe, 2000), and reflected in many of the interviews conducted.

4.8 Part three – validating the emergent identity cues and cue types

The 24 identity cues comprising the strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling identity cue types were cross-matched with data from part one of the analysis (section 4.6). This analysis addresses the last objective of the qualitative study, which focuses on validating these identity cues and cue types with the central, enduring and distinctive attributes that define the corporate identity. In so doing, this analysis provides deeper insights into, the strategy components, organisational voice and relational signalling identity cues that shape each of the central, enduring and distinctive attributes comprising the corporate identity. More pertinently, it is on the basis of this joint perspective – along with much of the literature presented in Chapter 2 – that scales from extant research were selected to represent and further validate the emergent identity cues.

Here, each identity cue was marked according to its identity cue type. In this case, the strategy component identity cues related to the strategy component identity cue type were marked with a single asterisk (*); the organisational voice corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice identity cue type marked with a double asterisk (**); and the relational signalling corporate identity cues related to the relational signalling identity cue type marked with a triple asterisk (***)
These identity cues were then re-categorised under their original CED dimensions. Table 4.14 shows the results of the cross-match and validation analysis.

It is on the basis of these results that the emergent identity cues were formally classified as CSC corporate identity cues, and the emergent identity cue types formally classified as CSC corporate identity cue types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined CED Attributes and Identity Cue Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise and offerings at different levels*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Vision*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International business*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image and recognised status**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable, societal and environmental focus**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom and Flexibility***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People - what the company is***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational atmosphere***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Strategy component identity cues and cue type
** Organisational voice identity cues and cue type
*** Relational signalling identity cues and cue type

Table 4.14 Classification of emergent identity cues and corresponding cue types according to the original central, enduring and distinctive attributes comprising CSC’s corporate identity

What is immediately noticeable in table 4.14 is that the full complement of emergent corporate identity cues is distributed across all aspects of CSC’s corporate identity. That is to say, whether controlled or uncontrolled by the organisations, the corporate identity cues that reflect CSC’s strategic components, organisational voice and relational signalling are embedded at two levels: firstly in the member organisational associations; and secondly in the attributes of the organisation that its members consider to be central, enduring and distinctive. Moreover, it is evident that those attributes deemed central, enduring or distinctive also comprise a combination of all three identity cue types. It is this latter observation that gives the sharpest insight into what actually comprises a central, enduring or distinctive organisational attribute at CSC.

The central aspects of CSC’s corporate identity for example are drawn from a combination of ten corporate identity cues, four of which correspond with the organisational voice cue type. The remaining six corporate identity cues are drawn equally from the strategy component and relational signalling cue types. In contrast, the enduring aspect of the firm’s corporate identity is shaped by a
mix of eight corporate identity cues, four of which are related to the relational signalling identity cue type. The remaining four corporate identity cues are drawn evenly from the strategy component and organisational voice cue types. Finally, the distinctive attributes of CSC’s corporate identity are supported by a total of six identity cues. As with the enduring aspects of CSC’s identity, the relational signalling corporate identity cues dominate this attribute. Of the remaining three corporate identity cues, two are drawn from the strategy component identity cue type, and one is related to the organisational voice identity cue type.

The following section discusses in detail the distribution of these CSC corporate identity cues and cue types and attempts to draw some conclusions from the results of the cross-match/validation analysis.

4.8.1 The CSC corporate identity cue types and their centrality
Close examination of table 4.14 reveals that the highest number of strategy component and organisational voice CSC corporate identity cues (in fact the highest number of CSC corporate identity cues overall) were found in the centrality of CSC’s corporate identity. This is logical since mission, vision, values and overall business focus are considered a pre-requisite for igniting the organisation’s distinctive features (Whetten, 2006) that make it identifiable to those with an interest in the firm (Ashforth and Mael, 1996). The organisational voice identity cues also feature prominently as they embody the essence of the firm in terms of its history, image and broader social focus. The employees themselves, the conditions within and manner in which they drive forward these central aspects of CSC’s corporate identity are all therefore intrinsic to maintaining what members consider to be central to the organisation. In short, the analysis demonstrates the extent to which this attribute influences the attention, actions and behaviours of the informants. What is noteworthy here however, is the equal number (three) of strategy related and relational signalling identity cues. Although the significance of these cues cannot be quantified or compared statistically, it is plausible that this distribution may be indicative of the fine balance between the effects of [non]strategy and the individual-level requirements required to deliver against it.

4.8.2 The CSC corporate identity cue types and their endurance
CSC’s relational signalling corporate identity cues were the most prevalent of all the three CSC corporate identity cues in reflecting the endurance of the firm. Specifically, employees’ In-company knowledge, feelings and Client relationships, together with the Growth and size of the company present evidence of what keeps the firm – or perhaps more appropriately, the shop floor – going, even in the presence of ongoing organisational Changes and a vaguely articulated Approach to business. These CSC corporate identity cues may go some way to explaining how the firm has
continued to operate successfully in the absence of a clear strategy. The CSC corporate identity cues Changes and Approach to business also point to those areas of the immediate business environment which might trigger and influence employees’ sensemaking. That an equal number of CSC’s organisational voice corporate identity cues, reflecting the firm’s Brand, image and attraction factors and its Reputation, contribute to shaping the enduring nature of the firm’s corporate identity is perhaps not coincidental since in order to be registered and received, the voice of the organisation is also reliant upon signals from and reactions to the organisation.

4.8.3 The CSC corporate identity cue types and their distinctiveness

The distinctiveness of CSC’s corporate identity is overwhelmingly dominated by inter-collegial and organisational relationships; that is to say, the relational signalling corporate identity cues. The prominences of these relational signalling corporate identity cues as part of this attribute is perhaps to be expected since these identity cues are valuable in terms of the unique knowledge and expertise they contain. They are possibly the most challenging to imitate. As the analyses described in previous subsections demonstrate, what lies at the heart of this assertion is the people-centric Current organisational culture within CSC and what this offers or means to its employees. While the culture fuels the Sense of belonging transmitted to and the entrepreneurial spirit practiced by CSC employees, these corporate identity cues also make tangible the strategic component corporate identity cues of Quality in people and projects as well as the Managerial words and deeds. In other words, it is the relational aspect endemic in CSC’s corporate identity which ensures that quality and managerial claims are delivered. What is of particular interest here, is that out of all the organisational voice CSC corporate identity cues, Status (and pride) appears to be the only cue seen as truly distinctive.

4.9 Part four – fitting the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types

In the final part of this qualitative study, the emergent CSC corporate identity cues and cue types were briefly validated against extant frameworks of corporate identity that encompass some notions of corporate identity cues. The objective here was to assess the overall alignment, or fit, of the emergent corporate identity cues and cue types and anchor them within the corporate identity domain.

Fitting, much like the identity cue and identity cue type validation process described in section 4.8, involved brief appraisal of the emergent strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling identity cues and cue types against the communications, behavioural, symbolic (Birkigt and Stadler, 1986) as well as culture (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002) dimensions of corporate identity.
noted in the Literature Review (Chapter 2) and reflected in the loose definitions of corporate identity cues (Fill, 2005). In this instance, the fitting process is oriented primarily around Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) four dimensional model of corporate identity (figure 2.1) and complemented with thinking from later iterations of the model as reflected in the corporate identity taxonomy proposed by Melewar (2003).

While the researcher is unaware of the selected corporate identity models being applied specifically in the manner presented here, Melewar and Storrie’s (2001) successful deployment of Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) model in analysing the role of corporate identity within an international franchise was found to be helpful in understanding the importance of and interconnectivity between the framework’s four sub-constructs. The model was similarly used in appraising the strategic objectives supporting the corporate identity program of a UK university (Melewar and Akel, 2005). These examples would seem to support the use of Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) model of corporate identity as an assessment aid and thus contributes to the decision to apply them in the present study to support the fitting process. The researcher further acknowledges the work of Simões et al., (2005) which while differing from the frameworks put forward by Melewar and Jenkins (2002), recognises the roles of symbolism, communications as well as philosophy, mission and values as part of the management and measurement of corporate identity.

4.9.1 Summary of the fitted corporate identity cues and cue types

In chart 4.1 the emergent CSC corporate identity cues and identity cue types have been laid out alongside Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) four dimension model of corporate identity and later taxonomy of corporate identity (Melewar, 2003) described in the Literature Review (Chapter 2). The four dimensions, of corporate identity along with the detail supporting each appear in the left hand side of the diagram followed by Melewar’s (2003) seven-construct corporate identity taxonomy in the centre column. The emergent CSC corporate identity cues and identity cue types appear in the right hand column. From this visual representation, it can be observed that the CSC corporate identity cues and identity cue types derived from the qualitative study align reasonably well with both frameworks.

The CSC corporate identity cue type organisational voice, along with the majority of its seven corporate identity cues for example, match well the dimension of Corporate Communication and Visual Identity illustrated in Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) work as well as the Corporate Communication and Corporate Design constructs illustrated in Melewar’s 2003 taxonomy. One of the CSC corporate identity cues, History, does not to fit within this category however and appears
to be better accommodated in the Corporate Culture Dimension which also encompasses the Corporate History.

The CSC corporate identity cue type relational signalling with its eight corporate identity cues is located mostly within the Behaviour Dimensions of the two frameworks, but is also present in the Corporate Culture dimension in the form of the *Current organisational culture*, *The people – what the company is*, and the *Organisational atmosphere* CSC corporate identity cues. Two further CSC corporate identity cues, *Client relationships* and *Growth and size* were allocated to the Corporate Strategy dimension within the taxonomy to better reflect the differentiation and positioning activities of CSC that have taken place over the years.

Turning to the last set of CSC corporate identity cues, it can be seen that all but three of the seven corporate identity cues categorised under the strategy component CSC corporate identity cue type sit comfortably in the Corporate Culture dimensions which address the approach, history and subculture within the firm. The remaining two strategy component CSC corporate identity cues have been positioned within the area of Corporate Strategy, again on account of their relationship to the company’s strategies.

Although the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types are not distributed across all facets of Melewar and Jenkins’ four dimensions (2002) or Melewar’s (2003) taxonomy of corporate identity, the output still provides good support, and indeed a sound theoretical foundation, for anchoring the emergent corporate identity cues and cue types. At the same time however, the CSC corporate identity cues that do not precisely fit in certain sub-constructs (see for example, *History*, *Organisational culture* and *International business* which are separated from the majority of the corporate identity in their respective corporate identity cue types) may indicate the distinctiveness or impact of these corporate identity cues themselves as part of the case organisation’s specific culture and strategy. Nevertheless, as the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types in this study were derived from interpretations and response to the corporate identity (i.e., the CED member organisational association), the results of the fitting process suggest that there is good alignment between these associations derived from a cross-section of the firm’s employees, and extant models of corporate identity which reflect the communications, behavioural, symbolic and cultural dimensions of corporate identity and its cues.
Chart 4.1 Fitting of the emergent corporate identity cues and cue types against two extant frameworks of corporate identity
4.10 Revised conceptual model, hypotheses and measures for Phase II

On the basis of the analyses presented so far, the strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling CSC corporate identity cue types were incorporated into the revised conceptual model indicated in figure 4.2.

![Conceptual model incorporating the three emergent CSC corporate identity cue types containing the corresponding CSC corporate identity cues](image)

4.10.1 Selecting constructs to represent CSC’s strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling corporate identity cues and cue types

As noted in section 4.8 of this chapter, the CSC corporate identity cues emerged as a result of cross-matching/validating the emergent identity cues and cue types from Part two of the analysis, against the derived corporate identity described in section 4.6. It is on the basis of this cross-matching procedure together with a review of domain-relevant literature that the constructs (i.e. rigorously tested scales) from extant research most closely reflective of the emergent CSC corporate identity cues were identified. In this sense, the identification of these representative constructs further validates the emergent CSC corporate identity cues as derived from the elicited member organisational associations. This marks an important phase of the study as these constructs comprise a substantial element of the conceptual model tested in Phase II as detailed in Chapters 5 and 6. This section of the present chapter briefly summarises the characteristics of the three types of CSC corporate identity cues, i.e., the strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling corporate identity cues illustrated in figure 4.2, and relates them to domain-relevant constructs.
**CSC’s strategy component corporate identity cues**

As noted earlier, perhaps the most dominant theme underpinning the strategy component CSC corporate identity cue type is that of the organisation’s apparent ability to maintain a strategic course in the absence of any formal strategy-related guidance for its employees. Indeed, the strategic substance of the attendant corporate identity cues which include *Management words and deeds, Quality* and wide-ranging *Expertise*, was almost overshadowed by the perceived lack of a clear mission, vision or values. Yet, as the analyses show, the firm maintained a strategic course through an apparently informal expression of its intent and philosophy. This suggests that measurement of the classic components of mission, vision and values, together with their degree of dispersion throughout the firm could still yield valuable information in terms of understanding the degree to which these CSC corporate identity cues keep employees informed, encouraged, and potentially make them *feel* about its purpose (i.e., the shared vision). It may furthermore shed some light on employees’ general agreement with and commitment to the few formal signals of the firm’s direction and objectives as transmitted by the firm (i.e., its mission and values dissemination).

*Mission and Values Dissemination and Shared Vision*

To capture these somewhat diverse aspects of the firm’s strategy component cues, the constructs of mission and values dissemination as advanced by Simões et al., (2005), and that of *Shared Vision* as delineated by Wong, Tjosvold and Liu (2009) were selected for inclusion and empirical testing (Phase II) in the conceptual model. Given that *Mission and Values Dissemination* provides a measure of one particular aspect of the corporate identity management process – a process that incorporates the behavioural, symbolic and communicative aspects of corporate identity cues – from an internal perspective (Simões et al., 2005), it was deemed particularly relevant to this study. The specifics of these constructs are outlined in the *Measures* section of Chapter 3 and detailed in Appendix 5.

**CSC’s organisational voice corporate identity cues**

The organisational voice corporate identity cues within CSC point more clearly than any other set of cues point to the importance of believability and consistency in the transmitted corporate identity. That identity cues illustrative of the firm’s *history*, its *image and attraction factors*, were used with apparent deliberacy for this purpose is self-evident. Once received by employees however, this triggered not only a sense of what the company *is* but, perhaps more emotively, what it should mean to its employees. For example, the communications *picked up* by employees regarding the company’s many mergers and acquisitions left an impression of an organisation that had not have fully dealt with the effects of such activities thus leaving something of a gap between management expectation and *shop floor* reality.
Contrastingly, the firm’s altruistic focus on socio-environmental issues was held up as a truthful and constant example of its image that some viewed as a source of lasting pride and emotional connection.

This connection between authentic image signalling and employee action towards the firm in the form identification is unsurprising since it is through the steady and constant transmission of the company image that the employees’ role in the organisation is accentuated and their construal of the corporate identity influenced (Simões et al 2005). These observations are suggestive not only of the need for consistency in image presentation, but also of the importance of recognisable representations of the company’s history and achievements. In this sense, CSC’s organisational voice corporate identity cues may be viewed as delivering some of the most authentic and credible manifestations of its image. To reflect and indeed test this notion, the following hypothesis is introduced:

$$H_4 \quad \text{Corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice will contribute positively to organisational identification}$$

In section 4.7.4.2, it was stated that stakeholder impression of the firm such as these, are galvanised and maintained through the connected internal and external communications (Cornelissen, 2014); i.e., the corporate communications. Since many of the CSC corporate identity cues outlined here were drawn from signals transmitted within the company and absorbed from outside the company (via the Image and attraction factors and Reputation for example), these cues along with those reflective of the firm’s history may be considered part of CSC’s corporate communications. Indeed, the posited link between corporate communications and corporate reputation (Van Riel and Fombrun, 2007; Swoboda et al., 2013) and company image, is partly reflected in the organisational voice CSC corporate identity cue type.

**Consistent Image Implementation and Corporate Communications**

To operationalise the image consistency and corporate communications aspect of CSC’s organisational voice corporate identity cues, the constructs Corporate Communications (Swoboda et al., 2013) and Consistent Image Implementation (Simões et al 2005) were selected for inclusion in the conceptual model. As consistent image implementation provides a measure of an additional facet of the corporate identity management process, again from the internal perspective (Simões et al., 2005), this construct was considered particularly appropriate for this study. The specifics of these constructs are outlined in the Measures section of Chapter 3 and detailed in Appendix 5.
CSC’s relational signalling corporate identity cues

The relational signalling corporate identity cues within CSC appeared to be the only cues transmitted vertically, laterally and beyond the organisation’s internal boundaries towards its clients. These corporate identity cues represent the most people-centric and seemingly least controlled of all the CSC corporate identity cues. With little reference to formalised ways of working but emphasising the firm’s implicit support of reciprocal, networked and team working behaviours, these corporate identity cues express the overall sense of belonging perceived through the Current organisational culture, its atmosphere and ultimately, the behaviours this encouraged. As a result, these corporate identity cues focus almost exclusively on intra-collegial activity, exchange and reciprocation; the sense of Freedom, flexibility and Entrepreneurial spirit this evoked; and in fact, the ongoing efforts that freedom and flexibility seemed to encourage amongst employees.

As noted briefly in section 4.7.3.4, these outputs find favour in the conceptualisations of reciprocity which capture the perceived level of care and value from the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990) from the perspective of the employee. Similar, parallels can also be drawn from the collaborative, social and connective collegial behaviours exercised in the firm and reflected in instances of team member exchange; that is to say, the quality of the exchange between colleagues (Seers, 1989). In fact many of the corporate identity cues described here can be traced to the interactions amongst colleagues, with management and towards the organisation itself. These are all facets of collegial exchange which have been linked to work engagement (Liao, Yang, Wand, Drown and Shi, 2013) and even performance (Seers, 1989; Liden, Wayne and Sparrowe, 2000) in the team member exchange literature. This implies that of all the corporate identity cues revealed, those signalling the relational aspects could have a significant impact on organisational identification, role behaviours, and extra-role behaviour in particular. Because these relational signalling corporate identity cues help explain what it means to be an employee at CSC, it is probable that the effects might outweigh those of any other CSC corporate identity cue.

To test this notion, the following hypotheses are introduced:

\[ H_5 \quad \text{Corporate identity cues of reciprocity and exchange will exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (OID)} \]

\[ H_6 \quad \text{Corporate identity cues related to team member exchange will have a significant positive effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB)} \]
Reciprocity and Team Member Exchange

In order to fully assess both the reciprocal and exchange aspects of the relational signalling corporate identity cues, the construct of Reciprocity introduced by Eisenberger et al., 1986, and the construct of Team Member Exchange adapted by Love and Forret (2008) from the original Seers et al., (1995) instrument were selected for inclusion in the conceptual model. The specifics of these constructs are outlined in the Measures section of Chapter 3 and detailed in Appendix 5.

4.10.2 Final adjustments to the conceptual model

The six constructs described earlier were selected to operationalise the strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling CSC corporate identity cues as presented in the revised conceptual model illustrated in figure 4.3. Incorporating the three additional hypotheses introduced in this chapter, it is this revised conceptual model that is tested empirically in Phase II of this study.

![Figure 4.3 Revised conceptual model illustrating the six constructs selected to represent the emergent CSC corporate identity cues](image-url)
4.11 Conclusion
This phase of the mixed-methods study set out to address the first four objectives supporting the research aim, namely to:

1. elicit member organisational associations from a cross-section of company employees
2. identify the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (i.e., CED member organisational associations) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity
3. establish whether additional patterns beyond those that are CED are present in the elicited member organisational associations that reflect how these associations may be perceived in the working environment context and,
4. determine the CED member organisational associations, along with their corresponding patterns, that are linked to the present environment; trigger sensemaking; and influence future action and attention. In short, those that illustrate the use of these associations as sensemaking cues to the corporate identity.

To fulfil these objectives, a qualitative study was undertaken within an international consulting engineering company, ConSeng Corp (CSC). Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 30 employees of the case organisation to elicit instances of their member organisations associations; that is to say, those aspects or experiences of the firm held in the minds of its employees and which determine the identity of the organisation (Brown et al., 2006). The resultant output was transcribed, categorised and finally analysed using a generic approach.

In the first part of the analysis, the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of corporate identity as defined by Albert and Whetten (1985) were applied to the elicited member organisational associations yielding a total of 32 member organisational associations reflective of the case organisation’s corporate identity. This initial categorisation of member organisational association was examined by three independent parties to establish and confirm trustworthiness in the data as well as the generic qualitative analysis procedure applied. Establishing data trustworthiness in this way was deemed particularly helpful given the subjective nature of the categorisation processes.

In the second stage of the analysis, the member organisational association were examined for evidence of underlying patterns unrelated to the CED aspects of the corporate identity. Three conceptual areas relating to strategy, communication and relationships within CSC were detected across which 25 of the original 32 member organisational associations could be categorised.
These 25 member organisational associations were then examined for cue characteristics using the two definitions of cues advanced by Weick (1995), and the single definition put forward by Weber and Glynn (2006). A total of 24 of the 25 member organisational associations were found to display two or more of the defined cue characteristics thus providing evidence of their use by employees in guiding attention, action and/or behaviour. These member organisational associations were re-classified accordingly as identity cues. The three emergent conceptual areas under which the identity cues were categorised were examined on the basis of the corresponding in-vivo data then refined and re-classified to produce the identity cue types: strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling.

In the third stage of the analysis, these identity cues and identity cue types were validated against the derived corporate identity from the first part of the analysis. This revealed that the identity cues were well distributed and reflected across the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of the firm’s corporate identity. The identity cues were thus confirmed as CSC corporate identity cues and the corresponding emergent conceptual areas as CSC corporate identity cue types. In this sense, the member organisational associations in which the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types are anchored may be viewed as highly salient cues in their own right, if not examples of CSC’s most salient corporate identity cues.

In the final step of the analysis, the emergent CSC corporate identity cues and cue types were briefly evaluated for their fit with extant models of corporate identity which reflect the communications, behavioural, symbolic (Birkigt and Stadler, 1986) and cultural (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002) dimensions of the concept and its corporate identity cues (Fill, 2005). The results showed that both the CSC corporate identity cues and cue types exhibited good fit across three of Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) four dimensions of corporate identity, and were furthermore accommodated in five of the seven sub-constructs comprising the corporate identity taxonomy proposed by Melewar (2003).

In pursuing and meeting the four objectives outlined, the study has also addressed the first of the research gaps defined; that is, the need to understand employees’ interpretations of and reactions to the corporate identity and its attendant cues. This phase of the study suggests that while corporate identity cues form part of and are formed in part by the member organisational associations that employees hold, employees may also use these cues to make sense of the corporate identity and their current environments.
It is on the basis of these findings that adjustments to the original conceptual model were made, three further hypotheses added to those introduced in the Literature Review (Chapter 2), and the existing scales selected to represent and operationalise the emergent corporate identity cues to be examined empirically in Phase II.
Chapter 5  Phase II – Examining the Effects of Corporate Identity Cues on Organisational Identification and Role Behaviours

5.1  Introduction

Phase II of the research focuses on the fifth objective supporting the overall aim of the study; i.e., to empirically examine the effect of corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on role behaviours at the aggregate level. In so doing, it also addresses the second and third of the research gaps identified in Chapter 2. Accordingly, it is not just the nature of the relationship between the corporate identity cues, organisational identification and role behaviour that this second phase of the study seeks to clarify, but also which and how corporate identity cues affect this relationship.

As detailed in section 4.10.1 and illustrated in the conceptual model (figure 4.3), a total of six constructs were selected from extant research to represent the breadth of the emergent CSC corporate identity cues derived in Phase I of this study. Full details on each construct are provided in Appendix 5. Partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) was applied to examine and analyse the model using survey data collected from 536 members of the case organisation. In this first part of the quantitative analysis, a number of models are introduced and assessed in order to arrive at the final model.

_Model 1_ encompasses all the items defined for each construct. In order to meet the standards of reliability and validity, some items were removed as described in section 5.5.1.1, resulting in a calibrated model, Model 1a. It is this calibrated model that was subsequently used as a means of gathering input for the mediation tests.

Mediation testing was subsequently conducted in three stages in this study. In the first stage, the direct effects of the corporate identity cue constructs on in-role and extra-role behaviour were assessed as described in section 5.5.4.1 (Model 2). In the second stage, the mediation variable, organisational identification (OID), was introduced and the model re-estimated (Model 3). In the third stage, on the basis of these mediation results, the model was subsequently revised and re-estimated (Model 4). These latter two stages are outlined in section 5.5.4.2.

The effects of gender, profession and tenure on in-role and extra-role behaviours were also controlled for as part of this study, thus _transforming_ the results into the final model, Model 5. It is this final model which is subsequently examined for robustness and unobserved heterogeneity in the present chapter, and analysed at the subgroup level in Chapter 6.
This chapter is divided into six sections. In the first two sections, the sampling strategy and data collection (section 5.2) along with the measures used and descriptive statistics (section 5.3) are presented. Section 5.4 then details the measures and results of the ex ante common method variance examinations carried out. Substantial attention is then given over in section 5.5 to describing the results of the measurement and structural model analyses including mediation analysis and hypothesis testing. The results of the heterogeneity testing conducted on the data are then put forward in section 5.6 before the chapter concludes with a summary of the study’s key findings in section 5.7.

5.2 Sampling strategy and data collection

As noted in the Methodology (Chapter 3), for the main study, access was negotiated to the organisation’s four largest, most geographically dispersed and sector diverse Divisions. This resulted in a sample population of approximately $n=1,700$ employees.

This population was invited via personal email from the researcher and the respective Divisional Director to participate in the research and sent a Participant Information Sheet providing a brief outline of the study. The survey instrument developed (see Chapter 3) was uploaded into the Qualtrics online survey platform to aid the data collection process. Seven days after the dispatch of the initial invitation to participate, the sample were sent an email containing a hyperlink to the online survey. To maximise the response rate, a charitable donation of €1 for each fully completed survey was also announced in the message. In order to reduce common method variance, an informed consent page assuring anonymity and emphasising the focus on opinion-based (no right or wrong answers) responses was additionally included at the start of the survey. Those selecting the option of declining participation were automatically precluded from providing any further responses in the survey. Of the 1,700 employees selected, 5 declined to participate in the study.

Data was subsequently collected over a ten-week period from September to November 2015. A total of three reminders to complete the survey were dispatched during this time – the first after two weeks; the second two weeks later, and the final reminder, one week prior to the survey closing date. This yielded a total of 730 responses (42% response rate), 194 of which were incomplete. That is to say, these respondents answered fewer than ten of the questions and subsequently did not complete the entire survey. These responses were therefore unsuitable for further use and excluded from further analysis. Consequently, a total of 536 (32% response rate) responses proved viable for use and analysis in the study.
From the viable data received, permanent employees provided the majority of responses (90%), with the remaining 10% coming from either temporary or sub-contracted employees. Three quarters of all responses were received from employees located in one of the case organisation’s three main operational hubs spanning Europe and Africa. Just under half (40%) of the survey respondents categorised themselves professionally as Consultant Engineers. A further 28% identified as Consultants, 10% as Engineers, and just over 20% as belonging to ‘other’ professions. Approximately two-thirds (n=336) of the samples’ respondents were employed by CSC for up to ten years. A further 127 (24%) had served for between ten and twenty years, and 73 respondents (14% of the sample) had worked for CSC for more than twenty years.

5.3 Measures
In order to test empirically the theorised relationship between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and, in-role and extra-role behaviours, existing constructs, i.e., scales, were used to represent each of the six corporate identity cues and the endogenous variables: organisational identification (OID), in-role behaviour (IRB) and extra-role behaviour (ERB). Each construct along with its corresponding measurement items is described in Chapter 3 and detailed in Appendix 5 along with its AVE, composite reliability and Cronbach’s α. More specifically, on the basis of the literature review, the qualitative data analysis presented in Chapter 4 and the scope of the three corporate identity cue types – i.e., strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling – identified as a result, two constructs were selected to represent each corporate identity cue type. The items comprising each construct were measured on 7-point Likert scales (strongly disagree=1; to strongly agree=7), with negatively-worded items reverse coded.

5.3.1 Descriptive statistics
Following Chin’s (Vinzi, Henseler and Wang, 2010) guidance on the reporting of PLS analyses, the means and standard deviations of the construct items used in the present study are presented in table 5.1.
Table 5.1 Descriptive statistics for the nine constructs comprising the model (N=536)

5.4 Common method variance (CMV)

Given that the quantitative phase of the research incorporates the use of a self-report survey, the recommendations of Chang et al. (2010) were adopted and a combination of ex ante (as introduced in the previous section) and ex post measures applied to reduce the effects of common method variance. The ex-ante methods described below and applied in this study indicate that the study
tested negative for common method variance. The results of the ex post methods are detailed separately in section 5.5.2.5 as part of the structural model analysis.

5.4.1 Ex ante management of CMV

A number of ex ante measures were taken to reduce the potential effects of common method variance in the study. These measures were introduced prior to and within the survey instrument itself.

For example, prior to completing the survey, all employees selected to participate were sent a participant information sheet (Appendix 4) providing a brief outline of the study. As an additional means of reducing common method variance, an informed consent page (Accept/Decline) assuring respondents’ anonymity and emphasising the focus on opinion-based (no right or wrong answers) responses was embedded in the start of the survey. Those selecting the option to decline participation were automatically precluded from providing any further responses in the survey. An example of the informed consent content may be found in Appendix 4a. Of the 706 employees who responded to the survey, 5 declined to participate.

The survey instrument was also structured such that questions related to the corporate identity cue, organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviour constructs were placed in distinctly separate sections of the survey instrument. For example, the in-role (IRB) and extra-role behaviour (ERB) specific questions were positioned at the start of the survey in the section addressing the respondent as an individual. The survey questions related to the shared vision (SCCSV) corporate identity cue and organisational identification (OID) were placed in the Section 2 of the survey dealing with respondents’ perspectives on the case organisation. The remaining corporate identity cues were placed in Section 4 of the survey focusing on respondents’ experiences of the company. Additionally, a combination of Likert and semantic differential scales with differing endpoints was applied to the range of responses connected with certain survey question.

5.5 Data analysis and results

Analysis in partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) requires that first the measurement (also referred to as the outer) model be assessed prior to evaluation of the structural (also referred to as the inner) model (Chin, 2010; Hair et al., 2010; 2011; Hair, et al 2014; 2017). This two-stage process ensures that subsequent testing of the relationship, or paths, between latent constructs in the model is predicated on the estimated relationship between constructs and their respective indicators being both valid and reliable (Chin, 2010).
These guidelines will be applied in reporting the analyses of both the measurement and structural models of the study’s Aggregate Model in the following section. Unless otherwise stated, all tests of significance were completed at the p<0.05 level of significance with t-values of ≥1.96 assumed and reported for all measures where appropriate.

5.5.1 The measurement model

Examination of the initial measurement model (Model 1), revealed that of all the item indicators applied from the original scales, a total of twelve fell below the recommended 0.70 (Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt (2011) and Hair, et al., (2014; 2017) cut-off for outer loadings. Despite this, the internal consistency reliability measures of composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha yielded convincing readings above the requisite 0.70 threshold. Convergent validity remained low for the team member exchange cue construct (RSCTX) which returned an AVE of 0.462. Further inspection of the cross-loadings indicated high levels of collinearity between four of the items measuring the mission and values dissemination cue construct (SCCMV) and the three items comprising the shared vision cue construct (SCCSV). Discriminant validity between the two constructs was reduced as a result.

5.5.1.1 Measure purification

Measure purification is the process of excluding measures that fail to meet the standards that would otherwise assure emergence of plausibly reliable and valid measures (Churchill Jr., 1979; Gerbing and Anderson, 1988). In order to meet the required standards for internal consistency reliability, indicator reliability, convergent and discriminant validity, the following indicators were removed from the model to purify the measures:

- Mission and Values Dissemination: SCCMV3, SCCMV4, SCCMV5 and SCCMV6R
- Consistent Image Implementation: OVCII5, OVCII6
- Team Member Exchange: RSCTX4 and RSCTX5
- Organisational Identification: OID6R
- In-Role Behaviour: IRB6 and IRB7
- Extra-Role Behaviour: ERB1 and ERB7

Although indicators RSCTX1 (β 0.690) and RSCTX2 (β 0.696) continued to exhibit loadings below the recommended 0.70 cut-off, removing both from the model was found to adversely affect the model’s validity. Therefore, in line with the recommendations of Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt (2011), to preserve model validity, these indicators were retained.
5.5.1.2 Model reliability and validity

Following removal of the indicators noted in the previous section, the calibrated model, Model 1a, produced satisfactory internal consistency reliability measures of above 0.70 for composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994) across all constructs as reported in table 5.2.

The calibrated model also returned acceptable measures of convergent validity with AVE values above the 0.50 threshold for all constructs (figure 5.1, table 5.2). Bootstrapping of the model with 5,000 sub-samples confirmed that all loadings within the adjusted model were significant at the p<0.05 level using the two-tailed test (figure 5.2).

Examination of the item cross loadings, Fornell-Larcker criterion and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) for discriminant validity indicated that: all indicators load highest on their respective constructs in terms of the cross-loadings (table 5.3); the square root of each construct’s AVE exceeds that of its uppermost correlation with other constructs thus meeting the Fornell-Larcker criterion (table 5.4); and that the model complies with the most conservative HTMT ratios – HTMT.90 and HTMT.85 ratios (table 5.5).

Thus it can be concluded that the measurement model exhibits acceptable levels of reliability and validity signifying a level of robustness conducive to further examination and estimation. In line with the two-phase approach for assessing PLS models outlined earlier, the following section of this paper focuses on the evaluation of the structural model.
**Figure 5.1** PLS-estimation of Model 1a (calibrated model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCCI = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.2  Significance testing (bootstrapping) of Model 1a using 5,000 sub-samples at p <0.05 level of significance (t-value 1.96)

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
SCCSV = Shared Vision

Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
OVCC = Corporate Communications
OVCCI = Consistent Image Implementation

Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
RSCR = Reciprocity

Additional Constructs
OID = Organisational Identification
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
IRB = In-Role Behaviour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCII</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCTX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB: Extra-Roll Behaviour</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.486</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB: In-Roll Behaviour</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.017</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID: Organ Identification</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.224</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC: Org Voice Cues</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.884</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII: Org Voice Cues</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.603</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR: Relational Signal Cues</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX: Relational Signal Cues</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.425</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV: Strategy Cues</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.558</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV: Strategy Cues</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.703</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Descriptive statistics, reliability, validity and latent variable correlations for Model 1a
Table 5.3 Cross loadings for Model 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCCI = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Fornell-Larcker readings for Model 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCCI</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) for Model 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCCI</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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5.5.2 The structural model

As noted in the chapter on Methodology (Chapter 3), evaluation of structural models in PLS-SEM comprises six sequentially-running assessments of: collinearity; significance and relevance of relationships; coefficient of determination (R²); $f^2$ effects size; predictive relevance (Q²); and $q^2$ effects size (figure 5.3).

Continuing with the calibrated model, Model 1a (figure 5.1), the following subsections of this chapter lay out the results for each of these assessments commencing with those for [multi]collinearity.

![Figure 5.3 Structural model assessment procedure in PLS-SEM](Source: Adapted from Hair et al. (2017))

5.5.2.1 (Multi)collinearity

The inner VIF values (i.e. between the latent variable constructs) as depicted in table 5.6 reveal that all measures fall below the upper limit of 5, with the highest measure of 2.294 reflected between the Strategy Component Cue construct shared vision (SCCSV) and the construct organisational identification (OID). The inner VIF values further illustrate that in returning values ≤3.3, the model is also free of common method bias (Kock, 2014; 2015). On this basis, no collinearity issues were identified in the model.
5.5.2.2 $R^2$ values

Taking into account the cautions noted in the Methodology chapter with regard to applying existing categorisations or magnitudes to describe coefficient of determination ($R^2$) values, in this study, the $R^2$ values are considered on their own merits and within the context of the study's aim and objectives.

Looking to the model’s $R^2$ values, it can be seen that the six exogenous latent variables representing the corporate identity cues account for 31% ($R^2 0.310$) of the variance in the organisational identification construct, OID (table 5.7). The $R^2$ values for extra-role behaviour (ERB) are considerably lower however indicating that organisational identification only explains 17% of the variation ($R^2 0.170$) in extra-role behaviour. The $R^2$ value of 0.051 returned for in-role behaviour (IRB) is even lower however, suggesting that factors other than organisational identification may influence this construct. These results nevertheless indicate that the model displays a degree of descriptive accuracy, or predictive accuracy in SmartPLS terms.
These results also suggest however that variables other than the six corporate identity cue constructs may contribute to the variance in organisational identification given that the construct returned a coefficient of determination value of $R^2 = 0.310$. It is thus prudent to identify additional variables that might account for this value. Here, re-examination of the data revealed that inclusion of the gender, tenure and profession control variables lead to a marginal increase of 0.009 in the $R^2$ value.

Introducing Meyer et al.’s., (1993) three-dimensional construct of [affective, normative and continuance] organisational commitment to the model as exogenous variables increased the $R^2$ value to 0.531, confirming that attitudinal processes further contribute substantially to explaining the variance in organisational identification at the aggregate level. This is unsurprising but also consistent with research that has established both distinctions (Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006) and correlations (Gautam et al., 2004; Riketta and Van Dick, 2005) between the two constructs as well as an underlying relationship between organisational commitment and concepts of reciprocity (Lam et al., 2016) as reflected in the Relational Signalling corporate identity cue of reciprocity (RSCR) used in this study. However as the focus of this research is not on organisational commitment or attitudinal facets of organisational behaviour, these constructs were excluded from the remaining analyses.

### 5.5.2.3 $f^2$ effect size

Evaluation of the $f^2$ effect size provides greater insight into the individual contribution of each exogenous variable to the $R^2$ value of endogenous construct organisational identification. Here, team member exchange (RSCTX), consistent image implementation (OVCII) and shared vision (SCCSV) return $f^2$ effect sizes of 0.092, 0.025 and 0.022 respectively. Reciprocity (RSCR) (0.012) and corporate communications (OVCC) (0.002) return marginally smaller $f^2$ effect sizes while no discernible effects were returned for mission and values dissemination (SCCMV). These latter three variables thus have no effect on the organisational identification construct. This construct itself however returned an $f^2$ effect size (and contribution to) extra-role behaviour (ERB) of 0.205, and a comparably smaller effect size of 0.054 for in-role behaviour (IRB).

### 5.5.2.4 Predictive power and relevance – $Q^2$ and $q^2$ effects size

Finally, the predictive power and relevance of the structural model is assessed by examination of the $Q^2$ and $q^2$ effects size respectively.
Table 5.8 shows the results of the blindfolding process in which the sum of the squared observations (SSO) and prediction errors (SSE) together with the subsequent $Q^2$ value ($1 - \frac{SSE}{SSO}$) are given. All three endogenous variables returned values greater than zero with organisational identification (OID) exhibiting the highest $Q^2$ value at 0.199, followed by extra-role behaviour (ERB) at 0.098, and in-role behaviour (IRB) at marginally above zero (0.030). Taken together, these readings imply a degree of descriptive and predictive relevance in all three endogenous constructs suggesting that the path model is to some extent able to predict the original values observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SSO</th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>$Q^2$ ($=1 - \frac{SSE}{SSO}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB: Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>2,680.000</td>
<td>2,416.427</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB: In-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>2,680.000</td>
<td>2,600.539</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID: Organisational Identification</td>
<td>2,680.000</td>
<td>2,147.748</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV: Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>1,072.000</td>
<td>1,072.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV: Shared Vision</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC: Corporate Communications</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCI: Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>2,144.000</td>
<td>2,144.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR: Reciprocity</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX: Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 Results of blindfolding process indicating exogenous variable predictive relevance ($Q^2$) values for Model 1a

Using the following equation to manually calculate the $q^2$ effects size

$$q^2 = \frac{Q^2_{\text{included}} - Q^2_{\text{excluded}}}{1 - Q^2_{\text{included}}}, \quad \text{(Equation 5.1)}$$

the results shown in table 5.8 reflect almost uniformly insignificant effects in the exogenous variables’ contributions to the latent construct $Q^2$ values. Here, the relationship between the exogenous latent variable team member exchange (RSCTX) and the endogenous latent variable organisational identification (OID) returned the highest $q^2$ effect size with a reading of 0.051. Table 5.9 nevertheless indicates that as exogenous variables, four of the six corporate identity cues – shared vision (SCCSV) consistent image implementation (OVCI), reciprocity (RSCR) and team member exchange (RSCTX) – contribute, albeit marginally, to the overall $Q^2$ value for OID.
Table 5.9 Overview of $q^2$ effect sizes produced for Model 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERB Extra-Role Behaviour</th>
<th>IRB In-Role Behaviour</th>
<th>OID Organisational Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OID: Organisational Identification</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV: Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV: Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC: Corporate Communications</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII: Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR: Reciprocity</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX: Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2.5 Ex post assessment of common method variance (CMV)

Given that SmartPLS 3.2.3 is able to generate by default variance inflation factor (VIF) values as part of the collinearity evaluations, and taking into account the fact that the full collinearity test proposed by Kock and Lynn (2012) and advanced by Kock (2015) has been examined specifically within the PLS-SEM context, assessment of the VIF values as an ex ante solutions was considered appropriate for examining the data in this study for common method variance.

As illustrated in Table 5.6, all structural (inner) model VIF values for the calibrated Model 1 are below the 3.3 threshold proposed by Kock (2015). This confirms that the model is free of common method bias and thus tests negative for common method variance.

5.5.3 Cross-validation of parameter estimate stability

To cross-validate the stability of the model’s parameter estimates, a randomly selected holdout sample of 25 per cent of observations was drawn from the overall data set. Although lower than the 30 percent recommended by Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt (2011), the split used in this study is aligned with the recommendations of Steckel and Vanhonacker (1993), Aurifeille and Deissenberg (2013) from the management science perspective, and extant applications in PLS (Boßow-Thies and Albers, 2010).

The results of the holdout sample presented no significant differences from the findings of the full dataset with validity, reliability and collinearity measures all meeting the specified thresholds within the holdout sample. The $R^2_{adj}$ values in the holdout sample for extra-role behaviour (ERB), in-role behaviour (IRB) and organisational identification (OID) returned values of 0.192, 0.045 and 0.224 respectively. These values compared favourably and indeed closely with those from the full dataset (ERB 0.168; IRB 0.049; OID 0.302 respectively).
5.5.4 Significance and relevance of structural model relationships

In this section, analysis of the structural model’s relationships for significance and relevance begins with an examination of the direct effects.

The results of estimating and examining the direct path relationships between the six corporate identity cues (or corporate identity cue constructs) and the organisational identification (OID) construct are presented first. The direct path relationships between OID and extra-role behaviour (ERB), and OID and in-role behaviour (IRB) are then detailed. This is followed by analysis of the model’s indirect and mediating effects. Specifically, the outcomes from analysis of the indirect path relationships between the six corporate identity cues and ERB and between the corporate identity cues and IRB are outlined. Finally, the results of the mediation analysis are laid out, and the section closes with a brief discussion on the robustness check of the model.

5.5.4.1 Direct effects

In section 5.5.2.2, the R² values returned for each of the constructs comprising Model 1a were discussed. The focus here is on the examination of the direct effects of the relationship between these constructs as part of Model 1a. Figure 5.4 shows that not all the exogenous variables, i.e., the corporate identity cues, in Model 1a contribute equally to the organisational identification construct (OID). A similar pattern may also be observed in terms of the contributory effect of OID on in-role (IRB) and extra-role behaviour (ERB). The relationships between these constructs are all positive.

The relationship between shared vision (SCCSV) and OID, despite its considerably weak path coefficient (Hinkle, et al., 1998) (β 0.185; t-value 3.235), and between consistent image implementation (OVCII) and OID with its equally low path coefficient of β 0.166 (t-value 3.360) are significant. Both reciprocity (RSCR) (β 0.124; t-value 2.203) and team member exchange (RSCTX) (β 0.271; t-value 6.162) returned significant but stronger readings. The relative importance of these corporate identity cues as drivers of organisational identification is reflected in the path densities (i.e., the weight of the paths between constructs) illustrated in figure 5.4; the heavier the line, the stronger the relationship between the constructs. It can be observed that team member exchange (RSCTX) is the strongest driver of organisational identification, followed by shared vision (SCCSV), consistent image implementation (OVCII) and reciprocity (RSCR). Collectively, these corporate identity cues contribute to explaining 31% (R² 0.310) of the variance in the organisational identification construct.
Examining the relationship between OID and role behaviours reveals that the direct effect between OID and ERB is not only significant (β 0.412; t-value 10.494), but slightly more than twice the strength of the relationship with IRB (β 0.226; t-value 5.216).

The results of these analyses are summarised and presented in table 5.10 in which the total effects (i.e., direct and indirect effects) are grouped according to the three corporate identity cue types defined in Chapter 4. Effects returning significant values are marked in bold type.
Figure 5.4 Relative importance of corporate identity cue and organisational identification (OID) constructs in Model 1a
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**Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)**
- SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
- SCCSV = Shared Vision

**Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)**
- OVCC = Corporate Communications
- OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

**Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)**
- RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
- RSCR = Reciprocity

**Additional Constructs**
- OID = Organisational Identification
- ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
- IRB = In-Role Behaviour
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231
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component</th>
<th>Corporate Identity Cues</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (STDEV)</th>
<th>t-values (O/STDEV)</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV - OID:</td>
<td>Mission Values Dissemination - Organisational Identification</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV - ERB:</td>
<td>Mission Values Dissemination - Extra-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV - IRB:</td>
<td>Mission Values Dissemination - In-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV - OID:</td>
<td>Shared Vision - Organisational Identification</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV - ERB:</td>
<td>Shared Vision - Extra-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>3.123</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV - IRB:</td>
<td>Shared Vision - In-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>2.702</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC - OID:</td>
<td>Consistent Image Implementation - Organisational Identification</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC - ERB:</td>
<td>Consistent Image Implementation - Extra-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC - IRB:</td>
<td>Consistent Image Implementation - In-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCI - OID:</td>
<td>Consistent Image Implementation - Organisational Identification</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>3.360</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCI - ERB:</td>
<td>Consistent Image Implementation - Extra-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCI - IRB:</td>
<td>Consistent Image Implementation - In-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR - OID:</td>
<td>Reciprocity - Organisational Identification</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR - ERB:</td>
<td>Reciprocity - Extra-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR - IRB:</td>
<td>Reciprocity - In-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX - OID:</td>
<td>Team Member Exchange - Organisational Identification</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>6.162</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX - ERB:</td>
<td>Team Member Exchange - Extra-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>4.718</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX - IRB:</td>
<td>Team Member Exchange - In-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>3.649</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID - ERB:</td>
<td>Organisational Identification - Extra-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>10.494</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID - IRB:</td>
<td>Organisational Identification - In-Rule Behaviour</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>5.216</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 Overview of total (direct and indirect) effects for Model 1a including results of significance testing at the p<0.05 (t-value ≥1.96) level and reflecting the corporate identity cue types derived from the qualitative study (Chapter 4)
5.5.4.2 Mediation effects

In the Literature Review (Chapter 2), reference was made to extant research that has highlighted the linkages between corporate identity (supported implicitly by its attendant cues) and organisational identification. Reference was also made to the acknowledged influence of organisational identification on employees’ in-role and extra-role behaviours i.e.; the supportive behaviours exhibited towards others and within the firm. These assertions, together with the nature of the corporate identity cue types derived from Phase I of this study, suggest that as a construct, organisational identification may have a mediating effect on the relationship between corporate identity cues and role behaviours.

In testing for mediation, a four-stage process was adopted incorporating: the assessment of direct effects of corporate identity cues on role behaviours (Model 2); inclusion of the mediator variable and re-estimation of the model (Model 3); revision of the model based on the mediation results (Model 4); and, re-estimation of the model controlling for the effects of gender, profession and tenure (Model 5).

Stage 1 Model 2 – direct effects of corporate identity cues on role behaviours

Drawing on figure 3.8 in which the direct effects (c) of exogenous variables (X) on the endogenous variables (Y) are illustrated in a mediation model (see Chapter 3, p.135), the direct effects (c) of corporate identity cues (X) on in-role (IRB) and extra-role behaviour (ERB) (Y), were estimated and tested for significance (Model 2, figures 5.5 and 5.6). The results as summarised in figure 5.6 indicate significance in the paths between: consistent image implementation (OVCII) and IRB (β 0.136; t-value 2.517); team member exchange (RSCTX) and ERB (β 0.437; t-value 9.883); and team member exchange (RSCTX) and IRB (β 0.276; t-value 5.266).
Figure 5.5 Path estimation of direct effects for Model 2
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IRB = In-Role Behaviour
Figure 5.6  Model 2 significance testing (bootstrapping) using 5,000 sub-samples at p <0.05 level of significance (t-value 1.96)
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Stage 2 Model 3 – inclusion of the mediator variable, organisational identification (OID)

In the second stage of analysis, the mediating variable, organisational identification (OID) was incorporated in the model and the model re-estimated and tested for significance (Model 3). As figure 5.7 and table 5.11 illustrate, the effects (depicted as $c^1$ in figure 3.8) of consistent Image Implementation (OVCII) on IRB with a VAF of 5%, along with the effects of team member exchange (RSCTX) on both ERB and IRB with VAFs of 16% and 5% respectively are not mediated by OID.
Figure 5.7  Path coefficients and significance values reflecting the mediation testing in Model 3.
Bootstrapping for significance* using 5,000 sub-samples at p < 0.05 level of significance (t-value 1.96)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path a</th>
<th>Path b</th>
<th>Path c Direct Effect</th>
<th>Path c' Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect $a * b$</th>
<th>$c' + a * b$</th>
<th>VAF $(a * b)/(a * b + c')$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Id. Cue ➔ OID</td>
<td>OID ➔ RB</td>
<td>Corp. Id. Cue ➔ RB</td>
<td>Corp. Id. Cue ➔ RB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII ➔ IRB Consistent Image Implementation ➔ In-Role Behaviours</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-value: 3.275</td>
<td>t-value: 1.088</td>
<td>t-value: 2.517</td>
<td>t-value: 3.814</td>
<td>t-value: 0.974</td>
<td>t-value: 4.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX ➔ ERB Team Member Exchange ➔ Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX ➔ IRB Team Member Exchange ➔ In-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-value: 5.087</td>
<td>t-value: 1.088</td>
<td>t-value: 5.266</td>
<td>t-value: 5.087</td>
<td>t-value: 1.072</td>
<td>t-value: 5.310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11 Summary of direct effects and mediation results including VAF values for Model 3
Further examination of measurement Model 3 revealed highly acceptable levels of indicator reliability; construct reliability with CR values above 0.70 and AVE above 0.50 for each of the constructs in the model. Discriminant validity met the thresholds set out for the Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross-loading examination and the 0.90 level defined for the heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations. The structural model was also examined for multicollinearity and all structural (inner) model VIF values were found to be far below the level of 5 defined by Hair et al., 2017 for PLS-SEM models; the highest being 2.293 for the shared vision (SCCSV) construct. Examination of the $R^2$, $Q^2$ effect results confirmed the model’s strength and descriptive, or predictive, relevance.

In addition to team member exchange (RSCTX) and consistent image implementation (OVCII), the direct effect of reciprocity (RSCR) ($\beta 0.126$; $t$-value 2.261) and shared vision (SCCSV) ($\beta 0.184$; $t$-value 3.200) vision on organisational identification (OID) remained significant and positive, as with their indirect effect through OID on extra-role behaviour (ERB) ($\beta 0.264$; $t$-value 6.105). In combination with the $R^2$ values of 0.308 and 0.281 returned for OID and ERB respectively, this provides some confirmation that a mix of all three corporate identity cue types influences employees’ sense of belonging with the firm and the subsequent extra lengths these employees will go to for the firm and their colleagues. The influence of OID on in-role behaviour (IRB) was not significant ($\beta 0.053$; $t$-value 1.088), the latter returning an $R^2$ value of 0.150.

Based on these results, the mediation model was revised estimated and bootstrapped with 5,000 sub-samples to test for significance at the $p<0.05$ ($t$-value >1.96) level. This represents the third stage of the process which resulted in Model 4. The resultant path diagram for Model 4 is presented in figure 5.8.

**Stage 3 Model 4 – the revised mediation model**

As part of the third stage of the process, the measurement model for Model 4 was analysed and found to display good levels of indicator reliability. Good levels of construct reliability and validity were also recorded with CA, CR and AVE readings above the respective 0.70 and 0.50 thresholds for each of the constructs in the model. Discriminant validity was also achieved in line with the requirements set out for Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross-loadings and the 0.90 level defined for the heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations as outlined in section 3.13.2. Given the inability of cross-loadings and the Fornell-Larcker measures to dependably identify discriminant validity under conditions of full construct correlation as in the application of cross loadings; and minor deviations in indicator loadings for given constructs, as in the case of the Fornell-Larcker criterion (Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2015), Henseler et al. (2015) and Hair et al., (2017) suggest
examination of the estimated correlation between specific constructs – i.e., the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT).

This is because the HTMT considers the average of indicator correlations from the full array of constructs relative to the average of those associated with individual constructs. Henseler et al. (2015) further set out three evaluative measures of HTMT ratio ranging from the most generous criterion of HTMT.90, to the highly conservative HTMT.85 criterion as well as the more statistically-grounded HTMT$_{\text{inference}}$ that incorporates the use of confidence within which values of 1 are considered symptomatic of poor discriminant validity. In this instance, the model exhibited good validity since all values were within the HTMT.90 and HTMT.85 ratio levels.

The structural model was also examined for multicollinearity issues. All structural (inner) model variance inflation factor (VIF) values were found to be far below the level of 5 defined by Hair et al., 2017 for PLS-SEM models with the highest being 2.258 for shared vision (SCCSV).

Examination of the coefficient of determination returned values that differed markedly from those in Model 3 (i.e., the non-revised mediation model). Here, the $R^2$ values for OID ($R^2$ 0.246) were notably lower than those for ERB ($R^2$ 0.282). The $R^2$ values for IRB remained constant at $R^2$ 0.150. In short, when compared to Model 3, the $R^2$ values returned in the revised model were lower for OID, slightly higher for both ERB and remained constant for IRB when compared with the mediation model.
**Figure 5.8** Path coefficients and significance values for Model 4 as a result of mediation testing. Bootstrapping for significance* using 5,000 sub-samples at p < 0.05 level of significance (t-value 1.96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t-values appear in parentheses
Stage 4 Model 5 – model re-estimation controlling for the effects of gender, profession and tenure

In the fourth and final stage of the analysis, the effects of Gender, Profession and Tenure on the role behaviours were controlled for resulting in Model 5.

The measurement model for Model 5 was examined and found to exhibit acceptable levels of indicator reliability; construct reliability with CR values above 0.70 and AVE above 0.50 for each of the constructs in the model (table 5.12). Discriminant validity was also achieved according to the thresholds set out for the Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross-loading examination and, as illustrated in table 5.13, the 0.85 and more liberal 0.90 levels defined for the heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations. The structural model was also examined for multicollinearity. All structural (inner) model VIF values were found to be far below the level of 5 defined by Hair et al., 2017 for PLS-SEM models with the highest being 2.258 for the shared vision (SCCSV) construct (table 5.14). Examination of the $R^2$, the $Q^2$ (table 5.15) and $q^2$ effect results (table 5.16) confirmed the model’s strength and predictive relevance.

These results similarly confirm the apparent clear distinction between the effects of controllable (Strategy Component and Organisational Voice Corporate Cue Types) and seemingly uncontrollable (Relational Signalling corporate identity cue type) communications revealed during stage three of the analysis. Similarly, they also show the influence and indeed importance of the group-internal as opposed to group-external cues and communication on employee role behaviours.

It is also worth mentioning that in addition to team member exchange (RSCTX) and consistent image implementation (OVCII), the direct effect of reciprocity (RSCR $\beta$ 0.174; t-value 2.959) and shared vision (SCCSV $\beta$ 0.137; t-value 2.247) vision on organisational identification (OID) in Model 5 remains both significant and positive, as does the indirect effect through OID on extra-role behaviour (ERB $\beta$ 0.259; t-value 5.926). An overview of these results along with the model’s direct and total effects is presented in Table 5.17 later in this section.

The $R^2$ values for organisational identification (OID) also remain unchanged at 0.246 ($R^2_{adj}$ 0.239) when compared with the Model 4 in which the control variables were not present. When compared with the same model however, a slight increase in extra-role behaviour (ERB $R^2$ 0.294; $R^2_{adj}$ 0.287) and in-role behaviours ($R^2$ 0.153; $R^2_{adj}$ 0.143) can be observed. The $R^2_{adj}$ values were all significant with t-values of 6.448; 7.127 and 4.077 respectively at the t-value 1.96 (p<0.05) level of significance.
This revised model, Model 5 (figure 5.9), is subsequently used in the following sections of this chapter in assessing model robustness, unobserved heterogeneity and, in Chapter 6, conducting the multigroup analyses.
Figure 5.9  Significance testing (bootstrapping) of Model 5 using 5,000 sub-samples at \( p < 0.05 \) level of significance (t-value 1.96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t \)-values appear in parentheses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCII</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCTX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB: extra-role behaviour</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.546</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (control variable)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB: in-role behaviour</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.016</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID: org. identification</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.217</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC: corporate communications</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.884</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII: consistent image</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profession (control variable)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.161</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.301</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR: reciprocity</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX: team member exchange</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.444</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV: mission and values dissemination</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.558</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV: shared vision</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.703</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (control variable)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12 Descriptive statistics, reliability, validity and latent variable correlations for Model 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCII</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCTX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERB: Extra-Role Behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (Control Variable)</strong></td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRB: In-Role Behaviour</strong></td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OID: Org. Identification</strong></td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVCC: Corporate Communications</strong></td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVCII: Consistent Image Implementation</strong></td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession (Control Variable)</strong></td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSCR: Reciprocity</strong></td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSCTX: Team Member Exchange</strong></td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.059 0.243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCCMV: Mission and Values Dissemination</strong></td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.078 0.535</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCCSV: Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.128 0.692</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure (Control Variable)</strong></td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.060 0.041</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.13** Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) for Model 5

---

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)  
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination  
SCCSV = Shared Vision

Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)  
OVCC = Corporate Communications  
OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)  
RSCTX = Team Member Exchange  
RSCR = Reciprocity

Additional Constructs  
OID = Organisational Identification  
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour  
IRB = In-Role Behaviour

246
ERB: Extra-Role Behaviour
Gender (Control Variable)  1.114  1.117
IRB: In-Role Behaviour
OID: Org. Identification  1.153  1.315
OVCC: Corporate Communications  1.718
OVCII: Consistent Image Implementation  1.284  1.511
Profession (Control Variable)  1.104  1.107
RSCR: Reciprocity  1.864
RSCTX: Team Member Exchange  1.159  1.206
SCCMV: Mission and Values Dissemination  1.799
SCCSV: Shared Vision  2.258
Tenure (Control Variable)  1.018  1.036

Table 5.14  Inner (structural) model VIF values for Model 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV: Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV: Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC: Corporate Communications</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII: Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR: Reciprocity</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX: Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16  q² effects sizes for Model 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>SSO</th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>Q² (=1-SSE/SSO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB: Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>2,680.000</td>
<td>2,234.162</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Control Variable)</td>
<td>536.000</td>
<td>536.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB: In-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>2,680.000</td>
<td>2,447.984</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID: Org. Identification</td>
<td>2,680.000</td>
<td>2,280.582</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC: Corporate Communications</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII: Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>2,144.000</td>
<td>2,144.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession (Control Variable)</td>
<td>536.000</td>
<td>536.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR: Reciprocity</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX: Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td>3,216.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV: Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>1,072.000</td>
<td>1,072.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV: Shared Vision</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td>1,608.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (Control Variable)</td>
<td>536.000</td>
<td>536.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15  Q² values for Model 5

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
SCCSV = Shared Vision

Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
OVCC = Corporate Communications
OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
RSCR = Reciprocity

Additional Constructs
OID = Organisational Identification
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
IRB = In-Role Behaviour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Sample (O)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (STDEV)</th>
<th>t-values (O/STDEV)</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>5.926</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>3.621</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>4.497</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>8.057</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>4.938</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>2.117</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17 Summary of total (direct and indirect) effects in Model 5 with significant effects (p < 0.05 level of significance; t-value 1.96) marked in bold type

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)  
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination  
SCCSV = Shared Vision

Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)  
OVCC = Corporate Communications  
OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)  
RSCTX = Team Member Exchange  
RSCR = Reciprocity

Additional Constructs  
OID = Organisational Identification  
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour  
IRB = In-Role Behaviour
5.5.5 Robustness Check
To evaluate the robustness of the mediation analysis outcomes, two further checks were conducted on Model 5.

In the first check, extra-role behaviour (ERB) was approached via the in-role behaviour construct (IRB), effectively positioning IRB as a mediating variable (Figures 5.10, Model 5a). The direct effect \( (c) \) of organisational identification (OID) on ERB, excluding the mediating variable IRB was significant (\( \beta 0.259; t\)-value 5.920). As table 5.17 shows, although the direct effect of OID on ERB \( (c') \) remained significant with the inclusion of the mediating variable \( \beta 0.223; t\)-value 5.187), the indirect effect on ERB (\( \beta 0.016; t\)-value 1.091) proved non-significant. Similarly, the direct effect of OID on IRB (\( \beta 0.056; t\)-value 1.138) was also found to be non-significant. Examination of the \( R^2 \) values, shows an increase for ERB (\( R^2 0.365 / R^2_{adj} 0.357 \)) and for IRB (\( R^2 0.152 / R^2_{adj} 0.142 \)) nevertheless, OID remains at \( R^2 0.246 / R^2_{adj} 0.239 \) (table 5.18).

In the second check, IRB is approached via the ERB construct, effectively positioning ERB as the mediating variable (Figure 5.11, Model 5b). The direct effect of organisational identification (OID) on IRB, excluding the mediating variable ERB, was not significant (\( \beta 0.055; t\)-value 1.126). As table 5.17 shows, the direct effects between OID and ERB (\( \beta 0.256; t\)-value 5.877), and between ERB and IRB (\( \beta 0.350; t\)-value 8.298) are both significant. The total effect however becomes insignificant (\( \beta 0.057; t\)-value 1.155). The direct effect of OID on IRB while negative is not significant (\( \beta -0.033; t\)-value 0.672). Examination of the coefficient of determination shows an increase in IRB (\( 0.238 / R^2_{adj} 0.228 \)) and slight increase in ERB (\( 0.285 / R^2_{adj} 0.288 \)) (table 5.19). The \( R^2 \) values for OID remain the same at 0.246.

On the basis of these results, Model 5 is considered robust.
Figure 5.10 Path coefficients and t-values for Robustness Check 1 (Model 5a) bootstrapped using 5,000 sub-samples at the p<0.05 level of significance (t-value 1.96)

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
SCCSV = Shared Vision

Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
OVCC = Corporate Communications
OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
RSCR = Reciprocity

Additional Constructs
OID = Organisational Identification
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
IRB = In-Role Behaviour
Figure 5.11  Path coefficients and t-values for Robustness Check 2 (Model 5b) bootstrapped using 5,000 sub-samples at the p<0.05 level of significance (t-value 1.96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*t-values appear in parentheses*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path a (OID → RB)</th>
<th>Path b (RB → RB)</th>
<th>Path c (OID → RB)</th>
<th>Path c'/Direct Effect (OID → RB)</th>
<th>Indirect Effect $a * b$</th>
<th>$c' + a * b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OID → ERB (Check 1: IRB as Mediator)</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Identification → Extra-Role Behaviours</td>
<td>t-Value: 1.138</td>
<td>t-Value: 7.768</td>
<td>t-Value: 5.920</td>
<td>t-Value: 5.187</td>
<td>t-Value: 1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID → ERB (Check 2: ERB as Mediator)</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Identification → In-Role Behaviours</td>
<td>t-Value: 5.877</td>
<td>t-Value: 8.298</td>
<td>t-Value: 1.126</td>
<td>t-Value: 0.672</td>
<td>t-Value: 4.618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18 Overview of results from Robustness Checks 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check 1 R² Results</th>
<th>Check 2 R² Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>R²_adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19 R² and $R²_{adj}$ values from Robustness Checks 1 and 2
5.5.6 Hypotheses testing

Based on the aim of this study, the literature review and the outcomes of the qualitative study (Phase I), the following six hypotheses were defined:

\[ H_1 \] Corporate identity cues that point to the mission, vision and values of the organisation (i.e., its philosophy) will positively influence employees’ identification with the organisation (OID)

\[ H_2 \] The higher the organisational identification (OID) the higher the extra-role behaviour (ERB)

\[ H_3 \] Organisational identification (OID) will have a significant positive effect on in-role behaviour (IRB)

\[ H_4 \] Corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice will contribute positively to organisational identification

\[ H_5 \] Corporate identity cues of reciprocity and exchange will exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (OID)

\[ H_6 \] Corporate identity cues related to team member exchange will have a significant positive effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB)

To test these hypotheses, the results from the analysis of the conceptual model’s direct effects (table 5.20; figure 5.9) were considered. The outcomes of the hypothesis testing are presented in the following paragraphs starting with the direct effects between the corporate identity cues and organisational identification (OID), before moving on to the direct effects of OID on in-role behaviours (IRB) and extra-role (ERB).

**Direct Effects**

The analysis showed that three corporate identity cues – **shared vision (SCCSV)** (\( \beta 0.137 \); t-value 2.247), **consistent image implementation (OVCI)I** (\( \beta 0.251 \); t-value 4.497), and **reciprocity (RSCR)** (\( \beta 0.174 \); t-value 2.959) – contributed significantly to **organisational identification (OID)**.
On the basis of these results, the hypothesis that corporate identity cues pointing to the mission, vision and values of the organisation (i.e., its philosophy) positively influence employees’ identification with the organisation (H₁) could only be partially supported since the relationship between mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) and OID (β -0.015; t-value 0.299) was not significant. Shared vision (SCCSV) was found to positively influence organisational identification however (β 0.137; t-value 2.247).

Although the results showed the relationship between organisational identification and extra-role (ERB) behaviour to be both positive and significant, this data by itself could not fully confirm H₂ that high levels of organisational identification lead to high levels of extra-role behaviour since it reflects only the aggregate level results. The result for this hypothesis is therefore reported as part of the subgroup level analyses presented in Chapter 6 and in the Discussion presented in Chapter 7.

Organisational identification was found to have a significant influence on extra-role behaviour (ERB) (β 0.259; t-value 5.926) but no significant effect on in-role behaviour (IRB) (β 0.055; t-value 1.126). Accordingly, hypothesis H₃ which stated that organisational identification would significantly and positively affect in-role behaviour was rejected.

In examining the significance of the relationship between consistent image implementation (OVCII) and OID (β 0.251; t-value 4.497), the consistency with which the organisation’s image was implemented was found to positively contribute to organisational identification. The relationship between corporate communications (OVCC) and OID was not significant however. Thus only partial support was found for the hypothesis (H₄) that corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice corporate identity cue type contribute positively to organisational identification.

Only partial support for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues of reciprocity and team member exchange contribute positively to organisational identification (H₅) could be confirmed at aggregate level since reciprocity (RSCR) was the only one of the two cues to be directly related to OID.

Support was found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues of team member exchange (RSCTX) would contribute positively and significantly to extra-role behaviour (H₆) on the basis of the positive, significant path coefficient returned between the two constructs (Table 5.20).
Indirect Effects

A significant path relationship was confirmed between consistent image implementation (OVCII) and in-role behaviour (IRB) (β 0.190; t-value 4.341), and between OVCII and extra-role behaviour (ERB) (β 0.065; t-value 3.621). The path relationships between reciprocity (RSCR) and ERB (β 0.045; t-value 2.485), and between shared vision (SCCSV) and ERB (β 0.036; t-value 2.117) were also significant (table 5.17).
### Hypotheses Path Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Relationships</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₁</strong> (partially supported)</td>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID&lt;br&gt;Mission and Values Dissemination → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>rejected</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID&lt;br&gt;Shared Vision → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₂</strong> (supported*)</td>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB&lt;br&gt;Organisational Identification → Extra-role Behaviour</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>5.926</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₃</strong> (rejected)</td>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB&lt;br&gt;Organisational Identification → In-role Behaviour</td>
<td>rejected</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₄</strong> (partially supported)</td>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID&lt;br&gt;Corporate Communications → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>rejected</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OVCII -&gt; OID&lt;br&gt;Consistent Image Implementation → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>4.497</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₅</strong> (partially supported)</td>
<td>RSCR -&gt; OID&lt;br&gt;Reciprocity → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₆</strong> (supported)</td>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; ERB&lt;br&gt;Team Member Exchange → Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>8.057</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant path coefficients appear in bold type*

*The full results for this hypothesis, including subgroup data, are reported in Chapters 5 and 6*

**Table 5.20** Overview of direct effects and hypotheses tested
5.6 Heterogeneity check

In addition to inspecting the structural (inner) models as described in the previous section, it is essential that at the structural level, the model be free of or at least treated for unobserved heterogeneity so that Type I and II data errors of inference (Hair et al., 2012; Becker et al., 2013) may be avoided. Latent class analysis was therefore carried out on the data via the FIMIX-PLS procedure described in Chapter 3.

5.6.1 Sample size and segment definition

Assuming a Statistical Power of 80% and a significance level of 5%, it was determined that a minimum sample size of 75 would be required to provide reliable estimates of the model. Dividing the total sample (N = 536) by the minimum sample size, the resultant figure of 7.146 reduced down to a whole integer delivered a theoretical upper bound of 7.

Scrutiny of the fit indices produced, showed that both AIC4 and BIC pointed to a 4-segment solution (table 5.21). The EN or normed entropy statistic (Ramaswamy, et al 1997) value of 0.587 (i.e. above the 0.50 threshold) further indicated good separation quality between each segment, thus facilitating categorisation of the data (Ringle et al., 2005; 2010). An examination of the relative segment size substantiated the 4-segment solution (table 5.22). Here for example, selection of segments above the four already defined would yield a segment size inappropriate for conducting analyses5. The absolute segment size reported in table 5.23 provided additional confirmation of the 4-segment solution.

5 Taking the 5-segment solution as an example, dividing the total sample size (536) by the relative segment size (0.036) yields a total of 19 observations. As a significance level of 5% with a minimum R² of 0.25 (i.e., statistical power of 80%) was defined for this procedure, the minimum sample size or number of observations required is therefore 75.
Table 5.21 Determining the number of segments in step 2 of the FIMIX-PLS procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC (Akaike's Information Criterion)</td>
<td>4,258.77</td>
<td>4,145.62</td>
<td>3,870.53</td>
<td>3,815.83</td>
<td>4,019.17</td>
<td>4,137.94</td>
<td>3,777.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC3 (Modified AIC with Factor 3)</td>
<td>4,269.77</td>
<td>4,168.62</td>
<td>3,905.53</td>
<td>3,862.83</td>
<td>4,078.17</td>
<td>4,208.94</td>
<td>3,860.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC4 (Modified AIC with Factor 4)</td>
<td>4,280.77</td>
<td>4,191.62</td>
<td>3,940.53</td>
<td><strong>3,909.83</strong></td>
<td>4,137.17</td>
<td>4,279.94</td>
<td>3,943.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC (Bayesian Information Criteria)</td>
<td>4,305.90</td>
<td>4,244.15</td>
<td>4,020.48</td>
<td><strong>4,017.18</strong></td>
<td>4,271.93</td>
<td>4,442.11</td>
<td>4,133.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIC (Consistent AIC)</td>
<td>4,316.90</td>
<td>4,267.15</td>
<td><strong>4,055.48</strong></td>
<td>4,064.18</td>
<td>4,330.93</td>
<td>4,513.11</td>
<td>4,216.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ (Hannan Quinn Criterion)</td>
<td>4,277.21</td>
<td>4,184.17</td>
<td>3,929.20</td>
<td>3,894.60</td>
<td>4,118.05</td>
<td>4,256.94</td>
<td><strong>3,916.70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDLS (Minimum Description Length with Factor 5)</td>
<td><strong>4,582.40</strong></td>
<td>4,822.29</td>
<td>4,900.26</td>
<td>5,198.60</td>
<td>5,754.99</td>
<td>6,226.80</td>
<td>6,219.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LnL (LogLikelihood)</td>
<td>-2,118.39</td>
<td>-2,049.81</td>
<td>-1,900.27</td>
<td>-1,860.91</td>
<td>-1,950.58</td>
<td>-1,997.97</td>
<td>-1,805.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN (Entropy Statistic (Normed))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td><strong>0.738</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI (Non-Fuzzy Index)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC (Normalized Entropy Criterion)</td>
<td>-342.155</td>
<td>194.791</td>
<td>221.43</td>
<td>196.767</td>
<td>183.36</td>
<td><strong>140.472</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.22 Relative segment size calculations based on FIMIX-PLS procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Segments</th>
<th>Segment 1</th>
<th>Segment 2</th>
<th>Segment 3</th>
<th>Segment 4</th>
<th>Segment 5</th>
<th>Segment 6</th>
<th>Segment 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.23 Confirmation of the 4-segment solution

NB: figures have been rounded resulting in a difference of ±1 in some absolute segment sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Segments</th>
<th>Segment 1</th>
<th>Segment 2</th>
<th>Segment 3</th>
<th>Segment 4</th>
<th>Segment 5</th>
<th>Segment 6</th>
<th>Segment 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.2 The latent segment structure

Through ex post analysis (Hahn et al., 2002) of the data, the 536 observations in the data set were allocated to one of the four segments defined earlier and the probability of any given observation belonging to a specific segment calculated. An extract from the corresponding data partition is presented in tabular format in Appendix 6 and shows for example that the probability of observation 18 being allocated to Segment 1 is lower (0.144 or 14%) than the same observation being allocated to Segment 4 (0.190 or 19%). The right-hand column, ‘FIMIX-PLS’, contains the partitioned data which was subsequently imported into SmartPLS and designated as a grouping variable to aid analysis and explanation of the latent segment structure.

In accordance with the procedure outlined by Matthews et al., (2016), Microsoft Excel was also used to contrast the data from the four segments presented in the FIMIX-PLS partition with observable variables in the data set. In this instance, the Cell Count function was applied to each of the response categories of the fourteen observable explanatory variables to generate a count of all responses for each category and the corresponding FIMIX-PLS group. The fourteen explanatory variables are listed below.

- Contract Type
- Country Office
- Direct Responsibility
- Exposure
- Front-Office/Back-Office (FOBO)
- Gender
- Location

- Profession
- Professional Membership
- Seniority
- Shareholding
- Starting Company
- Start Year
- Tenure

Tables 5.24 and 5.25 display the results of the comparisons made between the four FIMIX-PLS segments and two explanatory variables; Profession and Contract Type. Here, the higher cell counts appear in bold type with the sum of these counts used to calculate the degree of overlap between segment and partition.

Taking the explanatory variable ‘Profession’ as an example (table 5.24), one can see that this variable comprises four response categories: Consultant (0), Engineer (1), Consultant Engineer/Engineering Consultant (2), and Other (3). The results of the Cell Count show that for all four FIMIX-PLS groups, the highest number of responses returned is in the Other category.
The results also indicate that there is a 15.9% chance that the 85 respondents in the Other category fall into Segment 1. In total, 217 (85+63+51+18) response were recorded for this response category. Dividing this figure by the total number of observations (N=536), returns a value of 0.40. In other words, there is only a 40% overlap or match between the FIMIX-PLS partition and that produced by the explanatory variable, Profession. This figure is substantially lower than the stipulated 0.60 cut off and accordingly, the overlap is considered unsatisfactory. By contrast, in applying the same process of analysis using the explanatory variable, ‘Contract Type’, (table 5.25) it can be seen that for all the FIMIX-PLS segments, the highest number of responses is returned for the category Permanent. Furthermore, there is a 35.1% chance that the 188 respondents with permanent contracts fall into Segment 1. A total of 481 responses were recorded for this response category with a value of 0.90, or 90%. Unlike the previous example, this figure is clearly above the 0.60 threshold indicating a satisfactory overlap between the FIMIX-PLS partition and that produced by the explanatory variable, Contract Type.

Applying this formula to the remaining data set revealed that in addition to ‘Contract Type’, a further four explanatory variables (Direct Responsibility, Professional Membership, Starting Company and Seniority) exhibited unsatisfactory overlap values of <0.60 with the FIMIX-PLS segments as reflected in the correspondingly low overlap value/percentage. By comparison, in addition to ‘Tenure’, satisfactory overlap (≥ 0.60) was achieved between the FIMIX-PLS groups for seven explanatory variables: Country Office, Exposure, Front-Office/Back-Office (FOBO), Gender, Location and Profession.
Table 5.24  Results of the comparisons made between the four FIMIX-PLS segments and the explanatory variable, **Profession**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIMIX-PLS Segment</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlap</strong></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.25  Results of the comparisons made between the four FIMIX-PLS segments and the explanatory variable, **Contract Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Type, absolute numbers</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIMIX-PLS Segment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlap</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.3 Segment-specific model estimations

Model estimations were generated for those response categories that returned the highest counts only. As the highest counts were returned in only one response category for each of the eight explanatory variables that met the 0.60 cut off, estimations were thus made for the following response categories (in parentheses) of the eight explanatory variables:

- Contract Type (Permanent)
- Country Office – i.e., a CSC office located in a specific country – (Non-Country Office)
- Exposure – i.e. contact or awareness of CSC’s strategic change announcement (Pre-Exposure); FOBO – i.e. client or non-client facing position (Front-Office)
- Gender (Male)
- Location (Core Countries)
- Shareholder (Shareholdership)
- Tenure (Short Tenure)

The results of these estimations are presented in table 5.26. Following Matthews et al. (2016), the table shows the aggregate-level data and group-specific results along with the measurement model evaluation criteria as documented in Hair et al. (2017). Significant paths are marked in bold font. The results are also discussed in the following section starting with the variables that match closest the results from the FIMIX-PLS partition. The results and description of the FIMIX-PLS Segments are addressed separately in section 5.6.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment/Group</th>
<th>FIMIX-PLS</th>
<th>FIMIX-PLS</th>
<th>FIMIX-PLS</th>
<th>FIMIX-PLS</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Discriminant Validity</th>
<th>Coefficient of Det., R²</th>
<th>Weighted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Countries</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.26 Comparative view of results from the partitioned FIMIX-PLS 4-segment solution and the observable explanatory variables

- **Type 1 error** = threshold not met
- **Type 2 error** = threshold met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Office</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>FOB</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Shareholder-ship</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Non-Country Office</td>
<td>Pre-Exposure</td>
<td>Front-Office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Core Countries</td>
<td>Shareholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.74</td>
<td>84.26</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td>80.78</td>
<td>78.17</td>
<td>74.44</td>
<td>22.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rel. segment size (%) | 100% | 40.30 | 27.43 | 21.83 | 10.45 | 89.41 | 44.22 | 385 | 433 | 419 | 399 | 119 | 336 |

**Path**

- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**
- **β / t-value**

**Coefficient of Det., R²**

- **OEID** = 0.246
- **ERB** = 0.294
- **IRB** = 0.133
- **RSCTX = 0.499

**Weighted R²**

- **OEID** = 0.246
- **ERB** = 0.294
- **IRB** = 0.133

**Strategy Component Core (SCC)**

- **SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination**
- **SCCSV = Shared Vision**

**Organisational Voice Core (OVC)**

- **OVC = Corporate Communications**
- **OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation**

**Relational Signalling Core (RSC)**

- **RSCM = Team Member Exchange**
- **RSCR = Reciprocity**

**Additional Constructs**

- **OEID = Organisational Identification**
- **ERB = Extra-Roll Behaviour**
- **IRB = In-Roll Behaviour**
5.6.3.1 Explanatory variables

Contract, Exposure and FOBO – Permanent, Pre-exposure and Front-Office employees

Inspection of the data shows that permanent employees (n=481) together with those occupying Front-Office role (n=433), and those not exposed to the company’s strategic announcement (i.e., Pre-Exposure; n=385) draw on the same combination of corporate identity cues to influence their organisational identification (OID) as reflected in the FIMIX-PLS partition. Indeed the path coefficients and t-values returned are also in broad alignment. But here, it is the shared vision (SCCSV), reciprocity (RSCR) and, in particular, the consistent image implementation (OVCII) corporate identity cues that lead to broadly similar levels of OID as expressed through the $R^2$ values of 0.256 for the Permanent employee; 0.241 for the Pre-Exposure; and 0.243 for client-facing/Front-Office staff, groups as outlined earlier in this chapter. Nevertheless shared vision appears to be an equally critical ingredient.

The direct effects of consistent image implementation (OVCII) and team member exchange (RSCTX) on the role-prescribed behaviours (IRB) also displays similar patterns of significance across these groups although, OVCII proved insignificant in the FIMIX-PLS partition. This is all the more interesting because it is solely via these cues and not OID that in-role behaviour is activated. Similarly, it is only through the direct effect of RSCTX that employees’ extra-role, or discretionary, behaviours (ERB) are triggered, and, to great effect given the associated path coefficient and t-values. This is matched almost evenly by the direct effect of OID on ERB, hinting at the very fine balance between the effects of RSCTX and OID on role behaviours within this group of employees.

The OID weighted $R^2$ values for these three groups (Contract Type Permanent 0.230; Exposure Pre-Exposure 0.173; FOBO, Front-Office 0.196), along with those for ERB and IRB, show a slight decrease in the in-sample predictive power when contrasted with the aggregate-level figures. But this is not substantial and therefore indicates that heterogeneity does not significantly affect the data.

Country Office – Non-Country Office

Despite drawing on only two corporate identity cues, the Non-Country office group (n=442) – that is to say, those working directly for a Business Division – with its reliance on only OVCII ($\beta$ 0.229; t-value 3.858) and reciprocity (RSCR) ($\beta$ 0.159; t-value 2.406) returns an $R^2$ of 0.241 for OID. This is somewhat higher than the value produced by the FIMIX-PLS partition (i.e., $R^2$ 0.246) though not excessively so. Accordingly, this leads to slightly elevated $R^2$ values for ERB (0.312) and somewhat lower values for IRB ($R^2$ 0.133). As in the FIMIX-PLS partition, the path between organisational identification (OID) and in-role (IRB) ($\beta$ 0.046; t-value 0.833) remains insignificant for this grouping
variable. Unlike the partition, OID exerts a non-significant effect on extra-role (ERB) ($\beta$ 0.318; t-value 6.931).

The weighted $R^2$ values for the three endogenous variables (OID $R^2$ 0.199; ERB 0.257; IRB 0.110) are also marginally above those produced by the partition indicative of good in-sample predictive power in comparison to that of the partition (OID $R^2_{adj}$ 0.246; ERB 0.294; IRB 0.153). But again, the increase is not extreme and thus provides further confirmation that heterogeneity does not significantly influence the data.

**Location – Core Countries**

Employees within the core countries (n=399) rely on an identical combination of corporate identity cues as their Non-Country Office located peers – consistent image implementation (OVCII) ($\beta$ 0.153; t-value 2.673) and reciprocity (RSCR) ($\beta$ 0.186; t-value 2.788) to drive their identification with the firm; and the same direct influences of team member exchange (RSCTX) ($\beta$ 0.296; t-value 6.261) to drive extra-role behaviour (ERB). The only notable difference is that OID also contributes to the level of extra-role behaviour in this group. Unlike the Permanent, Pre-Exposure and Front-Office groups, shared vision (SCCSV) has no influence on this group, despite the historical relationship between the countries it comprises. Both the path coefficients and the t-values produced match reasonably closely those of the FIMIX-PLS partition. The weighted $R^2$ values by contrast are slightly below those of the partition (OID $R^2$ 0.141; ERB 0.223; IRB 0.111) suggesting that heterogeneity has no adverse effect on the data.

**Shareholdership – Shareholders**

Finally, examination of content derived from the Shareholder explanatory variable (n=119), reveals that only one corporate identity cue delivers any significance contribution to organisational identification – reciprocity (RSCR) ($\beta$ 0.280; t-value 2.315). Unsurprisingly, this results in the lowest value for organisational identification ($R^2$ 0.162) of all the groups. The only other cues of significance are consistent image implementation (OVCII) with its direct effect on in-role behaviour (IRB) (0.246; t-value 2.716); and team member exchange (RSCTX) with its direct effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB) ($\beta$ 0.269; t-value 2.953). In effect, three different corporate identity cues trigger three different outcomes. This paints a fragmented picture of the corporate identity cue effects which unfortunately is not improved by the low AVE 0.479 for RSCTX. The weighted $R^2$ values for this variable differ markedly from those of the partition as might be expected given the low sample size and poor convergent validity (OID weighted $R^2$ 0.036; ERB 0.060; IRB 0.045).

From these analyses, it may be concluded that overall, unobserved heterogeneity poses no substantial threat to the data given the four segments identified.
5.6.4 Describing the FIMIX-PLS segments

Although it is common when reporting on the FIMIX-PLS segments to focus on those response categories returning the highest cell count, to contextualise the results for each segment, the cell counts from other response categories within the corresponding explanatory variables are discussed where appropriate in the following sections.

The data reveals that across all four segments, a number of commonalities can be found. For example, the number of male respondents can be seen to outnumber female respondents in all cases. Collectively, the majority of respondents hold permanent employment contracts (Contract Type) with the firm but are not shareholders (Shareholdership). And, a greater number of employees occupy client-facing, front-office than back-office positions (FOBO).

The data also shows that the greatest number of employees are based in one of the company’s core operating countries (i.e., UK, The Netherlands and South Africa), and that the number of employees who joined the company prior to its last major strategic development in 2012 exceeds those who joined after. Across all segments, the number of respondents affiliated with the multiple Divisions of the firm is higher than those attached to country-specific operations; the latter typically being locally employed support staff. The data further shows that the number of respondents not exposed to the strategic change announcement in the company (Pre-Exposure) is significantly higher in all segments than those who were exposed (Post-Exposure) to the announcement.

There are some deviations from this general picture. These are highlighted in the segment-specific descriptions below. An overview of these four segments is marked and illustrated in table 5.27.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. segment size (%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>β / t-value</td>
<td>β / t-value</td>
<td>β / t-value</td>
<td>β / t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV → OID</td>
<td>-0.015 / 0.299</td>
<td>-0.212 / 3.036</td>
<td>0.048 / 0.000</td>
<td>0.502 / 9.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV → OID</td>
<td>0.137 / 2.281</td>
<td>-0.048 / 0.566</td>
<td>0.205 / 0.000</td>
<td>0.233 / 3.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC → OID</td>
<td>0.067 / 1.153</td>
<td>0.194 / 2.470</td>
<td>0.165 / 0.000</td>
<td>-0.055 / 0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII → OID</td>
<td>0.251 / 4.538</td>
<td>0.523 / 6.564</td>
<td>0.130 / 0.000</td>
<td>0.386 / 6.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR → OID</td>
<td>0.174 / 2.993</td>
<td>0.238 / 2.894</td>
<td>0.244 / 0.000</td>
<td>-0.028 / 0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII → IRB</td>
<td>0.176 / 3.728</td>
<td>0.057 / 1.026</td>
<td>-0.233 / 0.000</td>
<td>0.138 / 1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX → ERB</td>
<td>0.367 / 7.966</td>
<td>0.111 / 1.779</td>
<td>0.140 / 0.000</td>
<td>0.379 / 4.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX → IRB</td>
<td>0.259 / 5.028</td>
<td>0.214 / 3.021</td>
<td>0.073 / 0.000</td>
<td>0.218 / 2.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID → ERB</td>
<td>0.595 / 5.795</td>
<td>0.715 / 13.806</td>
<td>0.371 / 0.000</td>
<td>-0.238 / 3.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID → IRB</td>
<td>0.055 / 1.128</td>
<td>0.560 / 7.802</td>
<td>0.121 / 0.000</td>
<td>-0.229 / 2.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- ERB 0.468</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB 0.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RSC 0.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- IRB 0.065</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbachs Alpha</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- IRB -5.320</td>
<td>- OVCC 0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- OVCII 0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminant Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTMT inference</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- OID → ERB 0.915</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- SCCMV → OID 0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of Det., R^2</td>
<td>OID 0.246</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERB 0.294</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRB 0.153</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2_adj</td>
<td>OID 0.239</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERB 0.287</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRB 0.143</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted R^2</td>
<td>OID 0.246</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERB 0.294</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRB 0.153</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = threshold level met  
- = threshold not met  
Figures in bold type denote significance at the p<0.05 level/t-value >1.96  
Figures in red denote no significance at the p<0.05 level/t-value >1.96  

### Table 5.27 Comparative view of the four FIMIX-PLS segments

**Strategy Component Cues (SCC)**  
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination  
SCCSV = Shared Vision  

**Organisational Voice Cues (OVC)**  
OVCC = Corporate Communications  
OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation  

**Relational Signalling Cues (RSC)**  
RSC = Team Member Exchange  
RSC = Reciprocity  

**Additional Constructs**  
OID = Organisational Identification  
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour  
IRB = In-Role Behaviour  

---
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5.6.4.1 FIMIX-PLS Segment 1 – the team/department

FIMIX-PLS Segment 1 contains the largest number of responses (n=216) and represents approximately 40.3% of the overall sample. It also contains the largest number of male respondents out of all the segments (n=174) and the highest number of pre-2012 employees at n=147. This segment’s 188 permanent contract holders represent approximately 35% of the total sample’s permanent workers. A similar percentage of Segment 1 respondents hold client-facing, front office roles; at n=184, this is more than five times the number of respondents in the same segment holding back-office roles. The majority of respondents (n=177) also operate on a multi-divisional level (i.e., not specifically tied to a country office). FIMIX Segment 1 is also the most geographically diverse of all the segments with presence in all but two (Australia and the Americas) regions. However, as noted previously, this segment’s respondents are concentrated primarily in the company’s core countries, i.e., the UK, The Netherlands and South Africa.

Analysis of the path coefficients in the segment, revealed that all but one of the six corporate identity cue constructs – in this instance, shared vision (SCCSV) (β -0.048; t-value 0.566) – returns a significant reading in the path relationship with organisational identification (OID). By contrast, consistent image implementation (OVCII) delivers the highest significant path coefficient at β 0.523 (t-value 6.564) followed by reciprocity (RSCR) β 0.238 (t-value 2.894). The corporate identity cue mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) returns the only significant negative path coefficient at β -0.212 (t-value 3.036) in the model thereby illustrating the adverse effect that promotion of these cues has on employees’ identification with the firm.

Yet, unlike any other segment or group studied, Segment 1 employees are able to draw on corporate communications (OVCC) (β 0.194; t-value 2.470) about the firm in general in identifying with their organisation. As a result, these employees appear to be the least distracted [by other cues], most identified and possibly the highest focused of all employees. Taking into account the significant direct effect of team member exchange (RSCTX) on in-role behaviours (IRB), it is plausible that the level of organisational identification here together with the apparent focus of this segment is more a reflection of bonding with their immediate environment or subgroup (i.e., team, department, work unit) as opposed to company. This could explain the negative effect of the company’s mission and values (a company level transmission) on OID 45% (R² 0.453) (if perceived at the team level). The significant influence of OID on in-role behaviour (IRB), as reflected in the path coefficient of β 0.560 (t-value 7.802) and R² value of 0.581, would also seem to bear out this supposition.
Even though this group returns the most extensive contribution of corporate identity cues to its organisational identification, the significant negative effect of mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) coupled with the non-significance of shared vision (SCCSV) should not be overlooked. If anything, it is demonstrative of the non-conducive effect of the CSC strategic component corporate identity cue type on member’s sense of oneness with the firm as a whole, and the ability of this group to convert their organisational identification into delivering precisely what is required within their remit.

Although examination of the Fornell-Larcker values and cross-loadings reveal good discriminant validity, this is not the case in terms of HTMT inference with extra-role behaviour (ERB) returning a value above the 0.90 cut-off point at 0.915. The model nevertheless displays good construct reliability and convergent validity for this segment.

5.6.4.2 FIMIX-PLS Segment 2 – the ‘routine’ workers

FIMIX Segment 2 contains the second largest number of responses (n=147) amongst the four segments accounting for approximately 27% of the total sample. Correspondingly, it also has the second largest number of male respondents (n=115) which is almost four times the figure returned for female respondents (n=32) in the same segment. Those who commenced their careers with the company after the merger furthermore account for 21% (n=112) of the full 536 observations made.

There are a number of unique characteristics that do not appear in other segments. For example, Contract Type reveals one of the largest disparities in the data; namely the substantial gap between permanent (n=138) and temporary (n=9) staff members. The data also shows that at n=101 (approximately 19% of the overall sample), the number of employees not exposed to the strategic change announcement (Pre-Exposure) is more than twice that of the employees directly exposed (Post-Exposure) to it (n=46). Perhaps most interesting of all however is the fact that even though this segment has the second highest number of employees located in CSC’s core countries of operation (n=120; 22% of the total sample), it still remains one of the most geographically spread with staff in Asia, the Americas, the European Union and CSC’s core countries.

As with the other 3 segments, the majority of respondents in FIMIX-PLS Segment 2 serve the organisation’s multiple Divisions (n=126; 24% of the total sample) rather than one specific Country Office (n=21; 4% of the total sample).
Similarly, in terms of Shareholdership, the majority of respondents in the segment are non-shareholders (n=114) and that once again, those employed with the company for up to 10 years (‘Short’ Tenure) is higher than in any of the other categories.

Examination of the model for FIMIX-PLS Segment 2 reveals an equally diverse pattern in which none of the path relationships are significant. Despite this, the relationship between reciprocity (RSCR) and organisational identification (OID) and that between OID and extra-role behaviour (ERB) produce the second highest path coefficients across all four groups at β 0.244 and β 0.371 respectively. These Cues nonetheless account for 38% of the variation in OID (R² 0.376). This returns the lowest R² values for extra-role (0.214) and in-role behaviour (IRB) (0.117).

These observations are purely academic however since in addition to the non-significance readings for all paths, three constructs did not meet the 0.50 threshold for AVE and CR could not be established. It may be cautiously concluded that with the third highest R² value for OID, the respondents in this segment are less reliant on CSC’s corporate identity cues to trigger their sense of belonging with or role behaviours towards the firm. Indeed, the role behaviours are evidently driven by factors beyond the psychological bonds with the organisation which suggests that the respondents in this segment have a more normative, routine working relationship with the company.

5.6.4.3 FIMIX-PLS Segment 3 – the company ambassadors

FIMIX-PLS Segment 3 contains approximately 22% (n=117) of the total sample making it the third largest of all the segments.

In terms of Contract Type, the majority of respondents are permanent employees of CSC. Relatively speaking, the delta between permanent (n=102) and temporary (n=15) contract holders is as large as that found in FIMIX-PLS Segment 1, i.e., 74%. There are also almost twice as many males (n=73) than females (n=44) in this segment. Despite returning the third highest number of respondents joining the company prior to its merger with Tech Corporation in February 2012 (n=73; approximately 14% of the total sample), the Start Year explanatory variable shows that FIMIX-PLS Segment 3 contains the second highest number of employees joining the company after the merger (n=44; approximately 8% of the total sample). The relative difference between these two figures however is only 25%. In fact, this is the smallest difference recorded across all 4 segments for this explanatory variable.
Once again, as with all other segments, Front-Office facing staff (n=88) outnumber those in Back-Office positions (n=29) in the FOBO explanatory variable as do those working for multiple Divisions (n=94) as opposed to country-specific office alone (n=23). Given the company’s international presence through the activities of its Divisions, the results for this Country Office variable are notable given that FiMIX-PLS Segment 3 contains a reasonably good geographic spread of respondents throughout the Americas, Asia (n=32), the European Union (n=2), CSC’s key countries of operation (n=79) and indeed the rest of the world (RoW). The number of non-shareholders (n=97) is higher than shareholders (n=20), and the vast majority (n=79; approximately 15% of the total sample) of respondents in this segment are located in one of the company’s three key countries of operation, i.e., the UK, The Netherlands and South Africa.

A defining characteristic of this group is its high level of organisational identification as reflected in the coefficient of determination (OID $R^2 0.732$) and the high t-values returned for the three most significant corporate identity cues – mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) ($\beta 0.502$; t-value 9.356); shared vision (SCCSV) $\beta 0.233$; t-value 3.758); and consistent image implementation (OVCII) ($\beta 0.386$; t-value 6.392). Equally noteworthy is the significant direct effect of team member exchange (RSCTX) on this Segment’s extra-role (ERB $\beta 0.379$; t-value 4.011) and in role behaviours (IRB $\beta 0.218$; t-value 2.065).

This could at first glance suggest that respondents in this group are able to balance particularly well their identification with the organisation with the level of exchange required within their direct working group.

Closer inspection of the data provides an alternative perspective however. The relationships between OID and ERB ($\beta -0.238$; t-value 3.166), and OID and IRB ($\beta -0.229$; t-value 2.126) are both negative and significant. Thus beyond yielding low levels of the role behaviours, organisational identification actually reduces these behaviours; a pattern not evident in any other FiMIX-PLS segment.

While the reasons behind this are not entirely clear, one possible explanation could lie in the nature of the sample itself. For instance, it is possible that the Seniority explanatory variable, despite exhibiting an overlap just under the 0.60 threshold with the FiMIX-PLS partition at 55% may hold some clues. Here it can be seen for example that a number of employees within this segment hold senior-level roles in which they are expected to reflect and embody the firm’s values rather than exclusively apply or cascade them on a daily basis within the firm. By way of example, the supervisory board members of many companies work primarily alongside other board members but are rarely involved on the ground with the day-to-day running of the firm and its interactions.
with clients or suppliers. Such members are expected however to have some affinity with the organisation. The percentage of the sample with a Senior Management role (i.e. ≤1 layer of management between themselves and the Chairman of the company) is relatively low however at 14% providing limited support for this supposition.

It may be summised that as corporate identity cues, mission and values dissemination and the consistency with which the image of the organisation is implemented are vital to the highly identified nature of this group. As the high degree of organisational identification apparently does not translate into high levels of extra-role (ERB) and in-role behaviour (IRB) – in fact, it appears to reduce them – this suggests that employees in this segment, are likely to be reliant on other factors beyond the sense of belonging to influence their behaviours towards and within the firm.

5.6.4.4 FIMIX-PLS Segment 4 – the externally-focused

FIMIX Segment 4 is the smallest of all the segments defined and reflects approximately 10% ((N=56) of the total sample. In addition to being the least geographically dispersed or represented of the four groups (Location) with presence limited to Asia (n=8), the European Union (n=2) and the companies three core countries of operation (n=79), this particular group displays patterns of divergence not evidenced in any other.

For example, the pre-Exposure figures (n=44) are more than three times that of the post-Exposure (n=12), and only twice as many males (n=37) as females (n=19) are contained within this sample. In all other segments, the pre-Exposure to post-Exposure ratios are lower whereas the males to female ratios are higher. The data also shows that the number of employees in this segment who started working for the company prior to its last major strategic initiative in 2012 (Start Year) (n=46) outnumber those who started after the initiative (n=10) by more than four to one. More interesting however is that when these figures are compared with those of the other three segments, the delta between the pre and post 2012 joiners is the smallest, relatively speaking (25%). As with all other groups, non-shareholders (n=44) outnumber shareholders (n=12) in the Shareholdership explanatory variable, while permanent employees (n=53) outnumber temporary employees in the Contract Type explanatory variable. Similarly, the number of Short Tenure employees (n=33) is higher than in any other response category of the Tenure variable, while the segment contains 53% more Front-Office employees (n=43) than Back-Office employees (n=13) (FOBO).
As with FIMIX-PLS Segment 3, this segment exhibits a considerably high level of identification with the organisation. However in contrast to the other three segments, only one corporate identity cue is of significance, albeit negative. Consistent image implementation (OVCII $\beta$=-0.302; t-value 2.253) has a distinctly negative influence on organisational identification (OID). The $R^2$ for OID (0.304) nonetheless contributes to respondents extra-role behaviours (ERB) in the Group. This suggests that the more inconsistently CSC’s image is applied, the weaker the sense of belonging between employee and company. The respondents in this group are thus likely to be in positions in which the image of the firm plays a particularly crucial role in their daily work. This assertion is supported by the demographic variables illustrating that the segment contains 53% more Front-Office than Back-Office staff. These results should be viewed with caution however since neither construct validity nor reliability could be fully established for this segment.

**Hypotheses**

As is evident from the results presented so far and illustrated in tables 5.26 and 5.27, not all hypotheses hold for the four segments identified. This is to be expected since each segment exhibits uniquely different characteristics as outlined in subsections 5.6.4.1 to 5.6.4.4.
5.7 Conclusion

With no studies, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, having operationalised or empirically tested the effects of corporate identity cues drawn member organisational associations, on organisational identification and employees’ in-role and extra-role behaviours, the central aim of the overall study was to address this shortfall. The study presented here has contributed to meeting this aim by analysing these effects at the aggregate level, thereby responding to fifth objective of the overall study.

Using PLS-SEM, the results revealed that the conceptual model was robust and that a clear and significant relationship exists between the four of the six original corporate identity cues defined – shared vision (SCCSV), consistent image implementation (OVCII), reciprocity (RSCR) and team member exchange (RSCTX) – and organisational identification. More specifically, the results indicated that via this combination of corporate identity cues, organisational identification positively influences employees’ extra-role (ERB) and, to a lesser extent, their in-role behaviours (IRB).

To bring further clarity to these results, the mediating effect of organisational identification on the relationship between the corporate identity cues and the two role behaviours was also tested. Although a significant direct effect was established between consistent image implementation (OVCII) and in-role behaviour, and team member exchange (RSCTX) and both role behaviours, no mediation effects were detected. The original conceptual model was subsequently adjusted, estimated and tested for significance, and its validity and reliability confirmed. Full support was found for H6 that team member exchange would contribute positively and significantly to extra-role behaviour. Partial support was confirmed for all remaining hypotheses with exception to H2 and H3. In the case of H2, data from the subgroup level of analysis (Chapter 6) will additionally be evaluated in order to verify fully the results of this hypothesis. No support was found for H3 however and the hypothesis was subsequently rejected; i.e., at the aggregate level, organisational identification does not have a significant positive effect on employees’ in-role behaviour.

The final model, Model 5, was also examined for unobserved heterogeneity using the finite mixture (FIMIX-PLS) procedure. The FIMIX-PLS partition resulted in a four segment solution with these segments, or groups, characterised as: the Team/Department; Routine Workers; Company Ambassadors; and Externally-Focused employees. Eight explanatory variables in the data were found to have an overlap of 60% above with the FIMIX-PLS partition and were further analysed. With heterogeneity identified, examined and treated, the results presented in this chapter confirm that the data analysis was not considerably biased by unobserved heterogeneity.
From these results, three conclusions can be made. Firstly, employees of CSC rely on a combination of all three CSC corporate identity cue types. Specifically, they rely on the shared vision (SCCSV), consistent image implementation (OVCII) and reciprocity (RSCR) corporate identity cues, to influence their sense of belonging with the organisation.

Secondly, organisational identification only has a significant influence on these members’ extra-role behaviours. Thirdly, despite exerting a direct positive and significant effect on employees’ in-role and extra-role behaviours, the corporate identity cue team member exchange (RSCTX) does not influence organisational identification in the mediated model; that is to say, the relationship between RSCTX and role behaviours is not mediated by organisational identification. To understand better the implication of these results, it is helpful to consider the corporate identity cue and organisational identification effects from the perspective of their potential impact in improving in-role and extra-role behaviours. These potential effects are discussed briefly in the importance performance map analyses summarised below.

**Importance Performance Map Analysis**

Analysis of the model’s constructs in terms of their effects on extra-role behaviour (ERB) further shows that in decreasing order, team member exchange (RSCTX), organisational identification (OID) and consistent image implementation (OVCII) are the most important drivers of extra-role behaviour (chart 5.1). In fact, with an importance score of 0.47, RSCTX is also the highest performing corporate identity cue. A one-point increase in this corporate identity cue would therefore increase employees’ extra-role behaviour by 74.0 points. While OID is of less importance (0.22), a similar point increase in this construct, driven by the corporate identity cues that directly influence it – OVCII in particular (importance 0.05; performance 60.0) – would improve extra-role behaviour performance by 70.3 points. Concentrating efforts on RSCTX and OVCII corporate identity cues could therefore lead to substantial extra-role behaviour improvements at the aggregate level.

Analysing the model’s constructs in terms of their effects on in-role behaviour shows that while RSCTX remains the most important (74.0) and impactful (0.24) corporate identity cue, consistent implementation of the image is also crucial to lifting role-prescribed behaviours (chart 5.2). As the second most importance corporate identity cue, a one point increase in OVCII would improve in-role behaviour by 60.0 points. While organisational identification is the second highest performing construct (70.3), its potential contribution to in-role behaviour improvement is of clearly lower importance (0.03). All remaining corporate identity cues, though influential, are of even lower importance in influencing in-role behaviour.
Thus while the influence of the corporate identity cues shared vision (SCCSV), consistent image implementation (OVCII) and reciprocity (RSCR) on organisational identification are significant at aggregate level, not all are important in driving up in-role and extra-role behaviours. Organisational identification itself is only of notable impact in influencing extra-role behaviours.
Chart 5.1  Importance-performance map analysis (IPMA) for the target construct Extra-Role Behaviour (ERB) at aggregate level

Chart 5.2  Importance-performance map analysis (IPMA) for the target construct In-Role Behaviour (IRB) at aggregate level
Addressing the research gaps

In addition to addressing the main aim of the study at the aggregate level, this part of the study has tackled two gaps identified from the literature review. That is to say, it has created understanding around the nature of the relationship between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and role behaviours, and brought clarity around how and which corporate identity cues affect organisational identification, and its subsequent influences on employees’ role behaviours. The results presented here furthermore confirm a positive and significant relationship between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and role behaviours.

In the following chapter, the conceptual model is explored further at the subgroup-level.
Chapter 6  Phase II – Multigroup Analysis of the Effects of Corporate Identity Cues on Organisational Identification and Role Behaviours

6.1  Introduction

This chapter focuses on the results from empirical testing of the final model (Model 5) introduced in Chapter 5 (figure 5.9). More specifically, these results address the sixth and final objective of the overall study; namely, to build understanding around the effects of corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations, on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the subgroup level. The subgroup level focus is tested from two perspectives. The first is based on the client-facing and non-client facing positions held by employees of the case organisation and is referred to as Front-Office/Back-Office, or FOBO. The second is under conditions of change – in this case, prior and post exposure to a strategic change announcement – and is referred to as EXPOSURE.

In training examination at this level, the results reported here are expected to address the final gap identified in the research by providing insights into the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and role behaviours across other areas comprising the firm and during change.

Partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) was used again to first establish invariance within subgroups using the PLS measurement invariance of composites (MICOM) procedure. PLS Multigroup Analysis (PLS-MGA) was subsequently applied to examine the role of the CSC corporate identity cues (referred to from this point on as corporate identity cues) within the respective models of each subgroup.

The chapter is divided into five sections, commencing with a brief outline of the theoretical context and objectives of this phase of the study (section 6.2). In the sections that follow, a brief discussion on the sampling strategy and measures adopted in the study is given (section 6.3). This is followed in section 6.4 by a presentation of the results from analyses conducted amongst the FOBO and EXPOSURE subgroups within the case organisation. This section starts with an overview of the measurement invariance outcomes and then goes on to detail the results of the two multigroup analyses carried out on these subgroups. In section 6.5, the results from testing of the six hypotheses introduced in Chapters 2 and 4 are presented. This is followed by presentation of the importance performance map analysis (IPMA) results for each of the subgroups in section 6.6. The chapter then closes with a summary in section 6.7 of this final part of the Phase II study.
6.2 Context

In the Literature Review (Chapter 2), it was asserted that cues to the corporate identity are inherently woven into the communications that support organisational identification, and that organisational identification in turn influences role behaviours; behaviours which indirectly influence the performance of the organisation (Podsakoff et al., 2009). In-role and extra-role service behaviours are defined as ‘helpful behaviors of employees directed towards the organization or other individuals’ (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997, p.41).

Output from the FIMIX-PLS procedure described in the previous chapter indicated that at the subgroup level expressed by the segments derived, organisational identification was driven by various combinations of corporate identity cues. Moreover, the level of organisational identification itself delivered different effects in terms of extra-role (ERB) and in-role (IRB) behaviours for these groups. In other words, the corporate identity cues within the case organisation did not exact an equal or uniform effect on employees’ sense of oneness with the firm or their behaviours subsequently exercised within and towards it.

Such differences in terms of the combination and influence of corporate identity cues becomes extremely important when considering the desirable or even undesirable effects this might have on employees identification with and behaviours towards the firm particularly amongst the subgroups that comprise it. During times of environmental change for example, employee perceptions of the organisation’s identity, are often challenged (Elsbach and Kramer, 1996; Tripsas, 2009; Clark et al., 2010) and can lead to problems in adjusting to change (Kjaergaard, 2009). It is conceivable that the combination and influence of corporate identity cues too might alter as companies make strategy adjustments in response to change. Therefore examination of the theorised relationship prior to and after exposure to strategy change announcements could offer potentially valuable insights into the corporate identity cues likely to encourage desirable [or undesirable] levels of identification and subsequently affect role behaviours.

The position of the employee – whether client-facing or non client-facing – is also of notable concern given that client-focused employees who identify strongly with their organisation have a propensity to engage in helpful behaviours (Bell and Menguc, 2002), focus on generating value for clients (Steiner, 1972) and are inclined to perform extra-role behaviours in supporting their customers and colleagues alike (Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016). This can lead to improved external service results, satisfaction and loyalty for customers that drive firm performance (Heskett et al., 2008) as noted in the Literature Review (Chapter 2).
These brief observations point to the value of analysing the data at the subgroup level. Accordingly, this chapter addresses the sixth and final objective of the study by testing empirically the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and subsequent role behaviours at subgroup level:

- Amongst client-facing and non client-facing (Front-Office/Back-Office, or FOBO) employees
- Pre and post-exposure (EXPOSURE) to the firm’s strategic change announcement

6.3 Sampling strategy and measures
The sampling strategy and measure used for the aggregate level analysis were also applied in the subgroup analyses presented here. The resultant breakdown of respondents by subgroup is presented in Graph 6.1.

![Graph 6.1](image)

Graph 6.1 Breakdown of respondent numbers by FOBO and EXPOSURE subgroups

6.4 Data analysis

6.4.1 Invariance testing
As is required prior to the application of multigroup analyses, the subgroups, FOBO and EXPOSURE, were examined for measurement invariance. The measurement invariance of composite models (MICOM) procedure advanced by Henseler et al., (2016) was applied for this purpose using 5,000 permutations at the 0.05 (two-tailed) level of significance.
The FOBO and EXPOSURE subgroups were disaggregated into two further categories/samples – Front-Office Employees and Back-Office Employees (FOBO), and Pre Strategic Change Announcement and Post Strategic Change Announcement respectively – to enable thorough analysis of the data. A summary of the MICOM analyses for the two subgroups is presented in table 6.1.

The table shows that configural and compositional invariance was established for the FOBO subgroup. On the basis of the poor p-values returned for some constructs (i.e., none exceeded p >0.05 threshold), the equality of means and variances could not be established as three constructs related to the equality of means extra-role behaviour (ERB 0.034), consistent image implementation (OVCII 0.023) and shared vision (SCCSV 0.018); and one related to the equality of variances (ERB 0.032) were below this threshold. The model for FOBO therefore exhibits partial measurement invariance. This result enables further comparison of structural model path coefficients across the Front-Office and the Back-Office subgroups.

Although configural invariance was established for the EXPOSURE subgroup, the shared vision (SCCSV) construct returned a p-value of 0.003. It may thus be inferred that shared vision is interpreted and understood differently between the Pre and Post-Exposure subgroups. Accordingly, this result is taken into account in the multigroup analyses described in the following section. Partial measurement invariance was established for the EXPOSURE subgroup thereby allowing for the comparison of structural model path coefficients with the exception of those from SCCSV.

On the basis of these results, PLS multigroup analysis (PLS-MGA) was conducted on the FOBO and EXPOSURE subgroups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Step 1 Configural invariance</th>
<th>Step 2 Compositional invariance (permutation p-value &gt;0.05)</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOBO (Front-Office/Back-Office)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial measurement invariance comparison of structural model path coefficient across groups possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPOSURE (Pre-Exposure/Post-Exposure)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCCSV failed: p-value 0.003</td>
<td>Partial measurement invariance comparison of structural model path coefficient across groups possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 Summary of invariance testing (MICOM) results for the FOBO and EXPOSURE subgroups at the p<0.05 level of significance
6.4.2 Multigroup analysis – the moderating effect of subgroups

The so-called moderating effects of subgroups detailed here focus wholly on the outcomes of the FOBO (Front-Office/Back-Office) and EXPOSURE (i.e. those exposed and those not exposed to strategic change announcement communications) analyses and take into account the results of the MICOM (measurement invariance testing) procedure. PLS-MGA, as with the significance tests applied throughout this study, was conducted at a significance level of p< 0.05 (t-value ≥1.96) using 5,000 samples. Model fit, following Eberl (2010) and predictive power were determined through assessment of latent variable R² values. More specifically, in following the precedent set by Hair et al., (2017) and Sarstedt, Wilcynski and Melewar (2013) outlined in Chapter 3 (see section 3.14.2), the R²adj values are additionally reported as a means of comparing PLS-SEM results (as opposed to selecting models) as subgroup sample sizes and/or endogenous variables differ. It should also be noted that as a largely theory-extending study, the focus is on examining and understanding group-level differences and patterns.

In the following section, starting with the outcomes from the FOBO subgroup, the comparative effects of the corporate identity cues on organisational identification (OID), followed by the effects of OID on in-role (IRB) and extra-role behaviour (ERB) and in the Front-Office and Back-Office groups are reported. The outcomes from the EXPOSURE subgroup are reported in the same manner.

6.4.3 Front-Office/Back-Office (FOBO)

In this analysis, data was grouped according to direct client-contact (Front-office sample, n=433) and non-client contact positions (Back-office sample, n=103). The path coefficients and significance results, R² and R²adj, and PLS-MGA figures related to this analysis are presented in table 6.2. Construct reliability, validity and discriminant validity at or above the accepted thresholds was achieved for the model, details of which are presented in Appendix 7.

The analysis is presented in three steps; firstly for the Front-Office data and then for the Back-Office Data. In step one, the direct influence of the corporate identity cues on organisational identification is described. This is followed in step two by detailing of the direct effect of the corporate identity cues consistent image implementation (OVCII) and team member exchange (RSCTX) on employees’ extra-role (ERB) and in-role behaviours (IRB). In the third and final step, the direct effects of OID on ERB and IRB are presented. The path coefficients and t-values for significant path relationships are discussed along with the associated R² values throughout.

Data produced for the Front-office subgroup (figure 6.1, table 6.2) revealed that organisational identification (OID) is driven by a combination of three corporate identity cues: shared vision...
(SCCSV $\beta 0.169$; t-value 2.510), consistent image implementation (OVCII $\beta 0.237$; t-value 3.802) and reciprocity (RSCR $\beta 0.137$; t-value 2.213). Collectively, these cues contribute to explaining 24% ($R^2 0.243$; $R^2_{adj} 0.234$) of the variance in OID.

This does not imply that the remaining cues are irrelevant for this subgroup but rather that they have comparatively less influence on organisational identification. Significant path relationships were confirmed between team member exchange (RSCTX) and extra-role (ERB $\beta 0.341$; t-value 6.420), and RSCTX and in-role behaviour (IRB) ($\beta 0.252$; t-value 4.406). OVCII was also found to directly influence IRB ($\beta 0.197$; t-value 3.865). As with the revised model (i.e. Model 5) at aggregate level, the levels of ERB returned here are significantly higher than those for IRB. A correspondingly strong and significant path relationship was confirmed between OID and ERB ($\beta 0.293$; t-value 5.915) ($R^2 0.293$; $R^2_{adj} 0.282$). The non-significant, negative path relationship between OID and IRB ($\beta 0.082$; t-value 1.572) with its $R^2 0.170$ and $R^2_{adj} 0.158$ seem to indicate that factors other than identification with the firm trigger this particular behaviour.

For the Back-Office subgroup (figure 6.2, table 6.2), with its lack of direct exposure to clients, only two corporate identity cues are of significance – OVCII ($\beta 0.318$; t-value 2.691) and RSCR ($0.293$; t-value 2.099) which collectively explain approximately 29% ($R^2 0.293$; $R^2_{adj} 0.257$) of the variance in the organisational identification construct. As with the Front-Office subgroup sample, team member exchange (RSCTX) has a significant, positive effect on both in-role (IRB) and extra-role (ERB) behaviours. Although the level of OID is higher than that of the Front-Office subgroup, it has no significant effect on the in-role or extra-role behaviours within the Back-Office subgroup sample. The non-significant relationship between OID and ERB ($\beta 0.188$; t-value 1.919) together with the comparably higher $R^2$ value of ERB ($R^2 0.351$; $R^2_{adj} 0.317$) seem to emphasise the importance of Back-Office employees’ extra role behaviours in supporting Front-Office efforts. This suggests that the lower $R^2$ values for in-role behaviour ($R^2 0.145$; $R^2_{adj} 0.091$) could be a possible indicator of the emphasis placed on serving Front-Office needs.
Figure 6.1  PLS-MGA estimation of Front-Office subgroup (n = 433)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 6.2 PLS-MGA estimation of Back-Office subgroup (n = 103)

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
SCCSV = Shared Vision

Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
OVCC = Corporate Communications
OVCCI = Consistent Image Implementation

Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
RSCR = Reciprocity

Additional Constructs
OID = Organisational Identification
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
IRB = In-Role Behaviour
### Table 6.2 Overview of path coefficients, significant path values, PLS-MGA, $R^2$ and $R^2_{adj}$ results for the Front-Office and Back-Office (FOBO) subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Pair</th>
<th>Path Coefficients ($\beta$)</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Construct Pair</th>
<th>Path Coefficients ($\beta$)</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Construct Pair</th>
<th>Path Coefficients ($\beta$)</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>PLS-MGA (FOBO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>SCCMV $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>SCCMV $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>SCCSV $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>SCCSV $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>OVCC $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>OVCC $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>3.802</td>
<td>OVCII $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>2.619</td>
<td>OVCII $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>2.213</td>
<td>RSCR $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>RSCR $\rightarrow$ OID</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID $\rightarrow$ ERB</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>5.915</td>
<td>OID $\rightarrow$ ERB</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>OID $\rightarrow$ ERB</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX $\rightarrow$ ERB</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>RSCTX $\rightarrow$ ERB</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>RSCTX $\rightarrow$ ERB</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>OID $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>OID $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>4.406</td>
<td>RSCTX $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>RSCTX $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>3.865</td>
<td>OVCII $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>OVCII $\rightarrow$ IRB</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R^2$ (Front-Office)</th>
<th>$R^2_{adj}$ (Front-Office)</th>
<th>$R^2$ (Back-Office)</th>
<th>$R^2_{adj}$ (Back-Office)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>ERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>IRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>OID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
- SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
- SCCSV = Shared Vision

Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
- OVCC = Corporate Communications
- OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
- RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
- RSCR = Reciprocity

Additional Constructs
- OID = Organisational Identification
- ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
- IRB = In-Role Behaviour
Summary
Overall, the results of the FOBO subgroup analysis indicate that:

- the organisational identification of the Front-Office subgroup is driven by three corporate identity cues (shared vision (SCCSV), consistent image implementation, OVCII; and reciprocity (RSCR), while the Back-Office subgroup's identification is driven by two cues (OVCII and RSCR).
  - organisational identification (OID) as reflected in the $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ values presented, is higher for the Back-Office sample than for the Front-Office subgroup sample

- while OID only influences the extra-role behaviours (ERB) amongst the Front-Office subgroup, it has no effect on the in-role (IRB) or extra-role behaviours of the Back-Office subgroup

- based on the path coefficient values, the quality of the exchange (RSCTX) within the Back-Office subgroup is stronger than that of the Front-Office group in terms of influencing extra-role behaviours ($\beta 0.442; t$-value 4.321) and in-role behaviour ($\beta 0.305; t$-value 2.419)

- team member exchange (RSCTX) has a direct and significant effect on the role behaviours in the Front-Office and Back-Office subgroups

- collectively, organisational identification (OID) and team member exchange (RSCTX) account for a higher percentage of the variance in the extra-role behaviours of the Front-Office subgroup than for the Back-Office subgroup and,

- based on the $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ values, in-role behaviour (IRB) driven by the corporate identity cues team member exchange (RSCTX) and consistent image implementation (OVCII), are higher for the Front-Office than the Back-Office subgroup where team member exchange is the only significant driver for the latter.

Analysis of the differences between the subgroup-specific results (i.e., the PLS multigroup analysis: PLS-MGA) show that at the 5% probability error level, the differences between the Front-Office and Back-Office subgroups are not significant however. This is confirmed in the p-values returned as illustrated in table 6.2. Here, none of the path coefficient differences between the Front-Office and Back-Office subgroups returned a p-value of $> 0.95$ or $< 0.05$ that would denote significance.

A detailed comparison of these results is presented in table 6.2.
6.4.4 Pre- and Post-Exposure to Strategic Change Announcement (EXPOSURE)

During the course of data collection, CSC announced unexpectedly a major change in its overall strategic direction that would incorporate restructuring of the organisation including its operations, employee roles and responsibilities, as well as the focus to be adopted in specific parts of the business. This strategic change announcement was communicated in-person via the organisation’s senior managers and through a number of online (live webinars/webcasts) and physical communications materials – i.e., corporate identity cues – and channels such as the company intranet.

The subgroups were defined according to survey completion date and time stamp. Surveys completed prior to 21:20 CET on 5 October (n=385) were categorised as Pre-Strategic Change Announcement Exposure. This sample is referred to in this section as Pre-Exposure for short and contains all employees who responded to the survey before the company’s strategic change announcements were released and publicised within the organisation. Surveys completed after 21:20 CET on 5 October 2015 were categorised as Post-Strategic Change Announcement Exposure. This timing was determined in order to capture responses from respondents located in time zones spanning CSC’s Asian and Australasian locations where the announcement would first have been received. This sample is referred to in this section as Post-Exposure for short. The path coefficients and significance results, $R^2$ and $R^2_{adj}$ figures, and PLS-MGA values related to this analysis are presented in table 6.3. Construct reliability, validity and discriminant validity at or above the accepted thresholds was achieved for the model, details of which are presented in Appendix 8.

As with the PLS-MGA for the FOBO subgroup, the analysis is presented in three steps; firstly for the Pre-Exposure data and then for the Post-Exposure Data. In step one, the direct influence of the corporate identity cues on organisational identification (OID) is described. This is followed in step two by detailing of the direct effect of the corporate identity cues consistent image implementation (OVCII) and team member exchange (RSCTX) on employees’ extra-role (ERB) and in-role behaviours (IRB). In the third and final step, the direct effects of OID on ERB and IRB are presented. The path coefficients and t-values for significant path relationships are discussed throughout along with the associated $R^2$ values.

The Pre-Exposure sample (figure 6.3, table 6.3) indicated that a combination of three cues – consistent image implementation (shared vision (SCCSV $\beta$ 0.185; t-value 2.561), OVCII $\beta$ 0.253; t-value 3.870) and reciprocity (RSCR $\beta$ 0.145; t-value 2.119) explain approximately 23% of the variance in OID ($R^2$ 0.241, $R^2_{adj}$ 0.231). However, the results for SCCSV are not conducive to further comparison given that invariance could not be established for this construct.
The direct effect of the corporate identity cue, team member exchange (RSCTX) is significant for both role behaviours – ERB (β 0.393; t-value 7.512) and IRB (β 0.196; t-value 3.092). The direct effect of OVCII on IRB was also found to be significant (β 0.217; t-value 4.000). Together with the significant direct effect of OID on ERB (β 0.245; t-value 4.829), these cues contribute to explaining approximately 29% of the variance (R² 0.299; R²adj 0.290) in ERB. OID had no discernible effect on IRB, however the direct effects of OVCII and RSCTX combined contributed to explaining 11% (R² 0.130; R²adj 0.116) of the variance in IRB.

For the Post-Exposure sample (figure 6.4), only two corporate identity cues, OVCII (β 0.267; t-value 2.895) and RSCR (β 0.239; t-value 2.101) contribute to OID. These cues account for approximately 29% of the variance in OID (R² 0.288; R²adj 0.263) resulting in R²adj values notably higher than those of the Pre-Exposure group, the Front-Office sample of the FOBO subgroup and indeed the aggregate group. The path relationships between OID and ERB (β 0.333; t-value 3.949), and between OID and IRB were both significant (β 0.208; t-value 2.228).

Although the direct relationship between OVCII and IRB becomes non-significant post exposure (β 0.050; t-value 0.588), the direct relationship between RSCTX and ERB (0.299; t-value 3.403), and RSCTX and IRB (0.446; t-value 5.632) returns R² values higher than those reported for the Pre-Exposure sample at R² 0.318; R²adj 0.294 for ERB, and at R² 0.323; R²adj 0.295 for IRB.

The PLS-MGA results (table 6.3), show that the difference in the OID to IRB path relationship coefficients for the EXPOSURE subgroup (β 0.195) is significant as reflected in the p-Value of 0.960. The results further indicate that the difference in the OVCII to IRB path coefficient (β 0.167; p-value 0.047), and the RSCTX to IRB path coefficients are also significant (β 0.250; p-value 0.992). While RSCTX positively contributed to the in-role behaviour of both samples, the contribution is higher for the Post-Exposure sample as reflected in the path coefficient and t-values (β 0.446; t-value 5.632) for this group (see table 6.3).
Figure 6.3  PLS-MGA estimation of Pre-Exposure subgroup (n = 355)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC1</td>
<td>RSCTR1</td>
<td>RSCRT1</td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.4  PLS-MGA estimation of Post-Exposure subgroup (n = 151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSC = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Path Coefficients (β)</td>
<td>t-values</td>
<td>Path Coefficients (β)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>4.829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCCTX -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>7.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCCTX -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>3.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² (Pre-Exposure)</td>
<td>R² adj (Pre-Exposure)</td>
<td>R² (Post-Exposure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 Overview of path coefficients, significant path values, PLS-MGA, R² and R² adj results for the Pre-Exposure and Post-Exposure (EXPOSURE) subgroup

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
SCCSV = Shared Vision
Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
OVCC = Corporate Communications
OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation
Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
RSCCTX = Team Member Exchange
RSCR = Reciprocity
Additional Constructs
OID = Organisational Identification
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
IRB = In-Role Behaviour
Summary

Overall, the results of the EXPOSURE subgroup analysis show that:

- the organisational identification of the Pre-Exposure subgroup is driven by three corporate identity cues, while the Post-Exposure subgroup’s identification is driven by two cues
  - organisational identification (OID) is higher (and indeed at its highest level overall in the study) amongst the Post-Exposure subgroup

- based on the $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ values returned:
  - in-role behaviour (IRB) levels exceed those for extra-role behaviour (ERB) amongst the Post-Exposure subgroup; indeed this is the only condition in which this occurs in the entire study
  - extra-role behaviour driven by organisational identification and team member exchange (RSCTX) is also higher for the Post-Exposure subgroup than for the Pre-Exposure subgroup

- while organisational identification only influences the extra-role behaviours of the Pre-Exposure subgroup, it has a direct and significant effect on the in-role and extra-role behaviours of the Post Exposure subgroup; this is the only condition under which this occurs in the entire study

- based on the path coefficients returned, team member exchange (RSCTX) has a stronger effect on the extra-role than the in-role behaviours of the Pre-Exposure subgroup; however the opposite holds true for the Post-Exposure subgroup

- team member exchange (RSCTX) has a direct and significant effect on the in-role (IRB) and extra-role behaviours (ERB) of the Pre-Exposure as well as the Post-Exposure subgroups and,

- the path coefficient differences in the relationships between organisational identification (p-value 0.960), team member exchange (RSCTX) (p-value 0.992) and consistent image implementation (OVCII) and in-role behaviour (IRB) (p-value 0.047) are significant at the 5% probability of error level for the EXPOSURE subgroup.

A detailed comparison of these results is presented in table 6.3.
6.5 Hypotheses testing

As part of the overall study, the following six hypotheses tested at the aggregate level were also tested at the subgroup level:

\[ H_1 \] Corporate identity cues that point to the mission, vision and values of the organisation (i.e., its philosophy) will positively influence employees' identification with the organisation (OID)

\[ H_2 \] The higher the organisational identification (OID) the higher the extra-role behaviour (ERB)

\[ H_3 \] Organisational identification (OID) will have a significant positive effect on in-role behaviour (IRB)

\[ H_4 \] Corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice will contribute positively to organisational identification

\[ H_5 \] Corporate identity cues of reciprocity and exchange will exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (OID)

\[ H_6 \] Corporate identity cues related to team member exchange will have a significant positive effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB)

An overview of the result from the hypotheses testing is presented in table 6.4 (FOBO) and 6.5 (EXPOSURE). The results are briefly discussed in the paragraphs that follow. As with the previous chapter, the results of the direct effect hypotheses are reported first.

**Direct Effects – FOBO (Front-Office)**

For the Front-Office sample, only partial support could be found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues pointing to the mission, vision and values of the organisation positively influence employees’ identification with the organisation (H1) for the Front-Office sample as only shared vision (SCCSV) significantly affected organisational identification (β 0.169; t-value 2.510). The influence of mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) on organisational identification (OID) was not significant (β -0.018; t-value 0.315).
The data showed that at aggregate level, organisational identification (OID) exhibited an $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ level of 0.239. A significant path coefficient of $\beta$ 0.259 (t-value 5.926) was returned for the relationship between OID and extra-role behaviour (ERB). For the Front-Office subgroup, an $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ value of 0.234 was recorded for OID, and a path coefficient of $\beta$ 0.293 (t-value 5.915) returned for the relationship between OID and ERB. On this basis, H2 is rejected for the Front-Office group since this group had a comparatively lower $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ figure for OID but returned higher beta coefficient values for the path between OID and ERB.

While a significant path relationship was identified between OID and ERB as described previously, the relationship between OID and in-role behaviour (IRB) was not significant ($\beta$ 0.082; t-value 1.572). H3 which stated that OID would have a significant positive effect on IRB was therefore rejected.

The analysis further showed that the consistency with which the organisation’s image is implemented (OVCI) contributed positively to OID for this subgroup ($\beta$ 0.237; t-value 3.802). The path relationship between corporate communications (OVCC) and OID was not significant however ($\beta$ 0.085; t-value 1.290). Thus only partial support was found for the hypothesis, H4, that corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice would contribute positively to organisational identification.

Partial support was found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues of reciprocity and exchange exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (H5) as only reciprocity was directly and significantly linked ($\beta$ 0.137; t-value 2.213) to organisational identification for the Front-Office group.

Since the model showed a significant and direct path relationship between team member exchange (RSCTX) and both role behaviours, the hypothesis (H6) that RSCTX would have a significant effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB) ($\beta$ 0.341; t-value 6.420) was supported.

**Direct Effects – FOBO (Back-Office)**

Turning to the Back-Office sample, no support was found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues pointing to the mission, vision and values of the organisation positively influence employees’ identification with the organisation (H1) as the paths from shared vision (SCCSV) and organisational identification (OID) (β 0.064; t-value 0.448), and mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) and OID (β -0.019; t-value 0.157) were not significant.

As reported earlier, the data showed that at aggregate level, OID exhibited an $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ level of 0.239 and a significant path coefficient value of $\beta$ 0.259 (t-value 5.926) was also returned for the relationship between OID and extra-role behaviour (ERB).
For the Back-Office subgroup, an $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ value of 0.257 was recorded for OID, and a path coefficient of $\beta 0.188$ (t-value 1.919) returned for the relationship between OID and ERB. On this basis, H₂ is rejected for the Back-Office group since this group had a lower $R^2_{\text{adj}}$ figure for OID and the path between OID and ERB was not significant.

H₃ was also rejected for the Back-Office sample since the relationships between OID and in-role behaviour (IRB) was not significant.

The analysis also showed that the consistency with which the organisation’s image is implemented (OVCII) contributed positively to organisational identification for this subgroup ($\beta 0.318$; t-value 2.619). The path relationship between corporate communications (OVCC) and organisational identification was not significant however ($\beta -0.028$; t-value 0.221). Thus only partial support was found for the hypothesis, H₄, that corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice would contribute positively to organisational identification.

Partial support was found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues of reciprocity and exchange exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (H₅) as only reciprocity (RSCR) was directly and significantly related ($\beta 0.293$; t-value 2.099) to organisational identification of the Front-Office group.

Since the model showed a significant and direct path relationship between team member exchange (RSCTX) and both role behaviours, the hypothesis (H₆) that RSCTX would have a significant effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB) ($\beta 0.442$; t-value 4.321) was supported.

**Indirect Effects – FOBO**

As illustrated in Appendix 7, the relationship between shared vision (SCCSV) and extra-role behaviour (ERB) ($\beta 0.050$; t-value 2.347), and separately between consistent image implementation (OVCII) and ERB ($\beta 0.070$; t-value 3.228) were significant for the Front-Office sample. All other relationships between corporate identity cues and extra-role behaviour for the FOBO subgroup were non-significant.
### Table 6.4 Overview of direct effects and hypotheses tested for the FOBO (Front-Office/Back-Office) subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Relationships</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₁</strong> (partially supported for Front-Office, rejected for Back-Office)</td>
<td>SCCMV → OID (Front-Office) Mission and Values Dissemination → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCMV → OID (Back-Office) Mission and Values Dissemination → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCSV → OID (Front-Office) Shared Vision → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCSV → OID (Back-Office) Shared Vision → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₂</strong> (rejected*)</td>
<td>OID → ERB (Front-Office) Organisational Identification → Extra-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>5.915</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OID → ERB (Back-Office) Organisational Identification → Extra-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₃</strong> (rejected)</td>
<td>OID → IRB (Front-Office) Organisational Identification → In-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OID → IRB (Back-Office) Organisational Identification → In-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant path coefficients appear in bold type  
*H₂ was rejected for the Front-Office groups given the results were lower than those at aggregate level*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Relationships</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₄ (partially supported)</td>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID (Front-Office) Corporate Communications → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID (Back-Office) Corporate Communications → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OVCII -&gt; OID (Front-Office) Consistent Image Implementation → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>3.802</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OVCII -&gt; OID (Back-Office) Consistent Image Implementation → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>2.619</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅ (Partially Supported)</td>
<td>RSCR -&gt; OID (Front-Office) Reciprocity → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>2.213</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSCR -&gt; OID (Back-Office) Reciprocity → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₆ (supported)</td>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; ERB (Front-Office) Team Member Exchange → Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; ERB (Back-Office) Team Member Exchange → Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant path coefficients appear in bold type

Table 6.4 cont., Overview of direct effects and hypotheses tested for the FOBO (Front-Office/Back-Office) subgroup
Direct Effects – EXPOSURE (Pre-Exposure)

The results of the hypothesis tests conducted for the EXPOSURE subgroup are shown in table 6.5. Amongst the Pre-Exposure sample, partial support was found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues pointing to the mission, vision and values of the organisation positively influence employees’ identification with the organisation (H1) since a positive influence was found between shared vision (SCCSV) and organisational identification (OID) ($\beta = 0.185; t$-value 2.561). The corporate identity mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) had no significant effect OID ($-0.044; t$-value 0.738).

Once again, as reported previously, the data showed that at aggregate level, organisational identification (OID) exhibited an $R^2_{adj}$ level of 0.239 and returned a significant path coefficient value of $\beta = 0.259$ ($t$-value 5.926) for the relationship between OID and extra-role behaviour (ERB). For the Pre-Exposure subgroup, an $R^2_{adj}$ value of 0.231 was recorded for OID, and a path coefficient of $\beta = 0.245$ ($t$-value 4.829) returned for the relationship between OID and ERB. Compared with the aggregate level data, H2 is supported for the Pre-Exposure group since a lower $R^2_{adj}$ value for OID was returned and a correspondingly lower path coefficient between OID and ERB recorded.

As the path relationship between OID and in-role behaviour (IRB) was not significant ($\beta = 0.013; t$-value 0.234), H3 was rejected.

The results also showed that the consistency with which the organisation’s image is implemented (OVCII) contributed positively to organisational identification for this subgroup ($\beta = 0.253; t$-value 3.870). The path relationship between corporate communications (OVCC) and organisational identification was not significant however ($\beta = 0.074; t$-value 1.145). Thus only partial support was found for the hypothesis, H4, that corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice would contribute positively to organisational identification.

Partial support was also found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues of reciprocity and exchange exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (H5) as only reciprocity was directly and significantly linked ($\beta = 0.145; t$-value 2.119) to organisational identification for the Front-Office group.

As the model showed a significant and direct path relationship between team member exchange (RSCTX) and both role behaviours, the hypothesis (H6) that RSCTX would have a significant effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB) ($\beta = 0.393; t$-value 7.512) was supported.
Direct Effects – EXPOSURE (Post-Exposure)

Amongst the Post-Exposure sample, the hypothesis that corporate identity cues pointing to the mission, vision and values of the organisation positively influence employees’ identification with the organisation (H₃) was rejected. Neither the path between shared vision (SCCSV) and organisational identification (OID) (β 0.094; t-value 0.776) nor between mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) and organisational identification were significant (0.021; t-value 0.217).

In the Pre-Exposure subgroup, it was noted that an R²_adj value of 0.231 was recorded for OID, and a path coefficient of β 0.245 (t-value 4.829) returned for the relationship between OID and extra-role behaviour (ERB). By comparison, the Post-Exposure sample returned a higher R²_adj value of 0.263, and an increased path coefficient of β 0.333 (t-value 3.949). Thus the hypothesis that higher levels of organisational identification lead to higher levels of extra-role behaviour (H₂) is supported by the Post-Exposure subgroup sample.

Support was similarly found for the hypothesis that OID would have a positive effect on in-role behaviour (IRB) (H₃) since the path relationship between OID and in-role behaviour (β 0.208; t-value 2.228) was significant.

The results also showed that the consistency with which the organisation’s image is implemented (OVCII) contributed positively to organisational identification for this subgroup (β 0.267; t-value 2.895). The path relationship between corporate communications (OVCC) and OID was not significant however (β 0.019; t-value 0.159). Thus only partial support was found for the hypothesis, H₄, that corporate identity cues related to the organisational voice would contribute positively to organisational identification.

Partial support was also found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues of reciprocity (RSCR) and exchange (RSCTX) exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (H₅) as only reciprocity was directly and significantly linked (β 0.239; t-value 2.101) to organisational identification for the Front-Office group.

As the model showed a significant and direct path relationship between team member exchange (RSCTX) and both role behaviours, the hypothesis (H₆) that RSCTX would have a significant effect on extra-role behaviour (ERB) (β 0.299; t-value 3.403) was supported.

Indirect Effects

As illustrated in Appendix 8, the path relationship between shared vision (SCCSV) and extra-role behaviour (ERB) (β 0.045; t-value 2.262) and between OVCII and ERB (β 0.062; t-value 3.024) were
significant for the Pre-Exposure sample. Only the path relationship between OVCII and ERB (β 0.089; t-value 2.344) was significant for the Post-Exposure sample. All other relationships were found to be non-significant.
### Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Relationships</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong> (Pre-Exposure partially supported)</td>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID (Pre-Exposure) Mission and Values Dissemination → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID (Post-Exposure) Mission and Values Dissemination → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID (Pre-Exposure) Shared Vision → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID (Post-Exposure) Shared Vision → Organisational Identification</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong> (supported)</td>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB (Pre-Exposure) Organisational Identification → Extra-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>4.829</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB (Post-Exposure) Organisational Identification → Extra-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>3.949</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong> (Pre-Exposure rejected)</td>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB (Pre-Exposure) Organisational Identification → In-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB (Post-Exposure) Organisational Identification → In-role Behaviour</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant path coefficients appear in bold type*

Table 6.5 Overview of direct effects and hypotheses tested for the EXPOSURE (Pre-Exposure/Post-Exposure) subgroup
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Relationships</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H4   (partially supported) | OVCC -> OID (Pre-Exposure)  
Corporate Communications → Organisational Identification | Rejected      | 0.074            | 1.145    | 0.252    |
|                  | OVCC -> OID (Post-Exposure)  
Corporate Communications → Organisational Identification | Rejected      | 0.019            | 0.159    | 0.873    |
|                  | OVCII -> OID (Pre-Exposure)  
Consistent Image Implementation → Organisational Identification | Supported     | 0.253            | 3.870    | 0.000    |
|                  | OVCII -> OID (Post-Exposure)  
Consistent Image Implementation → Organisational Identification | Supported     | 0.267            | 2.895    | 0.004    |
| H5   (partially supported) | RSCR -> OID (Pre-Exposure)  
Reciprocity → Organisational Identification | Supported     | 0.145            | 2.119    | 0.034    |
|                  | RSCR -> OID (Post-Exposure)  
Reciprocity → Organisational Identification | Supported     | 0.239            | 2.101    | 0.036    |
| H6   (supported) | RSCTX -> ERB (Pre-Exposure)  
Team Member Exchange → Extra-Role Behaviour | Supported     | 0.393            | 7.512    | 0.000    |
|                  | RSCTX -> ERB (Post-Exposure)  
Team Member Exchange → Extra-Role Behaviour | Supported     | 0.299            | 3.403    | 0.001    |

*Significant path coefficients appear in bold type*

Table 6.5 cont., Overview of direct effects and hypotheses tested for the EXPOSURE (Pre-Exposure/Post-Exposure) subgroup
6.6 Importance performance map analysis (IPMA)

6.6.1 FOBO subgroup

Amongst the Front-Office subgroup, the results of the importance performance map analysis (IPMA) show more precisely that the corporate identity cue team member exchange (RSCTX) is not only the most important cue for improving the voluntary (ERB) behaviours of employees in returning an importance score of 0.41 but that this corporate identity cues is also the highest performing (74.4) (chart 6.1). This is followed by organisational identification (OID – importance: 0.24; performance: 70.0). The remaining corporate identity cues although high in performance, yield relatively low impact in terms of their relevance to increasing voluntary behaviour amongst employees. However, a one-point increase in team member exchange would increase employees’ extra-role behaviours by 74.4 points, and a one-point increase in organisational identification would lift the same behaviours by 70.0.

Amongst the Back-Office subgroup (Chart 6.1), by focusing attention on promoting team member exchange (RSCTX) (importance: 0.58; performance: 72.8), the IPMA suggests that employees discretionary behaviours (i.e., ERB) could be improved by 73 points (chart 6.1). This compares slightly more favourably than driving up organisational identification (importance: 0.17; performance: 71.3) which would lead to a 71-point improvement in the same behaviours. Although team member exchange (importance: 0.29; performance: 72.9) is of critical importance to increasing in-role behaviours, consistent image implementation (OVCII) is of considerably lower importance (0.062) and performance (65.3) but nevertheless a close priority for improving these behaviours (chart 6.2).
Chart 6.1 Importance-performance map analysis (IPMA) for the target construct Extra-Role Behaviour (ERB) for the FOBO subgroup

Chart 6.2 Importance-performance map analysis (IPMA) for the target construct In-Role Behaviour (IRB) for the FOBO subgroup
6.6.2 EXPOSURE subgroup

The IPMA shows that prior to strategic change, the combination of team member exchange (RSCTX) (importance: 0.47; performance: 74.0) and organisational identification (OID) (importance: 0.21; performance: 69.8) is critical to promoting extra-role behaviours (ERB) (chart 6.3). A similar degree of attention invested in organisational identification-promoting activity would improve the same behaviours by almost 0.70 points. The combination of OID and consistent image implementation (OVCII) appears to be marginal though beneficial to improving in-role behaviour (IRB) (chart 6.4). RSCTX (importance: 0.18; performance: 74.0). Consistent image implementation itself (importance: 0.13; performance: 60.0) could increase these behaviours potentially by 74 and 60 points respectively.

The IPMA suggests that team member exchange (importance: 0.39; performance: 74.2) is critical in building extra-role behaviour amongst the Post-Exposure subgroup as is maintaining the subgroup’s levels of identification with the organisation (importance: 0.30; performance: 72.0) (Chart 6.4). Given the high levels of organisational identification noted previously in section 6.4.4, the IPMA indicates that a one point increase in team member exchange or organisational identification would raise extra-role behaviour performance by 0.74 and 0.72 points respectively. Team member exchange (importance: 0.49; performance: 74.2) (chart 7.4) also appears to be of more importance to increasing in-role behaviour such that a one-point improvement in this corporate identity cue would increase these behaviours by 74.2 points. A one point increase in organisational identification (importance: 0.16; performance: 72.0) by comparison would increase in-role behaviour by a similar degree.
### Chart 6.3
Importance-performance map analysis (IPMA) for the target construct Extra-Role Behaviour (ERB) for the EXPOSURE subgroup

### Chart 6.4
Importance-performance map analysis (IPMA) for the target construct In-Role Behaviour (IRB) for the EXPOSURE subgroup

**Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)**
- SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
- SCCSV = Shared Vision

**Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)**
- OVCC = Corporate Communications
- OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

**Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)**
- RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
- RSCR = Reciprocity

**Additional Constructs**
- OID = Organisational Identification
- ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
- IRB = In-Role Behaviour
6.7 Conclusion

This chapter sought to address the sixth and final objective of the overall study; namely to test empirically the effects of corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations on organisational identification, and the subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the subgroup level. Given the paucity of research conducted at this level and during strategic change, this study set out to address this shortfall by analysing these corporate identity cues effects across:

- Client-facing and non client-facing – i.e., Front-Office/Back-Office – employees (FOBO subgroup)
- Groups prior to (Pre-Exposure) and following exposure (Post-Exposure) to the case organisation’s announcement of strategic change (EXPOSURE subgroup)

Application of the measurement invariance of composite (MICOM) process showed that both the FOBO and EXPOSURE subgroups exhibited partial invariance thus permitting multigroup analyses (PLS-MGA) to be conducted on each subgroup.

Of the six corporate identity cues examined, only two, consistent image implementation (OVCII) and reciprocity (RSCR), were found to contribute positively, directly and significantly to organisational identification (OID) in each subgroup. The corporate identity cue team member exchange (RSCTX) was also found to have a positive, direct and significant effect on the in-role (IRB) and extra-role behaviours (ERB) of employees across both subgroups. While organisational identification contributed positively to extra-role behaviour in both subgroups, it was only found to influence in-role behaviour in the Post-Exposure sample.

The FOBO subgroup

Amongst the Front-Office sample in the FOBO subgroup, organisational identification was found to be driven by a combination of three corporate identity cues – shared vision (SCCSV), consistent image implementation (OVCII) and reciprocity (RSCR) – with significant path relationships to organisational identification. OVCII was also found to directly influence in-role behaviour. Amongst the Back-Office sample, organisational identification was influenced by only two of these cues – consistent image implementation and reciprocity. Organisational identification had no significant effect on in-role or extra-role behaviour however. By contrast, team member exchange (RSCTX) was found to have a positive and significant influence on the in-role and extra-role behaviours.
Despite relying on only two corporate identity cues, organisational identification and extra-role behaviour were higher for the Back-Office sample than for the Front-Office sample. In-role behaviour was higher for the Back-Office sample however.

While these results are important in understanding the effects of corporate identity cues across the organisation’s subgroups, the PLS-MGA showed that the differences in path coefficients between the two samples were not significant. The importance performance map analysis (IPMA) showed however that team member exchange and organisational identification were of crucial importance and likely to be most impactful in improving both in-role and extra-role behaviour.

**The EXPOSURE subgroup**

Amongst the EXPOSURE subgroup, organisational identification was found to be influenced by a similar combination of corporate identity cues. In the Pre-Exposure sample, the effects of shared vision (SCCSV), consistent image implementation (OVCII) and reciprocity (RSCR) on organisational identification (OID) were significant. Collectively, organisational identification and the corporate identity cue team member exchange (RSCTX) contributed significantly to extra-role behaviour (ERB). In-role behaviour (IRB) was influenced by a combination of team member exchange and consistent image implementation corporate identity cues.

In the Post-Exposure sample, only two corporate identity cues, consistent image implementation (OVCII) and reciprocity (RSCR) were found to affect significantly the organisational identification of this sample. Organisational identification was subsequently found to influence in-role and extra-role behaviour. This is the only case in the entire study in which a significant path relationship was detected between organisational identification and both role behaviours. A positive relationship was also found between team member exchange on both in-role and extra-role behaviour. This sample also returned the highest $R^2_{adj}$ values for in-role behaviour overall.

The results of the PLS-MGA indicated significant differences in three direct relationships: that between organisational identification and in-role behaviour; between consistent image implementation and in-role behaviour; and that between team member exchange and in-role behaviour. The importance performance map analysis (IPMA) additionally revealed that team member exchange and organisational identification are key areas of focus in terms of improving both in-role and extra-role behaviour.
**Hypotheses**

Six hypotheses were tested across both subgroups. Although the combination, strength and effects of corporate identity cues differed across the subgroups, broadly similar patterns of acceptance and rejection amongst some relationships (i.e., the effects of mission and values dissemination, and corporate communications corporate identity cues on organisational identification; the effect of organisational identification on extra-role behaviour) were identified.

**Summary**

The study confirmed that the effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and subsequent role behaviours differ within and between subgroups, and that these differences are related to positioning in the firm (Front-Office/Back-Office) and exposure to strategic change announcements across the firm. This addresses the final objective of the overall study. In so doing, the study has also addressed the fourth and final gap identified in the literature by clarifying the conditions under which the effects of corporate identity cues vary.
Chapter 7  General Discussion

7.1  Introduction

In this final chapter of the thesis, the findings are presented for each of the three empirical studies comprising the overall study. The chapter commences with a recapitulation of the research aim and supporting objectives in section 7.2. The methodological approach applied in the study is then briefly presented and an appraisal of its efficacy in meeting the aim and objectives of the study discussed in section 7.3. This is followed in section 7.4 by a summary of the study’s findings. The study’s contribution to theory and implications for management are then put forward in sections 7.5 and 7.6 respectively. The limitations of the study and directions for future research are then presented in section 7.7 and are followed by concluding remarks in section 7.8.

7.2  Summary of the research aim and objectives

The underlying premise of this thesis is that in order to evaluate sufficiently the effects of corporate identity cues, employees’ member organisational associations must be considered. This is because member organisational associations represent a range of experiences and perceptions that employees hold in memory about their organisations, and furthermore encompass these employees’ understandings of and reactions to the corporate identity (Brown et al., 2006). The main aim of this thesis was to build understanding around the range of corporate identity cues discerned from these member organisational associations and their effects on employees’ organisational identification and its subsequent influence on role behaviours:

- at the aggregate level of the organisation
- at the subgroup level of the organisation amongst client-facing and non-client facing employees and,
- pre and post exposure to strategic change announcement (i.e., the communications distributed throughout an organisation to transmit details of impending changes to its strategic direction).
In order to achieve this aim, six supporting objectives were defined with a focus on:

1. eliciting member organisational associations from a cross-section of company employees
2. identifying the member organisational associations that reflect the central, enduring and distinctive (i.e., \textit{CED} member organisational associations) attributes of the firm and comprise its corporate identity
3. establishing whether additional \textit{patterns} beyond those that are CED are present in the elicited member organisational associations that reflect how they may be perceived in the working environment context
4. determining the CED member organisational associations, along with their corresponding patterns, that are linked to the present environment; trigger sensemaking; and influence future action and attention. In short, the identification of those associations that also act as cues to the corporate identity
5. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the aggregate level of the firm and,
6. examining empirically the effects of the emergent corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours at the subgroup level of the firm across:
   a. Client-facing (Front-Office) and non client-facing (Back-Office) employees
   b. Employees prior to and post exposure to strategic change announcements.

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this is the only study of its kind to derive corporate identity cues from member organisational associations and to examine their subsequent effects in the manner described.

7.3 Methodological approach – achieving the objectives

In order to achieve the aim and objectives described, a mixed methods research approach was adopted for the study. Specifically, an exploratory sequential process was followed in which data was collected over two phases. A number of member organisational associations were elicited during the first phase from which the corporate identity, corporate identity cues and corporate identity cue types of the case organisation were derived (Phase I, objectives 1-4).
Research from the marketing, corporate identity and organisational behaviour domains was subsequently examined to identify constructs (i.e., scales) most representative of the case organisation’s emergent corporate identity cues, and to anchor them in the respective domains. The findings were used to guide selection of the six representative constructs. These constructs were subsequently incorporated in the eventual conceptual model to allow for the empirical examination of their effects on organisational identification, and its influence on role behaviours (Phase II, objectives 5 and 6).

**Phase I qualitative study – objectives 1 to 4**

To address the first four objectives comprising Phase I of the study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 30 employees of the case organisation. The output from the interviews was audio recorded, transcribed and a generic qualitative analysis approach applied as a means to examining qualitatively the member organisational associations elicited. Here, a priori theory was integrated to discern then categorise the member organisational associations perceived to represent the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of the firm and thus its corporate identity. From this, the corporate identity and a number of CED member organisational associations were identified. These member organisational associations were further examined for the presence of any underlying [non-CED] patterns reflective of how they might be perceived in the working environment context. Three patterns were identified. Based on their similarities, these CED member organisational associations were grouped according to the patterns identified, resulting in a reduction in the number of associations. These CED member organisations were further analysed to determine their ability to: trigger sensemaking and influence future action and attention; i.e., to reveal their characteristics and use as sensemaking cues to the corporate identity. A number of these CED member organisational associations were found to exhibit two or more sensemaking cue characteristics and were subsequently cross-checked and validated against the derived corporate identity to confirm them as CSC’s emergent corporate identity cues. The corresponding patterns – strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling – were then confirmed as CSC’s corporate identity cue types. The CSC corporate identity cues and cue types were assessed against two established models of corporate identity that reflect corporate identity cues in order to compare and anchor them in theory. Additional domain-relevant works were also examined to support the emergent corporate identity cues and cue types, and more specifically, to identify the most appropriate constructs (i.e., scales) from extant studies to represent them in the conceptual model examined in Phase II of the study.
The results from this phase of the research indicated that each stage of the analysis was robust. An independent assessment of the data’s trustworthiness and intercoder reliability (conducted by three independent, external coders) further confirmed a reasonable degree of confidence in the analytical process and coding methodology applied in the study. This phase of the research also achieved completely and successfully all four objectives defined by eliciting a number of member organisational associations, from which the case organisations corporate identity, corporate identity cues and cue types were discerned.

**Phase 2 quantitative study – objectives 5 and 6**

Objectives five and six of the research were addressed in Phase II of the study. Based on the corporate identity cues and cue types identified in the Phase I of the study, six constructs (scales) from extant research were selected to represent CSC’s emergent corporate identity cues. Established scales from extant literature were also selected to measure organisational identification, in-role behaviour and extra-role behaviour. Data was collected via online survey from 536 employees of the case organisation. The data was analysed using partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) and analysis conducted at the aggregate level to address objective 5; and at the subgroup level to address objectives 6a and 6b. In the case of the latter, data comprising Front-Office and Back-Office (FOBO) positioned employees, and those employees exposed and not exposed (EXPOSURE) to the case organisation’s strategic change announcement respectively were used in the subgroup analyses.

Based on the results presented in Chapters 5 and 6, the methodology and choice of data analysis (PLS-SEM) proved highly effective in achieving the objectives set out for this phase of the study. Since one of the key strengths of PLS-SEM is its ability to identify drivers of as well as relationships between constructs (Hair et al., 2014), this analysis was invaluable to addressing a substantive part of the aim; i.e., building understanding around the range of corporate identity cues. In addition to highlighting the range of corporate identity cues, the analysis further revealed the effects of various combinations of these corporate identity cues under different organisational and environmental conditions.

From this brief presentation, the mixed methods methodology applied in this study may be considered both effective and successful since the aim and all objectives of the study were fully achieved. It should be noted nevertheless that generalisability on the basis of the study may not be possible given that the research was conducted within a single organisation.
7.4 Summary of findings

The following paragraphs comprising this section outline the key findings of the study.

Deriving corporate identity cues from member organisational associations

As a result of the qualitative study conducted in Phase I, a total of 32 CED member organisational associations were identified. An underlying pattern in the data revealed that 25 of these CED member organisational associations were related either to the strategy components, organisational voice or the relational signalling transmitted by the organisation. This suggests that the central, enduring and distinctive attributes of the organisation (i.e., its corporate identity) take effect in the way the company strategizes, communicates and relates with its members. Twenty-four of these CED member organisational associations were further found to act as cues to the case organisation’s corporate identity (i.e. corporate identity cues) effectively linking their users to the present day but also guiding to varying degrees their sensemaking, attention and future actions. Within the framework of their corresponding patterns (i.e., the three corporate identity cue types), these corporate identity cues furthermore showed reasonable alignment with extant models of corporate identity from Melewar and Jenkins (2002) and Melewar (2003) indicating that they were reasonably well supported by extant theory. In this sense, the corporate identity cues can be said to exhibit both the information-transmitting and information-conveying characteristics described by Marwick and Fill (1997), Abratt (1989) and Fill (2005), as well as the sensemaking effects outlined by Weick (1995) and Weber and Glynn (2006) presented in the Literature Review (Chapter 2). Taking into account: the lack of a clear definition of corporate identity cues as discussed in Chapter 2; the emergent corporate identity cues derived from employees’ member organisational associations; and, the results and findings presented so far, this study proposes the following definition of corporate identity cues derived from CED member organisational associations:

The individual signals and pieces of information that are transmitted by and within organisations, that reflect the organisation’s central, enduring and distinctive attributes; its various representations and meanings as well as its corresponding behaviours, communications and symbols. They are rooted in the associations that employees have with their organisation and additionally act as guides to employee sensemaking and action.

The study further proposes the following definition for the corresponding corporate identity cue types:

The groups of strategic, communicative or relational-specific corporate identity cues that are: transmitted by and within organisations, that are reflected in the corporate identity and rooted in member organisational associations; and which act as guides to employee sensemaking and action.
Aggregate-level effects of corporate identity cues

Based on these findings, the following six constructs were selected to represent the range of corporate identity cues elicited from the member organisational associations for empirical examination in the conceptual model (Phase II):

- *mission and values dissemination* and *shared vision* (strategy component corporate identity cues/cue type)
- *corporate communications* and *consistent image implementation* (organisational voice corporate identity cues/cue type) and,
- *reciprocity* and *team member exchange* (relational signalling corporate identity cues/cue type).

The aggregate level data showed that organisational identification was driven by a combination of three of these corporate identity cues – *shared vision, consistent image implementation* and *reciprocity* – but did not mediate the relationship between corporate identity cues and in-role or extra-role behaviours. While organisational identification in turn only exerted a positive influence on extra-role behaviour, the corporate identity cue consistent image implementation exhibited a significant positive direct effect on in-role behaviour. Team member exchange by contrast was found to have a significant direct effect on in-role and extra-role behaviour.

This indicates that while organisational identification is influenced by a mixture of different corporate identity cues, not all cues in this mix are effective. Indeed, team member exchange was found to bypass organisational identification altogether to directly influence in-role and extra-role behaviours. Consistent image implementation by comparison was found to have an influence on both organisational identification and in-role behaviour.

Subgroup-level effects of corporate identity cues (Front-Office/Back-Office)

At the subgroup level, data was analysed from subsamples representing the firm’s Front-Office and Back-Office employees (FOBO); and separately, representing those pre and post exposure to the case organisation’s strategic change announcements (EXPOSURE).

Amongst the FOBO subgroup, much like the aggregate level group, organisational identification amongst employees with client-facing roles (Front-Office) was influenced by a mixture of three corporate identity cues – *shared vision, consistent image implementation* and *reciprocity*. Organisational identification also only exhibited a significant effect on their extra-role behaviours.
The corporate identity cue team member exchange, was found to have a significant direct effect on in-role and extra-role behaviour.

Employees behind the scenes (Back-Office) relied on comparatively fewer cues, in this case consistent image implementation and reciprocity, to influence their sense of belonging with the firm. Organisational identification however had no significant effect on their role behaviours. Instead the significant levels of extra-role behaviour (the highest recorded in the entire study) and in-role behaviour (lowest recorded in the entire study) were attributed solely to the corporate identity cue team member exchange. Back-Office employees consequently exhibited lower levels of in-role behaviour than their counterparts (graph 7.1). That reciprocity and exchange returned such positive values for the Back-Office subgroup could be illustrative of the nature and requirements of back-office work. Without the responsive exchange of information required for sales-supporting activities for example, it is plausible that the efficacy of Front-Office activity could be compromised.

In short, while Front-Office employees rely on more, and indeed a slightly different combination of cues, than Back-Office employees to drive their sense of belonging with the organisation, Back-Office employees however exhibit higher levels of belonging and voluntary behaviours. Only the quality of exchanges within the team influenced the role behaviours of both groups of employees.

**Subgroup-level effects of corporate identity cues (Pre-Exposure/Post-Exposure)**

Prior to exposure to the strategic change announcements, organisational identification was also found to be driven by a mixture of three cues – shared vision, consistent image implementation and reciprocity. Organisational identification however only had a significant positive effect on the extra-role behaviour of these employees. These results mirror almost exactly those at the aggregate level with in-role and extra-role behaviour additionally being influenced directly by the corporate identity cue team member exchange.

Post-exposure, only two corporate identity cues proved significant in driving organisational identification – consistent image implementation and reciprocity. The corporate identity cue, shared vision however did not contribute to organisational identification. Surprisingly, and unlike the FOBO subgroup and aggregate-level findings, organisational identification was found to have a direct and significant influence on these employees’ in-role and extra-role behaviours. Although this group had the most balanced use of its in-role and extra role behaviours (both of which returned higher $R^2_{adj}$ levels than organisational identification), it also exhibited the highest levels of in-role behaviour in the entire study despite being the only sample in which the effects of consistent image implementation on in-role behaviour were not significant.
This suggests that once exposed to strategic change, the tendency for employees is to focus on working to the exact specifics of their roles and with little focus on the firm’s [potentially shifting] image; this could be reflective of employee’s *shoring up* their individual positions under uncertain circumstances. The voluntary extra-role efforts nevertheless remain almost equally high pointing to increased collaborative efforts which themselves may be interpreted as a *collective* shoring up of the group (i.e. team, department, etc). It is also interesting to note that post strategic announcement, the psychological bond of organisational identification is stronger than that reported elsewhere at the subgroup level or at the aggregate level (see path coefficients illustrated in graph 7.1). That is to say, the significant relationships between corporate identity cues and organisational identification contribute to and explain a greater amount of the variance in organisational identification. The corporate identity cue *team member exchange* was also found to have a significant direct effect on both role behaviours of these employees.

The PLS multigroup analysis (PLS-MGA) further confirmed that the differences in the strengths of the effects recorded between: organisational identification and in-role behaviour; team member exchange and in-role behaviour; and consistent image implementation and in-role behaviour for this subgroup were all significant.

![Path Coefficient Values](image)

*Significant path coefficient values (β) appear in bold type*

**Graph 7.1** Comparison of organisational identification (OID), in-role behaviour (IRB) and extra-role behaviour (ERB) $R_{adj}^2$ values and path coefficients at aggregate and subgroup level
Hypotheses

The six hypotheses tested at the aggregate and subgroup level showed that even when organisational identification is driven by markedly different corporate identity cues that directly and indirectly lead to equally diverse behaviours, some cue effects (and non-effects) remain constant. For example, while corporate identity cues reflecting the dissemination of the organisation’s mission and values had no significant influence on employees’ identification with the firm, shared vision only had an influence at the aggregate level and amongst the Front-Office and Pre-Exposure samples (H1). Hypothesis H2 is discussed in the context of key conclusions presented later in this section. The study showed that with exception to the Back-Office subgroup sample, organisational identification had a direct and significant effect on extra-role behaviour at aggregate and subgroup level. More specifically, once exposed to strategic change, organisational identification was further found to influence in-role behaviour (H3).

Consistent image implementation was found to contribute significantly to organisational identification at both the aggregate and subgroup levels while corporate communications had no significant effect (H4).

The data indicated that only partial support could be found for the hypothesis that corporate identity cues of reciprocity and exchange (i.e., the relational signalling cue type) would exert a positive and significant influence on organisational identification (H5). This is because although reciprocity was positively and significantly related to organisational identification at the aggregate and subgroup level, team member exchange only exerted direct effects on in-role and extra-role behaviours.

As the findings have illustrated so far, team member exchange was the only corporate identity cue that positively and significantly influenced extra-role behaviour at all levels of the organisation (H6).
**Key conclusions**

From this summary of the study’s findings, six key conclusions may be drawn. Collectively, these conclusions also confirm that the relationship hypothesised to exist between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours is in fact significant. These key conclusions are outlined in the following paragraphs.

1. **Member organisational associations are strategically valuable components**

The first conclusion to be made is that corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations clearly play a valuable role in organisational life. This is not just in terms of understanding how employees view and respond to the corporate identity, but especially in terms of influencing the psychological bond that employees have with their firms and the effects this subsequently has on the behaviours they exhibit within and towards the firm.

2. **The combination of corporate identity cues is as important as the effects of individual cues**

The long-term aspirations of the company (shared vision) for example appear to be of little influence in maintaining the psychological bond with the firm *behind the scenes*, or during change where employees’ focus of attention is likely to be on getting the job done and surviving any potential disruption. The corporate identity cue, team member exchange, also bypasses the psychological bond with the organisation entirely to affect role behaviours directly. Consistent image implementation by contrast contributes to organisational identification while in parallel promoting in-role behaviour, suggesting that this corporate identity cue may have a reinforcing effect on employees performing in their roles as reflected in the consistent image being implemented. Others cues such as corporate communications and mission and values dissemination deliver no significant effect at all.

3. **Corporate identity cues and cue types vary in influence and dependability**

The results also indicated that within the case organisation, these corporate identity cues are classified into three corporate identity cue types: strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling. Here, the prominence of the relational signalling corporate identity cue type with its attendant corporate identity cues (i.e., reciprocity on organisational identification, and team member exchange on in-role and extra-role behaviours) is characterised in the stable nature of its effects organisation wide, group-wide and during change. This makes it the most effective of all the corporate identity cue types defined.

In contrast, the strategy component corporate identity cue type appears to be the least effective since only one of its cues is significant and only then at aggregate level, amongst Front-Office employees and prior to strategic change. The limited influence of this corporate identity cue type
in triggering psychological or behavioural response make it the least effective of the three corporate identity cues types. Between these two extremes, the organisational voice corporate identity cue type is unique in that it simultaneously serves psychological and behavioural outcomes at both levels of analysis. Moreover, this is achieved on the strength of one cue as described in the previous point.

While the corporate identity cues of reciprocity and consistent image implementation – as elements of the relational signalling and organisational voice corporate identity cue types respectively – exhibit a constant and significant effect on organisational identification, the effects of the corporate identity cue team member exchange on in-role and extra-role behaviours showed a similar effect. Thus, irrespective of the context, these corporate identity cues may be considered the most reliable in terms of maintaining the psychological bond between employee and employer, as well as the behavioural outputs between team member and team. This is also confirmed in the partial support for the hypothesis that consistent image implementation would contribute significantly to organisational identification at both the aggregate and subgroup levels (H4). Full support was also found for the hypothesis that team member exchange would positively and significantly contribute to extra-role behaviour at the aggregate and subgroup level (H5).

These findings with regard to the effects of the team member exchange corporate identity cue are consistent with the assertions of Van Dick et al., (2008) that individuals have a natural tendency for affiliation with smaller units than large scale operations. These authors posit that in line with the theory of optimal distinctiveness (Brewer, 1991) such members will seek an ideal equilibrium between being appreciated as individuals (for example, within the immediate workgroup) and acknowledged as part of a greater whole. Thus, it is plausible that the effects of the relational signalling cues represent this drive for employees to simultaneously ‘fit in and stand out at the same time’ (Van Dick et al., 2008, p.389) as manifested in their stability.

From this, it may be summised that the quality of exchange within teams can have a greater effect on role behaviour than organisational identification alone. It also underlines the centrality of the team to its members; a fact that brings to the forefront the importance of team managers in maintaining, motivating and engaging the role behaviours of staff.

4. Context affects the influence of corporate identity cues

The results further show that the combination of corporate identity cues and their influence on organisational identification are reasonably sensitive to operational shifts. Specifically, proximity to the client (Back-Office) and exposure (Post-Exposure) to strategic change announcements determine when the shared vision corporate identity cue becomes [in]effective. Whereas the loss
of this corporate identity cue results in the highest and second highest levels of organisational identification for these samples respectively, this has no significant effect on Back-Office employees’ in-role and extra-role behaviours, suggesting it may even inhibit strengthening of the psychological bond when external influences (i.e. clients) and organisational stresses (i.e., strategic change) are present. It does however contribute to strengthening Post-Exposure in-role behaviour. These results also illustrate that corporate identity cue effects differ within as well as between subgroups. Thus it may be concluded that corporate identity cues are generally prone to alter in strength and relevance across the firm, and as the firm negotiates strategic change.

5. Corporate philosophy does not always influence action

It has been posited that it is the ‘system of beliefs, values and norms...anchored in the organizational mission that informs sense-making and action’ (Ashforth and Mael, 1996, p.24). Yet a recurrent and somewhat paradoxical theme throughout the qualitative interviews conducted was the company’s ability to maintain its operations in the apparent absence of such beliefs or values; in short, without philosophy and strategy. It was suggested that organisational direction was received by employees through a range of networks and the informal impulses transmitted between colleagues and within the firm.

The quantitative analyses confirmed the ineffectual nature of the firms disseminated mission and values on its employees. More importantly however, they illustrated that this range of networks and impulses was not without substance. Rather, what the results show is that in the apparent absence of strategy and philosophy, the corporate identity cue reciprocity contributed directly to employees’ psychological bond with the organisation despite its unclear philosophy, while the corporate identity cue team member exchange influenced directly their actions and eventual role behaviours.

6. High organisational identification does not always lead to higher levels of extra-role behaviour

As the results of the hypothesis testing (H2) revealed, a positive link between higher levels of organisational identification and increased levels of extra-role behaviour could only be found within the EXPOSURE subgroup (graph 7.1) based on a comparison of the PLS-SEM results using the $R^2_{adj}$ values. Comparing these results with those from the aggregate level data would seem to suggest that this trend holds true at these two different levels (i.e., subgroup and aggregate). This is consistent with the findings in studies from Van Knippenberg (2000); Riketta (2005); and Kane, Magnusen and Perrewé (2012) that similarly identified a correlation between organisational identification and extra-role behaviour as outlined in the Literature Review (Chapter 2). However, the results of the study identify one within-group condition under which this this is not the case.
While the client-facing (Front-Office) members of the FOBO subgroup revealed a significant path relationship between organisational identification and extra-role behaviour, the effect of organisational identification for the non-client facing (Back-Office) counterpart was not significant. Thus, the correlation between increased organisational identification and extra-role behaviours does not hold true within this particular subgroup.

On the basis of this summary of the study’s overall findings and the six key conclusions outlined here, the study has also addressed all the research gaps outlined in Chapter 1 and 2 of this thesis. Taken together, these findings highlight a number of contributions that this work makes to theory, each of which is outlined in section 7.5.
7.5 Implications for theory

This study makes a number of contributions to theory, the primary and most substantive of which have been made within the domains of corporate identity and corporate associations. This has been achieved by extending understanding around the range and effects of corporate identity cues on organisational identification and its subsequent influence on in-role and extra-role behaviours. In so doing, the study has also identified a significant relationship between corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations, organisational identification and role behaviours. It has furthermore identified two conditions under which corporate identity cues vary and affect this relationship. The study consequently makes additional knowledge contributions to the domains of organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours. The implications for theory as they relate to these four core areas (i.e., corporate identity and corporate associations; organisational identification; in-role and extra-role [prosocial service] behaviours; and, the relationship between corporate identity cues, organisational identification and role behaviours) are outlined in this section.

1. Corporate identity and corporate associations

This study makes four important contributions to the corporate identity and corporate associations literatures.

Member organisational associations and the operationalisation of corporate identity cues

One of the major calls in studies of corporate identity centres on the desire for better operationalisation of the identity construct (Corley Harquail., et al, 2008) such that it may be subjected to empirical testing (Melewar and Jenkins, 2002; Elstak, 2008) and ultimately help answer two questions; the first around what groups and individuals comprehend and trust with regard to their organisations, and the second around how they react as a result (Bartel, 2001; Brown et al., 2006). Amongst the attempts that have been made so far, focus has been directed almost exclusively on revealing the corporate identity either via qualitative, or via quantitative methods such as: Balmer’s Affinity Audit (1996) and the Rotterdam Organizational Identification Test devised by Van Riel, Smidts and Pruyn (1994 cited in Van Riel and Balmer, 1997) for example. While the call has obviously not gone unnoticed, these efforts have not always been fully cognisant of the perceptions (i.e., the member organisational associations) that are triggered amongst employees as a result. The primary contribution that this study makes therefore is in its focus on member organisational associations as a source of corporate identity cues and the manner in which they are operationalised. In the following paragraphs, two further supporting contributions are outlined.
In their seminal paper on corporate associations, Brown et al. (2006) observed that of the numerous member organisational associations held, only a limited few would be central, enduring and distinctive (CED); and that their connection to corporate identity might not be clear. The findings of the present study certainly concur with the former observation. However through a rigorous process of qualitative analysis, this study has been able to identify a series of CED member organisational associations from a wider collection of member organisational associations which furthermore act as cues to the corporate identity. This not only relates the member organisational associations to the corporate identity, but in so doing indicates that in this study, corporate identity comprises individually held but commonly shared perceptions of the organisation. This latter point in particular complements the work of Dutton and Dukerich (1991) which has suggested that individuals’ collective perceptions of the firm, and in particular its corporate identity are pivotal to the actions of employees in addressing portrayals of the firm’s image. This marks the first of the supporting contributions made.

A further essential component of the primary contribution, is the manner in which the emergent corporate identity cues were operationalised. Careful assessment of the emergent CED member organisational associations led to the identification and definition of three new groups (or types) of corporate identity cues – strategy component, organisational voice and relational signalling – reflective of the case organisation’s working environment. These corporate identity cue types have enabled closer detailing of the composition of central-specific, endurance-specific and distinctive-specific corporate identity cues from a perspective that is complimentary to the traditional, communications, behaviour and symbolism conceptualisations delineated by Birkigt and Stadler (1986), Fill (2005), and reflected in the corporate identity frameworks of Melewar and Jenkins (2002), Melewar (2003) and others. It is as a result of this detailing that the constructs from extant research were selected to represent the corporate identity cues that were elicited and examined empirically. This represents the second supporting contribution made.

To the best of this researcher’s knowledge, no studies in the fields of corporate associations or corporate identity have drawn explicitly on member organisational associations as a means to define, derive or empirically test the effects of corporate identity cues. The study thus represents a unique response to the calls for research to focus on the operationalisation of the corporate identity construct and, as Elstak (2008) argues, to incorporate the use of quantitative methods in doing so.
Identifying the influential corporate identity cues

The second major contribution this study makes to the domains of corporate identity, corporate associations and member organisational associations is in identifying those corporate identity cues most commonly drawn on or most influential to the sense of oneness that employees experience with their organisations. This in turn has brought additional clarity of understanding around the link between corporate identity and organisational identification.

By identifying the combinations of corporate identity cues that represent this link as described in the Summary of findings (section 7.5), the study has provided insight into the cues and cue types most (or least) consistent and effective within the case organisation. The study shows specifically that the corporate identity cue team member exchange may also act as a useful predictor of in-role and extra-role behaviours rather than an influencer of organisational identification. This is interesting because despite the case organisation actively encouraging an organisation-wide, one team culture, these results suggest that it is the group in closest proximity to the employee and the quality of the exchanges experienced within it (Seers, 1989; Love and Forret, 2008) that takes precedence. This helps to explain the significant effect that team member exchange has particularly on the discretionary behaviours that employees are likely to exercise in support of their colleagues as members of the firm.

Together with the pattern of corporate identity cue combinations (shared vision, consistent image implementation and reciprocity; or just consistent image implementation and reciprocity) identified, this suggests a certain stability in certain corporate identity cues within the case organisation that may also be found at aggregate and subgroup level.

Through this contribution, it is evident that corporate identity cues can be embedded within member organisational associations, and that the most salient of these cues may trigger psychological (as in the case of organisational identification), cognitive (as in the case of sensemaking) and behavioural (as expressed by in-role and extra-role behaviours) outcomes.

The effects of corporate identity at the employee group level

The third contribution that this study makes to the corporate identity and corporate associations domains is in bringing clarity to the effects of corporate identity cues – and by extension, the corporate identity – at the subgroup (in this case, the employee-group) level. This is important since research in the field has tended traditionally to focus on the organisational level of analysis (Melewar, Gotsi and Andriopoulos, 2012), with few works examining the development and effects of corporate identity at what Glanfield et al. (2017, p. 135) term the ‘stakeholder level’. Indeed, of the limited number of studies that have addressed the subgroup level, clearly identifiable groups
such as managers (see for example: Gioia and Thomas, 1996 and Fox-Wolfgramm, Boal and Hunt, 1998) have often featured as the key groups of interest.

Yet, there is merit in examining the effects of corporate identity at the subgroup level and amongst other subgroups comprising the organisation.

In this study, the subgroups of interest were related to positions (i.e., client-facing/Front-Office, and non client-facing/Back-Office); and conditions (pre and post-exposure to strategic change announcements). Examination of the effects of corporate identity cues at this level has illustrated that the mix of corporate identity cues not only differ by subgroup, but also within the subgroup. This in turn showed that when compared to data at the aggregate, or organisational-level, the influence of organisational identification on role behaviours changed dramatically once strategic change was announced, thereby illustrating the depth of insight gained by examination at the subgroup level. Indeed it is only at this level that the nuanced importance of team member exchange as a corporate identity cue may be observed in terms of strengthening the discretionary Back-Office behaviours that might support Front-Office efforts for example.

Corporate identity and the management of change
Somewhat linked to the previous contribution, is the role of corporate identity during times of change; the fourth and final contribution this study makes to the corporate identity and corporate associations domains. As illustrated in the literature review (see table 2.1, Chapter 2), studies of corporate identity have rarely been given full consideration within the context of managing the results of organisational change. Yet the findings of the EXPOSURE multigroup and importance-performance map analyses indicate that it is precisely during times of change that the corporate identity cues of consistent image implementation and reciprocity become highly influential in increasing the psychological bond between employee and employer. This bond subsequently pushes in-role and extra-role behaviours to their highest levels. The implication here is that these elements of the corporate identity could be extremely valuable in supporting (via in-role behaviours) and potentially improving (via extra-role behaviours) the continuity of the firm’s operations during change through its members. In this sense corporate identity, through its cues, appears to be a crucial part of managing the effects of change on the psychological and behavioural outcomes of employees.

In this sense, the findings and contributions outlined so far can clearly be seen to support Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) interdisciplinary conceptualisation of corporate identity as a reflection of what the firm is, means and does as well as how and where it operates. Furthermore, as the following paragraphs show, the central, enduring and distinctive (CED) attributes of the firm which comprise
its corporate identity form an essential part of understanding the influence of corporate identity via its attendant cues.

2. Organisational identification
This study also makes a contribution to the organisational identification domain by articulating more keenly the corporate identity cues and cue types that help establish the psychological bond between employee and employer.

The results of the fitting procedure (see chart 4.1 in section 4.9.1) indicate that the dimensions of corporate culture and visual identity, behaviour and corporate communication reflected in the Melewar (2003) and Melewar and Jenkins’ (2002) models of corporate identity, all contribute to employees’ sense of belonging with the organisation. This is further reflected in the three corporate identity cues types derived in this study which align with these extant models of corporate identity. Coupled with the combination of cues known to influence organisational identification within the case organisation, the study has also demonstrated the types of corporate identity cues involved and the conditions under which they vary.

Although not strictly within the domain of corporate identity, these results align well with research from Lam, et al. (2016) that found a positive correlation between perceived organisational support as a corporate identity cue and nurses’ psychological bond of identification with their employers. Much as with the work of these researchers, the contribution that this study makes is to the slim body of work addressing how employees become identified or, in Pratt’s (1998) terms, how identification occurs. The specific advance made in the present study is in addressing this concern from the aggregate and subgroup level, and by sourcing the corporate identity cues from member organisational associations.

3. In-role and extra-role [prosocial service] behaviours
The research also makes a contribution to the growing body of literature on the in-role and extra-role behaviours associated with prosocial service behaviours (PSB) by outlining how organisational identification, driven by combinations of corporate identity cues, influences these behaviours.

Even with the most recent call to investigate the effects of organisational identification on in-role and extra-role behaviours (He and Brown, 2013) and the drivers of PSB in general (Bettencourt and Brown, 2003; Wintericht et al., 2013), the vast majority of studies addressing the subject have focused almost exclusively on the extra-role behaviour perspective (see for example: Riketta (2005); Van Dick et al. (2008); Kane et al. (2012); Marique et al. (2013)) commonly associated with organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB). Research from the related prosocial service behaviour
domain (PSB) has additionally shown extra-role behaviour to be a function of organisational identification (O’Reilly and Chatman, 1986), and organisation-specific communications as influential to prosocial service behaviour in general (Ackfeldt and Wong, 2005; Malhotra and Ackfeldt, 2016).

Consistent with these findings, the research presented here illustrates that organisational identification, driven by a combination of corporate identity cues, significantly and directly influences the extra-role behaviours of employees under all conditions but one; the Back-Office. This compliments research that points to the generally favourable effects of positive organisational identification in promoting inter-collegial interaction within and beyond the organisation (Bell and Menguc, 2002) and has brought new understandings around how organisational identification influences PSB.

More uniquely, the research has also highlighted the positive effects of organisational identification and, independently, the corporate identity cues consistent image implementation and team member exchange on in-role behaviours. By identifying additionally this combination of elements that drive in-role behaviours as ‘the glue which holds collective endeavors together’ (Organ, 1977, p.50), the study overall makes a clear contribution to the literature on prosocial service behaviours.

4. Linking corporate identity cues, organisational identification and role behaviours

The fourth contribution that this study makes concerns the relationship between corporate identity, organisational identification and role behaviour. As mentioned throughout the thesis, several studies have examined and confirmed the relationship between corporate identity and organisational identification, and separately between organisational identification and in-role and extra-role behaviours. Again, to the best of this researcher’s knowledge, no studies until now have examined the relationship between all three constructs. Indeed, no studies are known to have examined this relationship from a critical realist perspective by going beyond the corporate identity itself to elicit its composite cues and understand their relationship with these constructs. In this study, the relationship was not only confirmed as significant between the three main constructs through examination of the corporate identity cues as composite parts of the corporate identity, but was also found to vary under certain organisational conditions.

While these findings collectively contribute new knowledge to several scholarly domains it is essential to note that they are based on data drawn from a single organisation, thus inhibiting to some extent their generalisability.
7.6 Managerial implications

This section of the thesis outlines a number of practical managerial implications that may be drawn from the study. Given that the research was conducted within a single organisation and its results may not generalisable, the implications noted here, while potentially of relevance to other organisations, have been framed within the context of ConSeng Corporation, i.e., the case organisation. To this end, the implications are presented from the aggregate and the subgroup perspective.

7.6.1 The aggregate-level perspective

**Corporate identity cues in the communications mix**

The results presented here have several implications for the practice of corporate communications, internal communications and, given the role behaviour focus of the study, marketing communications.

It is common practice in many international organisations to develop and implement a range of communications initiatives, and to work across a number of channels (e.g., intranet, all-staff meetings) to transmit them. In many cases, what is transmitted from a corporate level is often intended for consumption by the wider organisation, with the mix of initiatives and channels adjusted to suit the needs and/or characteristics of the regions, groups, situations, strategic intentions and other specifics of the firm. In other cases, the transmissions may be generic. It is inevitable that the results of this mix or generic application help to form some of the numerous member organisational association that employees hold. Thus, the selection and deployment of components for the various mixes becomes critical.

This is of key importance since, as this study has shown, not all member organisational associations are central, enduring or act as cues to the corporate identity. Those that are and do have a substantial effect on the psychological bond of identification however. This means that the corporate identity cues deployed as part of the marketing and even the marketing communications (marcom) mix, may lack the all-important recipient perspective and response.

Despite the valuable strategic and behavioural outcomes that may be achieved as a result, the attention given by marketing and communications specialists in general to the role of member organisational associations is limited if not overlooked entirely. Accordingly, a key implication of this study is that those involved closely with these organisational practices more than any other, should incorporate the elicitation of member organisational associations and consideration of the desired psychological and behavioural outcomes into the planning of the corresponding initiatives.
This study has demonstrated that through application of five open questions (see Appendix 3), it is both possible and practical for marketing and corporate communications practitioners to extract sufficient member organisational association data to determine those associations that are CED and inherent in the corporate identity cues most salient to organisational members. Indeed, such an approach is not only likely to indicate areas of discrepancy between the image that the firm would like to promote (i.e., its intended organisational association (Brown et al., 2006) and current member organisational associations, but ultimately contribute to the relevance of those corporate identity cues to its members across and within groups comprising the organisation as well as during times of change. In this sense, the approach itself is also of practical benefit in employee engagement initiatives where authenticity is often key to their efficacy.

By further identifying and combining the corporate identity cues appropriate to the operating context, it is also possible that psychological and behavioural outcomes may be better maintained or even improved as a result. This becomes increasingly important when taking into consideration that while familiarity and activity between employees and their immediate work environment (i.e., team, group, department, etc) tends to reduce identification with the organisation (Vough, 2012), it is nevertheless linked positively to certain extra-role behaviours (Olkkonen and Lipponen, 2006). This in itself has implications for how organisations define their composite teams or departments and suggests that care needs to be taken when invoking the team spirit in pursuit of aggregate-level goals particularly where subgroup level interpretations are not immediately understood. In parallel, it also points to the benefits of leveraging the information exchange qualities and thus the culture of the team at subgroup level in pursuit of psychological and behavioural improvements.

**Investing in the psychological bond**

As outlined in the *Summary of findings* (section 7.4), this study has been effective in helping to identify the corporate identity cues that are most and least conducive to influencing the sense of belonging that employees have with their firms. Indeed it has also indicated that in contributing to levels of identification with the firm, organisational identification almost always triggers higher extra-role efforts and, during change, strengthens the role-prescribed behaviours that are essential to keeping the organisation running. Yet the process from [corporate identity] cue recognition to action is neither swift nor clear-cut (Weber and Glynn, 2006). This has direct managerial relevance because it highlights the need for ongoing managerial focus on the corporate identity as a vital ‘asset’ of the organisation (Van Riel and Balmer, 1997, p.351), as well as the management of the corporate identity. In fact, this is crucial since corporate identity management (CIM) is specifically concerned with the promotion of behaviours, expressions of the firm’s image, and the coordination of its visual systems such as its branding guidelines (Simões et al., 2005).
There is a general tendency in many organisations for corporate communications and the dissemination of mission and values to attract both attention and investment. This is confounded however by the results of this study which indicate that the dissemination of the firm’s mission and values were not only of little importance to some employees (qualitative study findings), but of no direct influence on their organisational identification (quantitative study results) either. The same is true of employee’s awareness and perceptions of the firm’s corporate communications. This raises questions around the effects of continuously investing in and promoting such corporate identity cues, as well as how best to manage cues such as reciprocity that lead to more desirable effects on organisational identification.

These concerns emphasise the need for managers to assess periodically the effects and selection of those corporate identity cues that are purposely implemented and, once again, to take into consideration the role of member organisational associations in which they are rooted since they reflect employees ‘interpretations and responses’ to the corporate identity (Dacin and Brown, 2002, p.254). This is critical given that corporate identity cues that raise feelings of pride, culture and well-being are often the sources of inertia during large-scale strategic change situations such as mergers (Clarke et al., 2010). Such assessments need not always be time dependent and thus reliant upon the deployment of regular initiatives such as employee satisfaction and engagement surveys. They could for example be incorporated as part of annual appraisals or half yearly performance review discussions.

The findings of this study show that organisational identification by itself, does not always influence employees’ prescribed (in-role) behaviours directly. Despite this, considerable effort is still invested in instilling within employees the expectations of the role, aligning these investments with the philosophy, values and strategic direction of their organisations, and occasionally introducing targets that encourage employees to achieve more (i.e., stretch targets) for the firm. In short, influencing extra-role behaviour through organisational identification.

The results of the robustness check conducted in this study show that there is little to be gained from leveraging members’ psychological bond with the organisation in this way. It is possible however to increase in-role behaviours significantly by appealing through members’ voluntary behaviours. Thus one further practical implication of this study is its indication of the importance of defining the target, or focus, of attention (i.e., in-role or extra-role behaviour) before considering how or if organisational identification may be leveraged as a conduit to influencing the target.

These observation suggest that the regular evaluation of the corporate identity cues selected and used could prove valuable not just in increasing identification with the firm and leveraging in-role
behaviours to increase voluntary efforts, but particularly in directing or influencing investment and attention more effectually in the pursuit of organisational ambitions. In this sense, the [choice of] corporate identity cues, their effects and their subsequent evaluations would seem valuable as the type of marketing activities associated with “distinguished marketing” – i.e., the marketing direction, coordination and decision-making quality – advocated by Leeflang and posited to support the creation of value for customers (2011, p. 76).

The value and meaning of corporate identity

Given the breadth of these managerial implications, it is difficult at best to know whether organisations fully comprehend or consider the potential impact of corporate identity. The qualitative findings presented here would seem to suggest that some facets of the corporate identity were implicit, though not necessarily identified as such within the case organisation. For many organisations, the philosophies, cultures, communications and behaviours that characterise them often appear to be accepted as part of the overall brand identity, as was also the case at CSC Corporation. The results of this study suggest that while it may not be wholly inaccurate to consider corporate identity as an aspect of brand identity, to do so exclusively could delimit understanding of the valuable psychological and behavioural effects of corporate identity. Appreciating the link and differences between these identities becomes all the more pertinent when considering the influence, and indeed the potential benefits of the corresponding corporate identity cues, during the early stages of strategic change.

7.6.2 The subgroup-level perspective

As has been made apparent throughout this study, the subgroup perspective is crucial to understanding the effects of corporate identity cues under different organisational conditions. In order to provide more practical insights into the managerial implications, the findings of the importance-performance map analysis (IPMA) as applied to the Front-Office/Back-Office (FOBO) and Pre/Post-Exposure (EXPOSURE) subgroup level findings in Chapter 6 are a particularly useful resource.

The Front-Office perspective

As engineers, project managers, business developers and consultants Front-Office (client-facing) employees in particular are triply charged with representing, enacting and transmitting the corporate identity of CSC through their roles, with clients and via the company’s promotional materials. With the salesforce itself considered by some researchers to be an identity cue (see for example Dimopoulou and Fill, 2000), Front-Office employees within CSC appeared to value highly
the consistency with which the firm’s image was implemented and the extent to which its vision was shared making these cues integral to their sense of oneness with the firm.

The importance performance map analyses presented in section 6.6 for the FOBO subgroup, indicate that some improvements can be made to in-role and extra-role behaviours based on the potential effects of focusing effort on specific corporate identity cues. For example, in order to improve in-role behaviours, team member exchange still remains a key driving force. However, consistent image implementation is likely to be of strong significance for employees in achieving this aim (see chart 6.1). The remaining corporate identity cues although high in performance, are only of minor relevance. Accordingly, an increase in team member exchange and consistent image implementation would increase the in-role behaviours of Front-Office employees.

**The Back-Office perspective**

By focusing attention on promoting team member exchange, the IPMA suggests that employees discretionary, extra-role behaviours could also be improved (chart 6.2). This compares slightly more favourably than focusing attention on organisational identification which would lead to marginally lower improvement in the same behaviours. Although team member exchange is of critical importance to lifting in-role behaviours, consistent image implementation is of considerably lower impact but nevertheless is a close priority for improving both psychological and role-behaviour outcomes.

By combining the right cues and constructs—team member exchange with consistent image implementation or organisational identification for example—the IPMA also suggests that increases can be achieved in employees’ in-role behaviours as well as their willingness to *go the extra-mile* for the organisation. Conversely, where the focus of the organisation is on maintaining the efficacy of its operations, for instance during times of uncertainty, signalling the consistency of the firm’s image within the team environment is likely to strengthen employees’ in-role behaviours.

**FOBO Summary**

As noted in the previous section, there is clearly merit in evaluating the effects of corporate identity cues. The IPMA suggests that in order of priority, management should focus its efforts primarily on maintaining the quality of exchanges within teams since this influences both in-role and extra-role behaviour. This is not only of importance for the sales force, but also for client account management teams for example where Front and Back-Office must necessarily work in a highly integrated manner. As these findings illustrate however, influencing employees’ sense of belonging is almost of equal import for client-facing employees. This is supported by research that has indicated the significance of organisational identification as a resource and as a source of support for those
charged with promoting and selling the intangible (Alvesson and Empson, 2008). Because the findings indicated that organisational identification had no discernible effect on the role behaviours of Back-Office employees, this provides a good indication of where management attention could be directed in terms of deploying behaviour-promoting initiatives and communications. It is equally necessary however for the corporate communications department to sustain, if not improve in parallel, the consistency with which it implements CSC’s image since this drives both organisational identification and in-role behaviour. In this sense, the implications noted here could potentially be extend towards the marketing and communications efforts of the organisation.
The Pre-Exposure perspective

The IPMA additionally confirmed that ahead of strategic change, it is the combination of team member exchange and organisational identification that is critical to promoting extra-role behaviours (chart 6.3). Accordingly, an increase in the quality of team member exchange would increase extra-role efforts from employees. A similar degree of attention invested in organisational identification-promoting activity would improve the same behaviours by almost the same degree. By contrast, building up in-role behaviours requires a different combination of corporate identity cues. Here, it is the mix of organisational identification and consistent image implementation that is most beneficial (chart 6.4). This does not lead to substantial increases in in-role behaviour influenced by team member exchange and consistent image implementation.

The Post-Exposure perspective

Once strategic change has been announced, the results of the IPMA suggest that it is of vital importance for the firm to adjust the corporate identity cues deployed. For instance, it is evident from chart 6.3 that the only corporate identity cue that is of immediate relevance to increasing extra-role behaviour — arguably a critical objective for many firms negotiating change — is team member exchange. However sustaining employees’ levels of identification with the organisation is also key.

With organisational identification at its strongest post exposure to strategic change (chart 6.4), it is clear that attention should be trained on maintaining this level considering its psychological importance to employees. Consequently, the IPMA indicates that a one point increase in team member exchange or organisational identification would lead to an increase in extra-role behaviour performance. Team member exchange (chart 6.4) appears to be of more importance for increasing in-role behaviour during times of change, whereby a one-point improvement in this corporate identity cue would lead to a notable increase in these behaviours. An increase in organisational identification by comparison would increase in-role behaviour to a significant but lesser degree.
EXPOSURE Summary

In addition to being attentive to the effects and fluctuation of corporate identity cues during strategic change, the IPMA points to the importance of maintaining a clear focus on team member exchange not just in the run-up to, but especially in the period immediately following exposure to strategic change announcements as it is these corporate identity cues in particular that positively and significantly affect organisational identification and extra-role behaviour. But it is also clear that efforts to preserve employees’ sense of belonging to the organisation, whether at company-wide or department level, are imperative. This is logical given the operational and personal uncertainty that often arises as a result of strategic change. This is also crucial since from a management perspective, robust corporate identities continue to direct employee actions even once environmental change has been registered (Kjærgaard’s, 2009).

As noted previously, these results also underline how important it is that management regularly evaluate the effects of corporate identity cues. For even though reciprocity and team member exchange are indirectly and directly vital to organisational identification, during times of change it is the quality of the exchange within the team that matters most and carries the greatest capacity to encourage the behaviours conducive to navigating successfully the effects of imminent and ongoing change.

For those charged with implementing and/or managing strategic change, these insights should be considered as part of the overall process of planning.
7.7 Research limitations and directions for future research

As with any study, there are a number of limitations to the work presented here which should be noted. In this study, a total of four limitations have been identified along with several potential areas for future research.

**Single versus multi organisation/industry focus**

The most immediate limitation to this study is that data was gathered from a single organisation. This is not unusual in studies of corporate identity (see for example: Glynn (2000); Melewar and Akel (2005); and, Cole and Bruch (2006)), however, even with bootstrapping of the data, generalisability is inhibited. This becomes a particular concern when taking into account the cultural and demographic dimensions of organisations.

The results of the multigroup analyses showed for example that proximity to the client and exposure to strategic change announcements both have a profound effect on the relationship between corporate identity cues and subsequent employee role behaviours. These conditions not only alter the combination, but also the strength of the cues that employees draw from. From this it may be construed that demographics may play a key role in this relationship. Indeed they are recognised as an important area of concern through research that has highlighted the close affiliation of tenure (Barker and Tompkins, 1994; Dutton et al., 1994) and seniority (Smidts et al., 2000; Corley, 2004; Cole and Bruch, 2006) with organisational identification for instance.

Given that the multigroup analyses in this study were limited to two subgroups, and conducted within a single organisation, future research could benefit from being directed towards several additional areas.

The first area should deal with testing of the conceptual model across some of the demographics outlined in the FIMIX study (i.e., tenure, seniority, profession, etc). The second potential area of focus should be on the collection of data from other organisations operating within the consulting engineering domain to verify whether the patterns identified in this study are unique to the case organisation or to the wider industry. Indeed, this is a particularly useful avenue of exploration since as Melewar (2003) notes, ‘The identity of the industry in which a company operates influences the extent to which the company can have and project its individual corporate identity.’ (p.207). One further area of focus moves the research beyond the current industry and towards other organisational structures such as governmental, non-governmental or stock-listed organisations. In fact, the focus on stock-listed organisations may be especially insightful since research indicates that employees who hold shares in their organisations seemingly perform better than those who do not (Long, 1978; Pendleton, 1997).
Pursuing research in these areas would additionally offer an opportunity to further test the robustness of the overall model.

**Corporate identity cues and further effects**

Although a number of corporate identity cues were elicited and empirically examined in this study, it would be remiss to assume that no further cues exist given what Brown et al. (2006) describe as the virtually infinite number of member organisational associations. It would be equally limiting to assume the corporate identity cues examined in this study are not subject to influences beyond those addressed in this study. One such influence could be the role of motivation.

This presents an interesting avenue of exploration since employees who feel a sense of belonging with their organisations generally have stronger work motivations (Lee, 1971; Wegge, Van Dick, Wecking and Molten, 2006). Moreover, research in this domain also suggests that individuals with ‘high motivating potential’ in the workplace produce more organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB) (Wegge et al., 2006, p.60), a construct closely related to prosocial service behaviours.

Since the work presented here represents a tentative step in the elicitation of further identity cues, it could be fruitful for research to focus not only on identifying additional corporate identity cues, but also on developing more practicable methods of extracting these cues from the numerous member organisational associations.

**Client-side perceptions**

An additional limitation in the present study is the quantitative study’s reliance on data gathered from within the case organisation. While the study presents a clear picture of the effects on in-role and extra-role behaviour as outcomes of corporate identity cue-driven organisational identification, the absence of data from the external stakeholder (particularly client) perspective delimits comprehensive verification of these outcomes. In this sense, the conclusions drawn yield a relatively fixed view with implications directed more toward the internal management and effects of corporate identity. Yet there are longterm advantages to taking into consideration client-side perspectives. The service profit chain literature contends for example that the latitude conferred on front-office employees to deliver results for clients leads to customer loyalty and positive financial outcomes for organisations (Heskett et al., 2008). Accordingly, by conducting research simultaneously between an organisation and its client(s), it is plausible that a more complete picture of corporate identity cue effects from the originator through the actor to the beneficiary of the role behaviours can be delivered.
Model and context-specific scales

The final limitation of the research concerns the use of existing, pre-validated scales to approximate the corporate identity cues in the theorised model. While this is not a wholly unusual practice in mixed methods studies or indeed in studies of corporate identity, it is evident that the selected scales cannot represent perfectly the depth of the member organisational associations from which the corporate identity cues and cue types were derived. This could explain for example the consistently low and non-significant path coefficients generated by the mission and values dissemination and, in particular, the corporate communications corporate identity constructs. While it is also possible that these cues might return significant effects in other subgroups, the commonality and specificity in member organisational associations elicited from multiple informants puts forward a reasonable case for the development of measures that are in closer alignment with member organisational associations elicited. Indeed, this would be a highly desirable area for future research that could improve the strength of the model while in parallel addressing ongoing calls for greater operationalisation of the corporate identity concept (Corley et al., 2008; Elstak, 2008).
7.8 Conclusion

This study set out to examine the effects of corporate identity cues drawn from member organisational associations on employees’ organisational identification, and its subsequent influence on the in-role and extra-role behaviours exercised by these employees within and towards their organisation. In so doing, it has made several contributions to the domain of corporate identity in particular by delineating the range and effects of these corporate identity cues at the aggregate and subgroup level. The findings indicate that the combination of corporate identity cues that influence organisational identification are prone to change in strength and influence across the firm, and as the firm contends with strategic change.

In appraising the theoretical implications of the study additionally from the perspectives of corporate associations, organisational identification as well as that of in-role and extra-role behaviours, a number of contributions to each domain were outlined. The managerial implications of the study point to the importance of considering corporate identity cues from the perspective of member organisational associations and, more importantly, to identifying and periodically evaluating the [combinations of] cues that influence organisational identification and ultimately role behaviours.

In fulfilling completely its stated aim and objectives, this study represents an important initial step towards bringing theoretical and empirical clarity to what remains an under-explored area; that is, the relationship between corporate identity cues derived from member organisational associations, organisational identification and role behaviours. While the study itself contains a number of limitations, it is the contention of the researcher that in examining empirically this relationship and acknowledging the study’s shortcomings, new and further opportunities for research have been opened up.
References


Appendices
Appendix 1  The Strathclyde Statement
International Corporate Identity Group’s (ICIG) statement on corporate identity

Every organization has an identity. It articulates the corporate ethos, aims and values and presents a sense of individuality that can help to differentiate the organization within its competitive environment.

When well managed, corporate identity can be a powerful means of integrating the many disciplines and activities essential to an organization’s success. It can also provide the visual cohesion necessary to ensure that all corporate communications are coherent with each other and result in an image consistent with the organization’s defining ethos and character.

By effectively managing its corporate identity an organization can build understanding and commitment among its diverse stakeholders. This can be manifested in an ability to attract and retain customers and employees, achieve strategic alliances, gain the support of financial markets and generate a sense of direction and purpose. Corporate identity is a strategic issue.

Corporate identity differs from traditional brand marketing since it is concerned with all of an organization’s stakeholders and the multi-faceted way in which an organization communicates.

Balmer, J.M.T.
Bernstein, D.
Day, A.
Greyser, S.
Ind, N.
Lewis, S.
Ludlow, C.
Markwick, N.
Riel, Van C.
Thomas, S.

This is a revised version of the original statement which was drafted at Strachur, Argyll, Scotland, on 17 and 18 February 1995.
Appendix 2  Informant profiles register
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No</th>
<th>Broad Job Description</th>
<th>Location (Country)</th>
<th>Location (City)</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>CONTRACT</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000-2411-PTT-1</td>
<td>Team Assistant</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001-2411-PS</td>
<td>Business Development Manager</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002-2411-PS</td>
<td>Director of Business Development</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003-2411-PS</td>
<td>Business Development Manager</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004-2411-PS</td>
<td>Business Team Secretary</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005-2411-PS</td>
<td>Online Communications Executive</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006-2411-PS</td>
<td>Medior Consultant Engineer</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007-2411-PS</td>
<td>Market Researcher</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Amersfoort</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008-2411-PS</td>
<td>Senior Asset Management Leader</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Amersfoort</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009-2411-PS</td>
<td>Manager, Asset Management</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Eindhoven</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010-2411-PS</td>
<td>Mining Engineer</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011-2411-PS</td>
<td>Bio-Based Economy Consultant</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012-2411-PS</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013-2411-PS</td>
<td>Team Assistant</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014-2411-PS</td>
<td>Director of Business Development</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015-2411-PS</td>
<td>Advisory Team Secretary</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017-2411-PS</td>
<td>Advisory Team Secretary</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018-2411-PS</td>
<td>Senior Communications Assistant</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020-2411-PS</td>
<td>Business Team Secretary (Consulting)</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021-2411-PS</td>
<td>Oil and Gas Engineer</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022-2411-PS</td>
<td>Business Team Secretary (Technical)</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023-2411-PS</td>
<td>Communications Assistant</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Maastricht</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024-2411-PS</td>
<td>Environmental Engineer</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025-2411-PS</td>
<td>Client Relationship Strategy Manager</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027-2411-PS</td>
<td>Junior Consultant - New Economies</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028-2411-PS</td>
<td>Senior Aviation Consultant</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Den Haag</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-2411-PS</td>
<td>Medior Consultant Engineer</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030-2411-PS</td>
<td>Business Development Manager</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Amersfoort</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031-2411-PS</td>
<td>Process Management Lead</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032-2411-PS</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033-2411-PS</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Interview schedule
Phase I: Eliciting Member Organisational Associations

Interview Schedule

Welcome

• Thank participant for attending; introduce self as research
• Discuss the signed consent form
• Confirm participant’s agreement to take part
• Confirm participant does not have to answer any questions s/he may feel uncomfortable with
• Confirm participant’s agreement for interview to be recorded
• Confirm participant’s understanding that interview transcript will be sent

Introduction

• Background to and objectives of study
  • Confidentiality assured
  • No right or
  •
  • wrong answers
  • Personal perceptions, insight and experiences
  • Meaning
• Position independence of the university study
• Check whether participant understands and/or has questions
• Outline duration of interview

Interview

• History, affiliation and recognition; guidance, sensemaking and action;
  identification and meaning

Closing

• Next Steps
  • Transcription review and approval – timing and guidelines
• Respondent history
  • Duration of service with company
• Level within company
• If acquired, how does the above compare with previous?

• **Member organisational associations, Affiliation and recognition**
  • When asked who you work for, or what you do, what do you say?
  • What stands out most for you or is most prominent about the company?
  • How do you pick this up? (see, hear, do, read, say) *

• **Guidance, sensemaking and action**
  • What helps and guides you in your daily work:
    o At individual level
    o At group level
    o At organisation-wide level
  • How do you know what is/is not appropriate?
    o How would you describe your relationship with each of these elements?
    o You have not mentioned ‘x’ or ‘y’, why is that? *
    o What stands out for you about these things? *

* Prompt if or where required. See ‘Supporting and Prompt Questions’ on page 4 for guidance

• **Organisational identification and meaning through associations**
  • What does it mean to you to work for the company?
    *Key concepts to elicit: Experience, emotion, change, culture*
    *(the way we do things here), strength discontinuity and continuity, identifying, membership, community, clients, stakeholders*

  o = prompt/guide questions

---

For use **only if no satisfactory responses elicited via main interview framework on**
• What do you see as the most important aspect of the organisation?
• Why do you view this aspect/these aspects as important?

• When you reflect on your early days at the company, what stands out most?
• Which of these aspects do you still see reflected today?

• Is there anything or any part of the organisation that you think is particularly different from any of its peers or competitors?
Appendix 4  Participant information sheet
Ref: 000-2411-PS

Monday 22 December 2014

Participant Information Form – Preliminary Phase
Research Study

You have been invited to take part in the Preliminary Phase of an independent, university-led study on organisational identity that will be conducted within ConSeng Corporation by Aston Business School. This will require a maximum of 30 minutes of your time on one occasion during December 2014 or January 2015 in which a short talk will take place either in person, via video conference or online meeting.

Before you decide whether or not you would like to participate in the study, it is important that you understand its background, aims and requirements. Please would you therefore take a moment to read through the following information.

What is the purpose of the study?
This study aims to explore your experiences and thoughts around working as a member of various groups across the organisation. Your input will help in understanding how we work, connect and communicate across ConSeng Corporation and how this influences other areas of the business.

How will the research be rolled out?
The research will be conducted in two parts – a Preliminary Phase and a Survey Phase.

The Preliminary Phase will take the form of a confidential 30-minute talk which will be audio-recorded. The Survey Phase will take the form of an online survey.

Why have I been invited to participate?
You have been selected to take part in the preliminary phase because your profile (role, duration of service, hierarchical position, location) suggests that you can provide useful insights that will help build a good foundation for the research. The other participants in this phase of the study have been selected along the same criteria.

Do I have to take part?
Participation in the research is entirely voluntary so it is up to you to decide whether or not you would like to take part. If you do decide to participate you will be given this information sheet to keep and you will be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

Participation or non-participation in the research will not affect your role or any aspect of your job in the organisation as this is a completely independent university study. Your participation and any other details will be kept entirely confidential and the output secured in a location only accessible by the researcher.
What will happen if I decide to take part?
As you have been selected to take part in the Preliminary Phase, you will be involved in a single 30-minute interview.

The session will be audio/video recorded and you will have the opportunity to view the written transcript after the session. No financial costs are expected to be incurred.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?
By taking part in this phase of the research, you will be making a significant contribution to academic and practitioner understanding of organisational and corporate identity theory. The research itself is unique in that this area of study has never been examined in such detail. For the company, it will deliver essential information and guidance on managing its identity and strategy.

Will what I say in this study be kept confidential?
Yes, it will.

Any information that you provide within the realms of the study will be kept strictly confidential subject to legal limitations. Although you will need to give written consent (see form enclosed), from this point your name will not be used or disclosed in any part of this study that is published. Instead, you will only be allocated a reference number as shown on the front page of this document and the consent form. Should any part of this research be published, you and indeed the company will remain 100% anonymous unless you personally request to be identified.

All data collected during the course of the research programme will be held in a secure and undisclosed location which will only be accessible by the researcher. The data will be retained in accordance with Aston University's policy on Academic Integrity which means it will be kept securely in paper or electronic form for a period of ten years after the completion of the research project.

What should I do if I want to take part?
If you agree to take part in the study, please make sure you read and add your initials in the boxes next to each of the statements in the enclosed consent form. Please then write your name, then sign and date the form where indicated on page 2.

The document should then be sent by email or post to the researcher, Gabrielle Daniels-Gombert at the above address in The Netherlands, or you may scan and email it to: danielsg@aston.ac.uk by Wednesday 7 January 2015.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The results of the research will be used in the doctoral (PhD) thesis and may also be used in academic publications and conferences which the researcher may be involved in. In any case, the doctoral thesis and any academic publications will be made available to any research participants requesting copies. Royal HaskoningDHV will also be given an electronic and bound copy of the PhD thesis.

Who is organising and funding the research?
The study is being conducted in fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at Aston Business School, UK. The lead researcher is Mrs Gabrielle Daniels-Gombert, BA Hons, PG Dip, MSc, MCIM.

The lead researcher is enrolled as a doctoral researcher at Aston University (Aston Business School) in Birmingham, UK within the faculty of marketing. The research is supervised by: Professor Dr Peter Leeflang (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, The Netherlands, Aston Business School, UK; Professor Dr Helen Higson, Pro-Vice Chancellor Aston University, UK; and Dr Keith Glanfield (PhD, MBA, MCIM, ITP, FHEA), Aston Business School, UK.

Who has reviewed the study?
The research proposal has been reviewed and given favourable opinion by the University Research Ethics Committee, Aston University.

Contact for Further Information
For further information on this research study, you may contact the researcher: Gabrielle Daniels-Gombert at: danielsg@aston.ac.uk.

Should you have any concerns about the way in which the study has been or is being conducted, please contact the Secretary of the Aston Business School Research Ethics Committee at: r.hancock@aston.ac.uk.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet
30 November 2014
Appendix 4a  Participant consent (informed consent) form
Research Participation Consent Form – Preliminary Phase

Research Study

Once you have read through the accompanying information sheet for this research study, and if you agree to take part in the study, please would you read each statement below and place your initials in the boxes. Please then write your name, then sign and date the form where indicated on page 2.

The document should then be posted to the researcher at the above address in The Netherlands, or you may scan and email it to: danielsg@aston.ac.uk by Wednesday 7 January 2015.

Please initial box

I confirm that I have read and understand the Participant Information Sheet for the above study and that I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research I will participate in.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.

I agree to take part in the above study.
Please tick a box:

I agree that any interview, focus group, or consultation that I take part in as part of this research may be audio recorded

I agree that any interview, focus group, or consultation that I take part in as part of this research may be video recorded

I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications

I understand that any audio or video recorded material from my interviews, focus groups or consultations will be held in a secure location accessible only to the researcher, and that these materials will be destroyed in accordance with the terms outlined in the Research Participant Information/Briefing Sheet

Name of Participant __________________________  Date __________________________  Signature __________________________
Appendix 4b  Ethics approval
Dear Gabrielle

Study Title: ‘Organisational Identity - Understanding Identity Endurance during Change’

REC Reference: Ethics Application H-2014 Protocol Number:

Confirmation of ethical opinion

On behalf of the Committee, I am pleased to confirm a favourable ethical opinion for the above research on the basis described in the application form, protocol and supporting documentation as revised.

The project is approved until the completion date specified provided it is commenced within two years of the date of this letter and you are required to notify the Committee when the project is completed.

Approved documents

The final list of documents reviewed and approved by the Committee is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>EC Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Ethics Application Form (signed by supervisor)</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol - Organisational Identity</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information Sheet - Assessment Phase 3</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information Sheet - Pilot Phase 1</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information Sheet - Test Verification Phase 2 Group 1</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Participant Consent Form</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of compliance

The Committee operates in accordance with the Aston University Ethics policy and procedures:

http://www1.aston.ac.uk/registry/for-staff/regsandpolicies/ethics-policy-and-procedures/

Reporting Requirements

The details of the investigation will be placed on file. You should notify the Secretary of the University Ethics Committee of any adverse events which occur in connection with this study and/or which may alter its ethical consideration, and/or any difficulties experienced by the volunteer subjects.

If you intend to make any future protocol amendments these must be approved by the Ethics Committee prior to implementation. You should also seek approval for any extension of the approved completion date.

Membership

The members of the University Ethics Committee present at the meeting are listed below:

- Ms Nichola Seare, AHRIC Director, Aston University
- Mr John Walter, Director of Governance, Aston University

REC reference: Ethics Application H-2014

Please quote this number on all correspondence

With the Committee’s best wishes for the success of the project

Yours sincerely

Secretary of the Ethics Committee
CSC strategy component corporate identity cues

Based on the output from Phase I of this study, the seven strategy component corporate identity cues (SCC) represent the CSC corporate identity cues that reflect what the company believes, claims and does in fostering alignment with its philosophy and strategy. In order to assess comprehensively these corporate identity cues, two separate scales from extant research were selected: Mission and Values Dissemination and Shared Vision. These scales are described and their items listed below.

Mission and Values Dissemination
The 6-item mission and values dissemination (SCCMV) scale developed by Simoës, Dibb and Fisk (2005, p.160) represents ‘the company’s internal sense of purpose and how it is communicated in the organization.’ The scales produced composite reliability (ρ), average variance extracted (AVE) and a coefficient alpha (α) of 0.96, 0.79 and 0.81 respectively in the original study from Simoës et al. (2005). Mission and values dissemination is operationalised as follows:

SCCMV1: There is total agreement on CSC’s mission across all levels and business areas
SCCMV2: All employees are committed to achieving CSC’s goals
SCCMV3: CSC’s values and achievements are regularly communicated to employees
SCCMV4: Senior management shares the corporate mission with employees
SCCMV5: Employees view themselves as partners in charting the direction of the company
SCCMV6: We do not have a well-defined mission

Shared Vision
The 3-itme shared vision scale (SCCSV) originally developed by Tjosvold (1998) and later adapted by Wong et al., (2009) encompasses both managerial ambition and the longterm, model condition of the organisation that its employees bind themselves to achieving (Wong et al., 2009). It provides an assessment of the degree to which this vision exists and is shared. The scales produced a coefficient alpha of α 0.64 in the original study conducted by Wong et al., (2009). Shared vision is operationalised as follows:

SCCSV1: CSC tries to keep employees informed about the overall organization
SCCSV2: CSC encourages employees to feel they are part of one unit dedicated to a common purpose
SCCSV3: CSC makes employees feel responsible for its goals
Organisational voice corporate identity cues
Based on the output from Phase I of this study, the seven organisational voice corporate identity cues (OVC) represent the long-lasting reflections that were purposely transmitted and retransmitted by and within the company and received by its employees. In order to cover comprehensively these corporate identity cues, two separate scales from extant research were selected: Consistent Image Implementation, and Corporate Communications. These scales are described and their items listed below.

Consistent Image Implementation
The 6-item consistent image implementation (OVCII) scale developed by Simões et al. (2005) reflects a number of components including the symbolic and physical aspects of the corporate identity such the image developed through marketing and as its buildings, and the manner in which these aspects are understood by organisational employees (Simoês et al., 2005). The scales produced composite reliability (ρ), average variance extracted (AVE) and a coefficient alpha (α) of 0.92, 0.66 and 0.79 respectively in the original study from Simões et al. (2005). Consistent image implementation is operationalised as follows:

OVCII1: Our company name is part of our image
OVCII2: Our corporate symbols (logo, colours, tag line) are part of our image
OVCII3: Our offices are designed to portray a specific image
OVCII4: All employees understand the symbols of our company
OVCII5: Much of our marketing is geared to projecting a specific image
OVCII6: We all dress in a way that projects CSC’s image

Corporate Communications
The 3-item corporate communications (OVCC) scaled adapted by Swoboda et al. (2013) from the original Kelly and Stephenson (1967) instrument provides a measure of the informativeness, frequency and believability of communications transmitted by the firm. Composite reliability (ρ) and coefficient alpha (α) of 0.847 and 0.845 respectively were reported in the original study conducted by Swoboda et al. (2013). Corporate communications construct is operationalised as follows:

OVCC1: Communications on company issues by CSC is informative
OVCC2: I frequently see corporate communications activities from CSC
OVCC3: Information on what happens in CSC is believable
Relational signalling corporate identity cues

Based on the output from Phase I of this study, the ten relational signalling corporate identity cues (RSC) represent the spirit, nature and quality of exchange and inter-collegial support exhibited between and towards members of the organisation. In order to cover comprehensively these corporate identity cues, two separate scales from extant research were selected: Reciprocity and Team Member Exchange. These scales are described and their items listed below.

Reciprocity
Reciprocity (RSCR) as conceived by Arnett et al. (2003) refers to the perceived level of gratitude genuinely felt and conveyed by an organisation in acknowledgment of employee support. The six-item measure was drawn from the original 36-item measure of perceived organisational support drafted by Eisenberger, Fasolo and Davis-LaMastro (1990). Reliability and average variance extracted (AVE) of 0.91 and 0.66 respectively were reported in the study conducted by Arnett et al. (2003). Reciprocity is operationalised as follows:

RSCR1: CSC values my contribution to its well-being
RSCR2: CSC appreciates an extra effort from me
RSCR3: CSC listens to any complaints I might have concerning the company
RSCR4: CSC would notice if I did something that benefitted the company
RSCR5: CSC shows concern for me
RSCR6: CSC takes pride in my accomplishments

Team Member Exchange
The 10-item measure of team member exchange (RSCTX) adapted by Love and Forret (2008) from the original Team Member Exchange Quality Scale developed by Seers, et al. (1995), assesses ‘the quality of the exchange relationships between the members of an individual’s immediate work group’ (Love and Forret, 2008, p.347). A coefficient alpha of 0.80 was reported for the scale in Love and Forret’s study. Team member exchange is operationalised as follows:

RSCTX1: I often make suggestions for better work methods to other colleagues in CSC
RSCTX2: Colleagues in CSC usually tell me when I do something that makes their job easier (or harder)
RSCTX3: I often tell colleagues when they have done something that makes my job easier (or harder)
RSCTX4: Colleagues in CSC recognize my potential
RSCTX5: Colleagues in CSC understand my problems and needs
RSCTX6: I am flexible when it comes to switching job responsibilities to make things easier for other colleagues
RSCTX7: In busy situations, other colleagues often ask me to help them out
RSCTX8: In busy situations, I often volunteer to help others in CSC
RSCTX9: I am willing to help finish work that has been assigned to others
RSCTX10: Colleagues in CSC are willing to help me finish work that was assigned to me
Organisational identification

The six-item organisational identification scales developed originally by Mael (1988) and applied by Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) assess the perception of oneness with and experiences of the firm in terms of achievements and disappointments. Alpha coefficients of 0.81 and 0.87 were reported by Mael (1988) and Mael and Ashforth (1992) in their respective studies. Organisational identification construct (OID) is operationalised as follows:

OID1R: When someone criticizes CSC, it feels like a personal insult
OID2R: I am very interested in what others think about CSC
OID3R: When I talk about CSC, I usually say “we” rather than “they”
OID4R: CSC’s successes are also my successes
OID5R: When someone praises CSC, it feels like a personal compliment
OID6R: If a story in the media criticizes CSC, I feel embarrassed

In-role (role-prescribed) and extra-role behaviour

The seven-item in-role behaviour and extra-role behaviour scales adapted by Ackfeldt and Wong (2006) from the original prosocial service behaviour measures developed by Bettencourt and Brown (1997) capture: the behaviours specified by the description of the job that are expected to be carried out, i.e., the in-role behaviour (IRB); and the behaviours that are voluntarily carried out beyond in addition to those that are prescribed, i.e., the extra-role behaviour (ERB) (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997). Composite reliability (ρ), average variance extracted (AVE) and a coefficient alpha (α) of 0.75, 0.53 and 0.78 respectively for the in-role behaviour scale as applied in Ackfeldt and Won’s (2006) study. Composite reliability (ρ), average variance extracted (AVE) and a coefficient alpha (α) of 0.78, 0.58 and 0.85 respectively for the extra-role behaviour scale as applied in the same study.

For the purposes of the present study, the wording used in some scale items was adjusted to better represent the case organisation’s philosophy as communicated to its employees. Here, the efforts of employees in serving the client whether directly or indirectly are channelled almost exclusively through the organisation as part of its collaborative philosophy.

In-role behaviour and extra-role behaviour were operationalised as follows:

**In-role behaviour**

IRB1: I perform all those tasks for CSC that are required of me by management
IRB2: I meet formal performance requirements when serving CSC
IRB3: I fulfil responsibilities to CSC as specified in my job description
IRB4: I adequately complete all expected CSC behaviours
IRB5: I help CSC with those things that are required of me by management
IRB6: I rarely go beyond my strict job requirements in serving CSC
IRB7: I know what the expected performance requirements for serving CSC are

**Extra-role behaviour**

ERB1: I voluntarily assist others even if it means going beyond my job requirement
ERB2: I help with problems beyond what is expected or required of me by management
ERB3: I often go beyond the call of duty when serving CSC
ERB4: I willingly go out of my way to satisfy CSC
ERB5: I frequently go out of my way to help CSC
ERB6: I enjoy going the extra mile to satisfy CSC
ERB7: I do not feel it necessary to assist CSC beyond my job requirements
Appendix 6   Extract from FIMIX partition
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Appendix 7  FOBO total effects, measurement and structural model values
### Total effects (FOBO Front-Office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Original (FOBO FO)</th>
<th>Mean (FOBO FO)</th>
<th>STDEV (FOBO FO)</th>
<th>t-Values (FOBO FO)</th>
<th>p-Values (FOBO FO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>5.915</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>3.228</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>4.616</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>3.802</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>2.213</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>4.406</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
- SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
- SCCSV = Shared Vision

### Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
- OVCC = Corporate Communications
- OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

### Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
- RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
- RSCR = Reciprocity

### Additional Constructs
- OID = Organisational Identification
- ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
- IRB = In-Role Behaviour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite Reliability Original (FOBO: Front-Office)</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Original (FOBO: Front-Office)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted (FOBO Front-Office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCII</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCTX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HTMT (FOBO Front-Office)
## Total effects (FOBO Back-Office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Original (FOBO.BO)</th>
<th>Mean (FOBO.BO)</th>
<th>STDEV (FOBO.BO)</th>
<th>t-Values (FOBO.BO)</th>
<th>p-Values (FOBO.BO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVClI -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCI -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCI -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>2.619</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTX -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTX -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
- SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
- SCCSV = Shared Vision

### Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
- OVCC = Corporate Communications
- OVCI = Consistent Image Implementation

### Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
- RSTX = Team Member Exchange
- RSCR = Reciprocity

### Additional Constructs
- OID = Organisational Identification
- ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
- IRB = In-Role Behaviour
Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted (FOBO Back-Office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original (FOBO: Back-Office)</td>
<td>Original (AVE) Back-Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCCTX</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HTMT (FOBO Back-Office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCII</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCTX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.231 0.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.103 0.529</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.136 0.540</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)  
SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination  
SCCSV = Shared Vision  
Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)  
OVCC = Corporate Communications  
OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation  
Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)  
RSCTX = Team Member Exchange  
RSCR = Reciprocity  
Additional Constructs  
OID = Organisational Identification  
ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour  
IRB = In-Role Behaviour
Appendix 8    EXPOSURE total effects, measurement and structural model values
### Total effects (EXPOSURE Pre-Exposure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</th>
<th>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</th>
<th>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</th>
<th>Additional Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Effects Original (PRE_EXPO)</th>
<th>Total Effects Mean (PRE_EXPO)</th>
<th>STDEV (PRE_EXPO)</th>
<th>t-Values (PRE_EXPO)</th>
<th>p-Values (PRE_EXPO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>4.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>3.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>4.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>3.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>1.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>2.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; ERB</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>2.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; IRB</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV -&gt; OID</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>2.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)</td>
<td>Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)</td>
<td>Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)</td>
<td>Additional Constructs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination</td>
<td>OVCC = Corporate Communications</td>
<td>RSCTX = Team Member Exchange</td>
<td>OID = Organisational Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV = Shared Vision</td>
<td>OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation</td>
<td>RSCR = Reciprocity</td>
<td>ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB = In-Role Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted (EXPOSURE Pre-Exposure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite Reliability Original (Pre-Exposure)</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Original (Pre-Exposure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HTMT (EXPOSURE Pre-Exposure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCII</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCTX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total effects (EXPOSURE Post-Exposure)
### Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted (EXPOSURE Post-Exposure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite Reliability Original (Post-Exposure)</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Original (Post-Exposure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HTMT (EXPOSURE Post-Exposure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>OVCC</th>
<th>OVCII</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>RSCR</th>
<th>RSCTX</th>
<th>SCCMV</th>
<th>SCCSV</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCC</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCII</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCR</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCTX</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMV</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCSV</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy Component Cue Constructs (SCC)
- SCCMV = Mission and Values Dissemination
- SCCSV = Shared Vision

#### Organisational Voice Cue Constructs (OVC)
- OVCC = Corporate Communications
- OVCII = Consistent Image Implementation

#### Relational Signalling Cue Constructs (RSC)
- RSCTX = Team Member Exchange
- RSCR = Reciprocity

#### Additional Constructs
- OID = Organisational Identification
- ERB = Extra-Role Behaviour
- IRB = In-Role Behaviour

---
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