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Summary

This research explores how Irish peacebuilding organisations are responding to deinstitutionalisation, the decline of a set of practices and beliefs, by engaging in different patterns of organisational identity work, the self-other negotiation of “who we are” as an organisation. I review the diverse and contradictory literature on organisational survival, before homing in on deinstitutionalisation and organisational identity in order to help explain the observed empirical phenomena and to draw boundaries around the specific theoretical areas which became the focus of this research.

The research journey is divided into four phases. Phase one involves initial inquiry into the context of peacebuilding in Ireland, where I find that the perception of a successful peace process poses a serious challenge to the raison d’être of organisations committed to peace and reconciliation in Ireland. Organisational survival is the overarching theme of this first phase as it seems an unlikely achievement for peacebuilding organisations (PBOs) to survive at all in a context characterised by severe social, political and economic challenges. In order to clearly delineate what those challenges are, and choose the focal organisations for inclusion in the research, the next step, phase two, includes identifying the field and population of peacebuilding organisations in Ireland.

Defining and mapping the field of peacebuilding in Ireland reveals that there are at least 289 organisations that do some form of peacebuilding, activities that aim to bring about peace following violent conflict. Within the field, I identify the population of 15 organisations that have peacebuilding as their primary purpose or mission. Interviews with the population of PBOs reveal that the environmental changes they encounter correspond with the process of deinstitutionalisation, the fading and dissipating of a set of practices and beliefs that have social, political and functional elements. In response to the deinstitutionalisation of their very mission, PBOs are engaging in defensive, custodial work, adapting their activities, and questioning their core beliefs and purpose, their organisational identity.

Phase three, therefore, is a study of organisational identity work, the negotiation of organisational self-other between stakeholders, in response to mission loss. A comparative case study of the Alpha and Beta Peace Centres shows three different types of differentiation, or self-other talk. Conflictual differentiation involves promoting one identity claim by rejecting another as inappropriate. Neutral differentiation is stating
one identity claim as distinct from another. Plural differentiation is embracing multiple identity claims simultaneously. While both case organisations display all three types of differentiation, Alpha expresses mostly conflictual, while Beta expresses mostly neutral and plural. The outcomes of these different patterns of differentiation are that Alpha 'turns outwards' trying to adapt, resulting in a fragmented identity, expressing hypocrisy and lack of integrity, and struggling to survive. Beta, conversely, 'turns inwards' reflecting on its core values, expressing coherence and consistency around its identity claims, and is more successfully re-orienting around a reformed identity. As a final step, phase four, I combine the levels of institution, field, population and organisation to create a process model illustrating and explaining organisational identity work process in response to deinstitutionalisation.

This research provides original contributions that are theoretical, methodological, empirical and practical. The four major theoretical contributions are in the areas of deinstitutionalisation, organisational identity, identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation, and organisational survival. When an institution fades in a process of deinstitutionalisation, structures, beliefs, practices and assumptions lose their taken-for-granted legitimacy. In response, organisations engage in defensive, custodial work, defending the outgoing institution, but also experience an identity threat and engage in organisational identity work. Different patterns of identity work result in different degrees of consistency and coherence, affecting an organisation's ability to reform its identity. This study shows that consistency between past, present and future and integrity between values and actions help organisations' survival prospects, whereas, a sense of hypocrisy and identity fragmentation is detrimental to organisational survival.

Other theoretical contributions are in the areas of peacebuilding, non-profit management and managerialism. Methodological contributions include mapping, the use of qualitative data analysis software, insider-outsider research and operationalising deinstitutionalisation. An empirical contribution is that this study is the first to document and analyse a deinstitutionalisation process in real time. Furthermore, it is the first one to map the field of peacebuilding in Ireland, despite existing mapping projects in political science and non-profit research.
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Chapter 1. Introduction and Overview

"There is no quick fix to our problems in Northern Ireland, and while great progress has been made since the peace agreement was signed in 1998, great setbacks have also occurred, making the need for this type of work as valid as ever. Though often difficult, the rewards can be huge, with the overall goal a peaceful, inclusive society for all." (Peace and Reconciliation Group Derry, website May 2012)

1.1 Research context and background

In October 2007 leaders of two opposing sides of the conflict in Northern Ireland, the Democratic Unionist Party and Sinn Fein, shook hands and agreed to share power in government. Locally and internationally, newspaper headlines captured the dramatic turnaround of this historic moment. The strong and well-funded peacebuilding industry, which had preceded and had continued to thrive following the Belfast Agreement in 1998, greeted this development with cautious optimism. During the ensuing celebrations, an elected member of the new power-sharing government said to the leader of a prominent peacebuilding organisation, "Well, we won’t need to come to the peace center anymore." And with that, organised peacebuilding started to look more historic than current. This globally recognised political settlement triggered questioning of the continued need for peacebuilding organisations (PBOs) as their raison d’être was fundamentally challenged. Yet, how are these organisations continuing to survive several years after the taken-for-granted legitimacy of their entire field was so shaken? Is the "need for this type of work as valid as ever," as stated by one PBO’s website, quoted above?

The initial impetus for this PhD research in 2009 was a curiosity about how peacebuilding organisations in Ireland are surviving a successful peace process. Currently, there are 15 organisations in Ireland primarily devoted to peace and reconciliation in Ireland. A series of dialogues and agreements culminated in the Belfast Agreement in 1998 which then led to a devolved government in Belfast based on a power sharing agreement in 2007. The fact that this peace process is widely considered to be a success, ending almost four decades of violent conflict, poses a fundamental challenge to the need and mission of peacebuilding organisations. Yet they continue to exist to this day.
Having worked in the area of peace and reconciliation in Ireland and the Balkans for 12 years, I began my PhD journey deeply embedded in the empirical context of the research. I was drawn to investigate fairly general questions, at least in respect to organisation theory. My research journey from 2009 until 2014 reflects a narrowing in of theoretical focus from general to specific. I began with the question: How are peacebuilding organisations surviving the existential challenge of a successful peace process? And even more generally: How do organisations respond to major changes in their environment? The first half of the PhD journey involved homing in on the most relevant and specific areas of theory in order to best capture and understand the empirical context, and to draw boundaries around the theoretical area of study to make an original contribution to academic literature.

In order to narrow down the focus of my research, I proceeded in phases, allowing myself to be more general in the first phase, in order to discover what was really significant about the specific empirical context in which I was interested. The empirical setting guided the evolution of the research question. As I became more familiar with the various theoretical perspectives that could be applied to make sense of the concept of organisational survival and the emerging data, I took an abductive approach, cycling between data and theory (Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010; Mantere & Ketokivi, 2013). I settled on two concepts: deinstitutionalisation and organisational identity. The exercise of mapping the field of peacebuilding in Ireland allowed me to discover and document that peacebuilding in Ireland was, in fact, fading away as donors drew funding programmes to a close and many organisations moved on to other areas of work. Thus, the concept of deinstitutionalisation - the decline of institutionalised practices and beliefs (Oliver, 1992) - emerged as a distinctive and interesting aspect of the empirical context. Within neo-institutionalism, *institutionalised* practices and beliefs, as opposed to organisational practices and beliefs, are those that are structural, taken for granted and shared (Jepperson, 1991, p. 143). Institution is defined as the “regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life” (Scott, 2008, p. 48). So an institution is the norms, rules, taken-for-granted assumptions, practices, laws and policies that shape organisational life. Over time, institutions can change, with new practices and beliefs becoming institutionalised, gaining taken for granted status, and, less frequently, institutionalised practices and beliefs fade away, losing their taken for granted status (Jepperson, 1991).
The next step was to explore how individual PBOs are responding to the deinstitutionalisation of their mission. As I moved to a lower level of analysis, individual organisations, I discovered that organisational actors were not only engaged in a process of figuring out how to adapt to major challenges in their environment, but, given the changes that undermine the very mission of these organisations, they were asking themselves, “What does it mean anymore to be a peacebuilding organisation?” And, “Who are we now?” The concept of identity work – the inter-subjective renegotiation of self-other divisions (Alvesson, Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008; Ybema et al., 2009) – helped to explain organisational level phenomena. The changes that the PBOs faced resonated at the very core of the organisations, affecting their identities. Organisational identity (OI) is by definition, that which is central, distinctive and enduring about an organisation (Albert & Whetten, 1985).

The empirical context reflected a sequence of events, including deinstitutionalisation, which catalysed mission loss and identity work, leading to organisational level responses and outcomes, which reflected change over time and at multiple levels. Thus, I described the object of analysis as a process (Gioia, Price, Hamilton, & Thomas, 2010; Hinings, 1997; Pettigrew, 1997; Pettigrew, Woodman, & Cameron, 2001; Wright & Zammuto, 2013). The final research question guiding this study evolved as: *What are the identity work processes that take place when organisations face deinstitutionalisation of their mission?*

1.1.1 The PhD journey: Four phases of research

The research has developed in four phases which I have written up from 2010 to 2014 in the form of 4 conference papers, 3 journal publications, and this dissertation:


organisations.” 27th Colloquium of the European Group for Organisational Studies (EGOS), Gothenburg, Sweden.


The seven papers listed above overlap with much of the text in this PhD thesis and correspond with four phases. Papers 1 and 2 are the first phase, exploring and describing the changing context for NPOs and PBOs in Ireland. Phase one mostly set the context and guided the literature review of the different perspectives on organisational survival. The second phase, papers 3 and 4, focus on defining the term, peacebuilding organisation, and mapping the sector, and is chapter 4 of this thesis. The field of peacebuilding in Ireland had ambiguous boundaries, consisting of many different actors involved in different ways. In mapping the peacebuilding field (chapter 4) and exploring how PBOs are reacting to change (chapter 5), it became clear that the empirical context provided a case of deinstitutionalisation, as the practices and beliefs of peacebuilding in Ireland were fading. Deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding undermines the very need for PBOs, as peacebuilding, their purpose and mission, began to be seen as no longer necessary, as explained in chapter 5. Papers 5 and 6, the third phase of the PhD research, explore organisational identity work in response to mission loss (chapters 6-8). Deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding on the institutional level translated into mission loss on the organisational level, explained in phase three below. Phase four, conference paper 7 above, consists of embedding OI work in a context of
deinstitutionalisation in a multi-level analysis bringing together multiple units of analysis into one framework: institutional, field, population, organisation. Chapter 9 presents this final phase, which I have written up as a conceptual paper that has been accepted at the EGOS Colloquium in July 2014. Chapter 10 elaborates the theoretical, methodological, empirical and practical contributions of this research.

Table 1.1. PhD Journey – Four Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Key themes, Contributions</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Theoretical areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase one</td>
<td>How are NPOs in Ireland responding to crisis and altered conditions of support?</td>
<td>Categorising organisational responses. Organisational survival</td>
<td>NPO sector</td>
<td>Resource dependency. Institutionalism. Organisational survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase two</td>
<td>Which organisations constitute the field and population of peacebuilding in Ireland? How are PBOs responding to deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding?</td>
<td>Mapping a field and population. Deinstitutionalisation. Defensive institutional work.</td>
<td>Field and population level</td>
<td>Institutionalism. Deinstitutionalisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase three</td>
<td>What are the identity work processes that take place as the organisation struggles to re-invent itself following mission loss?</td>
<td>Categorising three different types of differentiation. Organisational survival. Strategic and cognitive consistency.</td>
<td>Individual organisation</td>
<td>Organisational identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase four</td>
<td>How do identity work processes elucidate organisational responses to deinstitutionalisation?</td>
<td>Agency and structure interact and interrelate in an iterative cycle.</td>
<td>Multiple: organisation population, field, institution.</td>
<td>Organisational identity, deinstitutionalisation, organisational survival.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I elaborate on these four phases, below, describing the different parts of the research journey and how they emerged and inter-relate.

Phase One

Phase one explored the wider context in which PBOs exist, and how they are responding to changes in their resource environment. This first phase enabled me to explore different ways of framing the empirical context and to examine the existing...
literature on organisational survival. I took a functionalist and pragmatic approach with the aim of uncovering what is happening in the empirical context. This phase included interviews with 12 third-sector leaders in Ireland (Donnelly-Cox, 2009) and then presented a case study of the Alpha peacebuilding organisation (Donnelly-Cox & Cannon, 2010a). This research applied resource dependency and institutional frameworks to shed light on how NPOs in Ireland, particularly the Alpha Peace Centre, are responding to crisis, primarily economic. I categorised data into response modes of what organisations are doing (economising, harmonising, diversifying and monopolising) and what they say they should be doing (collaboration, specialisation and strategic leadership). NPOs in general, and PBOs in particular, were facing the dual challenge of reduced resources and depleting legitimacy, and in response they are remaining fairly silent. The dominant theme I found was organisational survival. Actors were responding to crisis by withdrawing and focussing on survival. While this research did not find any major difference between NPOs and PBOs in responding to environmental challenges, it was clear that the resource and legitimacy challenges for the Alpha Peace Centre, and possibly for PBOs in general, were more severe than for NPOs. NPOs had to prove their value for money, while PBOs had to argue that they were still needed at all (Donnelly-Cox & Cannon, 2010a).

I wrote up the case of Alpha relying on informal interviews, printed documents and personal experience. I had excellent access as I was an employee at the organisation at the time, from 2006 until the end of 2011. The findings from the first two papers indicated that the Alpha PBO responded to crisis predominantly by economising, but also by diversifying and harmonising. Economising means doing more with less; focussing on efficiency and making cut-backs. Diversifying refers to increasing capacity in new areas. Alpha invested in fundraising, as well as new areas of work that were easier to fund than peacebuilding in Ireland, such as international peacebuilding. The harmonising response means aligning organisational activities with donor and government priorities. To some extent, Alpha undertook international work, and adapted their local work, according to donors’ wishes. It was clear from writing up the case of Alpha and from the initial interviews that the successful peace process in Ireland presented a serious legitimacy challenge to peacebuilding organisations in Ireland, as their very raison d’être was being undermined by socio-political developments. We concluded paper 2 by saying: “Non-profits such as the Peace Centre can imagine a different future when other actors are mired in the present – or the past. The challenge
for non-profits is that if and when they achieve that future, they by default alter their conditions of support, creating new challenges for their own survival. The greatest challenges may arise not from exogenous shock but from the pursuit of the organisation’s mission” (Donnelly-Cox & Cannon, 2010a, p. 350). Thus, the initial case study provided some of the key themes that guided the rest of the research: exogenous shocks versus internal responses, legitimacy, mission loss and organisational survival.

Phase one set the context within the literature on organisational survival, particularly regarding the importance of mission and values, the expressive role (Frumkin, 2002) in nonprofit survival. This literature is reviewed in chapter 2, section 2.2. I found that institutional theory was most useful in explaining the relationship between organisations and their environments, especially during times of change, and providing concepts for understanding organisational survival, reviewed in chapter 2, section 2.3.

**Phase Two**

Following from phase one of the PhD research, I realised that I needed to be clearer about the definition and boundaries of the empirical context under study: peacebuilding organisations (PBOs). Therefore, the focus of the next paper, number 3 above, is mapping the field and population of PBOs and is included in chapter 4 of this thesis. I found that Grønbjerg provided some clear guidelines on mapping nonprofits (1989). This phase relied on an open system approach (Scott & Davis, 2007) in that I used concepts from theories that placed organisations in their wider context, such as institutionalism and population ecology.

I chose to investigate, and thus define and map, the organisational field and then population. The ‘field’ concept provided a comprehensive coverage of all those actors involved in peacebuilding, and also was part of institutional theory, which was an area of theory necessary for understanding the concept of legitimacy, that had emerged as important in the previous phase. I also needed to narrow down the field to organisations primarily focussed on peacebuilding, so I found that the term ‘organisational population’ was useful because it consists of all organisations that are equally dependent on the same pool of resources, and therefore have a shared vulnerability to changes in their resource environment (Hannan & Freeman, 1989). The concept, from population ecology literature, focussed on the importance of resources, and from the perspective of a group of organisations, not focussing on individual organisations. The
concepts of population and field helped to focus on the context, or organisational environment, rather than on individual organisations.

The mapping produced a field of almost 300 organisations and a population of 15 peacebuilding organisations (PBOs). As there was much exchange between the PBOs, the 5 key informants whom I interviewed could speak of first-hand experience at several PBOs. Printed materials, field-observation and web-based data provided further information on the population. I analysed how the field is changing, and how the population is responding to those changes, which is included in chapter 5. As in phase one, the field-level changes are multiple and complex, reflecting economic crisis, socio-economic changes implied in a successful peace process, as well as trends and new emerging issues, such as integration. I interpreted the population responses as deliberate strategic efforts to adapt, as well as unintentional consequences of change. Deliberate change included taking on new projects in line with funders’ interests, as well as adopting managerialism and a more ‘business-like’ approach. Unintended consequences of change included conflict, poor communication and the impression of hypocrisy, when business decisions are seen to undermine the ethos of the organisations.

Mapping the field and population made clear that the field of peacebuilding is changing in ways that were social, political and functional, corresponding with the antecedents of deinstitutionalisation (Oliver, 1992). In paper 4 above, I re-wrote the mapping conference paper so that the focus of the paper was deinstitutionalisation. Mapping became an important element of capturing the deinstitutionalisation process in real-time. Contributions were to institutional theory, and more specifically the structure-agency debate (Heugens & Lander, 2009), shedding light on the deinstitutionalisation process, and the extent to which individual organisations can act in response to major institutional shifts. Findings supported that organisations can respond to institutional shocks through defensive institutional work (Maguire & Hardy, 2009), acting as custodians (Dacin & Dacin, 2008), defending the need for and the value of the outgoing institution. At the end of this phase, I was left with the question, how are individual PBOs managing to survive the seismic shift that is deinstitutionalisation? While there was evidence of defensive institutional work, it was still unclear, both from this research and in the extant literature, the process by which organisations actually respond to the deinstitutionalisation of their mission.
**Phase Three**

In phase three, mission is an important concept for two reasons, one theoretical and the other empirical. Firstly, mission plays an important part of NPO survival (e.g. Fernandez, 2008; Hager, Galaskiewicz, Bielefeld, & Pins, 1996), as discussed in the literature review in chapter 2. Secondly, the empirical context was one in which the missions of the focal organisations seemed to have become redundant due to an ongoing deinstitutionalisation process. Interviewees described changes in the organisational environment and new areas of work that implied they were either accepting, denying or rejecting mission loss. Therefore, I used the term mission loss to describe how deinstitutionalisation, a theoretical term not used by interviewees, was experienced at the level of the organisation. For paper 5, I examined the language used by interviewees to analyse how they were interpreting and responding to mission loss. In the interviews thus far, I had noticed that participants respond to mission loss by saying in various ways, “who are we now?” This questioning corresponds with the concept of organisational identity work, the inter-subjective re-negotiation of organisational identity (e.g. A. D. Brown & Toyoki, 2013; Creed, DeJordy, & Lok, 2010). Thus, organisational identity (OI) became an important theme in the third phase of the research. This section was guided by the research question: What are the identity work processes that take place as the organisation struggles to re-invent itself following mission loss?

I used comparative case-study method (Eisenhardt, 1989) involving two PBOs, Alpha and Beta, in order to understand how individual organisations were responding to, and surviving, mission loss. Alpha was already the focal organisation in paper 1 above, and Alpha and Beta were included in the population in phase two, and interviewees came from both organisations, so I began phase three with a good background on and access into both organisations.

In phase three, social actor and social constructionist perspectives are combined in order to analyse how organisations are interpreting, creating and responding to changes in their Organisational Identity (OI) (Gioia et al., 2010). Chapter 3 explains the ‘Gioia methodology’ for studying OI (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2012), which is a grounded approach to interpretive, qualitative research (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The first two phases had set the scene by framing the empirical context and describing the environmental challenges, focussing on institutionalism as the area of literature most useful for explaining the observed phenomena, employing a functionalist approach.
The third phase, subsequently, brought in organisational perspectives to explore how they were interpreting and responding to those challenges.

I chose two PBOs that I thought represented success and failure in terms of organisational survival and OI reformation. Alpha seemed to be on the verge of closure, while Beta seemed to be growing and expanding. Both organisations are similar in many ways, and are facing similar challenges, according to the interviewees. I conducted 17-18 interviews at each case organisation and transcribed the interviews verbatim. I used NVivo software to support the coding process of the approximately 35 hours of interviews. The findings in Chapters 6 and 7 present these two cases, Alpha and Beta.

Alpha and Beta exhibit different responses to mission loss, reflecting different ways of engaging in identity work. Organisational actors engage in identity work by differentiating between self and other, 'what we are' versus 'what we are not' (Ybema et al., 2009). From the interview data I created a process model that includes catalysts of and responses to mission loss, three different types of differentiation (self-other talk) and outcomes. In chapter 8, I compare and contrast the two cases, Alpha and Beta and discuss the process model of identity work in response to mission loss.

**Phase Four**

The fourth and final phase, explained in chapter 9, consists of bringing together all the parts from the previous phases. In other words, identity work processes are embedded in a context of deinstitutionalisation. Thus the process begins with deinstitutionalisation, which leads to mission loss, which in turn catalyses identity work and various outcomes. Those outcomes of OI work consist of two different patterns of differentiation, and different levels of coherence and consensus around a reformed OI. A process model of OI work in response to deinstitutionalisation illustrates this multi-level analysis.

Chapter 10 outlines the contributions made by this research which are theoretical, methodological, empirical and practical. The four major theoretical contributions are in the areas of deinstitutionalisation, organisational identity, identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation, and organisational survival. When an institution fades in a process of deinstitutionalisation, structures, beliefs, practices and assumptions lose their taken-for-granted legitimacy (Jepperson, 1991; Oliver, 1992; Scott, 2008). In response, organisations engage in defensive, custodial work, defending the outgoing institution,
but also experience an identity threat and engage in organisational identity work. Three minor theoretical contributions are in the areas of peacebuilding, non-profit management and managerialism. Methodological contributions include mapping, the use of qualitative data analysis software, insider-outsider research and operationalising deinstitutionalisation. An empirical contribution is that this study is the first to document and analyse a deinstitutionalisation process in real time. Furthermore, it is the first one to map the field of peacebuilding in Ireland, despite existing mapping projects in political science and non-profit research.

1.2 Positioning and gap: Deinstitutionalisation and organisational identity

Institutional theory and to a lesser extent Organisational Identity theory are mature areas of research. Current institutional research (or neo-institutionalism) was revitalised within organisational theory by the seminal works by Meyer and Rowan (1977), Zucker (1977), and DiMaggio and Powell (1983). This early research emphasised the isomorphic influence of institutions, such that organisations imitate practices, structures and beliefs (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) because they are legitimate (Suchman, 1995), not because they are the most efficient or effective way of organizing (J. W. Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Much of the institutional research in the past few decades has taken an “essentialist” view of institutions, as if they existed objectively, outside of human cognition (Suddaby, Elsbach, Greenwood, Meyer, & Zilber, 2010), and there have been several calls to take a more social constructionist view of institutions (Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Phillips & Lawrence, 2012; Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004; Zietsma & Lawrence, 2010). This PhD research responds to that call in that I take a social constructionist perspective in analysing how PBOs in Ireland are engaging in identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation.

While neo-institutionalism is a fairly mature area of study, deinstitutionalisation has received minimal attention (Dacin & Dacin, 2008; Maguire & Hardy, 2009). Zucker’s experiment in 1977 on cultural persistence suggested that institutions were easier to create than to destroy. However, since then there has been very little empirical research on the fading and dissipating of institutional beliefs, structures and practices, the process of deinstitutionalisation (Jepperson, 1991; Oliver, 1992; Zucker, 1991, p. 105). Existing studies examine changes in employment practices in Japan (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001), the fading of the conglomerate firm (Davis, Diekmann, & Tinsley,
1994), the nouvelle cuisine movement (Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003), the ending of a collegiate bonfire tradition (Dacin & Dacin, 2008), the ending of Paris Salon in the 19th Century (Delacour & Leca, 2011), strategy abandonment (Greve, 1995), and stopping the use of DDT insecticide (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). These studies look at practices, ways of organising, and traditions that fade, impacting on organisational activities. The case of peacebuilding in Ireland is an example of deinstitutionalisation of the mission of a set of organisations, and therefore undermines the very need for and existence of peacebuilding organisations, not just their activities. Yet, these organisations continue to exist, despite the deinstitutionalisation of their mission. This context provides a dramatic example of organisations surviving deinstitutionalisation, and is, therefore, worthy of study in that dramatic cases can more obviously reveal specific organisational phenomena (Yin, 2003).

Organisational Identity (OI) theory is also a mature area of study and much of that research stems from the seminal work by Albert and Whetten (1985), in which they apply the concept of individual identity to the level of the organisation. They describe OI as that which is central, enduring and distinctive, three elements that have been the focus of much of the subsequent research (Gioia, Patvardhan, Hamilton, & Corley, 2013). Since then, while there has been extensive research on OI change (e.g. S. M. Clark, Gioia, Ketchen, & Thomas, 2010; Empson, 2004), threats (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006), and OI conflict in nonprofits (Kreutzer & Jäger, 2011), none of the extant literature addresses a context of mission loss. This thesis addresses that gap by analysing OI threat and ambiguity in nonprofits and the processes by which organisations attempt to change their OI in response to mission loss.

Gioia et al categorise the different ontological perspectives on OI research as social constructionist, social actor, institutional and population ecology (2013). My research contributes to the reconciliation of the social actor and social constructionist approach, seeing the two positions as not only compatible, but mutually constitutive (Gioia et al., 2010). Similarly, recent OI research by institutional scholars also reconciles social actor and social constructionist positions (A. D. Brown, Ainsworth, & Grant, 2012; He & Baruch, 2010; Lok, 2010), following a wider trend in institutional scholarship to bring in a more significant role for agency in an institutional context (Heugens & Lander, 2009; Phillips & Lawrence, 2012; Suddaby et al., 2010). Despite this trend, my research is the first one that examines how organisations respond to deinstitutionalisation through identity work processes.
Similar to deinstitutionalisation, organisational identity work is a relatively neglected area. Several studies have focused on individual identity work (A. D. Brown & Toyoki, 2013; Creed et al., 2010; Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010; Petriglieri & Stein, 2012; Watson, 2008, 2009; Ybema et al., 2009), arguing that individual actors draw on both personal attributes and social settings in order to establish OI for themselves, and in the eyes of others, a process that is particularly apparent at times of identity formation or change. This doctoral study extends the concept of identity work to the level of the organisation. Analysing organisational identity work processes allowed me to explain how identity claims transform over time through different types of differentiation, organisational self-other talk (Ybema et al., 2009). In doing so, I support the position that organisational identity is not static, but dynamic, adapting to changing contexts (Gioia et al., 2013). This research contributes to the literature on OI change and resistance by analysing identity work processes that take place in response to deinstitutionalisation that directly affects organisational mission. Chapter 2 presents the literature on OI and the gap to which this research aims to contribute.

1.3 Importance and relevance

While the seven individual papers listed at the beginning of this chapter offer value in and of themselves, combining them in this doctoral thesis provides added value by bringing together in one conceptual framework deinstitutionalisation and organisational identity work, which is the focus of phase four. A significant contribution of this doctoral research is that deinstitutionalisation catalyses OI ambiguity and threat, which gives rise to organisational identity work. This insight was made possible by first analysing deinstitutionalisation of Irish peacebuilding (Cannon & Donnelly-Cox, 2014) and, OI work in PBOs (Cannon et al., 2013) separately, and then bringing them together in this doctoral thesis, a processes which is described in chapter 9.

In this chapter I have described the research journey, breaking it into four phases. The chapter structure that follows is: (chapter 2) literature review, (chapter 3) methodology, (chapter 4) mapping, (chapter 5) deinstitutionalisation, (chapters 6&7) identity work findings, (chapter 8) identity work discussion, (chapter 9) multi-level analysis, and (chapter 10) contributions. I now turn to the literature review chapter to present existing knowledge on organisational survival, deinstitutionalisation, and organisational identity work.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Academic literature on organisational survival provided a point of departure for understanding and explaining the empirical context in which Peacebuilding Organisations (PBOs) are surviving despite a successful peace process that has undermined their very purpose and mission. This chapter reflects a narrowing in of my research focus from a broad curiosity about organisational survival and challenging environments to a narrower concentration on deinstitutionalisation and organisational identity work processes. The final research question and subsequent contributions reflect the bringing together of these themes. Similarly, this chapter moves through different levels of analysis from a higher level of organisational environments, fields and populations, to individual organisations and their identities. The research contributions and design, in turn, reflect the challenge of how to bring these levels together in a meaningful way, accounting for both structure and agency. In sum, this literature review reflects the journey of the research process over the past five years, starting with organisational survival, homing in on institutional theory to conceptualise the context, and organisational identity to make sense of organisational responses to that context.

Reflected in this chapter is the way that I have treated the literature as a large pool of knowledge on which to draw to help explain the empirical phenomena. In other words, I have started, not with the literature and a theoretical framework, but with a curiosity and interest in a particular phenomenon, similar to Corbin and Strauss' approach to qualitative research (2008). Throughout the research journey I have cycled between the literature and the empirical context in order to develop concepts and theories. At the end of this abductive approach (Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010; Mantere & Ketokivi, 2013), I drew together the key literature and concepts which are explained in this chapter. So, while this chapter on literature precedes the findings, both the theory and empirical context were considered and developed in tandem. Therefore, at the end of this literature review chapter, rather than present a theoretical framework which I can bring to or even test in an empirical context, I summarise what existing literature has to say about the themes that emerged from the empirical context and how they relate to each
other. This review of literature, in combination with the empirical findings is the basis for developing new theory, a contribution which is explained in chapter 10.

The concept of organisational survival has been studied from many different perspectives and in various different application domains, including nonprofit studies (e.g. Lune, 2002; Wollebaek, 2009) and social movements (e.g. Minkoff, 1993; Staggenborg, 1988). In earlier drafts of this thesis I wrote three full chapters devoted to literature on organisational survival. In this final version, I have edited down that detailed coverage of broad literature to a more focussed review of the areas of theory that I found most useful and relevant to the empirical context, including a summary of the main theories and application domains that help explain organisational survival, see Table 2.2. Section 2.2, below, provides a brief overview of what research claims about organisational survival, including ways of framing it that I chose not to include in this research. In this body of literature the different perspectives are so disparate, and the results are so contradictory, that I found it necessary to home in on one theoretical perspective to be able to coherently explain the empirical context. Institutional theory provided explanations that included several levels of analysis, individual, organisational and environmental, that helped to capture the complexity of the empirical phenomenon, and provided a specific definition of the organisational environment with the concept of field. In section 2.3, I provide a review of the literature on institutionalism and how it elucidates organisational survival.

After explaining and exploring the empirical context and ways of conceptualising and approaching it, I then move to the question of how PBOs are responding to that context. I found that the concept of Organisational Identity (OI) was most germane to the data that was emerging. Furthermore, institutionalists use the concept of identity to explain how institutional phenomena translate to the individual and organisational levels (e.g. Lok, 2010). Therefore, this research primarily contributes to the literature on organisational identity processes in responses to institutional phenomena. Section 2.4, below, provides an overview of the OI literature, how it relates to institutionalism, and the gap to which this research contributes. Finally, section 2.5 presents some conclusions from this review of literature and lays out the conceptual framework that will enable me to explore and explain a surprising example of organisational survival.
2.2 Organisational Survival

Organisational scholars have explored the concept of survival from several different theoretical perspectives, and in many different contexts, which span the full spectrum from environmental determinism to voluntaristic individual agency. At the deterministic, or structural, end of the spectrum, population ecologists focus on populations of organisations and conduct quantitative studies on mortality rates (Hannan & Freeman, 1977, 1989). Population studies analyse organisational birth and death rates by analysing a few variables at a time such as: size, age, population density, niche width and strategy (Singh & Lumsden, 1990). Ecology studies provide a long list of possible factors influencing survival, even sometimes including managers’ efforts to adapt (Boeker, 1991; Haveman, 1993), which provides some scope for individual agency. The extant research does not provide insight into organisational responses to environmental threats and, for the most part, negates the role of individual agency in the survival process. In an equally deterministic and biological approach, life cycle theorists explain organisational survival and demise by considering the temporal aspects of organisational birth, growth, decline and death as a natural trajectory (Kimberly & Miles, 1980; Lester, Parnell, & Carraher, 2003; Whetten, 1987). Some have called for more balance between agency and structure in understanding survival: “A more realistic and comprehensive account of organisational survival is achieved by combining insights from both organisational ecology and more agency-oriented perspectives” (Wollebaek, 2009, p. 269). My research contributes to the literature by considering both structure (environmental factors) and agency (individual/organisational factors) in explaining the process of organisational survival.

The few existing empirical studies that are explicitly about the survival of nonprofit organisations (NPOs) (e.g. Angell, 2008; Golensky & Mulder, 2006; Hager, Galaskiewicz, & Larson, 2004; Lune, 2002; Minkoff, 1993; Mulroy & Tamburo, 2004; Walker & McCarthy, 2010; Wollebaek, 2009) draw on several areas of literature, primarily relying on theories of neo-institutionalism, population ecology and resource dependency. While these studies highlight survival as an interesting and distinctive phenomenon in NPOs, what is missing is an explanation of the process of survival and a clear conceptualisation of the organisational environment to elucidate why NPOs are so tenacious (Wollebaek, 2009) even in the face of serious external threats to their existence (Lune, 2002; Minkoff, 1993). From the resource dependency perspective, inter-organisational relationships enable NPOs to attract financial resources and thus
survive (L. Brown & Trout, 2004; Guo & Acar, 2005; Tsasis, 2009). The extant studies on NPO survival elaborate on many key moderators – individual, organisational and environmental - that influence survival, often establishing quantitatively how those factors impact the hazard rate of failure in a group of organisations (e.g. Hager et al., 1996; Minkoff, 1999). What is not clear is how numerous variables interact and influence each other over time to enable NPOs to attract the symbolic, financial and human resources they need to survive environmental threats. Furthermore, most of the extant NPO survival studies do not adequately conceptualise or explain those environmental threats.

Third sector literature on organisational survival illustrates the importance of the values, beliefs and mission of an organisation. For example, a clash of values can lead to organisational closure (Twersky & Lanzerotti, 1999); processes of professionalisation and formalisation, while they enhance organisational survival, can lead to compromising the mission (Lune, 2002); and, mission completion can lead to organisational closure (Fernandez, 2008; Hager et al., 1996). The concept of an organisation’s expressive role - the values, beliefs and mission, what the organisation stands for, including the reason organisational actors come together in the first place (Frumkin, 2002) - seems to be an important part of NPO survival. Survival and closure depend upon the organisation’s ability to pursue a mission that is relevant to and valued by the community it serves (Frumkin, 2002, p. 125). When an NPO embodies and expresses values to which communities can relate it is more likely to attract the human and financial resources it needs to survive from those communities.

Several areas of literature point to the important role of values and mission for organisational survival. In social movement literature the mere existence of organisations reflects that civil society is mobilising to support a cause, and as such reflects success (Minkoff, 1993). Similarly, from a civil society perspective, the existence of community based organisations in an economically disadvantaged neighbourhood is used as a measure of the health of civil society (Walker & McCarthy, 2010). Instead of seeing these studies as erroneously conflating survival and success, the expressive role shows how mere existence can be equivalent to success for an expressive organisation (D. E. Mason, 1995). From the population ecology perspective, magazine publishers with stronger ideological bases survived for longer than others (Haveman & Khaire, 2004). In a study of hospitals, ideological orientations influences how organisations respond to sudden environmental change giving them a 'comparative
advantage’ by helping them to fit better with their environments (A. D. Meyer, 1982, p. 535). A study on academic institutions shows that the survival advantage for organisations with a strong expressive role is that “as participants become ideologues, their common definition becomes a foundation for trust and for extreme loyalty. Such bonds give the organisation a competitive edge” (B. R. Clark, 1972, p. 183). Thus a strong expressive role generates commitment from organisational members. Similarly, a high level of solidarity, when organisational stakeholders coalesce based on shared knowledge, trust and morals (Douglas, 1987), contributes to organisational survival (Donnelly-Cox, 2001). The expressive role is an important part of survival in a range of organisations and from various theoretical perspectives.

Nonprofit management literature advises that efficiency and effectiveness, using tools like strategic planning, are the key to survival, a rational functional approach (Anheier, 2005; O’Neill, 1998). There is extensive professional management literature describing what organisational leaders should do in order to ensure organisational success and survival (e.g. Bennet & Bennet, 2004; Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1988), and specifically for nonprofits (Gibelman & Gelman, 2001; Herman & Renz, 2008; Mordaunt & Cornforth, 2004). Much of this professional advice literature, sometimes under the rubric of leadership, is focussed on the individual practitioner and thus lies outside the realm of organisational studies (Never, 2011). I am including in this thesis the literature that speaks primarily to academic audiences.

Academic NPO management literature explains how organisations and managers effectively interact with and manage the organisational environment (e.g. Never, 2011; Schmid, 2004), such as through stakeholder analysis (Tschirhart & Knueve, 2000) or environmental scanning and analysis (Mulroy & Tamburo, 2004). Wollebaek concludes that extroverted managers are more likely to lead their organisations to survival and success (2009). This brief review shows that even the literature on the role of the individual manager emphasises the importance of the environment for organisational success and survival.

Extant literature shows that the expressive role is important to survival, but also that efficiency and effectiveness ensure survival. For example, the instrumental role of an organisation, contrasts with the expressive role, and refers to the pursuit of social purposes when value can be assessed in the measurable and concrete outputs of the organisation (Frumkin, 2002, p. 23). An interesting dynamic around the expressive role is that it is often set in contrast to the instrumental role, i.e. efficiency and effectiveness,
which can take place at the expense of organisational values, as was the case in Lune’s study (2002). Professionalisation is often described as becoming more efficient and effective, or more “business-like” (Dart, 2004) or as employing a managerialist discourse (Maier & Meyer, 2011), which is promoted as beneficial to organisational survival from a rational-functional perspective. While a study of NPO governance found five distinct discourses, the managerialist one, promoting instrumental rationality, is strongly normative and hegemonic dominating the other discourses (Maier & Meyer, 2011, p. 738). In another study, being “business-like” helped an NPO gain legitimacy and therefore conferred survival advantages, but altered the programme work (Dart, 2004). That is not to say that commercial goals clashed with prosocial goals, but only some prosocial goals were compatible with a business-like approach, while others were not. "Business goals may be compatible with only a specific and narrow cluster of traditionally understood nonprofit organizing values" (Dart, 2004, p. 303). When services became more business-like they were completely transformed. Commercial goals improved prosocial goals when the programmes included volume, such as number of people served, but they clashed with prosocial goals such as reaching more needy and harder to reach beneficiaries (2004, p. 305). Both Lune and Dart’s empirical research has shown that while professionalism may increase organisational survival prospects, the result may be detrimental to beneficiaries.

Empirical research on organisational survival and closure in the third sector literature presents several examples of surprising results, that run counter to expectations (Carney, Dundon, & Ní Léime, 2012; Edwards & Marullo, 1995; Fernandez, 2008; Hager, 1999; Hager et al., 1996, 2004; Lune, 2002; Walker & McCarthy, 2010). NPOs are surprisingly tenacious (Wollebaek, 2009), surviving against all odds (Angell, 2008; Lune, 2002), when there are minimal resources to support them (Carney et al., 2012; Walker & McCarthy, 2010), and even after they have completed their mission (Sills, 1957; Staggenborg, 1988). This extant research shows that organisational survival is a distinctive phenomenon in NPOs and is contingent on a complex mix of interacting factors. Furthermore, the literature illustrates the importance and complexity of concepts related to the process of survival: professionalisation and commitment to values and mission.

What stands out from this review of organisational survival literature is the diversity of perspectives and ontological assumptions, such that survival is conceptualised in very different ways depending on the theoretical framing of the unit of analysis under
consideration. Table 2.2 provides an overview of the different theoretical underpinnings of survival, and the various application domains.

**Table 2.2. Literature on organisational survival**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Area of literature</strong></th>
<th><strong>Primary focus</strong></th>
<th><strong>Understanding of survival</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Ecology</td>
<td>Environment: Population, niche</td>
<td>Selection process: changes in the niche cause deaths in the population. In general, larger and older organisations in low-density niches are most likely to survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource dependency</td>
<td>Environment: Resources and the organisations that supply them</td>
<td>Maintaining relationships with resource dependencies is key to survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-institutionalism</td>
<td>Environment: Field and institution</td>
<td>Institutions provide stability. Isomorphic organisations ‘fit’ their environments and are more likely to survive. Embeddedness and legitimacy increase survival chances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life cycle</td>
<td>Organisation: temporal phases</td>
<td>Organisations, like all living organisms, pass through various phases, birth, growth, decline and turnaround, and eventually die.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social movements</td>
<td>Environment: Movement</td>
<td>Professionalisation and formalisation increase survival, but weaken the organisation’s ability to effect environmental change. Organisations can find creative ways to gain legitimacy, survive and effect social change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third sector studies</td>
<td>Combination of individual, organisational and environmental factors; universe of NPOs in a specific geographic location</td>
<td>Combines the above approaches. Mission plays an important role in survival; when survival becomes the mission, decline is inevitable; when the mission is accomplished, some NPOs close down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>Individual manager</td>
<td>Managers who pursue efficiency and effectiveness will lead organisations that survive and succeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the literature, organisational survival can be understood as the persistence over time of formal organisations in response to external threat. The research reviewed above illustrates that the organisational environment is a key factor in conceptualising survival, but that in much of the research the environment is described in general terms, as for example, "hostile" (Lune, 2002), rather than clearly defined and mapped. This doctoral research aims to contribute to the extant literature by, firstly, providing a clearer conceptualisation and identification of the organisational environment, and, secondly, by elucidating the identity work processes that take place in response to a survival threat.

Taken as a whole, the survival literature is highly disparate, with conflicting explanations of survival, very different understandings of relevance of individual agency, and relies on different levels of analysis. Of the four different theoretical frameworks listed in Table 2.2, I have chosen neo-institutionalism as the most useful and interesting way to frame the research context. In the next section, I turn to institutional theory to gain clarity on defining organisational environments and to shed further light on how organisations survive changing contexts.

2.3 Institutionalism

The theoretical perspective that I found most useful and relevant for explaining both the empirical context and organisational survival was neo-institutionalism, and within that, deinstitutionalisation. Neo-institutional theory not only provides an explanation of organisational survival, but also provides concepts that enable researchers to explore change processes at different levels of analysis: individual manager, organisation, organisational field and institution. Concepts of legitimacy and isomorphism help explain how organisations survive, and the concept of organisational field provides a conceptualisation of the environment from an organisational perspective. However, this theoretical perspective, like the others, falls short of providing a clear definition of survival.

Like resource dependency and population ecology, neo-institutionalism is an open systems theory and considers the organisation in the context of its environment (Scott & Davis, 2007). The basic claim of institutional theory is that organisations are culturally constituted (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006). In other words, institutionalism prioritises the symbolic, the cognitive and normative elements of organisational life (Bourdieu,
Institutionalists understand organisational survival to be dependent on the extent to which an organisation corresponds with cognitive, structural and political elements in its environment (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; J. W. Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; Scott, 2008). Institutions have a stabilising effect on organisations, perhaps best evidenced by the phenomenon of isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Given all the possible ways of organising, similar-purpose organisations often look very similar to each other, i.e. display isomorphism. DiMaggio and Powell describe regulative, normative and cognitive isomorphic pressures reflecting the influences of laws and policies, societal prescriptions and expectations on structures and behaviours of organisations. When organisations conform to isomorphic pressures, they have a survival advantage (1983).

Institutions confer stability on organisations in part due to the fact that institutions are durable: they are fairly resistant to change (Jepperson, 1991) and they are reproduced and maintained across generations (Zucker, 1977). Richard Scott defines institutions as follows: "Institutions are comprised of regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life" (2008, p. 48). This emphasis on the stabilising influence of institutions provides a relevant frame for understanding organisational survival. However, what happens when these stabilising structures shift or even dissipate? This research contributes to the institutional literature by examining how organisations respond to institutional decline. I return to the concept of deinstitutionalisation below.

Neo-institutionalism provides the key concept of legitimacy, a symbolic resource vital to organisational survival. When organisations conform to isomorphic pressures, they are congruent with their environments and gain taken-for-granted legitimacy that confers a survival advantage (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Suchman, 1995). According to Suchman's definition: "Legitimacy is a generalised perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs and definitions." (1995, p.574) Conforming to institutional rules, norms and expectations confers legitimacy, thus enhancing chances of survival (J. W. Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Singh, Tucker, & House, 1986). When the political and social context shifts, changing the institutional rules, organisations risk losing their legitimacy, therefore increasing their chances of demise (Minkoff & Powell, 2006; Suchman, 1995). The mere fact of trying to increase legitimacy confers survival advantage on organisations (Walker and
McCarthy 2010), supporting the idea that plans are symbolic (Clarke & Perrow, 1996); being seen to be doing something about an issue, regardless of the value of what you are actually doing, has benefits. He and Baruch describe how firms that narrated their organisational identity multiple times regained legitimacy after environmental change (2010). Their study shows how two concepts, legitimacy and identity, interrelate at different levels (generic, individual, institutional and organisational) as important parts of the process of adaptation and survival. Despite these advances in understanding the importance of legitimacy in institutional and organisational stability, it is still not clear how organisations can respond when taken-for-granted legitimacy, not only is challenged, but the bases of legitimacy actually fade away, such as in the process of deinstitutionalisation (Oliver, 1992).

Early neo-institutional research has primarily focused on institutional formation and development, emphasising the stabilising effect that institutions have on organisations. Institutionalism, however, is not equivalent to stagnation and usefully informs analyses of change (Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009; Dacin, Goodstein, & Scott, 2002; Greenwood & Hinings, 1993, 1996; Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Hardy & Maguire, 2010; Leblebici, Salancik, Copay, & King, 1991; Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004). Institutional change, including deinstitutionalisation, is conceptualised as a process, because it includes sources of and responses to change over time at multiple interacting levels of analysis (Dacin et al., 2002, pp. 45–6; Oliver, 1992). Furthermore, process is the interaction between organisational context and action that includes pressures towards radical change as well as pressures towards inertia and stability (Greenwood & Hinings, 1993, 1996). Institutions can change by dissipating and disappearing over time due to deinstitutionalisation, a process of shifting regulative, normative and cultural factors, (Scott, 2008, p. 196), which is a neglected area of research (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001; Dacin & Dacin, 2008; Dacin et al., 2002; Oliver, 1992; Scott, 2008). A shorter version of the review of literature on deinstitutionalisation is included in a journal article (Cannon & Donnelly-Cox, 2014).

2.3.1 Deinstitutionalisation

Deinstitutionalisation within an organisational field is “the process by which the legitimacy of an established or institutionalized organisational practice erodes or discontinues” (Oliver, 1992, p. 564). This involves multiple factors over a long period of time, often including a field configuring event (Delacour & Leca, 2011).
Deinstitutionalisation can explain why organisations abandon legitimated or institutionalised practices (Oliver, 1992). Oliver includes both agency and structure in her conception: "the failure of organisations to accept what was once a shared understanding of legitimate organisational conduct or by a discontinuity in the willingness or ability of organisations to take for granted and continually re-create an institutionalized organisational activity" (1992, p. 564). From an agency-oriented perspective, deinstitutionalisation is the deliberate abandonment of previously institutionalised practices (Davis et al., 1994) and strategies (Greve, 1995) in an organisational population. From a structural angle, deinstitutionalisation takes place when taken-for-granted legitimacy erodes at the field-level, pressurising organisations to adapt (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001). Wright and Zammuto combine agency and structure such that society-level change creates resource pressures on organisations causing central, intermediary and peripheral field actors to adapt through interactions over time (2013). The more organisations in a population that reject previously institutionalised practices, the more other organisations are also willing to take the risk of other "illegitimate" activities, thus feeding the process of deinstitutionalisation (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001). “Illegitimate actions” are risky as they are not part of the legitimated set of actions, beliefs and values of the existing institution (Kraatz & Zajac, 1996). Few empirical studies of deinstitutionalisation are available to clarify how and why organisations will abandon institutionalised practices, thus losing legitimacy and support, and risk undertaking illegitimate practices. These studies imply changes for organisations, but don’t actually threaten its existence. My research provides an example of deinstitutionalisation that threatens the very need for the focal organisations.

There are some other examples of institutional change in the literature that are similar to deinstitutionalisation without being labelled as such, but that provide examples of field-level threats that pose survival challenges for the organisations. For example, when the entire field is challenged by institutional shifts, in the case of building societies during demutualisation, organisations re-narrate their identities in order to retain legitimacy (He & Baruch, 2010). In the case of railway companies following a series of fatal accidents and deception, firms that are similar to the stricken firm are more likely to engage in field-level defensive efforts (Desai, 2011). So, while it is evident that firms engage in defensive institutional work (Maguire & Hardy, 2009), even when not directly afflicted by crisis (Desai, 2011), it is not clear whether firms could successfully
engage in defensive institutional work when their very mission is threatened by deinstitutionalisation.

Oliver identifies the antecedents of deinstitutionalisation as political, functional and social, originating from the environment or from the organisation itself (1992). Political factors refer to power relations and include organisational factors such as performance crises and environmental factors such as changing external dependencies. Functional pressures refer to the instrumentality of practices and include changing economic utility and emerging events and data. Social pressures involve loss of consensus around meanings and interpretations and include increasing social fragmentation and changing rules and values (1992, p. 567-8). Furthermore, entropic pressures accelerate deinstitutionalisation, whereas organisational inertia impedes it (1992).

Organisational inertia is overcome when a new set of practices, beliefs and patterns of action replace old ones, in the process of re-institutionalisation (Jepperson, 1991; Scott, 2008). Empirical examples demonstrate how one institution disappears when replaced by another (Rao et al., 2003), how parts of a declining institution can morph into something else, rather than completely disappear (Dacin and Dacin 2008), and how one type of firm can be replaced by another (Davis et al., 1994). These studies show how one institution fades when it is replaced by another, but do not explain how the deinstitutionalisation process can take place without being replaced by a new institution. These are important starting points. In the case of PBOs, a set of practices and beliefs is eroding, but not being replaced by an obvious alternative. In the context of this institutional change that undermines the very raison d'être of PBOs, how can these organisations respond? The question in this research setting goes to the heart of the agency-structure divide.

Explanations of institutional change have been divided between structure and agency (Heugens & Lander, 2009; Suddaby, 2010). Structural explanations emphasise isomorphism. Institutional pressures lead to homogeneity of form, resulting in increased legitimacy regardless of the functional benefits of adopting that form (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Agency approaches look at how organisations’ responses to institutional contexts vary from passive acquiescence to proactive manipulation (Oliver, 1991). Recent research has reconciled this divide by providing explanations of institutional change that account for both structure and agency (Alexander, 1998; Binder, 2007; S. Dixon & Day, 2010; Donnelly-Cox & Cannon, 2010a; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Mellahi & Wilkinson, 2004; Mone, McKinley, & Barker, 1998; Wollebaek, 2009).
None of these studies look at the process of deinstitutionalisation, whether and how organisations are able to influence or respond to institutional decline. The context of peacebuilding, therefore, provides a context for exploring the extent to which organisations are able to respond to deinstitutionalisation.

Empirical research shows that organisations can respond at least defensively to institutional decline. Internal actors engage in "defensive institutional work" - intentional attempts to defend existing institutional practices (Desai, 2011; Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2009; Maguire & Hardy, 2009) that can be directed at external and internal threats (Lefsrud & Meyer, 2012). Furthermore, Dacin and Dacin describe how traditions are sustained by "custodians" who defend their value in the face of threat (2008). These studies show how institutions resist change and how actors can intentionally prevent change in response to deinstitutionalisation (Dacin & Dacin, 2008; Maguire & Hardy, 2009). Extant studies, however, focus on traditions (Dacin & Dacin, 2008) and practices (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001; Maguire & Hardy, 2009) without examining how formal organisations can cope with such threats. This research contributes to the literature by providing an example of how organisations respond when deinstitutionalisation directly relates to their mission. Considering how important the expressive role, including mission and values, is to organisational survival (Frumkin, 2002), the case of PBOs in Ireland provides an extreme case of organisational survival, when the very mission of PBOs is undermined by deinstitutionalisation and loss of taken-for-granted legitimacy.

In order to further explore how organisations can respond to the deinstitutionalisation of their mission, I turn to the organisational identity literature.

2.4 Organisational Identity

In trying to address the distance between structural explanations of organisational change, such as institutionalism, and agency-based explanations of change, researchers have brought together concepts from institutionalism and organisational identity (OI) in a variety of ways (Fox-Wolfgramm, Boal, & Hunt, 1998; Gioia et al., 2013; Glynn & Abzug, 2002; Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011; He & Baruch, 2010; Lok, 2010; Pedersen & Dobbin, 2006). Institutionalists have used the concept of OI to reconcile the opposing forces of conformity (isomorphic influence of institutions) and uniqueness (the distinctive features of identity) (Deephouse, 1999;
Pedersen & Dobbin, 2006). Multiple organisational identities are seen as evidence of institutional change (R. E. Meyer, 2008, pp. 522–523; Rao et al., 2003). Researchers explain how OI is a filter for organisational actors to interpret and negotiate multiple, changing and sometimes conflicting institutional logics (Creed et al., 2010; Gioia et al., 2013; Greenwood et al., 2011; Lok, 2010). Similarly in this doctoral research, the concept of OI helps explain how organisations interpret and respond to institutional decline. Specifically, how are PBOs responding to deinstitutionalisation of their mission, or, from an organisational perspective, mission loss? A shorter version of this literature review on OI is included in a conference paper (Cannon et al., 2013).

Albert and Whetten’s (1985) idea of transferring the concept of “self” from the individual to organisations has received considerable attention in research so far. Organisational Identity (OI) refers to the organisational characteristics, which its members believe are central, distinctive and enduring (Albert & Whetten, 1985). These three pillars of identity have guided much of the subsequent research. The pillar most relevant to this doctoral research is the enduring characteristic of OI. In order to investigate how organisations are responding to and surviving institutional change, I focus on how OI is affected by that change. How does OI endure over time considering the severity and type of change?

The formerly divided landscape of OI research into a social constructionist view emphasizing members’ negotiations of shared meanings (Gioia et al., 2010; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006) and a social actor perspective perceiving OI as a property of the organisation itself as an entity (Corley et al., 2006; Whetten & Mackey, 2002) has been reconciled by Gioia et al portraying them as mutually constitutive (Gioia et al., 2010). Institutionalist approaches to OI have also reconciled the division between social actor and social constructionist approaches (Gioia et al., 2013; Greenwood et al., 2011). Social constructionists tend to support the claim that OI is dynamic, while social actor theorists argue for the enduring nature of OI (Gioia et al., 2013). Combining social actor and social constructionist approaches allows for consideration of organisational members’ interpretive and discursive identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation of mission, an external, structural factor.

The concept of OI has been applied to research on NPOs in various ways (Glynn, 2000; Golden-Biddle & Rao, 1997; Kreutzer & Jäger, 2011; Young, 2001a, 2001b). Much of this research shows conflict related to OI, often due to contested identity claims (Kreutzer & Jäger, 2011) stemming from the inherent plurivocity of NPOs, which often
have multiple stakeholders with ambiguous power relations (Denis, Langley, & Rouleau, 2007; Glynn, 2000; Golden-Biddle & Rao, 1997). However, OI research in nonprofits has not yet explored how potentially conflicting identity claims are mobilised or rejected in processes of organisational identity work.

2.4.1 Organisational identity work

At the individual level, identity work comprises processes through which organisational members seek to establish OI in their own estimation and in the eyes of others (Alvesson et al., 2008; A. D. Brown & Toyoki, 2013) and draw on resources from the social settings to make identity claims (Watson, 2008, 2009). At the organisational level, therefore, identity work enables organisations to shape relatively coherent, distinctive and enduring notions of their “organisational self”. Through a process of differentiation, or “self-other talk,” organisational members make distinctions to assert and reject possible identity claims in an attempt to weave together a coherent narrative of the organisation’s identity over time (Ybema et al., 2009, pp. 306-7). Organisational identity work serves as a means to collectively negotiate the values of an organisation, the claims organisational members make on its behalf, and the actions they would or would not engage in (Gioia et al., 2010). This doctoral research contributes to the current understanding of organisational identity with an analysis of self-other talk showing how organisational actors make sense of their organisations’ identity after it has been fundamentally threatened by mission loss.

The process of inter-subjective identity work has been identified as a key component in the construction of OI (Clegg, Rhodes, & Kornberger, 2007; Coupland & Brown, 2004; Gioia et al., 2010) and has been found to be especially apparent when OI is ambiguous (Ashforth & Mael, 1996). Identity work is pivotal to cope with “identity ambiguity” (Corley & Gioia, 2004) and to attain legitimacy (Clegg et al., 2007) in organisations. Existing studies provide valuable insights into OI change (S. M. Clark et al., 2010; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Fiol, 2002; Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006; Reger, Gustafson, Demarie, & Mullane, 1994), and how OI change is catalysed by attempts to adapt to changes in the organisational environment (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). Operating from the premise that OI is primarily defined by leaders or founders, these studies do not sufficiently account for how identity is also socially constructed, and thus continuously re-negotiated, between a wider range of organisational actors. In this study, I analyse how organisational staff,
board members and other volunteers describe, define and negotiate OI, thus including several perspectives capturing multiple identity claims and how they interact.

Extant literature investigates how organisations react to identity threats (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Such threats pose "a symbolic and sensemaking dilemma for organization members" (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). Focusing on identity threats, these studies fall short of analysing the OI dynamics that occur if identity is not only threatened by an external event but the very purpose of the organisation is undermined by changes in its organisational environment, e.g. the "achievement" of its mission.

2.4.2 Mission loss and organisational identity

As reviewed in section 2.2 on organisational survival, the few existing explanations of mission completion in NPOs reflect the importance of mission to organisational survival, but do not suggest how mission loss might influence OI. The limited third sector literature on mission accomplishment approaches it either as a way of conceptualising organisational change in relation to the environment (Minkoff & Powell, 2006), or as a posthumous explanation for demise (Fernandez, 2008; Hager et al., 1996). Empirical research shows that NPOs alter their missions to changing circumstances in order to survive (Minkoff, 1999; Minkoff & Powell, 2006; Mulroy & Tamburo, 2004; Powell & Friedkin, 1987; Sills, 1957; Zald, 1970). Alternatively, when mission is ignored, an organisation can persist despite failing to fulfil its stated purpose (Messinger, 1955). Similarly, when an organisation does not deliver its stated mission, but continues to exist, it becomes a "permanent failure" (M. W. Meyer & Zucker, 1989), a phenomenon observed in organisations such as NPOs where stakeholders have multiple motives and interests for keeping the organisation alive (Seibel, 1996). Despite these advances, to date it remains unclear how mission loss actually influences OI. How would an organisation transform an out-dated mission, ignore a defunct mission or decide that its mission is complete? And how would these responses influence OI? These questions address the issue of whether OI is enduring or dynamic.
2.5 Conclusion

Within an open system understanding of organisations (Scott & Davis, 2007), I am taking a pragmatic and functional approach to how organisations engage in OI work processes in response to deinstitutionalisation. I have outlined a conceptual framework in this chapter that includes concepts of organisational survival, deinstitutionalisation, OI, process and mission loss. As explained in the beginning of this chapter, this framework brings together multiple levels of analysis, institution, field, population and organisation. These different levels are brought together in the research question, which relates to how individual organisations can respond to institutional level change. This research contributes to the growing area of embedded agency (e.g. Phillips & Lawrence, 2012), where individual actors and organisations have a significant role in higher level processes, such as institutional change.

In moving through the literature, I found that the concept of organisational survival is quite broad, and is covered by a disparate set of theories. In order to meaningfully look at organisational survival, it was necessary to home in on one of these theories, neo-institutionalism. The institutional literature has provided some important concepts for framing the empirical context, particularly deinstitutionalisation, the fading of a set of practices, beliefs and structures. Thus it is important for this research to establish how and why Irish peacebuilding provides an example of deinstitutionalisation, which is explained in chapter 5.

The literature reviewed above suggests that there is very little information about the process of deinstitutionalisation and how organisations respond. In chapter 4, I identify the population and field of peacebuilding, which I describe as a “hidden landscape” as it has not been mapped before. Subsequently, in chapter 5, I examine population responses to an on-going process of deinstitutionalisation, which provides interesting insight on the agency-structure divide, contributing to knowledge on how institutions change. I analyse the extent to which organisations can act to determine their own fate in the context of significant external threats from institutional change. The extant literature purports that organisations defend outgoing institutions (Dacin & Dacin, 2008; Maguire & Hardy, 2009), but it is not clear what are the actual processes that take place when organisations are defending those institutions, or adapting to deinstitutionalisation.
In order to analyse organisational responses to institutional changes, I turned to OI theory. In chapters 6-8 I conduct an OI study of how organisations engage in identity work in response to mission loss. Deinstitutionalisation, which is an institutional-level theoretical term outside the experience of organisational actors, translated to mission loss on the organisational level. I analyse whether and how organisations can actually re-form their OI in response to mission loss. Considering that OI scholars have mostly argued that identity is that which is "enduring" (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Schultz & Hernes, 2013), the concept of re-forming OI is quite a radical one. In chapter 9, I return to the concept of deinstitutionalisation and propose a process model for identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation.

Bringing together the various concepts, the research question is: what are the identity work processes that take place when organisations face deinstitutionalisation of their mission? Having explained the conceptual framework for this question, the next chapter presents the methodology: how I addressed the research question.
Chapter 3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology employed in phase two, three and four of this interpretive, qualitative research: mapping the field and population, documenting deinstitutionalisation, analysing identity work processes, and embedding OI work in a context of deinstitutionalisation. Phase one was the preparatory work for this research, and contributed to exploring the research context as well as the survival literature, as explained in chapter 1. Phase two includes mapping the field and population of peacebuilding organisations (chapter 4), and documenting deinstitutionalisation (chapter 5). These chapters focus on a higher level of analysis, the organisational population and field, and explore the field of peacebuilding, its composition, and how is it changing. Phase three consists of chapters 6, 7 and 8, analysing identity work in response to mission loss. These chapters focus on the individual organisation, which is an appropriate level of analysis for exploring how individual PBOs are responding to deinstitutionalisation. I ask the question of how PBOs are responding to mission loss. Moving between levels of analysis requires re-casting deinstitutionalisation of mission, which takes places at the level of the institution, as mission loss, which is how this institutional change is experienced at the level of the organisation, as became evident in the findings. The data guided the research design, in that I found that PBOs were engaging in identity work, so phase three of the research evolved into an Organisational Identity study. A comparative case study (Eisenhardt, 1989) provides an in-depth exploration of how two organisations are engaging in identity work, and enables cross-case comparison, which increases the transferability of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Phase four involved returning to the institutional level and embedding the OI study in a context of deinstitutionalisation.

In this chapter, I explain the research design and how it fits with the research question, section 3.2. I include information about the ethical considerations guiding this research in section 3.3. I describe the research setting and why it is appropriate, section 3.4. I then present the methodology used for mapping the field and population (section 3.5), documenting deinstitutionalisation (section 3.6), and analysing OI (section 3.7).
conclude by describing how I bring the different phases of this research together by embedding OI in a context of deinstitutionalisation (section 3.8).

3.2 Research design

The research design, in order to fit the research question on identity work processes in response to deinstitutionalisation, has to be able to link multiple levels of analysis in a complex change process with ambiguous boundaries. The effects of higher order variables, such as field-level shifts, on organisational-level phenomena, such as identity re-formation, vary over time, presenting a significant challenge for researchers (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006, p. 200). The main difficulty in process research is how to link particular contextual causation with organisational response across levels (Dansereau, Yammarino, & Kohles, 1999; Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013; Pettigrew, 1997; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). Schneiberg and Clemens recommend combining multiple strategies for capturing how institutions influence organisations over time (2006). I employ multiple strategies by dividing the research into separate phases, each with different methodological tools. Specifically, in phase two, I mapped the organisations that constituted the field and population of peacebuilding, by compiling lists and collecting information on how they describe their work activities, purpose and mission. In order to understand field level changes and organisational responses I relied on ethnographic data, which “draws upon the writer’s close observation of and involvement with people in a particular social setting and relates the words spoken and the practices observed or experienced to the overall cultural framework within which they occurred” (Watson, 2012, p. 16). Therefore, ethnographic studies are a particularly effective way of gathering and analysing data across levels. In phase three, I conducted a comparative case study of two peacebuilding organisations and how they are responding to mission loss, coming social actor and social constructionist approaches. In phase four, I conducted conceptual work of combining the levels as ‘nested’ (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006) processes of identity work and deinstitutionalisation. Thus, each of these different phases relied on a different method to answer distinct research questions, as elaborated in chapter 1.

Case studies are appropriate for processual studies because they capture the complexity of multiple perspective enabling the researcher to analyse and re-create the process, which is made up of numerous stories, rather than a monolithic, carved-in-stone,
account (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991; Fox-Wolfgramm, 1997; Hinings, 1997). Case studies are frequently used to capture multi-dimensional change over time, specifically longitudinal case studies (Aaboen, Dubois, & Lind, 2012; Dansereau et al., 1999; Pettigrew, 1997; Townley, 2002), and historical case studies (Leblebici et al., 1991; Wright & Zammuto, 2013). Researchers using these approaches are able to analyse multiple cycles or distinct periods of change. These types of case studies emphasise time, both constructed and chronological, which is appropriate for processual studies (Pettigrew, 1997; Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006). Another approach is comparative case study to analyse heterogeneity in institutional processes (Maguire & Hardy, 2013), in particular on how they impact organisational actors (Barley, 1986; Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Clemens, 1997). In other words, because institutional change processes effect different organisations or actors in different ways, including two contrasting cases captures a range of ways in which institutions influence or are expressed by organisations. I have chosen to prioritise multiple levels of analysis and the dynamics between them over a shorter time period, rather than to prioritise time, and sequences or phases of time, consistent with many institutional and OI studies (e.g. Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Gioia et al., 2010). Therefore, this research says more about complex multi-level nested processes during one period of time, rather than how that process recurs or cycles over a longer period of time. That decision was also partially due to practical time constraints of a PhD programme.

3.3 Ethical considerations

In this section, I identify several relevant ethical issues and how they were dealt with in the research design. Consistent with Trinity College Dublin’s Good Research Practice (“Policy on Good Research Practice,” 2009), as well as general social science ethical principles, and in particular management research ethical guidelines (Bell & Bryman, 2007), this research follows the ethical standards regarding individuals and organisations including attempts to avoid any potential harm by anonymising research subjects, obtaining informed consent, storing data safely, and stating affiliation bias and power relations.

Specific attempts were made during the research to reduce any possible harm on research subjects, including individuals and organisations. Firstly, I began research into Alpha and Beta case organisations by obtaining permission from the CEOs, so as not to
undermine the internal power structures in the organisations. Secondly, I obtained informed consent by requesting interviews with staff and volunteers by email, sending a two-page summary of the research themes, aims and methods, and giving them time to consider the request and the possibility to decline the interview. Once an individual had agreed to an interview I obtained a signed copy of an “Interview Consent Form,” which they had time to read before the interview. This consent form is included in Appendix 2 and outlines the confidentiality agreement and data storage procedures. Interview transcripts and audio files are all kept in a password protected folder, in password protected computers. Interviewees’ names and details were coded and removed from transcripts, and the coding key was stored separately from the transcript files.

While I have anonymised Alpha and Beta and all participants, it would not be hard for someone to search the population of 15 PBOs and determine the identities of Alpha and Beta. I mentioned this to all research participants, so they were aware of the possibility that the identity of their organisation could be revealed. Furthermore, the findings in general show that Beta is succeeding at re-orienting around a new direction, while Alpha is struggling to adapt to a post-peace-process context. Potentially, this finding could cast Alpha in a negative light. Staff in both organisations were not concerned that this finding would cause the organisations harm, and that it was fairly public knowledge that these were challenging times of change.

In terms of reciprocity, I provided research participants with copies of findings and final publications. In some cases, based on personal feedback, these were useful documents for the practitioners to reflect upon. Overall, research participants gave their time very willingly and freely, out of their own goodwill, and not because they would receive my analysis in return.

A final area for ethical consideration is affiliation bias and power relations (Bell & Bryman, 2007). As I was an employee at one of the organisations of study, and collaborated with some of the other PBOs, there is a possibility of affiliation bias and power relations as ethical considerations, and as such I am giving explicit attention to those two issues. Firstly, affiliation bias means that the researcher may look more favourably, or be coloured negatively or positively, by an affiliation outside the boundaries of the research. This includes having a potential conflict of interest. As there were no conflicts of interest during the time the interviews were conducted, such as being a funder of the organisations of study, these concerns are minimised. One could argue that at the beginning of the research, as one of the organisations was my
employer, this constituted a conflict of interest. However, this was discussed openly with both the employer and my supervisor and it was agreed that because the research area was quite different from my staff duties, and because I was an employee only during the initial phases of the research, these concerns were minimal. A power relations issue could arise if I interviewed someone whom I was responsible for as a manager, for example. In one case I interviewed a former subordinate, but as I was not longer employed, the power differential would unlikely influence the interview. Furthermore, the themes coded in the transcript of that interview did not differ markedly from other transcripts, to alert a possible problem.

3.4 Research setting

3.4.1 The field of peacebuilding in Ireland

The field of peacebuilding in Ireland provides a rich and relevant context in which to analyse identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation, as it is a field in which PBOs are struggling to find a role for themselves, asking “who are we now,” following a successful peace process. Over the past 40 years, PBOs have been founded, have developed into institutions of international repute. They evolved as organisations often in response to incidences of violence in and in relation to Northern Ireland, but also as community groups coming together to meet local needs. The field of peacebuilding covers three legal jurisdictions: Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, and England. In other words, there are actors involved in peacebuilding related to the Northern Ireland conflict in all three jurisdictions. For shorthand, as is common within the field, I refer to ‘Irish peacebuilding.’

There are a set of activities included in peacebuilding. The most referenced activity is inclusive dialogues, bringing together individuals from different sides of the conflict for facilitated discussions that take place in a remote location and often last for several days. Conflict actors include politicians, community leaders, former combatants (anyone who carried a weapon as part of the conflict, either as military police, army or ‘terrorist’ group), victims (those who suffered injury or lost a loved one in the conflict), youth, and religious groups (usually including ‘both’ Christian denominations, Catholics and Protestants). Peacebuilding activities often focus on people at interface areas, that is the locations where communities live in close proximity, are often the site of violence, and are characterised by very tall ‘peace walls’ metal and cement structures.
separating the 'two' communities. The field has been largely shaped by 'Peace' funds, that is European Union funding, mostly to non-profit organisations with the aim of 'peace and reconciliation in Ireland'. There have been other significant sources of funding for peacebuilding work that are described in chapter 4. One of the main effects of the availability of formal grants for peacebuilding work is the formalising of peacebuilding groups into non-profit organisations. The field of peacebuilding in Ireland is also influenced by and connected with the international field of peacebuilding. There is cooperation and interaction between Irish and international peacebuilders and PBOs.

Currently, PBOs are struggling to respond to a changing context so as to secure sufficient support to survive. The peace process has ended decades of violence. Public perception is that peacebuilding is no longer needed (Never, 2011; Pollack, 2012). Additionally, PBOs are affected by economic recession, charity sector formalisation in the Republic of Ireland ("Charities Act," 2009) and in Northern Ireland ("Charities Act," 2008), and privatisation of public services in Northern Ireland (Acheson, 2010). Chapter 4 describes the population and field of peacebuilding in more detail. The decreasing public interest in as well as decreasing funding for peacebuilding in Ireland suggested that the context provides an example of deinstitutionalisation – the fading of a set of practices and beliefs that have taken-for-granted legitimacy (Oliver, 1992). The findings presented in chapter 5 provide evidence for the deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding.

Within the field of peacebuilding, phase two of this research focuses on the population of PBOs, which are NPOs with the primary mission of peacebuilding. Because PBOs are primarily committed to peacebuilding, they would experience mission loss more acutely in response to the deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding. Therefore, PBOs provide a relevant and interesting example of mission loss. The population includes Alpha and Beta, the two organisations included in phase three.

### 3.4.2. Alpha and Beta case organisations

For the OI study (chapters 6-8), I chose the Alpha and Beta Peace Centres because interviews with the 5 key informants in the population of PBOs (phase two) suggested that Alpha and Beta, while similar in many ways, exhibited very different responses. Two of the key informants in phase two were directly involved in Alpha and Beta. Therefore, I chose the two cases based on maximum variation rational to gain
information on the significance of specific variations on process and outcome (Flyvbjerg, 2011, p. 307). In this research, the specific variations were organisational success and failure as described by participants during preliminary interviews. Alpha seemed to be in turmoil about what it stood for and where it would position itself going forward; it made significant changes and seemed to be failing. Beta seemed to be doing well and know where it was going; it appeared to resist change and seemed to be growing and adapting successfully. Both Alpha and Beta increased in size and reputation during the violent conflict, but in the past few years, membership, income, programme activity and profile have dropped significantly, and both organisations are struggling to find a meaningful role in the new context. Therefore, Alpha and Beta provided ample opportunity to study identity work in response to mission loss.

The context in which the Alpha and Beta peace centres operate is described and analysed in chapter 5. Here I provide a brief background on Alpha and Beta, which are the focus of the OI study. The Alpha and Beta peace centres are similar in that they are mature membership organisations with charitable status based in isolated places of natural beauty. The Alpha Peace Centre was established in 1974 in response to the violent conflict with the goal of providing respite to people under threat and to promote alternative solutions to violence for responding to the conflict on the island. While it opened as an ecumenical peace centre, it became non-religious and has conducted youth training and education work, reconciliation dialogues with politicians, and international peacebuilding work. Programme work is primarily funded by the Irish Government and the European Union. Alpha is located in the Republic of Ireland and has a staff of 13, some of whom are part-time. The Board of Directors consists of 8 people who are legally responsible for the organisation, overseeing the accounts and strategic planning. The Policy Council is a team of 8 people who oversee the programme work. Alpha had a residential volunteer programme for many years, bringing people from around the world to live and work at Alpha for one year, but this programme closed down during the research period in 2011. Alpha also has an extensive network of members (about 60) and friends (about 80) who donate regularly to the organisation.

The Beta Peace Centre was established as a Christian Community in 1965 by a Presbyterian Minister who was a prisoner of war during the Second World War. This experience led him to set up a centre for an ecumenical Christian community that would help bridge the divisions between the churches in Northern Ireland. When the Troubles broke out in 1969, the Beta Peace Centre grew their activities in response to the conflict
including youth work, a family programme and conflict resolution training. Beta’s programme work is primarily funded by the Northern Ireland government and the European Union. Beta has a staff of 18 individuals, some of whom are part-time, and a group of 12 residential volunteers living at the peace centre for a year at a time. There are another 12 short-term and mid-term volunteers living and working at the centre at any given time. Beta also has an active community of 160 members, who participate in events, donate to the organisation, and volunteer their time to help run the centre. One of the main differences between the two organisations is that Alpha has served as a conflict mediator working with political parties and is located in the Republic of Ireland, whereas Beta is a Christian community working with families, schools, youth and community groups and is located in Northern Ireland.

3.4.3. My role in the field and in Alpha

From 2006 to 2012, I was employed by a PBO, Alpha, first as Development Officer, and then as Director of Development. In that role I interacted with the whole staff team, donors, volunteer board members, the residential volunteers who lived at the PBO for one year at a time, as well as users of the PBOs services, programme participants and visitors to the PBOs. Alpha went through some major changes while I was there, including three different CEOs, and a major financial crisis, when it was not certain whether the organisation would survive at all. I also worked closely with other PBOs, in particular leading a team of 3 PBOs to create a consortium of Peace Centres that ultimately received European Union grant funding to deliver programmes together. In preparing the grant application, I met regularly with PBOs, visited PBOs and worked with their leaders and programme teams to create a joint project. I also participated in numerous events which PBOs attended. In the findings chapters, particularly chapter 5 on field level changes and population responses, I draw on this ethnographic data extensively. In chapters 6 and 7, findings on Alpha and Beta, I also rely on my own experiences to gain access into Alpha and Beta and to interpret other data, like text documents and interviews.

3.5 Mapping the field and population

In chapter 4, I apply an organisational lens to the empirical context of Irish peacebuilding and in doing so draw out the challenges and value of clearly identifying an organisational population and field of nonprofit organisations associated with a complex social phenomenon with ambiguous boundaries and numerous actors. The
reason for carefully defining and mapping this field is to provide clarity on the borders around the empirical space that is the focus of this doctoral study. Identifying the organisations in this space allows me to then be more specific about the type of environmental change the population of PBOs face. I chose to focus on the organisational population of PBOs as this group of organisations has a shared vulnerability to changes in the field of peacebuilding, and is most acutely affected by them, thus providing insight on organisational responses to environmental change.

In order to identify a population and field of peacebuilding organisations, firstly I define the relevant terms, and secondly map the members of that field and population. To map the members I relied on methodology developed by Grønbjerg for mapping universe of NPOs (Grønbjerg, 1989, 2002). This approach involves starting with the most reliable and relevant list, cross-checking it with other lists, and finally consulting key informants. I started with lists from 2 extant studies of peacebuilding in Northern Ireland (Cochrane & Dunn, 2002; Hemmer, 2009), cross checked them with listings by the 10 major peacebuilding donors, and also consulted listings from NPO bodies in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. I relied on extensive internet searching of organisational websites to confirm details, including organisational mission. I trawled through the list of field organisations and pulled out those whose primary mission was peacebuilding in and about Northern Ireland, which is a rational, mission-focussed sampling logic. At the end of the mapping process, I had a field of almost 300 organisations (ones which did some peacebuilding) and a population of 15 PBOs (those which had peacebuilding as part of their primary mission), which included Alpha and Beta, the subjects of the comparative case study described in section 3.7, below.

3.6 Population responses to deinstitutionalisation

To examine how the population of 15 PBOs is affected by changes in the organisational field, I drew on three different sources of data, interviews with eight key informants in 2011, field observations, and secondary documents, which provided within-method triangulation (Denzin, 1978). These sources are listed in Table 3.6.
I held preliminary interviews with eight key informants, and further extensive, semi-structured interviews with four of those informants in Spring and Summer 2011. Preliminary interviews were semi-structured and lasted about 30 minutes each, for which I have detailed notes. Extensive interviews with four of those same informants lasted about 2 hours each, and were transcribed verbatim. I chose the informants based on their experience and knowledge of multiple other PBOs in the field. They were all currently senior managers at a PBO, which I labelled: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta and Epsilon. The interviewees had also served as donors, board members, facilitators and other various roles in other PBOs. They thus had a broad knowledge of changes that all PBOs are facing and the way organisations are responding, and they spoke both about their own organisations and other PBOs. I asked questions about how the environment is changing, as well as how PBOs are responding to those changes.

From 2006 to 2011 I was employed by Alpha, and include in this thesis reflections and experiences from that time as ethnographic data. From 2009 onwards, I was an embedded researcher, having begun this PhD, and observations were more deliberate and focussed. Those observations included participation in events and visits to PBOs by myself and my PhD supervisor. Field observation was conducted at peacebuilding conferences in September 2010, August 2011 and August 2012 where eight PBOs were represented, as well as many more organisations from the field. Visits with the purpose of gathering ethnographic data were made to two PBOs in 2009 and 2012.
Additionally, I gathered data from the 13 available websites. From six PBOs I examined internal documents (annual reports and strategic plans). This deinstitutionalisation study includes data from 2008 to 2012, a period of five years. Notes, transcripts and documents were compiled and reviewed; themes were identified and described.

The process of data analysis was abductive as I cycled between data and theory (Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010). Firstly, I divided data analysis into field-level disruptions and population responses. I manually coded and grouped the textual data into types of environmental changes, which I interpreted as structural drivers of change, and organisational responses to change, which I analyse as agency drivers of change.

3.7 Studying organisational identity: The Gioia methodology

In phase three of this research, exploring organisational identity work, I conducted a comparative case study (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007), and applied the ‘Gioia methodology’ which has been developed and applied over the past 20 years by numerous scholars of OI (e.g. Corley & Gioia, 2004; Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Maguire & Phillips, 2008; Ravasi & Phillips, 2011). While there are no commonly accepted guidelines on doing OI research (Ravasi & Canato, 2013), the ‘Gioia methodology’ has emerged as a flexible, rigorous approach to interpretive, qualitative research that has evolved from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Thus, in order to analyse identity work, how organisational actors inter-subjectively negotiate their shared identity, I chose a method that is already established in OI research, and that relies on the lived experience, the knowledge and insights of interviewees. While the Gioia methodology is situated in the social constructionist camp, it also allows for the social actor role of organisations that can be considered as outside, but connected to, participant’s reality (Gioia et al., 2010). Thus, the ontological orientation and epistemological position of this research is not extreme as per Burrell and Morgan’s scheme, but intermediate, “which allows for the influence of both situational and voluntary factors in accounting for the activities of human beings” (1979, p. 6). Furthermore, grounded concept development is well suited to case study approach, which enables the construction of concepts and models (Yin, 2003).
The Gioia methodology (Gioia et al., 2012) relies heavily on interview data, which is transcribed and coded into first order themes, similar to Corbin and Strauss’ open coding (2008), staying as close to the language of the interviewees as possible. The first order themes are clustered into second order themes and labelled using terms that are still close to the language of the participants, similar to Corbin and Strauss’ axial coding (2008). In the next step, the researcher interprets those themes and distils them into second order aggregate dimensions, which are related to the theoretical topic of interest, in a process that moves from inductive to abductive reasoning, i.e. cycling between theory and data (Alvesson & Karreman, 2007; Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010; Mantere & Ketokivi, 2013). These steps are illustrated in the data structure, which is a visual presentation of how aggregate dimensions are derived from first order codes, showing how the concepts are grounded in the data, see chapter 8. The aggregate dimensions then serve as building blocks for theory building. The process models presented in chapters 8 and 9 demonstrate how the dimensions interact and interrelate.

3.7.1 OI data collection

Data was collected from 2009 to 2013 in the form of interviews, observations and documents, all of which has provided rich data for the OI study. In order to analyse OI in particular, 34 semi-structured interviews were conducted with a wide range of organisational members from 2010 to 2013, each lasting on average one hour, and transcribed verbatim. Interviews were guided by the interviewees’ interests, roles and personalities, as well as with the evolution of the research question and findings (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). I focused on open and personal questions and looked for anecdotes and examples (J. Mason, 2002). The first interview questions were about how the organisation and its environment are changing or have changed, and what has stayed the same, thus exploring whether and how it is adapting to mission loss. Many of the answers to those questions addressed the issue of “who are we now?” As OI is quite an abstract concept for organisational actors, in order to elicit further reflection on what they perceive is central, distinctive and enduring (Albert & Whetten, 1985) about their organisations, I asked the following questions: what drew them to the organisation; what is unique about the organisation; and, if the organisation were an animal, what would it be. Appendix 2 contains the detailed interview protocol, which served as a guideline for the interviews, rather than a list of questions to cover.
For Alpha and Beta, I collected archival documents from 2009 onwards, such as brochures, and annual reports, as well as current documents, strategic plans, website and facebook texts. I also included a book on the history of each organisation since it was founded, both published in 2007 by long-time organisational stakeholders. The data collected for the OI study is presented in Table 3.7.1 below.

Table 3.7.1. OI Data Collection Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase three, semi-structured interviews (34)</td>
<td>18 (full transcripts)</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Staff at all levels, volunteers, members including board members</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (full transcripts)</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning docs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Senior managers</td>
<td>2009 - 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Staff and volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2009 - 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>2 websites, &amp; 2 facebook pages</td>
<td>Alpha and Beta</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2009-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and newsletters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2009 - 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Founder and volunteer Long-time member</td>
<td>Published in 2007 describing full history of organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings to present findings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Staff and volunteers</td>
<td>February - June 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.2 OI data analysis

I proceeded with the data analysis in seven steps guided by the principles of the Gioia methodology. First, I tracked for general themes by coding the interview transcripts using qualitative data analysis software. I chose to use NVivo because it is a tool that greatly facilitates data analysis such as coding, organising and clustering codes and writing memos, especially when there are large amounts of textual data (Odena, 2013). I identified first order themes, 31 in Alpha and 37 in Beta, which were the topics that emerged from the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Next I clustered those themes into categories by comparing emerging themes and grouping them together that resulted in a set of second order categories. I read through the secondary documents and noted down
key themes. These themes corresponded with the second order categories from the interviews, which provided construct validity (Singleton & Straits, 2005, p. 125). In step 3, I further broke down the codes into smaller sub-codes to get a more fine-grained understanding of the second order findings. I wrote a paragraph on each code, which contributed to understandings the overarching themes. This process is called memoing, and uses writing itself as a tool to prompt conceptual leaps in the data analysis (Bazeley, 2009; Rapley, 2011). In step 4, I distilled out the most relevant themes by compiling the paragraphs from step three and summarising. This resulted in removing some codes in a process of data reduction, further summarising the clustered codes, and deciding on the final labels for the aggregate dimensions. Step 5 consisted of writing up the in-case analysis. Steps 1-5 were repeated for Beta. Step 6 involved writing up a cross-case analysis, comparing the two cases and drawing out findings based on these two cases. In step 7, I critically re-evaluated the findings to identify elements of the process of identity work. Finally, I created a process model of identity work in response to mission loss. Appendix 4 shows two screenshots illustrating data analysis using NVivo software.

Table 3.7.2. OI Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim of Analysis</th>
<th>Analysis Activities</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tracking for general themes</td>
<td>Open coding</td>
<td>First-order findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deeper understanding of general themes</td>
<td>Coding on: further breaking down codes into sub-codes and memoing.</td>
<td>More detailed second order categories that are thoroughly described in detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of Identity related themes</td>
<td>Distilling the most relevant topics through data reduction and memoing. Succinctly describing key themes grounded in the data.</td>
<td>Aggregate dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In-case analysis</td>
<td>Writing up findings for each organisation.</td>
<td>Description of identity work processes in each organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cross-case analysis</td>
<td>Writing up a comparison between two organisations.</td>
<td>Description of identity work in response to mission loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reconstruction of processes of identity work</td>
<td>Interpretation of aggregate dimensions: how they interact and interrelate.</td>
<td>Process model of organisational identity work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data analysis as described above examines interviewees’ language as process data (Langley, 1999; Langley et al., 2013). There is extensive literature on organisational theorists studying language itself to understand organisational phenomena, particularly
process data on organisational change (e.g. Heracleous & Barrett, 2001). The Gioia method is a grounded theory strategy for analysing process data, in that the process, or sequence of events, is grounded in small units of text that are clustered and analysed for meanings and patterns (Langley, 1999). The sequence of events and their corresponding meanings and patterns are illustrated in two process models in chapters 8 and 9.

In step 4, above, the aggregate dimensions included two key concepts: identity claims and differentiation, which reflects two different approaches to language. In labelling the identity claims, I approached discourse as reflecting meaning (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000), as a mirror for understanding OI. Conversely for the concept of differentiation, I looked for discursive strategies of identity work, thus interpreted discourse as constituting meaning itself (Alvesson & Karreman, 2011; Hardy, Lawrence, & Grant, 2005). Because I conceive of OI as primarily socially constructed through actors’ interactions (Corley & Gioia, 2004; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Gioia et al., 2010), I analyse discursive and narrative accounts used by organisational stakeholders to propose, defend, reject and deny various organisational identity claims (Clegg et al., 2007; Ravasi & Canato, 2013).

3.7.3 Robustness checks

Following the Gioia methodology, I included three separate steps to ensure the trustworthiness of the data analysis (Corley & Gioia, 2004, p. 184; Gioia et al., 2010, p. 9). Firstly, during this data analysis for a conference paper, I worked with co-authors that included perspectives of insiders and outsiders of peacebuilding work so that we could cycle between and benefit from both perspectives (Evered & Louis, 1981; Gioia et al., 2010). Specifically, one of the researchers had not visited Peace Centres in Ireland and did not participate in the interviews; thus her outsider perspective in the data analysis focussed on uncovering the knowledge that could be transferred to other contexts. The other two researchers, myself and my PhD advisor, held an insider perspective, as we were very familiar with the peace centres and their work, so our primary aim was to understand and describe the observed phenomena (Evered & Louis, 1981). I began the research journey as an insider, an employee of a PBO. In 2012, when most of the interviews took place, I was no longer a staff member, but still had great familiarity with the workings and people in PBOs. This research team composition allowed me to have both detached and immersed perspectives in analysing
the data. Secondly, I met with two colleagues in the school of business for “peer debriefing” showing them interview excerpts and explaining the conceptual categories that I had created in order to gain their critical feedback. Thirdly, after conducting data analysis I held subsequent meetings with interviewees both individually and in groups, presented the findings and received feedback in order to confirm the internal credibility of my analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3.8 Embedding OI work in a context of deinstitutionalisation

In the final stage of this research, phase four, I return to the institutional level, and embed the OI study in a context of deinstitutionalisation. In chapter 9, I bring together the findings from the deinstitutionalisation study and from the OI study. I first compare the findings from the two studies. I then revise the process model of identity work by adding an institutional layer.

Embedding OI work in a context of deinstitutionalisation results in a multi-level process that moves from macro to micro, and out to macro again, including institutional pressures, field-level changes, population and organisational responses. In chapter 10 I discuss future research which includes further examination of how the organisational and population responses might influence institutional change. This movement through the levels of analysis is illustrated in the diagram below.

Diagram 3.8. Multi-level process-data summary
The levels of analysis appear on the y-axis, while research phases appear on the x-axis. The research begins by looking at the broader context of NPOs in Ireland and survival literature, as well as focussing on a single case, Alpha Peace Centre. Then, from a macro perspective, phase two investigates institutional change through field-level pressures and population responses. Phase three moves to the organisational level with the OI study. Phase four returns to deinstitutionalisation and analyses how processes of OI work influence institutional changes by embedding the levels of analysis into one process model. This process-data summary explains the multiple levels included in the second process model which is presented in chapter 9, identity work processes in response to deinstitutionalisation. As depicted by Diagram 3.8 above, the process model includes a large amount of data and multiple levels of analysis, a culmination of phases one, two and three.

3.9 Summary

This chapter has presented the methodology for mapping PBOs, documenting deinstitutionalisation, analysing OI work, and embedding OI work in the context of deinstitutionalisation. The next chapters describe the findings on mapping (chapter 4), deinstitutionalisation (chapter 5) and OI (chapters 6 and 7). The deinstitutionalisation chapter (5) contains findings and also the data analysis and some discussion. The analysis and discussion of OI are presented in chapter 8. Returning to the levels of institution and population, the OI study is embedded in the context of deinstitutionalisation, in chapter 9. I analyse how OI is a response to deinstitutionalisation in a revised, multi-level process model. Overall conclusions and contributions are presented in chapter 10.
Chapter 4. A Hidden Landscape: Identifying the population and field of Irish peacebuilding

"On the one hand Alpha might easily define itself as a peacebuilding organisation but, you know, what does it mean in the contemporary - I think we do sit down and talk about these things but we rarely come up with any easy agreements. We walk away with differences of opinion." Alpha staff member

4.1 Introduction

A case study of one peacebuilding organisation in phase one of this research documented that while NPOs in Ireland were facing a challenging environment, the peace centre studied, which I later named Alpha as part of the OI study, faced a more extreme situation in which its taken-for-granted legitimacy was shaken by a successful peace process (Donnelly-Cox & Cannon, 2010a). Following that case study, it became clear that in order to analyse institutional level phenomena, and in order to be more specific about the organisational environment, I would have to seek clarity about the space of peacebuilding, who the constituent actors are, and how to delineate the organisational environment. Thus, the next step, and the focus of this chapter is to identify the population and field of peacebuilding in Ireland. This was not an easy task considering that defining PBOs is not straightforward, not even for PBO staff, as evidenced by the quote above.

While I was interested in studying NPOs involved in peacebuilding, extant literature on peacebuilding or on the third sector did not provide a clear definition of PBOs. Earlier analyses of the field of peacebuilding have been largely restricted to peacebuilding activities and political developments, with limited attention paid to the organisation as focus of study (exceptions are: Cochrane & Dunn, 2002; Dudouet, 2007; Hemmer, 2009; Never, 2010; O'Regan, 2001). This may reflect a pattern that politically oriented organisations are included in political science literature, and left out of the third sector literature which tends to focus on the more socially oriented educational, health and cultural organisations (Clemens, 2006, p. 213). In this chapter, I redirect the spotlight to the organisations involved in peacebuilding in Ireland, contributing to the literature by defining and mapping this population and field for the first time. This chapter draws on
I apply an organisational lens to the empirical context of Irish peacebuilding. As mentioned in chapter 2, the extant literature on NPO survival describes the organisational environment in very general terms. This research helps to address that weakness by specifying the environmental boundaries. Furthermore, chapter 5 analyses field-level change by documenting in real-time the deinstitutionalisation of Irish peacebuilding, as well as the population response to it, thus providing specific parameters for the empirical context. In order to identify a population and field of peacebuilding organisations, firstly I define the relevant terms, and secondly map the members of that field and organisation.

4.2 Defining the terms

In order to identify the peacebuilding organisational field and population, I begin with definitions of the relevant terms: organisation, nonprofit organisation, peacebuilding, organisational field and population.

4.2.1 Organisation

The definition of organisation in this study is developed from Scott and Davis' layered model of organisation theories, combining rational, natural and open system perspectives (2007). Elements from the three perspectives are combined: organisations are collectivities with formal and informal structures and shared as well as personal goals that are embedded in a wider resource, cultural and institutional environment.

"Formal structures and shared goals" represents a rational perspective, highlighting two features that are useful for defining populations, and are most relevant to conventional understandings of organisations. "Informal structures and personal goals" reflects the natural system approach, emphasising that stakeholders have a variety of goals, personal interests and motivations, such as advancing their own careers, preserving their own jobs, developing their own knowledge and skills. The open system perspective sees organisations as "collectivities... that are embedded in a wider resource, cultural and institutional environment," highlighting the interrelatedness of the external environment and the organisation. The open system perspective emphasises the relevance of the organisational environment in understanding organisational behaviour.
4.2.2 Nonprofit organisation

While the nonprofit sector in both the UK and the Republic of Ireland is often referred to as the community and voluntary sector (Acheson, Harvey, & Williamson, 2005; Donoghue, Anheier, & Salamon, 1999), I use the term more common in international academic literature, nonprofit organisation (NPO), rather than community and voluntary organisation (CVO). Using the International Classification of Nonprofit Organisations (ICNPO), NPOs are defined as those that are organised (having an institutional presence and structure), private or non-governmental, non-profit distributing, self governing, and voluntary (Donoghue et al., 1999, p. 5). This definition corresponds with and does not contradict definitions used by the Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action (NICVA), (www.nicva.org), the Charity Commission of England and Wales (www.charity-commission.gov.uk) and other listings that contain PBOs.

4.2.3 Peacebuilding

One of the first definitions of peacebuilding, which is fairly general but is still referenced by scholars today, is by Boutros Boutros-Ghali in a United Nations report, in which he describes peacebuilding as efforts “to identify and support structures that will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict” (1992, p. paragraph 21). Peacebuilding remains a broad concept embracing a wide range of activities including engaging with multiple conflict actors to support and maintain formal peace accords (Lederach, 1997, p. 20). In general, peacebuilding is a set of activities that are undertaken “to reduce the risk of overt violent conflict and to pave the way for durable peace and development” (Björkdahl & Höglund, 2013, p. 291).

As I am interested in NPO activities, I examined the mission and activities of PBOs in Ireland and found that there is a general consensus that peacebuilding can include a wide range of activities, but usually involves working with conflict actors, either in single-community groups to build confidence, or in cross-community groups to facilitate dialogue and build trust. Peacebuilding does not fit easily into existing categorisations of community and voluntary activity in Ireland or internationally. Peacebuilding activities could include almost any of those classified within the 12 distinct ICNPO groups or fields (Donoghue et al., 1999). NICVA provides a list of 24 categories to describe the primary purpose of NPOs in Northern Ireland. The category that most closely corresponds to peacebuilding is “Cross-border/ cross-community work,” for which NICVA has 110 organisations listed (Acheson, Harvey, Kearney, &
Williamson, 2004, p. 208), even though peacebuilding and community relations work can be “single-community” work. I use the term peacebuilding to include community relations as they describe the same type of work: bringing people together to increase understanding across the conflict divide (interviews, chapter 4 findings). “Community relations” is a common term in Northern Ireland and is institutionalised in the Community Relations Council (CRC), established by the government in 1990. All public policy in Northern Ireland must consider a community relations dimension. Peacebuilding is the more common international term (Lederach, 1997), and is used by the European Union funding body in Northern Ireland.

4.2.4 Peacebuilding organisation (PBOs)

I define PBOs as nonprofit organisations that have peacebuilding as part of their primary mission and focus on the conflict in and about Northern Ireland.

4.2.5 Organisational population

Coming from the population ecology literature, an organisational population includes all organisations with a similar form, or archetype, that compete for the same pool of resources, and thus have a shared vulnerability and exist within a specific system (Hannan & Freeman, 1977, pp. 934–6, 1989) or shared social context (Stinchcombe, 1965). Therefore, I expect the population of PBOs to be equally and acutely effected by changes in the field of peacebuilding, particularly regarding resources.

4.2.6 Organisational field

Whereas a population is a narrower, more homogeneous group, the field, from the neo-institutional literature, is a wider, more diverse collection of actors: “those organisations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognised area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organisations that produce similar services or products” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148). Events and actions are interpreted and reproduced by field members to create shared meanings (Greenwood & Hinings, 1993; Jennings & Zandbergen, 1995). Those actors coalesce around a central issue (Hoffman, 1999), in this case peacebuilding as a response to violent conflict in and about Northern Ireland. Within a field, I define “core” population as one that is central and established (Aldrich & Fiol, 1994), consists of the key players (Mazza & Pedersen, 2004; Reay & Hinings, 2009), and has the most legitimacy (Sherer & Lee, 2002); conversely, “peripheral” populations consist of fringe
players that are not highly legitimated in the field (Leblebici et al., 1991) and have less commitment and respect for the field values (Shils, 1961; Wright & Zammuto, 2013). A field is also time-bound as a period "with distinct legal-moral orders" which does not necessarily have one single overriding logic or model (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006, p. 206).

Having defined the terms, I am now able to map the members of the organisational field of peacebuilding in Ireland, and the population of peacebuilding organisations within it.

4.3 Mapping the organisational field

The second step, mapping the constituent actors, answers questions about what organisations exist, including size, financing, activity and role. I define the field as the aggregate of actors involved in peacebuilding, including suppliers, consumers and regulators (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Grønbjerg outlines the methodological considerations for developing a universe of NPOs in one particular geographic location, Chicago, in contrast to this study, which focuses on all organisations involved in a specific area of work, Northern Ireland peacebuilding, but not limited to a defined geographic location. Nevertheless, the process and principles used to identify the NPO universe can be applied to identifying an organisational field. The list approach involves examining official lists of NPOs, including published directories and official registration and license listings, and cross examining those lists with other informal lists, such as grants and contract listings over several years, membership lists from coalitions, networks and task forces (Grønbjerg, 1989, pp. 76–77). Organisations and informants that support or work with nonprofits can be usefully consulted, and the various lists should be weighted for accuracy of source and cross-checked for duplicates and changes in contact details. Ambiguous cases should also be checked with the organisation or key informants (Grønbjerg, 1989, pp. 76–77).

I have applied Grønbjerg’s approach by transferring the principles she uses to this study, however, the different context does not allow me to follow her steps precisely. For example, in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland there is no equivalent of a searchable government Internal Revenue Service (IRS) list, Grønbjerg’s starting point. In the Republic of Ireland, one can obtain online a list of all organisations that have a CHY or charity number; this includes only company names and addresses, and not purpose or mission, and is a pdf document, so not easily searchable. NICVA lists
charities in a publication each year entitled State of the Sector, which is similar to the IRS list in that it is reliable and is the most inclusive list currently available for Northern Ireland. The NICVA listing, however, is not so relevant to our sample as it includes all NPOs in one geographic location, Northern Ireland, and the organisations are categorised in a way that is not useful in identifying PBOs, as mentioned in the definition of peacebuilding, above. Therefore, I chose to compile lists from two published academic studies of PBOs that were highly reliable, as they were published studies, inclusive and relevant for the peacebuilding field. One study claimed to include all peacebuilding nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) (Hemmer, 2008, 2009) and the other started with the NICVA list of all NPOs in Northern Ireland which was narrowed down to peace and conflict resolution organisations (Cochrane & Dunn, 2002). I expected these lists to include most of the relevant PBOs. Counter to expectations, there was little overlap between the two lists.

Cochrane and Dunn included 36 Peace and Conflict Resolution Organisations (P/CROs) and Hemmer included 59 Peacebuilding NGOs. Hemmer indicated that his list was exhaustive; he brought the list to all of his interviewees at the 59 organisations for them to further edit and expand. As there was little overlap between the two studies the combination of these two lists resulted in 86 organisations. It is clear from the studies that the researchers were more concerned with peacebuilding, the activities and the organisations' role in conflict resolution, and were not focussed on organisational forms per se. The fact that there were so few overlaps indicated the field is much larger and each study had included only a small part of it. The difficulty in defining the field is largely due to the problem that Cochrane and Dunn identified: “almost all of the voluntary groups would argue that they had a role to play in the creation of a peaceful and progressive society; at the same time, very few of them would describe themselves as being exclusively concerned with conflict-resolution and the promotion of peace” (2002, p. 153). Since the violent conflict in Northern Ireland pervaded every aspect of life, almost all organisations have some link to peacebuilding, whether they give or receive funding for work that brings communities together, or whether a group helps build confidence in a marginalised community that has been traumatised by the violent conflict. So, where do you draw the line around the field if almost all NPOs do peacebuilding?

Consulting extant published studies of PBOs resulted in a list of 86 organisations, which was not the complete organisational field as it did not include the resources and
suppliers of these organisations, the major peacebuilding donors. The next step was to compile lists from grant recipients from peacebuilding or community relations donors. A web-based search of the 86 organisations established that there are 10 main donors. The largest peacebuilding donor is the Special European Union Programmes Body (SEUPB) and is the European Commission office in Northern Ireland distributing 'Peace' funding since 1995. The main departments of the Northern Ireland Government that fund NPOs to do community relations work are the Department of Education, the Department of Employment and Learning, and the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFM DFM). The Republic of Ireland government has funded 'anti-sectarian' projects since 1982 through the Reconciliation Fund of the Anglo-Irish Desk, Department of Foreign Affairs. The International Fund for Ireland has funded community relations work since it was founded in 1986. Pobal in the Republic and the Community Relations Council in the North are both registered charities that administer European and other 'Peace' funding to organisations. The Ireland Funds has raised private funds internationally to support charities in Ireland, primarily to do peacebuilding, since 1976. The NPO, Cooperation Ireland, can also be categorised as a donor as it re-grants European and government funding to other organisations, while also conducting its own peacebuilding work.

These donors have a wealth of useful information as they have lists of organisations that they have funded over the years. As the data collection took place in 2010, that year was not included as it was not yet complete, so lists of recipient organisations were gathered for the years 2008 and 2009. There was much overlap between donor lists as the larger organisations received funding from more than one of the donors. This process resulted in 289 organisations, which includes neighbourhood groups, voluntary associations, charities, donors, businesses, theatre companies, schools and government agencies. Finally, I cross-checked these organisations with existing on-line listings of conflict related bodies in Northern Ireland, namely CAIN, Conflict Archive on the Internet which is part of INCORE in the University of Ulster (http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/index.html) and Insight on Conflict which lists 37 peacebuilding organisations (http://www.insightonconflict.org/conflicts/northern-ireland/peacebuilding-organisations/). The full list of field members is included in Appendix 3. Mapping the field is an open-ended process as there are so many organisations, groups and individuals that engage even briefly in activities that could be
classified as peacebuilding, and there is a constant flow of organisations entering and leaving the field.

The field is very diverse and difficult to describe in general terms. It includes very small community groups, such as the Ardoyne Focus Group, consisting of and working for residents in one interface area in North Belfast, to very large multinationals, such as Google Ireland, which has not only contributed to at least one PBO, but also organised a conference in Dublin to bring together former combatants and survivors from all over the world, including Northern Ireland.¹ The field includes specialist organisations that focus primarily on specific areas, for example youth (Opportunity Youth), the arts (Artability NI), religion (Hard Gospel Project) or a particular neighbourhood or geographic area (Inishowen Women’s Information Network). Organisations represent the various conflict actors, so there are separate organisations founded by and for Republican and Loyalist ex-paramilitaries, like EPIC (Ex-prisoners Interpretive Centre), and victims, or survivors, like FAIR (Families Acting for Innocent Relatives).

Similarly to Grønbjerg’s research, there were methodological challenges that were specific to this field. Contrary to expectations, the donors did not distinguish between formal and informal organisations and between public and private organisations. The IFI Annual Reports and the DFA press releases list grant recipients and use names of either projects or organisations interchangeably. The names of organisations and projects are misleading; for example the Hard Gospel Project is an organisation while the Irish Peace Centres is a project. Furthermore, several organisations have changed their names since their foundation; Mediation Northern Ireland, for example, was founded as Northern Ireland Conflict and Mediation Association (NICMA) in 1987, became Conflict Mediation Network (CMN), was renamed the Mediation Network for Northern Ireland (MNNI) before becoming Mediation Northern Ireland (MNI). The EU on-line database of grant recipients lists NPOs and public bodies together even though NPOs usually receive much smaller grants to implement a specific project, while the public bodies, such as district councils usually receive much larger grants some of which will be re-granted to NPOs. As with the academic studies, the emphasis is on the project activities, and not on the organisations that are implementing them. These challenges were overcome by careful attention to the reliability of lists, searching websites and by talking to key informants.

Having identified the field as thoroughly as possible, I now turn to mapping the population of PBOs from within that field. The fact that the field is as complete as it can be means that the population should also be complete, without major gaps that might bias the findings in chapter 5, thus ensuring greater accuracy.

4.4 Mapping the organisational population

Within the organisational field are several populations, so the next step is to narrow down from the field to the population of PBOs. Cochrane and Dunn move from the whole voluntary sector of 5,000 organisations to the 70 that they include in Phase I based mainly on the role of the organisation in the conflict, which reflects the identity of the organisational stakeholders. They include organisations as P/CROs that “included peace and conflict-resolution as part – or even only as incidental consequences- of their work, rather than as its central focus” (2002, p. 153). They apply a political science lens and view NPOs as conflict actors. My focus is organisational, and I apply a rational, mission-focussed sampling logic.

Returning to the definitions above, a population is a group of organisations that would all be affected by a change in the same pool of resources (Hannan & Freeman, 1989). A population of PBOs would all be directly affected by changes in funding for peacebuilding work. The logic here is that PBOs have peacebuilding as their primary mission or purpose, while the YMCA in Letterkenny, for example, is funded by the EU peace programme, but has a specific focus other than peacebuilding. I am focussing on NPOs that have peacebuilding or community relations as their primary purpose. I trawled through the list of 289 organisations and pulled out those that have peacebuilding as their primary mission. I excluded organisations that described their work as peacebuilding, but were *primarily* set up to serve or represent a specific neighbourhood or group of people. I included only those organisations that described their primary work as peacebuilding. The resulting population of PBOs consists of 15 organisations.
Table 4.4. Population of Peacebuilding Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Teach Ban, Donegal Peace Centre</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Downings/ L'Derry, ROI</td>
<td>A residential peace centre in Downings, Donegal, with offices in Derry. Organised a community reconciliation legacy project in NW region. Closed in 2010.</td>
<td>Formal mission statement not available as An Teach Ban had closed down. However, descriptions of activities, descriptions of the organisation by donors, and the name of the organisation all strongly indicate it is a PBO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations Council (CRC)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Belfast, NI</td>
<td>The Community Relations Council originated in 1986 as a proposal of a research report commissioned by the NI Standing Advisory Committee on Human Rights. It was set up to promote better community relations between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland and to promote recognition of cultural diversity.</td>
<td>&quot;Promoting a peaceful and fair society based on reconciliation and mutual trust.&quot; It primarily does peace, reconciliation and community relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation Ireland (formerly, Cooperation North)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Belfast/Dublin, NI (office in ROI)</td>
<td>Cooperation Ireland was set up to promote reconciliation on the island of Ireland. It is a non-sectarian and non-political. &quot;Co-operation Ireland’s mission is to underpin political agreement on the island of Ireland by building positive relationships at community level, both within Northern Ireland and between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, through the promotion of mutual understanding and co-operation. We do this by working with groups from all religious and cultural communities to build vibrant societies based on the principles of respect for diversity and peace and reconciliation.&quot; Its work is peace and reconciliation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrymeela Community</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Belfast/Ballycastle, Co Antrim, NI</td>
<td>The Corrymeela Community is a long standing reconciliation organisation with a Christian ethos. Its Creating Communities Programme, which targets young people and families, is designed to combat sectarianism. &quot;Corrymeela's mission is: embracing difference, healing division and enabling reconciliation. Our vision is of a peaceful and sustainable society based on social justice, positive relationships and respect for diversity. The Corrymeela Community strives to embody these values in every aspect of our lives.&quot; Its main focus is peace and reconciliation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Wicklow, ROI</td>
<td>Glencree works towards peacebuilding and the promotion of reconciliation. The Centre, through the delivery of its various programmes and summers schools, attracts participants from a cross-section of society, with a view to building peace and reconciliation. The residential facilities closed down in 2011. &quot;Glencree is dedicated to providing leadership and support in practical peacebuilding, and works to transform violent conflict within and between divided communities in Ireland, North and South, Britain, and elsewhere in the world.&quot; Its name and mission is peace and reconciliation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Community Trust at Glebe House</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Strangford, Co Down, NI</td>
<td>Harmony Community Trust is a cross community organisation set up to promote community relations and social inclusion. Its main base is a sixteen-acre wildlife area at Kilclief; it delivers community relations, social inclusion and respite programmes on a year round basis.</td>
<td>&quot;To enable all people to explore divisive barriers and to develop the self-confidence to build mutual respect, tolerance and trust through positive shared experiences.&quot; While its mission does not use the terms peace or peacebuilding, its programme activities use those terms, and it often uses the term, community relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercomm</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Belfast, NI</td>
<td>Intercomm operates primarily in, but not limited to, North Belfast. It promotes and facilitates community dialogue, build community leadership capacity, support groups in peace building activities, influence public policy, challenge sectarianism and promote reconciliation.</td>
<td>&quot;To forge fruitful links between Catholic/Nationalist and Protestant/Unionist community groups through long term strategic development work, community inspired peace building initiatives, youth programmes and job creation programmes.&quot; Its main mission is to build relationships for peacebuilding purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilcranny House</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Coleraine, NI</td>
<td>Kilcranny House is a residential peace centre located on a farm. It takes residential volunteers each year and its core values are participation, sustainability and inclusivity.</td>
<td>&quot;We are committed to promoting positive peace &amp; reconciliation, healing the divisions which exist between people and exploring non-violence as a way of life and a means of working for change in our society.&quot; Its main mission is to promote peace and reconciliation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meath Peace Group</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Parsons-town/ Batters-town, ROI</td>
<td>Meath Peace Group holds public talks, networking events, and educational workshops.</td>
<td>Aims and objectives (no mission stated): To promote peace through the fostering of understanding, mutual respect, trust, co-operation and friendship, through dialogue between people North and South.&quot; Its main mission is to promote peace in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Peace & Reconciliation Group (PRG) was set up to work towards reconciliation through comprehensive mediation services, the delivery of training programmes and various situation-specific projects.

"To promote the development of community understanding and cooperation through the delivery of community relations and community development programmes."

The mission statement focuses on community relations, but the organisation's name and activities use the terms peace and reconciliation.

The Quaker House in Belfast promotes cross community dialogue and was established to promote good community relations and good citizenship among the inhabitants of Northern Ireland. The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in Britain is the registered charity. Quaker Service provides community services for vulnerable individuals and families and works with community groups promoting peace and reconciliation. Quaker Cottage (on Black Mountain) was a residential centre set up for mothers and children from North and West Belfast and closed down in 2010.

"To provide a safe and caring environment where increased self-esteem, greater family understanding and cooperation, improved social and life skills, enhanced development and mutual understanding and respect, are actively promoted."

While the mission does not include the words peace or peacebuilding, the activities do use those terms, as well as reconciliation and community relations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| St. Columbs Park House             | 1994 | L'Derry  | St. Columb's Park House is an 18th century manor house situated in parkland on the Waterside of Derry. They do regional projects, work with young people, and provide assistance to local community groups, when requested. | "The centre seeks to contribute to peace-building and social inclusion through a range of programmes that promote civic participation, human rights, and democratic pluralism.”  
*Main focus is peacebuilding.* |
| St Ethelberga’s Centre for Reconciliation and Peace | 2003 | London  | It has a Christian ethos and was built out of the ruins of St Ethelberga’s church (CoE) when it was destroyed by an IRA bomb in 1993. There are no residential facilities, but space can be hired as conference venue. | The mission is “to inspire and equip people to practice reconciliation and peace-making in their own communities and lives.”  
*Mission is reconciliation and peace-making.* |
| Foundation for Peace               | 1995 | Warrington | A residential peace centre founded by parents of two children, Tim Parry and Jonathan Ball, who were killed in an IRA bombing in Warrington. They organise many programmes, such as youth leadership. | Their “vision was to create a safe place where ordinary people could learn about the causes and non-violent resolution of conflict, so that they might turn their passion for and commitment to peace, into the skills which can help prevent other atrocities.”  
*Its mission is peace.* |
| Tipperary Peace Convention         | 1983 | Tipperary | Set up to promote the concept of peace and reconciliation through music, song, debate and discussion, and to reward annually a person or persons who make a particularly noteworthy contribution to the peace making process. | "The Tipperary Peace Convention was established in 1983 to promote peace at home and abroad.”  
*Mission is to promote peace.* |
Of the 15 organisations in the population, eight are in Northern Ireland, five in the Republic of Ireland and two in England. Hemmer included eight of these organisations, while Cochrane and Dunn included five of them in Phase II of their research. Most have been established for over three decades, many as membership organisations, in response to specific incidents of violence. In some cases, the founders are still involved. Eight of the organisations had residential facilities for hosting peacebuilding work; three have closed down the residential facilities recently. One closed down entirely in 2010. Several are located in remote places of natural beauty, and have functioned as venues for respite, or ‘safe space’, away from the violent conflict. These organisations founded the field of peacebuilding and are established within the field. Many of them have close relationships with and pre-date the donors. PBOs, therefore, are the key players making up the core population at the centre of the field of peacebuilding. I brought this list to interviews with five key individuals from the population of PBOs and discussed the process with them to ensure that I had not left out any PBOs. I note that Alpha and Beta, the PBOs included in the comparative case in phase three of this research, are both included in the population mapped here.

4.5 Conclusion

This study is the first one that uses an organisational lens to identify the field of peacebuilding in Ireland as the extant literature on PBOs relies primarily on political science logic to select the organisations for study (Cochrane & Dunn, 2002; Hemmer, 2009). Grønbjerg’s (1989) methodological considerations have been applied in order to obtain as complete a field of peacebuilding as possible. Principles, such as starting with the most comprehensive, reliable and relevant lists and cross-checking them with other lists, have been applied to the specific situation of PBOs. This process has revealed the challenge of identifying a field and how to decide where to draw the boundaries around this “recognized area of institutional life” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148). The specific field of peacebuilding has ambiguous boundaries, in under-regulated and is plural, i.e. has many different types of actors. Because this is the first time that these steps have been taken for the field of peacebuilding in Ireland, I thus refer to the ‘hidden PBO landscape’.

Mapping the field of peacebuilding in Ireland has led me to the perspective that peacebuilding is an institution. I started this chapter with an organisational perspective
and focussed on the actors involved in peacebuilding. In defining and mapping the field of peacebuilding, I have moved to an institutional approach, which helps explain why the organisations are engaged in similar activities and describe their activities in similar ways on their websites. Returning to the definition: “Institutions are comprised of regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life” (Scott, 2008, p. 48). In other words, peacebuilding is an institution that defines the regulatory, normative and cognitive boundaries for the field, providing PBO activities with stability and meaning. For example, the specific activity of facilitating dialogue workshops at residential centres is shared by many members of the field, and thus has taken-for-granted legitimacy within the institution of peacebuilding.

Having painted a picture of the organisational field and population, I turn now to investigating how the field and population are changing. In analysing those changes, presented in the next chapter, I discovered that the field-level changes corresponded with the process of deinstitutionalisation (Oliver, 1992). The effort of rigorously defining and mapping the organisational field and population enabled me to identify the process of deinstitutionalisation, and document the population response to it.
Chapter 5. Findings: Organisational responses to the deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding in Ireland

"The biggest change is the environment in which we operate, I mean the peace process and the perceptions of it and we were just discussing this yesterday, that really - we're in a position now where there's a perception out there of this place, in my view, the long-term Northern Ireland conflict or British/Irish conflict is resolved and therefore people like Alpha don't really need to continue doing what they're doing." Alpha board member

"There was a sense of security in the idea of Beta and in the outworking of Beta that isn't there now. ... there isn't a lot of clarity around, you know, this is why Beta is needed and this is what Beta is going to do. So that's still in formation now." Beta member

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from phase two of the research in which I conducted interviews with key informants from the population of 15 PBOs identified in the previous chapter. As described in the methodology, chapter 3, the initial and overall aim of this phase and this chapter in particular, is to explore qualitatively the changes in the organisational environment, specifically in the field, and how are PBOs responding to those changes. The iterative process between data and literature led to two realisations. Firstly, as mentioned at the end of chapter 4, the field of peacebuilding is institutionally defined, meaning that the field members have shared structures, values and beliefs (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983); in other words, peacebuilding is an institution. Secondly, during the data-gathering, I realised that those shared structures, values and beliefs are losing their taken-for-granted legitimacy, corresponding with a process of deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding. These two realisations influenced the re-casting of the research question in this chapter to: how are PBOs responding to the deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding? The quotes above reflect the dissipating of the institution of peacebuilding, as PBOs express in various ways the loss of taken-for-granted legitimacy that they once had.

In this chapter, I document the process of deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding in Ireland in real-time. I examine how a population of organisations is impacted by, interprets and responds to field-level disruptions. To explore change in inter-organisation fields, I have first identified the field’s key actors and groups, the core
population of PBOs, in chapter 4. The boundaries around this field and population are so ambiguous as to make mapping a necessary first step. Parts of this chapter are included in a recently published article (Cannon & Donnelly-Cox, 2014).

The findings are divided into two sections, field-level disruptions and population responses, which are both described and illustrated with original quotes, to provide a balance of both showing and telling about the data (Pratt, 2008, p. 501, 2009, p. 857). The data is drawn from personal experience as an employee at a PBO, participant observation at events, formal interviews, as well as secondary documents from five PBOs: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta and Epsilon, as detailed in Table 3.6. The field-level disruptions consist of the content of the disruption, and the political, functional and social pressures that those disruptions reflect. Population responses correspond with those institutional changes. I find that deinstitutionalisation is both driving and inhibiting change in the population.

5.2 Field-level disruptions and institutional pressures

I interpreted PBOs' environmental changes as field-level disruptions, which reflect pressures of institutional change that correspond with Oliver's three categories: functional, social and political, the antecedents of deinstitutionalisation (1992).

The functional pressures reflect a weakening of economic viability of peacebuilding activities. Financial changes, primarily economic recession, have resulted in a reduction in public and private funding available for PBOs, resulting in closure of PBO programmes, facilities and, in one case, the organisation itself. The leader of Beta said, “The first challenge is money. It is one of the big problems that there is less of it, and that there are more organisations competing for it.” Not only are there fewer donations, but the available grant funding demands more accounting and reporting for expenses. For example, a programme worker at Epsilon stated: “The way that EU funding programmes are delivered is crippling; funding is given retroactively, i.e. expenses are reimbursed several months after they are incurred, rather than grants given up front, as in the past. As a result organisations carry a debt, which is crippling to most organisations. And on top of that the accounting procedures are very complicated and excessive paperwork is needed for all expenses. Five quotes are needed for every expense, every time an expense is incurred. There was even a suggestion by the donor at one point to take photographs of participants eating sandwiches to prove that the
expense was valid.” He described in detail how he spent more time reporting to donors than delivering programme work, which is a new development in grant funding. Accounting procedures for public grants have become more rigorous, described as the most challenging environmental constraint for PBOs.

Furthermore, the major peacebuilding donors are reviewing their funding programmes, some of which have been running for 25 years, and they are reluctant to continue funding the same work. The Delta peace centre stated that “Peacebuilding is not seen as a priority any more. We try to show potential donors that our work is not only traditional anti-sectarianism, but also contributes to the community integration strategy and cohesion strategy.” Thus, peace centres continue to do similar work under a different name to reflect current interests, so ‘integration’ has replaced ‘peace’. Revenue generated from services, such as overnight accommodation and training courses, has also reduced. These financial field-level disruptions reflect a functional institutional change such that peacebuilding is no longer a viable activity.

Political pressures reflect changing external dependencies, and while the financial changes might carry the most urgency, the changing role of civil society in the peace process poses a more fundamental challenge to PBOs. The role and need for PBOs is changing, but how it is changing is disputed and unclear. One theme is that politicians are now taking more responsibility for the peace process and there is less of a need for civil society actors. “The truth is that there is not a need for outsiders anymore. Communities in Northern Ireland are doing the work themselves.” On the other hand, another theme is that responsibility has transferred from politicians to civil society; politicians have created a power sharing agreement and have done their bit, and now civil society needs to play a bigger role in maintaining the peace. The leader of Delta described the shift in responsibility as follows: PBOs “are working much more closely with local politics as well, which I’m discovering to be the case certainly in our area, much more involved in having active relationships with local politicians and having the conversations with them as well as with other constituents.” Politicians need civil society to help translate public policy into real and meaningful actions in communities.

Looking at the evolution of peacebuilding over the past three decades illustrates how the context has changed, reflecting changing political pressures in the field. The leader of Alpha explained: “I think when you have such a broad thing as reconciliation it is so nebulous and in the 70s and 80s there was no science, if you like, of reconciliation. Now, 30 years later, the conflict resolution field is so much more clarified as to what we
mean by that and there are clearer models of it, ... it is about the stage of the conflict that’s important, ... whether we are at the conflict management phase, or the conflict resolution phase, which is post-ceasefire, or whether we are in the post-conflict phase, and therefore ... it’s about repositioning yourself as to which tasks you’re going to be doing, or which way you would be working at it.” In other words, as the political context has changed, as the conflict has evolved, the need for PBOs has shifted. As with functional pressures, political pressures reflect the weakening of institutionalised belief in the importance and need for PBOs, which I interpret as evidence for deinstitutionalisation.

Social pressures consist of changing rules and values that present a major field-level shift. The very need for PBOs is being called into question, both within and outside the population. . As one PBO leader put starkly, “PBOs may not be needed any more.” Another interviewee referred to PBOs as “dinosaurs facing extinction,” reflecting a breakdown in consensus on the need for PBOs even within the population, a clear indication of deinstitutionalisation. Local community groups, which have participated in peacebuilding training for over three decades, are now able and willing to conduct peacebuilding work themselves, without the support of intermediaries, such as PBOs. As summarised in Table 5.2, below, PBOs described significant changes in their environments, which are field-level disruptions corresponding with institutional pressures that are evidence of deinstitutionalisation. The pressures most referenced by PBOs are functional ones: a shift in available resources, both related to the global recession and cyclical changes in donor interests. Other changes, less frequently mentioned in interviews, but perhaps more indicative of deinstitutionalisation, are social and political: the need for PBOs is shifting and fundamentally called into question, partly due to the evolving peace process.
### Table 5.2. Field-Level Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotations</th>
<th>PBO perspective on changes in organisational environment</th>
<th>Field-level disruptions</th>
<th>Evidence of deinstitutionalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “We certainly have a situation now that if living in the south with cuts in government expenditure and everybody no longer wanting to know about the conflict, and everybody wanting to move on, it’s now a different agenda.” Alpha | Impact of global recession:  
- Fewer public grants due to general cut-backs;  
- Fewer donations from private sector;  
- Fundraising efforts less successful. | Economic change: reduced resources                           | Functional pressures: instrumentality of practices.  
Peacebuilding activities become difficult to conduct as funding dries up. |
| “For 25 years we have the same programmes. There is a need for renewal and a new vision.” Delta  | Life-cycle change:  
- Government funding is being reviewed after 25 years of funding the same thing;  
- Accounting procedures are more stringent. | Changing perceived need for PBOs                             | Social pressures: changing rules and values.  
Peacebuilding no longer has taken-for-granted legitimacy. |
| “The amount of accounting for that money is insane. It drains resources. It affects programme work dramatically.” Beta | Less of a need for PBOs – local groups can do their own peacebuilding work and no longer need intermediaries; changing social needs. | Changing perceived need for PBOs                             | Social pressures: changing rules and values.  
Peacebuilding no longer has taken-for-granted legitimacy. |
| “There is both more of a need for peacebuilding work now, yet a perception that there is no longer a need.” Epsilon  
“It is not called ‘peace’ any more… shared future, integration and the like.” Alpha | Peace process is evolving such that elected government claims they have achieved successful peace. | Shifting roles of organisations in peacebuilding field.      | Political: changing external dependencies. Politicians not engaging with PBOs. |
5.3 Population Responses

PBOs described their strategic adaptations to the changing environment, illustrating the agency that drives PBO changes. The most striking aspect of their adaptations was the number and diversity of different and new activities, which I interpret as multiple "illegitimate" actions (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001; Kraatz & Zajac, 1996) that PBOs are undertaking with the explicit intention of surviving as organisations. These include hosting weddings, having allotments, planting trees, and facilitating workshops on personal development in economically disadvantaged areas unrelated to the inter-ethnic conflict. They are not "legitimate" peacebuilding actions because they are not part of the PBOs' institutionalised understanding of what peacebuilding includes. For example, the leader of Delta stated: "we've kind of looked at as many golden opportunities as we can and we were able to do the tree planting because there was a grant with trees given to us by the woodland trust. So we were able to jump at that and say right let's get an application in to them, we'll do it and we'll make that happen, and everybody got on board with it. And the feedback was that they engaged and then the community engaged when they came to do the tree planting, so it was, there was an opportunity for us to do something positive and we just grabbed it while we could." The illegitimate actions are PBOs' deliberate strategic responses that are attempts to adapt to the pressures of deinstitutionalisation in order to survive as organisations. While these changes reflect PBO agency, they are driven by functional, social and political institutional factors that are structural pressures.

New "illegitimate" activities include programme work addressing social issues of equality, such as race, sexual orientation, gender and religion. PBOs are seen as outdated because the language has changed. People no longer talk about 'peace'; rather current buzz words include 'cohesion strategies' and 'community integration'. PBOs are adapting to the changing language and social needs by including 'cohesion' and 'integration' in their projects and in how they describe their work in line with policy trends. Programme workers can use their facilitation skills and expertise to address current issues, such as racism, especially in economically disadvantaged areas. Part of the shift towards this work is that there is now funding available for it, rather than peacebuilding. I worked as a fundraiser with one PBO from 2006 to 2012, and in that role attended events with many potential donors. A common response that I received when describing the work of PBOs was: why do we still need peacebuilding work? This experience shows that PBOs have been under pressure for some time to adapt their
work to more pressing and current issues, despite the fact that programme workers and users of the peace centres argue that there still is a real need for continued peacebuilding.

A frequently mentioned rationale for many of these new alternative activities is the need to become more business-like and to prioritise efficiency, effectiveness and strategic planning. PBOs have adopted more managerialist approaches (Maier & Meyer, 2011, p. 738), reducing their running costs and spending more time justifying and accounting for expenses. For example, an administrator at Gamma said: “People see me as a ‘peace bureaucrat’ because I see the business angle. As an organisation we need to be able to adapt and adjust to the changing environment. We need to diversify and find funding and find new areas of work. We have to be willing to take risks.” PBOs are finding alternative revenue streams to fund peacebuilding work, such as ‘selling’ their services and facilities more deliberately. For example, the PBOs with residential facilities are functioning like hotels in that any outside group can hire the venue for conferences or events. The leader of Beta stated: “Other groups also use the facilities, which we call self-programming. This is mainly weekend work. We have booked in Young Enterprise mid-week, which is room and board and brings in revenue for us.” Some stakeholders resist the changes, and PBOs struggle to communicate the changes effectively to their communities of members, donors and volunteers. There are numerous examples of tension and internal conflict arising from disagreement as to whether a more managerialist logic is appropriate for PBOs. Interviewees reported a sense that managers are not sympathetic to the delivery of peacebuilding programmes and need to listen more to those who deliver the programme work. From the managers’ perspective, the programme work needs to have a strong business case to survive.

Another rationale for a different set of responses is community valuing loyalty and commitment, emphasising contribution to the collective, rather than formal roles (Knutsen, 2012; Maier & Meyer, 2011). PBOs are embedded in communities of members, donors, volunteers, staff and beneficiaries. In three cases these are Christian communities, so include a religious-based rationale. Faith keeps people involved despite internal conflict or lack of direction. A programme worker at Epsilon stated: “faith means also that you stay committed, and possibly it means you get over your hurts, because your faith tells you, get over this, stay committed, don’t walk away. A community based project, people get hurt, they’re more inclined to say, I’ll cut my losses here.” So, faith helps keep peacebuilding communities together. Some PBOs, in
response to field-level disruptions, are turning inwards to their communities for direction and support, sometimes as part of a process of long-term consultation and voluntary participation. Delta stated: “We have a very actively involved management committee, so the staff and the volunteers know who the committee are, and will quite often be able to come in and sit, not every management meeting, but will often be able to sit in on management meetings. They will also be consulted. We have had a couple of vision days over the past three years where we’ve taken time out as an entire team to go and talk about what it is we want to do and where we are going and how we’re going to get there.” PBOs offer the promise of a close community with shared values, which takes a huge amount of energy, effort and resources to maintain. “That type of openness takes a lot more energy and but I think that when that’s available you’re going to have sustainable, what’s the word, in the world of psychology, a certain type of toughness, flexible toughness, a solidity, in the organisation, that again gives certainty to those involved that they know that this thing is secure, it’s steady” (Epsilon). If the promise is broken, or cannot be fulfilled, bitter feelings arise. For example, the leader of Delta talking about organisational conflict stated: “I think that the [organisational] conflict maybe impacts on a deeper level because people assume that the values of a peacebuilding organisation is supposed to be addressing conflict in a healthy way, yet and all we are still human organisations. We are capable of messing each other up and we are capable of all sorts of oversights. … it’s just I would have always hoped that we could have dealt with conflict differently as a PBO.” Thus, PBOs perceive community focused activities as important to organisational survival and success.

Throughout the data a recurring theme emerged that PBOs defend the continued need for peacebuilding, or a “custodian role” (Dacin & Dacin, 2008). For example, “there are people still living in war zones, that’s the reality, we are not post-conflict at all” (Epsilon). The defence of the need for PBOs is sometimes described as a conundrum as there is an increasing need for PBOs work, yet less funding available to do it. The argument given for the continued need for PBOs is that peacebuilding work can take place most effectively only after the violence has ended. Bringing people together across the conflict divide is often impossible while the bombs are still exploding. So, in some ways, now is the idea time to do peacebuilding work. One interviewee from Alpha responded to a question as to whether PBOs had accomplished their mission: “That is to underestimate the task of what the post-conflict work is… Mary MacAleese … said at one stage it took 30 years, the troubles lasted for 30 years, it’s going to take
another 30 years for us to work through the legacy of it.” In other words, there will be legacy issues following from the violent conflict for many years, and the idea that peace can be accomplished and we then move on to some new theme is an oversimplification of how violent conflict impacts the lives of people living through it. Rather, the trauma of inter-ethnic violent conflict persists, impacting subsequent generations, even if they haven’t directly experienced the violence. PBOs advocate ongoing recognition of the depth of impact of violent conflict on individuals and communities, keeping the flame alive for those who have been impacted, with the intention of maintaining the peace and not returning to violent conflict.

The increased need and simultaneous reduction in funds is also seen by some as an argument for increased managerialism, which would enable PBOs to be more efficient. Those dynamics are captured well in the following quote: “And as we over the years have had all those conversations in the past, certainly at Epsilon, holding onto the ideals of the mission, becoming more business minded within a strategic approach, and holding on to what we believe to be our ethos, is a journey that involves a lot of thought and discussion, but also just involves a lot of action too, because we don’t have time to discuss it around the houses, if you know what I mean, we’ve got to, we have to take the actions because it’s imperative. If we don’t do it, we’ll close. And then our mission is gone completely. Those are the kind of choices we are facing as well that we know we are doing this for our survival, but yes we’re doing this for our survival but we also want to hold on to what is important within that and try and protect that within a policy framework and try to protect that in how we deliver our work.” It is clear from this quote that the leader of Epsilon, as with the other peace centres, feels an urgency and survival imperative around becoming more managerial, but also that this shift will have to take place without completely altering the organisation’s mission.

One of the interesting and challenging features of PBOs was the conflict within them. While all organisations might have some degree of conflict, the particular challenge for PBOs was that they were supposed to be the peacemakers, so it was particularly troubling for them to have conflict. If they could not deal with their own conflict effectively, they were vulnerable to the charge of hypocrisy. An expression that was often invoked was “physician, heal thyself!” It was easier to help others with their conflicts then it was to help ourselves manage internal conflict. This conundrum was very challenging for PBOs, as it undermined their legitimacy; if you can’t deal with your own conflict, how can you help others? It led to feelings of hypocrisy.
Conflict in PBOs was referred to by many interviewees. From my experience of conflict in PBOs, and reflecting on the interview content, divisions arose along different pressures on the organisation. Managers were under pressure to run a viable organisation, comply with accounting and employment laws, comply with regulations regarding running accommodation and catering facilities, as well as bring in enough revenue to survive. Programme staff was under pressure to deliver quality experiences to participants, fulfil their staff duties, such as reporting to managers and donors, and develop new programmes to meet the evolving needs of the communities they served, and respond to developments in the peace process. Furthermore, most PBOs saw themselves as communities, communities of peace activists, in some cases Christians, who came together to work towards peace. Much time and effort was needed to maintain these communities, to make space for communication, to share ideas, to decide on priorities and goals.

The following example of conflict at Alpha is, on the one hand, quotidian and common to any organisation that manages both staff and volunteers, but on the other hand the organisational conflict is reflective of systematic divisions within Alpha and other PBOs. During much of my time at Alpha, there were weekly community meetings when all staff and volunteers would attend and with a fairly open agenda. These meetings were loosely structured, the only opportunity for the full community to talk, and often extremely frustrating for everyone involved. Either conflicts were aired, or there was a cold silence. They were a constant source of tensions and conflict. None of the CEOs or managers who led those meetings were able to constructively manage the emotions that were shared at community meetings. The residential volunteers were often the ones airing strong emotions, and even though there was a new cohort of volunteers each year, the same issues arose again and again. Individuals signed up for a one-year experience at a peace centre, expecting to learn about peacebuilding, and spent most of their time doing cooking and cleaning duties to help the residential centre function. Part of the problem was that programme staff were over stretched and found it hard to create meaningful roles for the volunteers in the programmes. Part of the problem was that there was not enough domestic staff to run the residential centre. It was a recipe for an annual disaster. Other PBOs have reported similar experiences, suggesting that there is some underlying structure tension that PBOs face. The divisions were often described as programme needs, versus community needs, versus organisational needs.
At the population level, PBOs are adapting and responding to field-level shifts. The first column in Table 5.3, below, represents deinstitutionalisation, the structural drivers of and barriers to population-level change that include functional, social and political changes. The second column describes how PBOs are deliberately and strategically responding to these changes by adjusting existing activities, taking on new activities and defending the continued need for peacebuilding. The PBO responses, however, result in specific barriers to change and re-institutionalisation: a lack of resources, multiple possible conflicting activities, and the custodian role. The population responses to deinstitutionalisation, searching for alternative activities that are more economically viable, are seen as their route to survival, but herein lie the perils too. No consensus on which alternative activities are appropriate leads to division and conflict. The third column provides illustrative quotes.
Table 5.3. PBO Population Responses to Deinstitutionalisation:

Drivers and barriers of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressures of deinstitutionalisation (Structure)</th>
<th>Population responses (Agency)</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional pressure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driver:</strong> lack of funding to continue peacebuilding work.</td>
<td><strong>Response to functional pressure:</strong> PBOs take on managerialist approach:</td>
<td><strong>Managerialist approach:</strong> “Those that are within the sphere of activism have had to become more engaged in business practices and thinking strategically about where do we go how do we get this, how do we pay for this? So can we charge people for a programme? And in Northern Ireland it is a new idea that people would actually want to pay for a services that would engage personal development or well-being, or social development or well-being in some way.” Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier:</strong> Lack of resources prevents change.</td>
<td>• Adapting activities to be more profitable: international peacebuilding work; charging community and school groups for services.</td>
<td><strong>Taking on profitable work:</strong> “We have to be able to get more bang for our buck, we have reduced overheads by 30%. We have to be able to find income from elsewhere. Gamma has programmes that have nothing to do with peacebuilding. We have to change the way the organisation operates. We have to look at our administration, finance, governance and reduce overheads. We need to be business driven, more business-like, and more efficient.” Gamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taking on profitable work outside PBOs’ definition of peacebuilding: running a café, planting trees, hosting weddings.</td>
<td><strong>Inability to resource new direction:</strong> “But there was no real clear there was no clarity or energy as to what now should be the core, and as a result then, because there were no programmes, there wasn’t a need to have a centre. And when there wasn’t any footfall through the centre, and it costs one million each year to keep that place going, why would you put all your energies into fundraising, to get that million or more, when no one has fire in their belly as to what the thing should be about. And as a result then, the businessmen said, well, what’s the point? There is no money for it, so the reality is, you have to close it. And it’s painful, but it has to be done. Because if there is no money, we can’t go into deficit on it.” Alpha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social pressure:
**Driver:** Peacebuilding no longer needed.

**Barrier:** Lack of consensus on which other activities are appropriate.

**Response to social pressure:** PBOs turn to their communities and stakeholders for guidance. They adapt activities to fit better with current social trends/needs: cohesion, integration, conflict resolution in economically disadvantaged areas.

**Barrier:** Conflict arises between multiple competing “illegitimate” actions with no consensus on new activities; lack of communication with stakeholders.

**Turn to communities:** “Let’s open this up, let’s call in the community, let’s have a massive meeting.” Epsilon

**Conflict:** “I’ve often heard people saying, “I thought I joined a so-called peace organisation” and it’s ripping with conflict.” Epsilon

**Conflict/dilemma:** “But the dilemma is, if you create a centre, you have to spend so much of your admin and your organisational effort to keep the centre going as opposed to being flexible and working with programme. So your programme must be at a critical mass in order to support a centre. Once the critical mass declines, then you are left with a ghost building. And what do you do with it? Do you change your mission to go on to something else, or do you hold to the core purpose from which you started?” Alpha

### Political pressure:
**Driver:** No longer a role for PBOs.

**Barrier:** PBOs’ reputation as actors in the Peace Process inhibits support for other activities.

**Response to political pressure:** Custodian role – PBOs continue to defend need for peacebuilding.

**Barrier:** Paralysis – inability to continue old role, but lack new role.

**Custodian role:** “there is still a need for the residential experience, and for the expertise and reputation of Alpha.”

**Defence:** “Organisation insiders will all argue a case for the need for PBOs because they have an interest in it and want to keep their jobs and justify what they do.” Alpha

**Paralysis:** “They saw that as a major change, and when we went through the reasons for it, people understood that, but there’s a part of all of us in organisations that can be quite traditional and you want to hold up the ‘we always did it that way’. That can be challenging to manage, and managing the stakeholder conversation around that.” Epsilon

**Paralysis:** “If you’ve got a train coming from this direction, and another train coming from this direction, you can’t always hold your sanity within that, and you’ve got to take action. I’ve been between a rock and a hard place a lot of times has just been a matter of holding on as much as possible. One of my favourite tactics at the moment has been delay, delay, delay. And I’ve found myself delaying decisions, delaying taking a particular action to see what positive things could emerge, and hoping for the best.” Epsilon
5.4 Discussion

In the previous chapter, I used an organisational lens to identify the field of peacebuilding and the core population of PBOs. The value of mapping this population is that I have been able to shed light on the complex, drawn-out process of deinstitutionalisation. The context of deinstitutionalisation demands that the population change or perish. Findings in this chapter show that the core population’s adaptation corresponds to the deinstitutionalisation process. Functional, social and political pressures act as structural drivers and barriers to change in the population. Barriers to successful adaptation also come from the population’s own response to field-level change. As PBOs are taking on numerous new activities, they do not have the resources to fund a focussed re-orientation around one new set of activities. PBOs turn to their stakeholder communities and try to explain all the changes, resulting in conflict and tension. Similarly, in response to political change, PBOs take on a custodian role and defend the need for peacebuilding, which leaves them paralysed by the inability to continue their old role, but lack clarity on a new role.

When institutionalised practices and beliefs dissipate, organisations pick up multiple possible alternative activities, some of which fit with their mission and values, while others seem to clash. “Illegitimate actions” are alternative practices that are outside and sometimes conflicting with the waning institutionalised practices and beliefs (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001; Kraatz & Zajac, 1996). Without a new normative framework to help eliminate or select alternative actions, there is no consensus on which of the many different activities are appropriate or worth pursuing and the result is internal conflict. This move towards chaos, or entropic pressure, drives deinstitutionalisation (Oliver 1992). The multiple new actions also provide a set of activities and beliefs from which a new institutional framework could emerge, and through which, new activities could be legitimated.

Applying Dacin and Dacin’s “custodian” concept (2008), I found that many PBO actors serve as custodians of peacebuilding, defending its continued importance. The custodian role could be interpreted as an attempt to preserve out-dated organisations due to self-interest, as in “permanently failing organisations” (M. W. Meyer & Zucker, 1989). In the case of peacebuilding, interviewees differentiated between the lack of interest in peacebuilding, and the real continued need for it. The need to defend the legitimacy of peacebuilding, as it has lost its taken-for-granted status, inhibits PBOs
from championing any of the other activities, such as international peacebuilding or social cohesion. Instead, they dabble in several of them in an attempt to keep peacebuilding in Ireland going, either because they know there is a real need, or due to an organisational survival imperative. I interpret this population response as evidence that the process of deinstitutionalisation is on-going and inconclusive in the absence of one convincing alternative set of beliefs or practices to replace the waning ones.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter identifies and documents some significant elements in the process of deinstitutionalisation. Functional, social and political pressures push PBOs either to resist change, by engaging in defensive work, or to adapt to change, mainly by taking on new activities. These elements of a process will be incorporated into the process model in chapter 9.

The sample population of PBOs which I defined and mapped in chapter 4 provided detailed and rich data on the deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding in Ireland because they are so affected by these changes due to the fact that their primary mission is peacebuilding. Therefore, this is an example of deinstitutionalisation of mission, not just deinstitutionalisation. These findings shed light on how organisations respond to the deinstitutionalisation of their mission. The experience for these organisations, as elaborated in the next chapter, is that of ‘mission loss’. Their very mission has lost its ‘security’ (as per the quote at the beginning of this chapter), or its taken-for-granted legitimacy. If the need for PBOs was “as valid as ever” (as quoted at the beginning of chapter 1), that need would be taken-for-granted and, thus, would not be so rigorously debated, discussed, or even mentioned.

While there is evidence in this chapter and in extant literature that organisations react defensively to deinstitutionalisation (Dacin & Dacin, 2008; Maguire & Hardy, 2009), it is still not clear what are the actual process that take place in organisations when their mission is undermined by deinstitutionalisation. In the next three chapters, I turn to those very micro-processes in the findings and analysis of organisational identity work. Furthermore, PBO stakeholders consider that the community rationale assists in their survival and success. Hence, the next phase of this research explores if and how prioritising the community rationale contributes to organisational survival.
It is important to note that in phase two of this research I investigated how the population is responding, and did not highlight the differences within the population of organisational responses. While all PBOs that I investigated are trying out several new areas of activity, not all are using the same combinations of new actions. For example, some PBOs are not focussing on religion, while others are also talking about environmentalism. This chapter does not capture the differences between individual organisational responses. Additionally, phase two does not document all of the possible responses to deinstitutionalisation within the field, which are numerous, and further research could explore the range of different responses within the field. I have captured one set of responses by the core population, which is significant, I argue, because it is the group of organisations most affected by deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding, their primary activity.

Having presented and discussed findings from phase two of this research, phase three, chapters 6-8, moves to the level of individual organisations. I home in on two of the PBOs included in the population, which I label Alpha and Beta. I analyse organisational identity work at the level of the individual organisation. In chapter 9, I return to the concept of deinstitutionalisation and analyse organisational identity work processes that take place in response to the deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding.
Chapter 6. Findings: Alpha Identity Work

"Alpha has developed a reputation that we haven’t lost yet for that, people do feel safe here. But we need to drop some of the formality and get back to some of the informal activities that we used to do." Alpha staff member

"I know from people telling me and from people I’ve met who’ve been here in the past how wonderful, it was great to come up to Alpha it would just lift their spirits and their souls and the people and the whole community effort of it all it was wonderful.” Alpha staff member

6.1 Introduction

Chapters 6, 7, and 8 comprise phase three of this research where I document and analyse how individual organisations are responding to deinstitutionalisation. In phase two, findings show how the population as a whole is responding but does not uncover the micro-processes within the PBOs that are catalysed by deinstitutionalisation of their very mission. Phase three focuses on those micro-processes, and analyses the language used within PBOs. I use the term ‘mission loss’ to capture how PBO members experience deinstitutionalisation for two reasons. Firstly, deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding relates directly to the mission of PBOs, which have by definition the primary purpose of peacebuilding. So, the end of peacebuilding equates with loss of mission. Secondly, the concept of deinstitutionalisation is abstract and not used by the research participants. As becomes clear in the next few chapters, participants express deinstitutionalisation of mission as loss of mission or purpose. Thus, the next two chapters describe the micro-processes in Alpha and Beta Peace Centres of how these organisations are responding to mission loss. A shorter version of these chapters is included in a conference paper (Cannon et al., 2013).

In this chapter, I distinguished five identity claims at Alpha by closely examining the discourse used by interviewees. I then explored how they interact by examining the differentiation evident in the interview transcripts. I categorised differentiation into three different degrees to illustrate how interviewees promote and reject identity claims in ways that are conflictual, neutral and plural.
6.2 Alpha Identity Claims

Identity claims are expressed by interviewees in their discourse. In the Alpha interview transcripts there are 997 units of meaning that I attribute to identity claims by all 18 interviewees. I interpreted the discourse as referring to five distinct identity claims: community, business, place, mediator, and educator.

The most frequently referenced claim states that the organisation is a **community** of people, staff and volunteers, who are brought together by their commitment to the mission and values, and by their belief in the need for peacebuilding work. The most frequently referenced dimension of the community claim is loss and sadness, mostly related to the departure of the community and the ending of the residential volunteer programme. Another strand of community is that people believe in the organisation, which I am interpreting as the expressive role (Frumkin, 2002), and refers to what draws people to the organisation, what makes them stay, and what the organisation stands for. The words used in reference to the expressive role are: belief, commitment, appealed to me, vocation, duty, welcoming, healing, interest, goodwill, spirit, meaning, reputation, connection with the past, ethos, people, stayed the same, loyalty, trust, affinity and passion. The references to the expressive role suggest that it has been challenged, but is still there. Interviewees say that the expressive role has been undervalued and that the community claim is the key to the organisation’s survival. Faith is part of the community claim and relates to the expressive role in that it reflects belief. It is an element of the organisation that has been rejected without remorse, and interviewees say in many different ways, ‘we are not a faith-based organisation.’

The **business** claim is a managerialist understanding of organisation, emphasizing efficiency and effectiveness in its capacity to deliver services, whether those services are peacebuilding programmes or hospitality events. Interviewees state that the business claim is necessary for the organisation to survive, but others reject the claim because its dominance is inappropriate. The business claim can be divided into two main elements: employer and finances as saviour. The business claim has gained prominence in the recent past in the organisation, and stricter financial controls and more financial expertise are seen to be the only route to survival in the face of organisational crisis. Individual board members and some staff were brought in because of their financial expertise to save the organisation in response to an organisational financial crisis. Within the saviour theme, the organisation acts as a fundraiser, and
must generate income for its survival. From a fundraising perspective, peace is no longer fashionable, so the organisation is challenged to find a new market for the product. The place, as in the buildings and surrounding land, is an asset that can help generate funding. The business claim includes the idea that the organisation is an employer, advertising for, hiring and firing staff, paying salaries, guided by specific roles and duties. There is a contrast between how people join the organisation from the business claim (by applying for a job, 7 references) and from the community claim (by invitation, 27 references). A newcomer might be invited and welcomed into a community, but joining a business is different in that potential newcomers have to apply and are assessed based on relevant skills. Finally, interviewees promote the business claim by rejecting uniqueness, stating that Alpha is not any different to any other business.

The **place claim** is an important dimension of the organisation’s identity, and specifically its uniqueness. It is important to note that the name of the organisation is also the name of the town in which it is located, and the name of historic buildings there. The history of the town, therefore, blends into the history of the organisation, and place more easily becomes a facet of the organisational identity. Often, interviewees do not distinguish between the town, the historic site and the organisation, so there are fuzzy boundaries around what is Alpha. The place claim represents that which is enduring about Alpha and has three distinct elements: the past, uniqueness, and the visitor’s centre. Interviewees describe the history of the site, which is eponymous with and pre-dates the organisation. Additionally, in the past, the organisation used to serve as a place for respite from people in cities, mainly from Belfast, whose daily lives were affected by the trauma of violent conflict. Interviewees describe what is unique about the place; for example a board member differentiates the place claim from facilitator, mediator and community claims: “He felt the actual location, not just the methodology and the people, but the location could be very important and, you know, there’s huge symbolism in Alpha if you look at the history of the place, you know, at the military barracks and then the boys’ home and all of that. There’s a lot of stuff there that again, we haven’t addressed but it’d be a shame if what is actually a fairly unique place as distinct from practice or people, a unique place with a unique history which has overlaid on it that sort of conflict resolution background and practice, if you like, it’d be a shame to lose it.” Uniqueness is related to the programme work, but that is also closely linked to place. Part of the uniqueness of the place is the beauty of nature at Alpha. The
natural environment at Alpha includes mountains, trees, streams, clear air and open space. There are 34 references to the Visitor’s Centre at Alpha, but only by 5 people. In fact, one person references the visitor centre 28 times, thus it is a very important aspect of the place for one person, whom I interpret as champion of the claim. She mostly refers to the visitor’s centre as a source of funding that will save the site, in a way that the peacebuilding organisation cannot.

The identity claim mediator relates to the organisation’s specific role in violent conflict: creating safe spaces to facilitate dialogue and cultivate communication and relationships between opposing parties in order to find peaceful solutions. The mediator claim corresponds with the Political Dialogue Programme run by the organisation since 1996 to bring together political parties and other conflict actors from Ireland, north and south, but also from Great Britain. While it is sometimes described as part of the organisation’s past, it is mainly described as part of the organisation’s current programme work. The mediator claim is referenced as the most important aspect of the organisation: “Our core is still the Irish/British conflict.” While many (15) interviewees reference the mediator role, there are four individuals who reference this role frequently, 17, 18, 28 and 33 times. So, this role is very important to a few people in the organisation, who are champions of the claim, but referenced one or a few times by most of the organisation. The subthemes in the mediator claim are international mediator, past, unique work, and rejecting mediator claim. The subtheme, unique work, is a way of promoting the mediator claim; it is the source of Alpha’s good name and reputation, which is a great benefit to the organisation’s current programme work.

The educator claim refers to programme work that addresses social needs such as youth violence, substance abuse, homelessness, among other issues. One staff member references the educator claim 16 times, while most others refer to it a few times, showing that it is particularly important to one staff member, who champions it, but also broadly relevant throughout the organisation. Within the educator claim, subthemes are new programme work and working in isolation. The educator identity claim is similar to the mediator claim, as both refer to Alpha as deliverer of programme work. I distinguish between these two identity claims below.

Part of the organisation’s purpose or mission is to deliver programme work; two kinds of programme work are apparent that respond to different social needs and are largely represented by specific individual staff members. I am interpreting these different programme focuses as the educator and mediator identity claims. While the mediator
claim refers to working with conflict actors in Ireland and abroad to find peaceful ways out of multi-generational, intractable inter-ethnic violent conflict, the educator claim sees the organisation’s purpose as delivering educational programmes in response to social issues that are not necessarily related to war. The mediator claim tends to respond to macro-level issues, like political leadership in a divided society, whereas the educator claim responds more to individuals’ needs, like substance abuse, youth violence, homelessness. For example, a board member says in response to poverty, drug and alcohol addiction and homelessness: “Alpha and Gamma can really help with things like that because the processes they have honed in making peace I think could be used to help people make peace with themselves, you know, and that filters through a community.” The distinction between macro-level needs and individuals’ needs is not clear-cut, but there is a demarcation between political work of the mediator and community work of the educator. One board member differentiates between other peacebuilding organisations and Alpha by saying: “Where Alpha is different in the past is in the ability to include political influences as opposed to community activists.” He goes on to say that Alpha also now works with community groups, youth and others, but the difference between Alpha and others in the past is Alpha’s work with politicians. This shows a distinction between the mediator claim and the educator claim. The mediator claim is something unique to Alpha, is associated with its good reputation, and is part of the past; the organisation can draw on that impressive work now to do educational programmes. The new programme work that is currently discussed by interviewees reflects a growing interest in the educator claim, but also in the international dimension of the mediator claim.

The educator claim includes references to new programme work that is just beginning, or is in the design stages. What is distinctive about this theme is that there are many different ideas, without clear direction. This could reflect the fact that this is a new and growing area, and that several new ideas have been proposed, but it is not clear which ones will continue to grow. This finding corresponds with the finding in chapter 3, where I analysed population responses to deinstitutionalisation and found that PBOs were taking on many new areas of work. Alpha’s new programmes in early stages include: renting out the buildings to a University to run residential courses, holding training in mediation for the law society, introducing restorative justice in schools, and teaching conflict resolution in economically disadvantaged areas. Interviewees refer to

2 Another PBO.
several different aspects of social challenges, like homelessness, violence, abuse, to name a few. “Social conflict is a feature of modern day society in the Republic and I suppose if you look at the riots in London last year, bubbling under the surface, fuelled by racketeers and gangsters. And maybe Alpha has a new breath of air to offer something.” The interviewee describes this new programme work as ‘a new breath of air’ for the organisation, to revive it. This statement suggests that the organisation is trying to adapt to mission loss by looking for new relevance.

All five identity claims represent dimensions of Alpha’s OI, and are all mentioned by almost all of the interviewees, as illustrated in Table 6.2 below.

### Table 6.2. Alpha Identity Claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Claim</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Interviewees (18 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community claim is referenced most frequently, whether being promoted or rejected, showing that the idea of community is an important part of Alpha for all but one interviewee. The other identity claims are also referenced frequently, particularly business, and place, showing that the organisational identity is multiple and complex. Additionally, one or a few interviewees clearly championed each identity claim, and references to the five claims were not evenly distributed across the 18 interview transcripts. The community and business claims each have four to five champions, while the educator, mediator and place claims each have one or two champions. This shows a lack of cohesion that is also referenced by the interviewees. Showing the frequency of references in each claim is enabled by the qualitative analysis software, and rather than detract from the descriptive qualitative analysis, this extra information provides insight on relative weighting of codes and themes (Odena, 2013).

### 6.3 Alpha Differentiation

In order to reconstruct the process of identity re-formation, I describe and analyse differentiation that I observed in the discourse of organisational stakeholders. Differentiation is a discursive devise used by interviewees to distinguish between
different elements of an organisation, between different points in time, or between different organisations. I conceptualise this process of differentiating between different identity claims as organisational identity work, and is a way of re-forming organisational identity in response to mission loss. I found that there are different degrees of differentiation: neutral, plural and conflictual. I have identified 324 examples of differentiation in the interview transcripts from Alpha. Conflictual differentiation appears 200 times by 17 people and is a way of asserting what the organisation is, “self” by negating what it is not, “other.” Neutral differentiation appears 114 times and includes simple comparisons of “what we are versus what we are not,” in order to promote and reject various claims as “self” and “other.” This theme includes temporal differentiation and inter-organisational comparisons mostly with two other peacebuilding organisations. Plural differentiation is expressed only 10 times by 4 people, and consists of reconciling conflictual positions by acknowledging difference between “self” and “other” while expressing the possibility of co-existence.

The most frequent type of differentiation at Alpha is conflictual when interviewees distinguish between different elements of the organisation in a way that reflects perceived incompatibility between claims. Conflictual differentiation consists of discourse that asserts one claim over another, negating the value of other identity claims, and is most evident between business and community claims. For example: “I remember one of the financial guys at a council meeting saying “Do we really have to pay redundancies, is there not some way we could get out of that”?…” And I just thought “God in heaven!”; this is not Alpha-speak or it shouldn’t be, you know, you’re letting somebody go which is bad enough and you’re trying to get out of paying the statutory requirement.” From the perspective of the community claim, the organisational “self” should treat people with kindness, respect and care. From the perspective of the business claim, the organisational “self” should save precious resources whenever and however possible. When the speaker says “this is not Alpha-speak or it shouldn’t be,” she is saying that the business claim is “other” and not appropriate for Alpha; she is negating it as inappropriate because it clashes with the community claim’s values.

Conflictual differentiation shows that the interaction and co-existence of various identity claims is expressed through ‘talking against them,’ ‘frustration,’ and ‘lack of integrity.’ Talking against them includes negative descriptions of others. For example: “I suppose it is the thing that annoyed me about Alpha when I first joined was that they talked completely about the programme work and - as if they had a right to be funded
for it, you know, but I think any philanthropic organisation or an organisation that has non-commercial values needs a commercial organisation behind it and is competing for funds, you know, with *thousands* of other charities or other NGOs. So they have to get their act together.” In this case, ‘they’ are the people involved in programme work, which represents the educator or mediator claims — it is not possible to distinguish which one from this statement or from the context. The speaker, from the perspective of the business claim, is expressing frustration at ‘their’ self-righteous sense of entitlement; from her perspective, ‘they’ are just like any business, competing for resources. This is a way of rejecting Alpha’s uniqueness, which is part of the place and mediator claims. She states that they do not have their act together, which is an example of putting down the other claims in order to assert the business claim. One way of talking against them that negates other identity claims is to use projected meaning void (10), in other words to state that the other claim has no meaning, thus should be rejected.

The frustration theme is widespread and appears most frequently in the community and business claims. From the perspective of the community claim, there is frustration around the fact that the organisation does not live up to expectations — its reputation and mission suggests one thing, while the reality is quite different, corresponding with the lack of integrity theme. Another type of conflictual differentiation involves comparing and contrasting internal versus external elements of the organisation. The external refers to the organisation’s reputation, what is known about the organisation from the outside. The internal refers to the reality on the inside of the organisation. Interviewees highlight the contrast and even conflict between the external reputation and the internal reality. An example of the internal reality of the organisation not living up to its external reputation: “It seemed to me like a dream job you know. To come into an organisation that had a reputation … like a dream come true. Coming here then, I rapidly began to understand that this was an organisation where you really to a large extent you were really on your own.” The interviewee is contrasting the external reputation, which leads him to expect an organisation with good communication and cooperation among the staff, with the internal reality, which was an organisation with very poor communication and a lack of collegiality. He came to the organisation as an employee (business claim) and expected that the espoused values (community claim) would be reflected in how the organisation operates. When speakers highlight this lack
of integrity between external and internal dimensions, they are suggesting incompatibility between claims.

**Neutral differentiation** consists of promoting and rejecting various identity claims. This discursive device is a way of differentiating between elements of an organisation, or identity claims, without aggressively rejecting the alternative, but simply by enacting the self-other relationship in discourse by saying: we are X, we are not Y. One explicit example is: "We set about resourcing programme work which is what it’s about, you know, the organisation is doing the work: programme work and that’s what it’s about. It’s not about the residential, it’s not about accommodation, it’s about programmes.”

The speaker states that the primary function of the organisation is to deliver programme work; in other words, the educator claim is primary. He could also be referring to the mediator claim, however, delivering programme work is more related to the educator claim; the mediator claim is more about playing a role in political developments. He is rejecting the place and community claims by saying it is not about residential; he is rejecting the business claim when he says it is not about accommodation, generating income from the site. In this way he is simply stating that the educator claim is primary. He is rejecting the other claims, but he is not totally negating them, as in conflictual differentiation. He is not saying that residential does not belong in this organisation; he is simply saying that it is not the primary focus.

Neutral differentiation can provide explanation and clarity, and is primarily used in explaining the organisation’s past, and in distinguishing between different organisations. Temporal differentiation illuminates what the organisation used to be, versus what it is now. One example reflects that the business claim has replaced the community claim: “For me it’s gone more of a business, it would be - like anywhere else it has to be drawn by money I suppose. The passion isn’t what it used to be, there was a lot of passion here at one time with the groups and that. And now it’s all gone, and shut up. It doesn’t have to be that way.” The passion refers to the expressive role in the community claim, which has faded. The speaker is comparing the past, when the community claim was more prominent, and the present, when the business claim is primary. Finally, interviewees use inter-organisational differentiation to explain how Alpha is different or similar to other peacebuilding organisations, primarily Beta and Gamma, as these were part of the interview questions. The main point of comparison is that Beta has a Christian ethos. For example, “They’re not a business. I suppose they need the money too but they seem to be more – especially from the volunteering side...
They seem to look after them better.” This quote reflects the fact that the business claim is stronger in Alpha than in Beta, and the community claim (looking after the volunteers better) is stronger in Beta.

The final type of differentiation is plural, which appears much less frequently than conflictual and neutral. When interviewees engage in plural differentiation they acknowledge more than one claim, but state that they can co-exist. Plural differentiation in Alpha indicates that conciliation between conflictual identity claims is evident. The following quote suggests some conciliation, but also reflects conflictual differentiation (frustration and lack of integrity): “The organisation, in its governance and in its running, doesn’t actually do what we know to be the right way to work in peacebuilding. So we know that in peacebuilding you’ve got to talk to people you don’t necessarily like or maybe you don’t agree with, you’ve got to find ways to work with them, you may have to compromise, you may have to, you know, look for very different ways of doing things than would be instinctively your way of doing it but ultimately you’re going to have to get on and work with people to achieve results and I think sometimes in this organisation some of the dysfunctions could be sorted out if people were prepared to sit down and really talk to each other, you know, in the way that we suggest other people in conflict should. But often that doesn’t happen.” While this quote primarily refers to frustration and lack of integrity, the speaker is also providing some advice for plural differentiation between identity claims. His statement suggests that for the organisation to successfully reform its identity in response to mission loss the organisational stakeholders will have to move beyond conflictual differentiation and find more conciliatory ways of working through the various identity claims. It is clear from the data that while some organisational stakeholders promote plural differentiation, very few of them (4) are actually engaging in it.

6.3.1 Summary of differentiation

In the case of Alpha, organisational stakeholders engage in identity work through the use of different types and degrees of differentiation. On the one hand they compare and contrast what the organisation is, including different elements of the organisation, different points in time and different organisations. These types of differentiation refer to what is compared and are part of the picture of how identity claims interact. Categorising differentiation into degrees illustrates that there are different ways of differentiating: conflictual, neutral and plural. These degrees of differentiation show
how the identity claims interact. Conflictual differentiation negates the value of identity claims, "other," in order to assert another claim, "self." Neutral differentiation is used to clarify and explain what the organisation is, "self," and what it is not, "other," by promoting and rejecting identity claims. Plural differentiation is used following conflict, to state that it is possible for various identity claims, "self and other," to co-exist in the organisation.

6.4 Alpha Mission Loss

The new programme work, the interaction between the educator and mediator claims, and the saviour theme demonstrate an organisation trying to adapt to mission loss. The educator claim is replacing the mediator claim in response to the changing context where there is less interest in and funding for the work of the mediator claim. The educator claim is more fluid – it includes several different ideas that are not yet very clear – as this is new work that is being proposed in order to adapt to the changing context. The idea that the organisation needs to be saved from imminent demise also reflects acknowledgement of mission loss. There are references to mission loss by all 18 interviewees, who either acknowledge it (163), deny it (12), reject it (16). Acknowledging mission loss takes the form of discussing organisational survival or closure (88), referring to socio-political changes in the organisational environment (16), organisational crisis (14) or loss of relevance and interest in Alpha’s work (14). Denying mission loss includes statements about how there is no doubt about the continued need for peacebuilding. When interviewees reject mission loss they accept that there are doubts about its need but cast those doubts aside as uninformed. Finally, others reject mission loss as temporary and are convinced that there will be a return to violent conflict because of the underlying tensions that still exist. These findings correspond with population responses to deinstitutionalisation, described in chapter 5, but provide much more detail and insight into how an individual organisation is interpreting and responding to changes in its environment.
6.5 Alpha in-case analysis

The identity work lens has highlighted an organisational response to OI ambiguity and threat that was catalysed by deinstitutionalisation, which was experienced on the organisational level as mission loss. Change in the organisational environment leaves stakeholders asking, “What should we do now?” focussing on the activities of the organisation. In this case there has been a shift from mediator to educator claim. This adaptive response has implications for the organisational identity, as stakeholders simultaneously ask: “What do we stand for now?” reflecting a recursive relationship between organisational actions and OI. In response to identity ambiguity, organisational stakeholders engage in differentiation, primarily conflictual, trying to construct a response to mission loss that would enable the organisation to re-form its identity and survive.

The case of Alpha illustrates how members use identity claims and differentiation to weave together a coherent narrative of the organisation’s identity over time (Ybema et al., 2009, pp. 306–7) combining social actor and social constructionist approaches (Gioia et al., 2010). The following description informs how the identity claims have emerged and how they interact in the present. The organisation began as a group of activists, the community claim, and was given the place, Alpha, which also gave them their name. The place then became an important part of the organisational identity, enduring throughout time, and an important part of its residential programme work. Then, with an emerging political peace process, the mediator claim came into ascendancy, and gave Alpha a good reputation for unique and relevant work, which was then the basis for an international political dialogue programme. As the mediator claim came to be seen as less relevant due to increasing perception of mission loss, the educator claim became more important, focussing on the instrumental rather than the expressive role of the organisation. When financial crisis hit the organisation, the business claim emerged as the only way to save the organisation, as members turned outwards to seek expertise, and the community claim was rejected, leaving sadness and loss in its wake. The business claim has replaced the community claim, and the educator claim is replacing the mediator claim, while the place claim is enduring. This history informs the current state of the organisational identity and reflects a prioritising of the instrumental role, and a turning outwards to financial experts, abandoning the founding claim. Organisational members draw on identity claims, the history of the
claim in the organisation, and the member’s experience and relationship with that claim to weave together an identity narrative.

The case of Alpha illustrates that extensive reliance on conflictual differentiation results in a paralysed organisation as stakeholders cannot see other organisational perspectives as valid, dismissing them as meaningless and inappropriate. In terms of outcome of the identity work processes: Alpha is an organisation that was once united in its opposition to war, but is now very much divided on what to unify around. The organisation is fragmented, in a state of limbo, suspended between conflicting identity claims, with no clear alternative emerging in response to mission loss. Organisational members propose several possible solutions with very little consensus on which ones to pursue. I attribute this state of protracted limbo to the type of differentiation that organisational members use; conflictual differentiation asserts one claim by negating the value of the other, denying the possibility of co-existing claims. Organisational stakeholders describe the lack of communication in the organisation, which I attribute to the excessive use of conflictual differentiation between claims. Extensive use of conflictual differentiation, negating other claims in order to promote one, is linked with frustration and feelings of lack of integrity and hypocrisy. For example, an Alpha member says, “essentially I also became aware of the fact that quite a lot that went on at council meetings was kind of window dressing and that didn’t seem to me to fit with the - with the ethos of Alpha. Now, maybe that’s terribly naive, I mean companies are companies are companies but I didn’t expect Alpha to operate in the same way that a commercial company would operate.” “Window dressing” reflects a belief that the organisation does not conduct its affairs in a consistent way, and that there is a surface reality at formal meetings, which contrasts with how the organisation actually operates. These contrasts seem inappropriate for a peace organisation, according to interviewees, and they see the organisation as hypocritical and lacking integrity. Excessive use of conflictual differentiation that pits identity claims against one another leading to fragmentation, hypocrisy and lack of integrity, leaves the organisation in a state of limbo, with no clear identity emerging, and no clear solution or way forward in response to mission loss.
Chapter 7. Findings: Beta Identity Work

If Beta were an animal, what would it be?

"I think it’s a very old female badger about to have cubs..... My explanation for that would be that it’s got a lot of experience but as a system it’s getting old and - but there’s cubs about to be born. There’s a tiredness, there’s a wisdom, there’s a fit-for-purposeness and a greediness and there’s a pregnancy and all the risks associated with that too. Will the mother live? Is she weak? We just don’t know.... the place is pregnant and the risk of that is palpable, the excitement of that is also there.” Beta staff member

7.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the organisational identity work processes at Beta, the second case organisation. Within case analysis is provided at the end of this chapter, followed by cross-case analysis in chapter 8. As suggested by the quote above, Beta is also going through a time of transition, complete with risk, expectation, excitement, worry and conflict. However, Beta’s organisational identity work processes reflect a distinctly different pattern than those of Alpha. A shorter version of this chapter is included in a conference paper (Cannon et al., 2013).

7.2 Beta Identity Claims

Interviewees describe Beta in terms of four distinct identity claims: community, business, educator and place. All 16 interviewees refer to the four identity claims, showing that these themes run throughout the organisation. The community claim is most frequently referenced, both indirectly and overtly. For example, one interviewee says: “It is essentially a community.” This is an overt and direct way of stating an identity claim. In most of the discourse, the claims are more implicit, as described below.

Beta was founded as and continues to be above all a Christian community, which consists foremost of the 160 members, who take a formal commitment each year and contribute their time and funds to sustain the community. The community is a model of reconciliation as they demonstrate acceptance and openness. It is Jesus’ message incarnate, and interviewees say in various different ways, ‘It is more important how we are together, rather than what we do.’ They engage in volunteer work together in order
to be in relationship with each other, not for themselves, but to model reconciliation intentionally, and to serve the wider community. The community is spread out across Ireland, Britain and the world, and meets in cell groups in various locations. It takes time and intentionality to form deep relationships with each other and with God. The community existed before the residential centre, before the outbreak of violence called the Troubles, and has modelled community for 50 years. It is described as old and wise collectively, and is the heart of Beta.

The community claim includes the expressive role of the organisation (Frumkin 2002), which means the values and beliefs that Beta embodies, as well as what attracts stakeholders to the organisation. The values of the community are welcoming, generosity, personal responsibility and transformation, trust, integrity and inclusivity. Welcome overlaps with the place claim, and many interviewees say that the organisation is very good at welcoming all people in, being a host and taking care of visitors, making them feel welcome. Inclusion refers to the fact that they deliberately try to include a diversity of people in their community. They attract residential volunteers from all over the world, and of all backgrounds and religions. They try to have a diverse membership, although most people come from Ireland, and so far they are all Christian, although there is a discussion about including people of other faiths in the membership in order to be true to their inclusive approach. Transformation is a theme that relates to members’ Christian beliefs and personal experiences at Beta. For example, “I can only comment on the difference it [Beta] has made to me, and no volume would be big enough to hold all that it has done for me. I have been able to grow and develop and it’s taught me how to relate to people. It has taught me a lot about facilitating groups, being alongside people. It has given me an opportunity for about 15 years of my life to be involved with bereaved families and especially the children. It gave me that opportunity to do that, that was a huge thing for me, and that seemed to be a practical expression of reconciliation in the context of grief and bereavement.” There are many examples of interviewees describing their own and others’ transformations when they come to and experience Beta. The openness, trust and acceptance opens participants hearts and minds to a different way of interacting with other people, especially within a context of violent conflict. Transformation at the core of the Christian story is an important symbol for Beta: the bread and wine becoming the body and blood of Christ.
Integrity is described in a variety of ways to reflect the fact that they try to act out their values in the running of the organisation and in their daily lives as community members. Beta members mostly express integrity and inclusivity in terms of their faith. They try to live out the Christian values and the teachings of Christ from crucifixion, which represents violence over the weak, and communion, which represents coming together with respect as equals. It is a para-church organisation in that it exists alongside the formal Christian Churches without replacing them. Beta gives pastoral care to others and to each other in a way that is more authentic than the church. Their commitment to inclusivity and integrity is often challenging to carry out, and can lead to possible contradictions, such as having only Christian members, but preaching inclusivity. Several interviewees mention this struggle and there is an awareness of the possible hypocrisy, and a commitment to work through the issues together in a respectful way.

The second most frequently referenced identity claim is Beta as a business, which contrasts with the community claim, and is often in tension with it. Interviewees use the word ‘organisation’ to refer to Beta as employer, which I am interpreting as the business claim. The business claim refers to a system that has a strategic plan and measures its work. It sets goals for itself and the organisation works towards those goals. The strategic plan was created by a very inclusive process in which all members, staff, volunteers and others were asked to contribute and participate. The staff was then tasked with operationalising that plan. The plan includes thematic areas, the mission and the values of the organisation. The business is an employer that has staff in two locations, the rural residential centre and the city office. The business is highly concerned with the reduction in funding from various sources, from churches, public and private donors. In response to this, the business is trying to generate income from use of the site and through its programme work. Some staff call the services that the business offers, its ‘product’, which they know causes disquiet among the members. Programme participants, like schools, find it hard to adjust to the idea of fundraising in order to engage with Beta, and some of the programme staff find it very uncomfortable to have to ask schools to raise funds. In response to the lack of funds, the business has also reduced its staff and is replacing them with volunteers.

The use of the term, product, does not sit well with the community, nor the idea of engaging with people in an economic interaction. The values of the community are such that relationships beyond economic interaction are the foundation of their community, so to introduce economic exchange into their work is an affront to their
values. There is an awareness of this and the tension is acknowledged. According to one member, the future of the organisation depends "on whether Beta, we as Beta and all concerned find ways of not just being seen as in the reconciliation business. In other words that there's something that not in order to be different but there's something on offer in the essence of Beta that isn't just a matter of providing a space and programmes..." He is differentiating between the essence of Beta (the community claim), and the idea of providing (business claim) space (place claim) and programmes (educator claim), and for him the community claim, the values and the essence is key to a successful future. Being just a business reduces the uniqueness of Beta, as any organisation can provide services.

Beta claims to be an educator, its instrumental role, which involves conducting training in community relations and conflict resolution, hosting summer workshops and silent spiritual retreats, organising conferences and meetings at the centre, delivering teacher and student training sessions in schools, and working in communities. In the early days of Beta, programme work consisted of family weeks, summer festivals, and other organised activities at the centre to provide space to model community and reconciliation. During the violent conflict, the programme work, and the place, provided safe space for respite away from the troubles for families and conflict actors, such as ex-combatants. From the 1990's until 2010, the programme work was influenced by the relatively large grants available for peace and reconciliation work from the European Union, the International Fund for Ireland, and the Northern Ireland Government (Department of Education, primarily). Several staff positions were fully funded to deliver programme work. Now, this funding has ended and there has been a reduction in programme staff and activity. The programme work is shifting so that staff work with schools and other groups to raise funds to do the activities, such a residential programmes at the centre. This is a big change and is felt by some to clash with the ethos of Beta. While different programmes have different goals, an underlying goal of the programme work is personal and group transformation, through increased awareness of relationships with each other and with God.

The educational work is often described as modelling community for others. All visitors and programme participants experience the community that is Beta, and this is apparent in the day-to-day tasks such as washing dishes together, clearing tables, praying, participating in worship and interacting with each other. This is called Beta's own programme work, rather than the externally funded other work that facilitators
(Beta programme staff) provide at Beta. Interviewees say, for example: “We seek to model the Kingdom and let go.” “Through our youth, family, community, and faith programmes we have developed a way of being with each other.” “It is not just about responding to those who are deprived, disabled or prisoners. It is standing alongside them as human beings and with them in challenging how we all move forward for a better quality of life.” “It is a new way of being together that I think Beta modelled for those who took part in the programmes. And that modelling for many has been life transforming in the sense that it’s given them hope that something different is possible.”

The identity claim place refers to the rural residential centre of Beta, a cluster of buildings that house groups of participants for programme work and members' meetings throughout the year. It is the main meeting place of the community and friends of the organisation. It is run by staff and volunteers and is managed by a centre director. A diverse group of international volunteers live at the centre and help run the operations and host the groups. The people at the centre model community and reconciliation, intentionally living their values. It is a place of natural beauty, by the sea, and is the focus of Beta's work. When the centre was first obtained, the community were enthused and gathered there, thus Beta really came into being. Although it was a community first, the obtaining of a physical space galvanised and focused their work in one place. The Worship House is an important building at Beta and is where the ritual of worship takes place twice a day. Interviewees differentiate between the place as part of Beta work, and the place hired by outside groups doing their own programme work. The idea that the place can be sold like a service is challenging to many participants because it conflicts with the values of the organisation, that human relationships beyond economic exchange are important. To treat Beta like a hotel is an affront to those values, as it reduces it to a service that is not unique, but like any similar service. Some staff are comfortable with this concept and do not see a problem, but they do acknowledge the tension.

Example of an overt statement of the place claim: "What’s unique and has stayed and an unchanged feature is that it has a residential centre, that’s been there right from the beginning... So, in addition to everything we do we would say that Beta offers a residential experience because it’s about community and community develops when you’re meeting with each other and able to have a period of time in a residential centre. It’s amazing how quickly relationships form and community is forged.” Here the place claim is highlighted as important, but it is interlinked with community. There is a
theme running through the interviews that the various claims are interlinked, and for the most part happily coexist. This is evident in the type and degrees of differentiation used by interviewees in talking about Beta.

An overview of the four claims and the number of quotations attributed to each claim is presented below.

Table 7.2. Beta Identity Claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Claim</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Interviewees (16 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows the relative weight of each claim in terms of frequency of references, and the number of interviewees referencing each claim. In contrast with Alpha, in Beta there are not a few people championing each claim, but quite a broad coverage of each claim in each interview. This reflects homogeneity across participants on how frequently they reference each claim. That is not to say that they have identical understandings of the meaning of each claim, but just that they are all talking about the same amount about each claim. Having presented Beta’s four identity claims, I turn now to how interviewees use self-other talk to promote and reject those claims.

7.3 Beta Differentiation

Interviewees use self-other talk, or differentiation to distinguish between the various identity claims, but also to distinguish between Beta at different points in time, and between Beta and other similar organisations. As in the case of Alpha, I found varying degrees of differentiation: conflictual, neutral and plural. Beta interviewees use differentiation mostly in relation to the community and business claims. The community claim corresponds most frequently with plural differentiation, while the business claim overlaps mostly with neutral differentiation.

Beta participants primarily use neutral differentiation (281 references by 16 people), which is a way of stating ‘we are X, we are not Y’, such as talking about the organisation in the past (we were X, now we are Y). Neutral differentiation involves a simple either/or comparison as a way of promoting one claim and rejecting another. Temporal differentiation is the most frequently used type of neutral differentiation,
showing that actors use the past as a frequent reference point for talking about Beta. For example, “It started out as a community and then became an organisation.” This is a clear use of identity claims, and a neutral way of stating how they have changed over time. Other examples are not as neutral, “In those days it was done in such a way that now Health and Safety would scream to high heaven, “Don’t do that!” and that’s why we can’t do it the same way…” While this example is neutral, we used to do things that way, now we do things this way, it also carries some remorse in the underlying message that in the past we did many things that built relationships of trust, such as doing the dishes together, jumping on a big trampoline, for example, which now we are prohibited from doing by the formal organisation. So there is some resentment towards the formal organisation, or the business claim, that it is compromising the community claim.

Another example that reflects nostalgia for the past: It seems like many things today I suppose are more diluted than they were because as Beatrix said earlier we’d a week long experience of people together. They had a whole week for the relationships to develop and become fruitful in a way that had a possibility of a more lasting impact on their lives, you know…. But I’m not saying that two days or three days isn’t worth something. But when you compare it… you wonder how much is it worth, you know?” While the comparison with the past is fairly neutral, as in, neither the past or present are rejected, there is still a sadness and sense of loss about the past, that things were better back then, especially in terms of relationship building and trust (the community claim). Temporal comparisons reflect a decline of the community claim, and a rise of the business claim, that is not welcomed by many organisational stakeholders. While the label of community claim is staying the same, the meaning behind it is being slightly diluted. Furthermore, several of the examples of temporal differentiation overlap with the concept of mission loss. For example: “Beta was borne out of a group of people that really wanted it to make an impact and continuously were always doing that. I think now we’re in a place of … ‘What’s our cause?’ Does that make sense?” In the past Beta had a clear mission; now its cause is ambiguous. There are several similar examples of temporal differentiation that clearly describe mission loss, which I will return to below.

Inter-organisational comparisons are the second most frequent type of neutral differentiation. Beta interviewees compare their organisation to other peacebuilding organisations, like Alpha and Gamma, which were part of the interview questions. The main point of difference is that Beta is a Christian organisation, while the others are not.
They say about Gamma in different ways that it is more business-like. Interviewees also compare Beta to other types of organisations, like other NPOs, churches, or hotels. This indicates that while Beta is neither a church, nor a hotel, it has some elements in common with these other types of organisations. For example, one interviewee states, “…church contexts as distinct from Beta, which isn’t a church.” He is simply clarifying what Beta is by saying what it is not, a church, with the implication that for both organisations faith is an important element. A longer example shows how Beta is similar and different to churches: “My deep criticism of churches is that they are not places where people are honest with each other. They’re places where people feel almost obliged by their circumstances to pretend and the pastoral nature of Beta to deal with peoples’ real needs is quite unusual… with people talking about things … in an actual pastoral way…it is good that people are here and all are open and welcome to that.” He is comparing and contrasting church and Beta. In a way this is conflictual because he is rejecting Church as disingenuous. This also reveals the value that members place on integrity of how they treat and respect all people. The clearest distinction between Beta and church is the following: “Originally it was set up quite deliberately as a Christian Community but definitely not a church…. So in a sense it is a para-church organisation. It belongs alongside the Churches; it works from a Christian basis, but, it is not a church itself… So both from Beta and from the Churches perspective there is a deliberate distance there.” Other types of organisations include hotels: “You’re not a hotel – the rules and regulations on safety, food hygiene, all – you have to comply with all of that.” So, while Beta is not a hotel, it has to comply with the same regulations as a hotel because it has residential facilities.

Other comparisons included in neutral differentiation are internal versus external, actorhoods and places. Internal versus external comparisons include references to Beta’s reputation, brand, or external image. A poetic example is: “The name, Beta, became an icon of hope flickering in the darkness and casting some light. We have cast our bread upon the waters and leave evaluation to posterity.” Beta build up a good and wide-reaching reputation for peace and reconciliation work. Internal versus external also refers to what members experience when they are at Beta, and how they live their lives outside of Beta. For example: “It gave me the challenge to examine the possibility of new ways to address social injustice, political and economic issues that affected my everyday life without getting shot dead or being judged, or isolated for expressing my views and opinions that needed to be expressed.” Inside Beta participants can speak
freely, but outside the organisation, in their own communities, they must be much more guarded due to physical threats. Comparing and contrasting different actorhoods (I, you, they, we) is part of neutral differentiation. Beta interviewees don’t put down others, but seem to be quite conscious of actorhood. For example, one participants speaks about when she first joined Beta: “I’d say ‘you should be doing this and doing that, are you?’ and he’d say, ‘No, Betty. ‘We’” This example shows that members deliberately take ownership of the organisation. Another example of comparing ‘they’ and ‘we’ relates to groups who come to Beta: “There are lots of different groups coming from other communities from other countries who need help, who need to be listened to. We need to listen to their story because we had grown into a time of our own political peacefulness and yet that energy that had been used up on the streets in the past with violence was now being turned on these strangers.” The speaker is recognising a similar experience between them and us. One of the values and messages of the organisation is that they recognise Jesus in others, which is the basis for their welcoming respect for others. They deliberately avoid stark distinctions between us and them, but in their examples of differentiating between actorhoods, there is often a suggested complexity. This could almost be classified as plural differentiation, because they express the belief that you and I are one. But in many of the examples, there is a simple distinction between highlighted between I and you, not in opposition, but in relationship, which I have classified as a neutral distinction. The final type of neutral differentiation is comparing and contrasting places. Participants refer in a neutral way to Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, France, America and other places. For example, “What in other places mightn’t be accepted or might be difficult, there, it’s made possible.” The interviewee is differentiating between the place of Beta and other places in a descriptive, positive way.

The second most common type of differentiation used in Beta is plural (273 by 15 people), when participants refer to more than one claim co-existing simultaneously, as in, ‘we are both X and Y together at the same time.’ For example, this interviewee demonstrates plural differentiation: “People think Beta is a place where everything’s solved by discussion and dialogue, you know, but the dialogue’ll go nowhere if the relationship isn’t there!” Firstly, he calls Beta a place, referring to the residential centre. Discussion and dialogue reflect the programme work, or the educator claim. Relationship refers to the community claim. So, simultaneously, Beta is a place, that promotes relationship, upon which good dialogue can be built. In his discourse, he is
acknowledging plurality, and the co-existence of multiple identity claims. He is indicating that relationship is primary, but the other two claims are also part of the picture. There are several sub-themes within plural differentiation: opening up questions (46), complex relationships (23), transition over time (16), holding in tension (20), highlighting part of Beta (18), and layers or shades (15).

Some examples of plural differentiation reflect a dialogical style of questioning; some interview comments were a series of rhetorical questions describing the issues that are currently being debated at Beta. For example: “there’s still the issue of the community and/or business; can they do both?” This is clearly a reference to two identity claims, using the same labels as I have used, and questioning whether they can co-exist. This reflects a current debate within the organisation. Some examples of questioning appear to be dissecting the organisation into pieces, rather than embracing multiple parts: “Do we really want bricks and mortar, or to cement relationships? And relationships should transcend bricks and mortar but if you have bricks and mortar you have an organisation that you have to manage and therefore that can be a distraction from your core business of relationship-building.” He is showing how three identity claims interact, place (bricks and mortar), business (organisation) and relationship-building (community). He is picking apart the organisation and questioning how and if they can fit together coherently and successfully. In a way this is the opposite of plural differentiation, because he is not embracing multiple claims, he is dissecting the organisation into multiple claims. While there are 46 examples of opening questions by 6 people, one interviewee gives 26 examples, so this theme reflects the current CEO’s talking style and current task of managing a transition, as well as a general theme throughout the organisation.

The subtheme, complex relationships, refers directly to relationships with others, but also refers to various issues (inter-church relationships, power differentials in Beta). One of the more clear examples is: “It really is about our relationship together and then we find ways we can express that in a way that accommodates the other and actually expresses the needs of the other as well.” So, it is more than just being in relationship, self-other, it is actually about working together for the common good together. The next subtheme, transition over time, indicates that temporal differentiation can be neutral or plural. In the neutral category, temporal differentiation refers to statements like, we used to be X, now we are Y. In plural differentiation, temporal distinctions refer to gradual transitions and transformations over time, as well as cyclical repetition
of time, so that we are X and Y together, over time. More specifically, interviewees talk about turning a negative experience into a positive experience and evolving relationships with self-other. For example, “That modelling for many has been life transforming in the sense that it’s given them hope that something different is possible… and that is a deeply Christian thing.” I have categorised references to communion as transformations over time, so, Christ returned to earth as the son of God, and they take communion, re-enacting and renewing their faith. They describe this in different ways in reference to their work in conflict resolution, that transformation happens when we accept each other as all children of God.

Another way plural differentiation is expressed is through references to holding different things (self-other) in tension. For example, in reference to Christianity and ecumenism, one interviewee says “I think it is emblematic of an approach, which actually I think is an important signal to us that it is uncomfortable in terms of our contemporary philosophical construct, and approach to life.” When two ideas cause tension when held together there is a learning opportunity, which is not something to avoid or resolve, but to accept and experience. The sub-themes, highlighting part of Beta and layers or shades are quite similar, and refer to interviewees talking about the multiplicity in the details of Beta. For example, “The programme that might deal with sectarianism and a programme that might deal with the issue of inclusion say of those that are differently abled.” He is differentiating between two different programmes, but the approach of both is very similar, so this is a way of teasing out shades of difference between various pieces of programme work. Another example is, “It’s been a sanctuary for people and then it’s also been this really challenging place that has created all these possibilities.” She is distinguishing between a safe versus a challenging place, and saying that Beta is both. This is a way of providing detail about the organisation that reveals layers of meaning.

The least frequent type of differentiation used is **conflictual** (91 references by 13 people), when interviewees assert one claim and negate the value of another: ‘we are X. Y does not belong here.’ Conflictual differentiation is expressed in different ways: talking about inappropriate behaviour and lack of integrity, and projecting hostility/adversity and meaning void. When interviewees describe inappropriate behaviour, I interpret this as a way of saying, this behaviour or claim does not belong in our organisation. For example, one interviewee says, “I have now had to say things like, ‘how much are you prepared to pay?’ and people think I’ve spat in their face.”
Referring to economic exchange is insulting to participants or visitors. This reflects a clash between the business claim, in which a price for a service can be calculated and agreed upon, discussed and considered fair, versus the community claim, where you welcome a guest into your home or place showing generosity and care. It is an insult to the guest-host relationship to put a price tag on it. Inappropriate behaviour subtheme illustrates the tension between the community and business claims, such that from the perspective of the business claim, much of what is practiced by the community at Beta is inappropriate for a formal NPO. For example: “Our community members weekends are important, and they are and great but it’s their weekend and you have the staff standing back because they [community members] go in and do and make the meals and the staff say, ‘well, we wouldn’t be allowed to do that with the 99 per cent of other groups that come here because we’re managed to do it in a way in which we have to do it through legislation.’ But when the members weekend comes they do it their way because, ‘it’s our centre. No-one tells us what to do’.” The interviewee is enacting a dialogue between staff and volunteer community members that demonstrates the interaction between the business and community claims. Staff are managed to follow legislation when hosting groups at Beta. On the other hand, being a volunteer community member means coming to Beta regularly, taking part in all aspects of community life, cleaning, cooking, interacting, facilitating groups, according to their values and practices, not according to legislation. From the perspective of the business claim, the volunteer community members are being irresponsible, inconsiderate to staff, and possibly even breaking the law. In this way, examples of talking about inappropriate behaviour reflect tension between claims, and are a way of rejecting one claim and promoting another.

When interviewees talk about a lack of integrity, they are also rejecting identity claims as invalid. For example, this interviewee is talking about the ad hoc way in which members use the Beta centre for events such as weddings: “Therefore it becomes a community that’s supposed to talk about inclusivity and reconciling; the only way you can get to use the centre is if you become a member, which is not then inclusive.” He is highlighting a practice at Beta that reveals a lack of integrity. The way the community claim is playing out at Beta could result in hypocrisy, which, however unintentional, is inappropriate. Another way of demonstrating conflictual differentiation is by projecting adversity and meaning void. One interviewer, in talking about Beta said that “it’s radically suspicious of power” and is not compatible with power structures. I interpret
power structures as part of the business claim in that a formal organisation with a staff hierarchy and guided by regulations and legislation is embedded in power structures. The phrase 'radically suspicious' is a strong way of rejecting the business claim, or indicating incompatibility between the business and the community claims. There are several examples of interviewees projecting hostility to the way the Churches have organised and behaved, as opposed to how Beta does. An example of projecting a meaning void is in the several instances of interviewees talking about community members and saying 'they don’t understand' usually in reference to why Beta has to follow the rules and procedures of any formal organisation.

A final example of conflictual differentiation by using a projected meaning void is the following: “... Our lack of insistence on clarity ... maybe we need to be clearer about ... what it is we believe. Sometimes I fear that it fudges in our reconciliation identity, which I’m absolutely sure is right. The point is the reconciliation of humanity to the reality in which we are, is the confident foggy Liberalism, bring it all in, there’s nothing we’ve got to say, there’s no hard edges, we just want to accommodate everybody. I’m not ever comfortable in that space. This is a real call to change to all of us. It’s radical. It’s very, very sharp actually.” This comment is fairly opaque, but it is clear that he is comparing and contrasting Beta’s approach to reconciliation with foggy Liberalism. Beta’s approach to reconciliation involves embracing two different things, humanity and the harsh reality of a world full of violence, which in itself is an expression of plural differentiation. On the other hand Liberalism is without meaning as it tries to be everything to all people (projected meaning void). So, he is using a projected meaning void to reject Liberalism and promote Beta’s reconciliation identity, which is the message of Christ, and reflects plurality and embracing difference. In a way, this is an example of talking about differentiation. There are several such examples, where interviewees are talking about their faith, and the meaning is quite elusive.

7.3.1 Talking about differentiation

An interesting observation I made about Beta discourse is that participants refer to how they talk about the organisation and each other, demonstrating a self-awareness or intentionality that was unexpected. There are 69 examples by 11 interviewees of self-reflection on how they are talking about the various elements of the organisation. They acknowledge that to set up the various elements in binary opposition, such as self-other talk, is conflictual, and that to embrace a more plural understanding of the situation
leads to more creative solutions. For example, “And there’s a real ideological struggle with that because some people hear that as “You’re about the money and you’re not about the work” and I just think that’s a binary conversation, either or. I think money is just there and it’s how we use it. … I’m trying to be a bit more intentional about that in terms of how we raise our funds as well.” This interviewee is stating that he acknowledges the limits of binary oppositions, and that he is being more intentional in his approach to the various clashing elements in Beta. This demonstrates an awareness of the self-other talk, which reduces the organisation into binary oppositions. Another interviewee, in describing how he feels the organisation could improve its communication skills, says, “I don’t want to insult anyone you’ve already spoken to” reflecting an awareness that by asserting one claim over another that could be putting down another part of the organisation. It could also reflect an organisational culture that does not accept overt conflict or criticism. The challenge of being plural is that Beta means different things to different people. Interviewees reference the fact that having such a plural organisation can mean that sometimes coherence can be elusive.

7.4 Mission Loss

Mission loss appears in some form in all the interviews. I interpret references to: the present, past and future organisational environment, socio-political changes, public perception of mission loss and organisational survival as reflecting an acceptance of mission loss (183 references in total by 15 people). Overall, changes in the environment, specifically the reduction in violence, as well as the secularisation of society, has resulted in a public perception that the conflict is over and there is no more need for peacebuilding. Referring to the past environment invariably means talking about the violent conflict; there is clearly nostalgia for how the original community members were drawn together and motivated to respond to the violent conflict. There are 14 references to rejecting mission loss as not accurate, and 15 references to denying mission loss, that Beta’s mission is not undermined by or is not relevant to the progress of the peace process.

The effects of mission loss are different for the various identity claims. Mission loss impacts the business and educator claims more than it does the community and place claims. As the interest in peacebuilding wanes and funding sources dry up, the business
has to adapt to reduced income, and the ending of several funded programmes. The community and place claims, on the other hand, are less affected by these changes.

### 7.5 Beta in-case analysis

The Beta findings present an organisation that is plurivocal with four coexisting identity claims, community, business, place and educator, that sit together quite comfortably. Most of the tension and conflict exists between the community and business claims. Interviewees primarily use neutral and plural differentiation to articulate Beta’s identity, modelling their values of acceptance, welcoming of difference, and generosity towards others in their discourse. Furthermore, interviewees frequently use ‘we’ and ‘us’ to talk about Beta, reflecting a consistency in Beta’s selfhood. So while Beta’s identity comprises of several and potentially conflicting claims, organisational members express those claims in a cohesive, not fragmented, way.

The identity work lens shows how interviewees co-create a narrative of Beta (Ybema et al., 2009, pp. 306–7) demonstrating social actor and social constructionist approaches as mutually constitutive (Gioia et al., 2010). Beta started as and is firstly a Christian community. It galvanised its work around the residential centre, that has become the place where community is modelled, by members, staff, international volunteers and programme participants. Community members govern and, along with other volunteers and staff, run the organisation, delivering programme work, acting as educator in community relations. Beta responded to the violent conflict by providing a safe space for respite, where people could recover from the trauma of violent conflict, experience community, and participate in programme work. A business evolved in response to increased funding for formal peacebuilding work. Now that this funding has come to an end, the business is trying to generate income from its buildings and from its programme work in order to survive. This managerialist approach causes tension (Hwang & Powell, 2009), and is resisted by some, which is acknowledged and reflected in the extent of differentiation used in relation to the business claim. Beta’s response to mission loss reflects a turning inwards towards the collective; they are prioritising the community claim and their founding values in managing their response to identity threat. This turning inwards corresponds with plural and neutral differentiation, reflecting that the content of their identity claims (social actor approach) corresponds with the discursive strategies they use (social constructionist approach). In other words,
they are promoting the community claim and at the same time demonstrating their values, acceptance and respect for difference, in their discourse. The outcome of Beta’s identity work is that participants are trying to embrace both the old and new elements of Beta, finding ways to adapt to change.
Chapter 8. Identity work processes in response to mission loss

"It’s about trying to work out who you are in a different context and different environment and I think it has and continues to be a key challenge." Programme staff, Beta, March 2013

"Maybe there’s not a market for what we’re doing. We can’t just - because I suppose the whole peace thing has changed over the years, you can’t just create a role for Alpha now. Maybe we’ve done ourselves out of a job?" Administrator, Alpha, July 2012

8.1 Introduction

In the previous two chapters I have described the findings from cases of two PBOs. Alpha and Beta both acknowledged mission loss and, in response, engaged in a process of identity work that included different types of differentiation: conflictual, neutral and plural. The above quotes capture the idea of mission loss, and responding with self-questioning. In order to move from the data, much of which is interview text, to concepts, I provide a detailed data structure illustrating how the three key concepts - identity claims, differentiation and mission loss - are grounded in the data. Using those concepts, I conduct a cross-case analysis of the two cases, as well as discuss the corresponding outcomes. I argue that the two organisations have different responses to the challenge of mission loss, as is suggested by the above quotes. Putting the pieces together, I propose a process model for identity work in response to mission loss.

8.2 Data structure

The data structures are visual presentations of how I derived aggregate dimensions from first order codes, showing how the concepts are grounded in the data. The aggregate dimensions then serve as the building blocks for the process model, which in turn demonstrates how the dimensions interact and interrelate. Below are two data structures, one presenting the concept of identity claim, and the other, the concepts of differentiation and mission loss.
As described in chapter 5, OI methodology, I followed the Gioia method to build the data structure (Gioia et al., 2012). The first order themes emerged from the data. I relied on the interviewees own words to create codes, or units of meaning, for the content of their discourse. In the diagram above, the numerous first order themes are summarised with short descriptions or sample phrases. In Appendix 4, a screenshot from NVivo shows all of the first order themes for Alpha. I then clustered those codes into second order categories, still staying close to the interviewees own words. I then further broke down the themes to understand them better, and re-grouped them into aggregate dimensions, which link with the literature. The arrows in the above diagram do not reflect causal relationships, but simply the flow of logic I used to create the
aggregate dimensions. As I was searching for the content of language, these aggregate dimensions reflect a social actor approach. This data structure shows how the concept of identity claim is grounded in the data.

Diagram 8.2.b. Data structure: Differentiation and mission loss

In a similar process to the previous data structure, this diagram illustrates how the concepts of differentiation and mission loss are grounded in the data by depicting how I moved from interviewees language to aggregate dimensions. The difference in the above is that for the concept of differentiation I returned to all of the original interviews and trawled through them looking for how participants were using language. So, while the identity claims reflect the content of interviewees’ discourse, a social actor approach, differentiation reflects how interviewees use language, a social constructionist approach. For example, when an Alpha interviewee states “I understand that they needed to stabilise the ship and they needed to stop spending. They needed to
curb spending. They needed to pull it and they needed to make it safe, but you have to have people there with vision to be able to bring the organisation forward and there’s a huge lack of vision.” This is a way of ‘talking against them’ (first order code). She is differentiating between those who came in to introduce fiscal control (aggregate dimension: business claim) and the people with vision, in touch with the values and mission (aggregate dimension: community claim). She rejects the business claim as not having vision and being out of touch with the values and mission; the second order category is conflictual differentiation, rejecting claims as inappropriate. I describe the use of conflictual differentiation, in combination with some neutral differentiation, as a ‘turning outwards’, the aggregate dimension.

The three second order categories above, acknowledging, denying and rejecting mission loss, reflect a combination of social actor and social constructionist approaches. The first order codes refer to the content of the interviewees speech, so social actor. One exception to this is the code ‘questioning who we are now,’ which refers to use of language, not content. The second order categories move to what they are doing with that speech, so social constructionist. And the aggregate dimensions reflect how I am interpreting their use of language. So, when interviewees talk in a variety of ways about the lack of interest in their work (which is the content of their discourse), I categorise this as ‘acknowledging mission loss,’ which describes how they are using discourse. This second order category moves away from the interviewees’ language to how they are using language. In other words, when they talk about lack of interest, they are acknowledging mission loss. I then interpret ‘acknowledging mission loss’ as a catalyst of OI threat or loss, which refers to use of language, not content. So, the first order codes reflect a social actor approach, while the second order categories and aggregate dimensions reflect a social constructionist approach. Thus, the above diagram illustrates how I interpret the data as catalysing or resisting identity loss. I note here that interviewees speak explicitly of mission change and adaptation, but not of acknowledging, denying or rejecting mission loss. I use these terms as second order categories, even though they move away from interviewees’ speech, because these concepts capture and highlight the role of mission, which is important regarding the theoretical framework and also regarding the specific impact of deinstitutionalisation on PBOs.

As with the identity claims, the arrows do not imply causal relationships or processes. They simply illustrate how I arrived at the aggregate dimensions from the data. The
reason for providing this detail is to demonstrate that the three key concepts in the process model - identity claims, differentiation and mission loss - have been rigorously developed, and are grounded in the data.

8.3 Cross-case analysis

Using the second order categories and aggregate dimensions, I can now expound on the specific cases. The cases of Alpha and Beta provide an interesting comparison of two equivalent organisations responding to a similar challenge of mission loss, but demonstrating two very different ways to respond. This section compares the two cases in terms of the content of identity claims, how they respond to mission loss, and contrasts the self-other talk they used in the subsequent identity work.

From a social actor perspective, I have identified four identity claims that seem to be in common between the two organisations, with Alpha having one additional one. While I labelled the claims identically, there are some important differences between the two organisations’ claims. The community claim, in Alpha, has been rejected, while in Beta it is the governing influence in the organisation, and referred to most frequently and overtly as the essence of Beta. The big difference in the content of the community claims in the two organisations is that Alpha has rejected faith, while Beta very much embraces faith as part of its expressive role. Regarding the business claim, Alpha has embraced managerialism fully, becoming more business-like (Dart, 2004) and rejecting other claims, while Beta is bringing in some managerial concepts in a very limited way, and sees it as a potential threat to the values. The educator claim for Beta includes continued work with schools, youth and families, as well as new programme work, while at Alpha this claim refers to new work with marginalised groups. The place claim in Alpha is the unique and enduring aspect, whereas in Beta, it is the locus for the community to express its values. Finally, Alpha also has a mediator claim, which gives a sense of uniqueness, working with politicians on peacebuilding. Essentially, Alpha and Beta provided two quite different responses to the question, “Who are you as an organisation? Alpha’s answer was: ‘We are a business like any other.’ They claim to be in the business of peacebuilding. Beta’s answer to the same question is essentially: ‘We are a community. We are unique. Our values and our processes provide a model for living, a model for organising.’
Analysing the dynamic between the various identity claims illuminated the difference between Alpha and Beta’s responses to mission loss. Put another way, Beta turned inwards, while Alpha turned outwards. Beta focussed on its founding values and beliefs, its expressive role, turning towards the collective to its community. Alpha brought in outside financial experts, focussed on its instrumental role, changing the services provided to adapt to a changing context, turning outwards, away from the collective.

References to mission loss help to explain and justify identity claim changes. In both Alpha and Beta, responses to mission loss include acknowledging, denying and rejecting mission loss, which are themselves attempts to promote and reject identity claims. Denying and rejecting mission loss are attempts to protect and defend the organisation from external threat and to resist change; acknowledging mission loss is a way of justifying change. For example, an Alpha staff member says, “nobody has any doubts about the need for this work and the need for this organisation to keep doing it.” He links the two ideas that there is still a need for continuing the same programme work, and also still a need for the organisation. This is a way of protecting the organisation from external threat and resisting change. Similarly, acknowledging mission loss is a way of justifying change. I found no major difference between Alpha and Beta in the frequency with which they acknowledged, denied or rejected mission loss.

Mission loss affects different identity claims in different ways. In Alpha, the business claim is promoted as the only means of survival in response to mission loss, and the mediator claim is rejected in response to mission loss, specifically the changing socio-political context. Conversely, the mediator claim is promoted by rejecting/denying mission loss on the basis of a continued need for peacebuilding work. Examining interviewees’ references to mission loss shows the reasons why mission loss is rejected or acknowledged, and the reasons why identity claims are rejected or acknowledged, but it does not show how claims are promoted or rejected. In order to examine how claims are rejected and promoted, I turn to differentiation, examining discourse as an end in itself, not as a mirror reflecting meaning. This social constructionist approach demonstrates how interviewees use language, as distinct from reasoning, to promote and reject claims. Identity work from a social constructionist perspective allows further exploration of two very different types of organisational responses to mission loss. Identity threat catalyses identity work and stakeholders engage in different degrees and types of differentiation:
conflictual, neutral and plural. The main difference in response to mission loss is in the degrees of differentiation used by the organisations. Alpha relies mainly on conflictual, while Beta employed neutral and plural. Differentiation, or self-other talk, sets up binary oppositions out of which emerge a competition for supremacy. Alpha demonstrates this well. Conflictual differentiation is frequent, revealing a struggle between the community and business claims, and to a lesser extent, between other claims. Beta is more conscious of embracing different perspectives, acknowledging the tension between identity claims and allowing for the possibility of co-existing claims. Correspondingly, Beta not only uses neutral differentiation primarily, but also uses plural differentiation frequently, and demonstrates an awareness of the fact that they try to use plural differentiation deliberately. Combining social actor and social constructionist approaches illustrates that one organisation turns toward the collective embracing plurality in their identity, while the other turns away from the collective in a competition for survival by asserting one claim at the expense of the others. This process can be illustrated in the form of a process model, described below.

8.4 Outcomes

Chapter 2, Literature Review, presented extant literature on the circumstances under which mission loss leads to organisational adaptation, persistence or demise. I describe here the organisational consequences of the differing responses to mission loss of Alpha and Beta which I have outlined above. Because identity re-formation in the two organisations is on-going, only preliminary conclusions can be drawn about the organisational consequences of the two inherently different approaches to identity work. Turning inwards seemed to have enabled adaptation, while turning outwards, led to persistence with an emphasis on survival and the possibility of demise. Alpha’s emphasis on the managerial claim has enabled Alpha to attract new funds which might not have enhanced its long-term survival probability as it lacks consistency with the organisation’s own history, values and traditions. On the contrary, Beta embracing potentially conflicting identity claims and turning inwards seemed to show a higher level of integrity and consistency with the organisations’ previous identity by staying true to core values. A consistency and coherence between the expressive role – shared

---

beliefs and values – and the instrumental role – the actions that they undertake – seems to enable a successful adaptation process to the changing environment.

I depict the outcome as two possibilities, representing different patterns of differentiation. Both Alpha and Beta survive, so that is the main outcome. But the ‘turning outwards’ outcome (Alpha) results in conflicting and fragmented understandings of OI. Alpha seems less likely to survive in the long term, but it is important to note that there is not definite evidence for organisational demise or closure within this research. The outcome from an approach that is primarily ‘turning inwards’ (Beta) is more cohesion around a new OI, with the possibility of more longer term planning. The resulting identity changes are fragmented versus coherent OI. These outcomes reflect a paradox. Turning outwards and trying to adapt to external changes results in less successful OI reform; conversely, turning inwards, away from external changes, results in more successful OI reform. So, attempts to adapt are actually detrimental to the adaptation efforts. I shall return to this paradox in the next chapter.

Another difference in the outcomes of Alpha and Beta’s OI work processes is the amount of consensus that organisational stakeholders have around the reformed OI claims. Alpha displays a low level of consensus, while in Beta there is more agreement across all the interviewees about the importance of the various identity claims. Firstly, consensus is evident in the amount of conflictual differentiation exhibited. High levels of conflictual differentiation, such as in Alpha, suggest that there is disagreement about the role, importance and validity of identity claims. Conflictual differentiation corresponds most frequently between the community and business claims, suggesting that in both organisations there is a struggle to establish the importance and even appropriateness of the business versus community claims. Secondly, I found that in Alpha there were more individuals championing one claim, while in Beta, references to all claims were more evenly distributed. I define champions of an identity claim as individuals who referred much more frequently than others to one identity claim - more than three times the average. So in Alpha there are four champions (1 for place, 1 for educator, and 2 for mediator), and in Beta there are two champions (1 for educator and 1 for business). The following graph illustrates the amount of consensus around each identity claim at each organisation.
Graph 8.4. Amount of consensus around identity claims

Graph 8.5 shows that Beta has higher levels of consensus, meaning that references to identity claims were fairly evenly distributed across identity claims. About 80% of interviewees were referencing the identity claims with similar frequency, and thus 20% of interviewees were talking either much more or less about the claims. Alpha has a lower level of consensus among interviewees, indicated by the uneven distribution of references to claims. For example, the mediator claim, half of the interviewees were either not talking about it hardly at all, or were championing it as the most important identity claim. Thus, there was a lack of consensus across the organisation on the importance of that claim. Nvivo software makes the above quantitative data easy to access and produce, illustrating how many references each interviewee makes to each identity claim. While this research is qualitative, it is useful to refer to quantitative data in order to add further evidence for observed qualitative phenomena. I found that Nvivo software provided readily available quantitative data as a way of confirming or challenging qualitative findings.

8.5 Process model: Identity work in response to mission loss

The process model shows how the aggregate dimensions from the data structure interact and interrelate. In the model below, mission loss catalyses identity threat and ambiguity. In response to identity threat and ambiguity, organisational actors engage in
identity work. I categorise this identity work into two types: turning inwards and turning outwards. Both Alpha and Beta do a bit of both, but Beta does more turning inwards, while Alpha does more turning outwards. Turning outwards refers to the use of primarily conflictual and neutral differentiation, using language to reject the founding values and purpose as inappropriate to the current organisation. The outcome of turning outwards is a lack of cohesion around identity claims, and the result is a fragmented OI which inhibits long-term planning.

Conversely, turning inwards refers to the use of primarily plural and neutral differentiation, trying to embrace the founding goals, the old and the new simultaneously. Taken to the extreme, one can imagine that a highly insular approach would leave organisational members blind to environmental changes. It seems that the benefit of turning inwards is the ability to hold on to the value of the founding goals, and reassure themselves, and perhaps others, that they are as relevant and important as ever. The outcome of turning inwards is cohesion around identity claims and a more cohesive re-formed OI.

Acknowledging, rejecting and denying mission loss are part of identity work not specifically associated with either turning inwards or turning outwards, so I include them in a separate box, in the middle of the identity work box. Logically, one might expect acknowledging mission loss to be more associated with turning outwards, as it provides a reason to turn away from founding goals, but the data did not support this. Similarly, I expected rejecting and denying mission loss to correspond with turning inwards, turning away from the external context and denying changes in the environment, but this was not the case. Therefore, turning inwards cannot be described as blindness to external realities, and turning outwards is not associated with being in tune with the environment, facing difficult truths and the reality of change. Both organisations and both responses equally include acknowledging, rejecting and denying an environmental change that impacts directly on their mission and continued legitimacy.
Diagram 8.5. Identity work process model

Identity work catalyst (social constructionist)

Turning outwards:
- Conflictual and neutral differentiation
- Rejecting and replacing founding goals
- Acknowledging, rejecting, denying mission loss

Turning inwards:
- Plural and neutral differentiation
- Embracing multiple claims, retaining founding values

Outcomes

- Survival
  - Low consensus on identity claims and new OI.
  - Short term planning with goal of survival

- Survival
  - High consensus on identity claims
  - Long-term planning with goal of consistency

Identity change (social actor)

- Identity evolves as fragmented and conflictual with multiple identity claims
- Consensus around new cohesive reformed identity with multiple identity claims

Previous identity (social actor)

Mission loss

Identity threat and ambiguity: who are we now?

Adaptive actions: new activities
In both cases, Alpha and Beta, there is evidence of OI work and, thus, an OI change process. The process model illustrates two different responses to mission loss, which corresponds with two different patterns of differentiation, which leads to two very different outcomes. Furthermore, this model illustrates how social actor and social constructionist approaches are combined, as the previous and reformed identities refer to the reality beyond the participants, social actor, whereas, the identity work process refers to how the organisational actors are inter-subjectively negotiating the various identity claims, from a social constructionist perspective.

8.6 Conclusion

I have teased out the two steps that I have taken to uncover identity claim changes: the ‘what’ and the ‘how.’ Firstly, I explored the content of identity claims present in both organisations. In the second step, I looked at how organisational members create, debate and negotiate identity claims, through differentiation, turning to how interviewees promote and reject claims, considering language as the object of study. When I first analysed the content of the identity claims I looked for meaning, what the language is signalling as existing in the organisation. That social actor approach uses discourse as a mirror or indicator of organisational phenomena. When I turned to how these claims interact, differentiation or self-other talk, the analytic focus shifted to how language is used, seeing discourse as a strategy used by participants to negotiate the OI, a social constructionist approach. Then, I analysed how these two approaches to discourse interact and mutually constitute each other (Gioia et al., 2010).

Approaching discourse in these two different ways enables understanding of OI as both part of the organisation, and inter-subjectively co-created by participants. Identity claims exist as part of the organisation for participants to draw on and use to understand and express OI; concurrently, participants are using language to negotiate and co-create these identity claims and they do so through differentiation. The degrees and type of differentiation influence the content of the identity claims. In this way I demonstrate empirically how discourse simultaneously reflects OI, but also creates it.

I have analysed the ways in which organisations engage in identity work in response to mission loss. In the next chapter, I return to the concept of deinstitutionalisation, embedding the discussion of OI work within a context of institutional decline.
Chapter 9. Identity work embedded in a context of deinstitutionalisation

"It'd be a shame if we lost that facility where you have a style of operation and of dealing with people and indeed a place, a safe place where people in conflict can come and discuss things... but it'd be a shame if what is actually a fairly unique place as distinct from practice or people, a unique place with a unique history which has overlaid on it that sort of conflict resolution background and practice, if you like, it'd be a shame to lose it." Alpha board member

9.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I return to the institutional level, and the context in which PBOs, including Alpha and Beta, operate. That changing organisational environment is documented in the chapter 5 findings and corresponds to the antecedents of deinstitutionalisation (Oliver, 1992), the decline of the set of structures and beliefs of peacebuilding, the PBOs' very mission. This chapter begins phase four of the research journey, returning to deinstitutionalisation, analysing the institutional change process that is the context for OI work. The question guiding this phase is: How do the various levels of analysis interact and inter-relate? More specifically, how do OI work processes contribute to understanding organisational responses to deinstitutionalisation? In order to address this question, I wrap the context of deinstitutionalisation around the OI work analysis. In other words, OI work is a response to deinstitutionalisation. As is evident in the quote above, organisational stakeholders differentiate between the various identity claims and contextual layers to work out who they are in this new and different world following deinstitutionalisation.

In order to take this final step in the research analysis, first, in section 9.2, I analyse the findings from the deinstitutionalisation study in chapter 5. Comparing those findings with the findings from the OI study in chapter 8 shows that they complement each other. The next step is to embed the OI study within the context of deinstitutionalisation, creating a multiple level process including institutional, field, population and organisation, section 9.3. The revised process model of identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation illustrates how those levels interact. I draw out some
conclusions from this last step in the analysis, before moving on to outline the various contributions made by this research in chapter 10.

9.2 Returning to deinstitutionalisation

I return now to the concept of deinstitutionalisation, the fading and dissipating of a set of institutional practices and beliefs (Scott, 2008). In chapter 5, I documented the functional, social and political aspects of field-level change that correspond with Oliver's antecedents of deinstitutionalisation (1992). Findings showed that PBOs were responding to drivers and barriers of change by undertaking several new activities, adopting managerialist logic, turning to their communities for guidance on how to adapt to changing social needs, and playing a custodian role, defending the outgoing institution. PBO responses to pressures of deinstitutionalisation created conflict and paralysis, serving as further barriers to successful adaptation to field-level change.

Chapters 4 and 5 provide a qualitative description of changes in the organisational field of peacebuilding and how these changes impact the population of PBOs. Identifying the field and population in chapter 4 has allowed me to specify the push and pull of deinstitutionalisation on a population of organisations in chapter 5, leading to an analysis on institutional change and organisational response, explained in this section. This research supports reconciliation within the structure versus agency debate (Heugens & Lander, 2009; Suddaby, 2010). Interaction between structural pressures and organisational responses are necessary to understand the messy reality of organisations adapting to their environments. Deinstitutionalisation has provided a context in which to analyse that interaction.

Analysis of population responses illustrates that deinstitutionalisation catalyses a defensive response in the core population. The role of custodian (Dacin & Dacin, 2008) of an outgoing institutionalised practice involves defensive institutional work as actors seek to defend the legitimacy of the falling institution (Desai, 2011; Maguire & Hardy, 2009). Institutional work is “the purposive action of individuals and organisations aimed at creating, maintaining and disrupting institutions” (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 215). Here, a population of organisations engaged in institutional work to maintain a dying institution. While defensive institutional work may help preserve institutions, in this case actors spend their energy defending an outgoing institution, rather than reorienting around an alternative more viable set of activities. Deinstitutionalisation is a
structural pressure from the field against the wishes and interests of PBOs. It may be that the custodian role slows the pace of deinstitutionalisation, acting as an inertial pressure, even inhibiting a re-institutionalisation process.

The findings from the subsequent analysis of identity work in chapters 6-8 do not contradict the findings on deinstitutionalisation, but provide further insight into the organisational processes that take place in response to deinstitutionalisation. For example, in chapter 5, PBO stakeholders consider that the community rationale assists in their survival and success, which is subsequently supported by findings from the OI study. Beta prioritised the community claim by turning inwards, and as a result was better able to reform its OI, thus enhancing its survival prospects. Similarly, taking on new managerialist logic corresponds to the idea of identity work as a turning outwards and becoming more business-like. Furthermore, the idea that change is driven by both structure and agency finds resonance in the combining of social actor and social constructionist approaches to OI. The concept of the custodian role corresponds with the idea that Alpha and Beta both denied and rejected mission loss, claiming that there is still a need for their work. Comparing the findings from the deinstitutionalisation and OI studies show that they are compatible. The next step is to combine the levels of analysis to re-create a multi-level process of organisational responses to institutional decline.

9.3 Embedding OI work in a context of deinstitutionalisation

Embedding OI work in a context of deinstitutionalisation results in a multi-level process that moves from macro to micro, including institutional pressures, field-level changes, population responses, and organisational responses. The revised process model of identity work brings together the studies on deinstitutionalisation and OI, see next page. The model illustrates how deinstitutionalisation can catalyse a set of organisational responses that can result in varying degrees of consistency or hypocrisy within organisations, in turn affecting how successfully organisations can reform their OI to adapt to institutional changes. Combining levels enables a discussion of how organisational actors are discursively responding to institutional shifts. I can now analyse the institution of peacebuilding as it is expressed in the identity work processes of organisational actors.
Diagram 9.3. Process model: Identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation

**Identity work**

- **Identity work catalyst**
  - Agency/social constructionist

**Deinstitutionalisation**

- Functional, social and political pressures

**Identity threat and ambiguity:** who are we now?

- Mission loss
  - Adaptive actions.
  - Drivers and barriers of organisational change

**Resistance to change**

**Adaptation efforts**

- **Turning outwards:**
  - Confictual and neutral differentiation
  - Rejecting and replacing founding goals with new logic of managerialism

- **Turning inwards:**
  - Plural and neutral differentiation
  - Embracing multiple claims, retaining founding values

**Outcomes**

- **Survival:**
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  - Short term planning with goal of survival
  - Sense of hypocrisy

- **Survival:**
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**Identity change**

- (structure/social actor)
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Describing the above model from left to right illuminates the process of institutional change and organisational responses. Beginning with the level of the institution, on the left, deinstitutionalisation is experienced by the population as field-level functional, social and political pressures. These pressures lead to mission loss which catalyses identity ambiguity and threat, as well as adaptive actions, on the level of the population. In chapter 5, population responses included questioning of ‘who we are’ as an organisation, as well organisational responses that served as drivers and barriers of change.

Moving to the organisational level to analyse how organisations are responding to this identity ambiguity and threat, the model presents two types of responses that reflect different patterns of differentiation, turning inwards and outwards, that correspond with different outcomes. When organisations turn outwards, taking on new activities and professionalising, engaging in conflictual differentiation, rejecting some identity claims as inappropriate while promoting others, the outcome is a fragmented OI, a low level of consensus and a sense of hypocrisy, which serves as a barrier to successful adaptation to institutional change. Conversely, when organisations turn inwards, they engage in plural and neutral differentiation, embracing multiple identity claims and as a result have a high level of consensus, a sense of integrity and a more cohesive reformed OI.

Combining levels elucidates how the organisations defend outgoing institutions, by denying and rejecting mission loss. Defensive institutional work, in this model, consists of discursive efforts to reject and deny mission loss. So organisations respond to institutional level changes through the language they use, by inter-subjectively negotiating identity claims, drawing on institutional elements, like a continued need for peacebuilding, and internal elements, like “who we are.”

As stated previously, presenting these two responses oversimplifies the empirical context as both organisations engaged in turning outwards and inwards. Thus, in the process model I depict turning outwards and inwards as two sets of possible responses reflecting different patterns of differentiation, one pulls towards resisting change, or inertia, while the other pulls towards adaptation. Turning inwards is a type of inertial response because it reflects resistance to change, which is not to say it is a lack of response.

As identified in the research design in chapter 3, the challenge of a multi-level process model is how to know if there is causation and response between the levels. In other
words, how do I know that the identity work is in response to deinstitutionalisation, and not some other internal or external factor? The case study method has allowed for multiple voices within each organisation by using semi-structured interviews with fairly open questions, such that the elements of change in the organisation and its environment described by interviewees were exhaustive and extensive. Furthermore, the functional, social and political aspects of institutional decline proved a comprehensive framework for analysing the organisational environment. In other words, institutional theory is broad enough to include multiple factors, rather than focusing in on one part of the environment. Because the environment is described so comprehensively, the organisational response is seen in context of the whole environment rather than one focussed aspect of it. Furthermore, research participants describe their organisational change processes as responses to these changes in the environment. As part of a social constructionist perspective, I allow the research participants to define their own motivations for change.

Combining the deinstitutionalisation and OI studies shows how the institution of peacebuilding is expressed through Alpha and Beta’s discursive identity work. For Alpha, being a peacebuilder means delivering and hosting mediation and education programmes. For Beta, being a peacebuilder means modelling peaceful relationships through community. Thus, combining levels shows how peacebuilding means different things to different people, both within the organisations, but also as an inter-organisational comparison. It is not clear from this research, as it is not longitudinal or historical, when and how fast the institution of peacebuilding has fragmented and diffused. However, there is extensive evidence in the data that stakeholders experience the institution of peacebuilding as fading and losing its meaning, when they acknowledge mission loss. For example, one interviewee asks: “What does it even mean anymore to be a peacebuilding organisation in the current context?” and “Are we just living off the past here? And has it [Beta] something to offer now?” Thus, the institution of peacebuilding is experienced by participants as fading. That being a PBO used to have a meaning that it does not have any more due to the changing context.

Institutions are notoriously hard to analyse because they influence the cognitive taken-for-granted assumptions of both interviewers and interviewees (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006). In this case, in which the institution is fading, it may be easier for interviewees to identify the unspoken assumptions, such as the taken-for-granted legitimacy, that were part of a past or fading institution. If values and beliefs are no longer taken-for-
granted, then they are more easily recognised and articulated. This fading of the cognitive pillar of the institution of peacebuilding is illustrated by the following quote: "People coming to Ireland today find it hard to believe that we needed to hide away in a remote peace centre to conduct political dialogues!" In other words, in the past it was taken-for-granted that the activities of the PBOs were necessary, but that is no longer the case.

9.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analysed the deinstitutionalisation process and taken the final step in the research by embedding the OI study with the context of the deinstitutionalisation study. Several conclusions can be drawn from this final part of the analysis. Combining levels in the process model elucidates processes that seemed highly paradoxical when analysed in the OI and deinstitutionalisation studies alone, in chapters 5 and 8. In the deinstitutionalisation study, structural and organisational changes served as barriers and drivers to both organisational and institutional change in a paradoxical, complex process in which organisational adaptation led to barriers of change. The OI study has further elucidated this process by showing that adaptation attempts correspond to a turning outwards that result in fragmented OI and failed adaptation attempts, while turning inwards and resisting change can result in more successful attempts to reform OI and adapt to a changing context. The model in this chapter further elucidates those processes by adding the contextual layers. While there is no evidence in this research, one can speculate on the next step of the process such that organisational responses of adaptation drive institutional change, while inertial responses inhibit institutional change. Stalled institutional decline would help to preserve the organisations, while accelerated institutional decline would speed up the processes contributing to organisational closure, such as weakening and disappearance of taken-for-granted legitimacy.

Embedding the OI study in the context of deinstitutionalisation sheds light on how inertia (turning inwards and ignoring external changes) enhances organisational survival. The main conclusion of the deinstitutionalisation study is that organisations can react to deinstitutionalisation, even if it undermines their very mission, defending the institution and playing a custodian role (Dacin & Dacin, 2008) for outgoing institutional practices. Having analysed findings on deinstitutionalisation in chapter 5,
OI in chapter 8, and OI embedded in deinstitutionalisation in chapter 9, I now turn to the concluding chapter to elaborate on how this analysis contributes to existing literature and theory.
Chapter 10. Contributions and Conclusions

"I'm not hung up, to be perfectly honest, that the peace work has to be done here, that doesn't float my boat totally, I don't think that it necessarily has to be done here. I think it's great if it can be done, there's an over-emphasis on, like, this place must stay open, it has to be - I don’t think so." Alpha staff member

10.1 Summary

In this concluding thesis chapter, I elaborate on the contributions of this research, beginning with the major theoretical ones in the areas of deinstitutionalisation and organisational identity. I also return to the concept of organisational survival, the starting point for the literature review, and the initial impetus for the research. The quote above indicates that PBOs are asking themselves, will they in fact survive the peace? Minor theoretical contributions are in the areas of non-profit management, managerialism and peacebuilding. I also outline contributions that are methodological, empirical and practical.

I began this research by looking broadly at how NPOs in Ireland are responding to times of crisis, and explored the case of one PBO (Donnelly-Cox & Cannon, 2010a), which was subsequently labelled as Alpha. Key themes in the case of Alpha arose as organisational survival, legitimacy loss, mission accomplishment and adaptation efforts. The next step of the research, phase two, involved mapping the field and population of PBOs in Ireland, and documenting how they are responding to institutional pressures, chapter 4. I analysed the environmental changes as deinstitutionalisation and the population responses to them as drivers and barriers of change, chapter 5.

In phase three of this research, chapters 6-8, I have extended the concept of identity work, which has mainly been applied at an individual level, to the level of the organisation to examine processes by which organisations strive to shape relatively coherent, distinctive and enduring notions of their organisational self. In chapter 8 I addressed the question of how organisations engage in identity work if severely threatened by mission loss. A comparative case of two Irish peacebuilding organisations, Alpha and Beta, illustrates two different types of organisational identity work processes in response to mission loss. The perceived redundancy of their missions
represented a major organisational threat which catalysed adaptive actions and identity ambiguity, which in turn prompted identity work. Organisational identity work consists of different patterns of differentiation, leading to different outcomes, with plural and neutral differentiation resulting in a more cohesively reformed OI.

Phase four of the research involved embedding the OI study in the context of deinstitutionalisation. In chapter 9, I returned to the institutional level and analysed the deinstitutionalisation process. Subsequently, I provided a revised process model of identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation and drew out the implications of a multi-level model for understanding both OI reformation and institutional change processes.

This chapter presents the major theoretical contributions of this study, specifically understandings of deinstitutionalisation (10.2.1), OI (10.2.2), identity work as a response to deinstitutionalisation (10.2.3) and organisational survival (10.2.4). In section 10.3, I elaborate on minor theoretical contributions in the areas of peacebuilding (10.3.1), NPO management (10.3.2) and managerialism (10.3.3). Subsequently, I describe the methodological (10.4), empirical (10.5) and practical (10.6) contributions. To conclude, I address the limitations of this study (10.7) and paths for future research (10.8).

**10.2 Major theoretical contributions**

This research leads to several major theoretical contributions in the areas of deinstitutionalisation, organisational identity, identity work as a response to deinstitutionalisation, and organisational survival.

**10.2.1 Deinstitutionalisation**

This research makes three substantial contributions to our understanding of deinstitutionalisation and organisational responses: peacebuilding in Ireland is an example of deinstitutionalisation; organisations engage in defensive institutional work; and that defensive work aids organisational survival.

First of all, this research posits that peacebuilding is an institution that is now fading in a process of deinstitutionalisation. The description of the research setting in chapter 3 outlines the set of practices and beliefs that is the institution of peacebuilding. PBOs
express in many ways in interviews that this set of activities and beliefs used to have taken-for-granted legitimacy and does not anymore. It is also clear from the print materials included in the data collection that peacebuilding used to have taken-for-granted legitimacy, and used to be an established institution, that was not questioned, but was and partly still is, part of government structures, as well as operating principles and values of NPOs. Thus, I am arguing that peacebuilding is an institution that existed in the past, but is now fading away.

Secondly, in response to deinstitutionalisation, organisations can react defensively. When an institution fades in a process of deinstitutionalisation, structures, beliefs, practices and assumptions lose their taken-for-granted legitimacy (Jepperson, 1991; Oliver, 1992; Scott, 2008). Phase two of this research has shown that organisations can respond to the deinstitutionalisation of their primary mission and activity by becoming custodians of fading traditions and practices (Dacin & Dacin, 2008), defending the outgoing institution (Maguire & Hardy, 2009), while not rejecting new adaptive activities. Defensive institutional work is an understudied phenomenon and this research provides empirical support for that concept. For NPOs in particular, defending the continued need for a particular area of work, such as peacebuilding, or advocacy of a cause, may even help organisational survival as stakeholders turn to their communities and strengthen their belief in the cause and reiterate their shared values.

Thirdly, PBO stakeholders’ continued belief in the value of peacebuilding and the defensive institutional work in which they engage contributes to their continued survival. PBOs serve as advocates for peacebuilding, maintaining some, albeit a low-level, of interest in their cause, which helps them to persist. Ironically, their commitment to the cause, the custodian role that they play, helps to keep them alive, but inhibits their ability to re-orient around a new direction. It seems that organisational inertia, which delays deinstitutionalisation (Oliver, 1992), might have survival benefits for individual organisations (R. D. Dixon, Boal, & Hoffman, 2003) by enabling successful OI reformation with a high level of consensus. Those benefits, however, may be short term and hard to sustain as deinstitutionalisation progresses, leaving PBOs behind.

While there is evidence from this research and from extant literature that organisations react defensively to deinstitutionalisation (Dacin & Dacin, 2008; Maguire & Hardy, 2009), the population and field level study did not clarify the actual processes that take place in organisations when threatened by the deinstitutionalisation of their mission.
Reflecting on OI work in the next sections, and combining OI work and
deinstitutionalisation, I explain how this research contributes to understanding those
individual organisational micro-processes in response to institutional pressures.

10.2.2 Organisational identity

This research contributes to our understanding of OI in three ways: OI is dynamic; OI
appears to endure while it changes; and plurivocal organisations are not necessarily
fragmented.

This research contributes to the on-going debate over OI temporality (Anteby &
Molnár, 2012; Schultz & Hemes, 2013) by supporting the dynamic OI position (Gioia et
al., 2013). I argue based on the extreme case of identity threat in PBOs that OI
meanings, and even the labels that actors use, are dynamic. I have shown how some
identity claims which have been central to the organisation are fundamentally
challenged when facing mission loss (e.g. Alpha’s expressive role as a community and
its instrumental role as a mediator) while others were not contested (e.g. place in Alpha;
community in Beta). PBOs even replace the word, peacebuilding, with ‘cohesion,’ and
Alpha changes its main identity claim from community to business. Connections
between the past and the future were highlighted in the case of Beta and suppressed in
the case of Alpha. In both cases, OI is perceived by organisational actors to be
enduring, but their language shows that they re-negotiate identity claims as their context
changes. This finding is significant as it provides a strong basis for the malleability of
OI, which was defined by Albert and Whetten in their seminal work as that which is
enduring (1985). This research suggests a revision of that definition: while actors
perceive OI as enduring, they actually re-negotiated OI over time, adapting to the
external context (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). This re-negotiation is apparent in the
language that they use, different types of self-other talk. This research, therefore,
supports the concept of identity claims as - at best - stabilising moments in an
continuous process of identity formation and re-formation (Ybema et al., 2009). From
such perspective, organisational identity is not an objective, enduring characteristic of
an organisation so much as a “temporary, context-sensitive and evolving set of
constructions” (Alvesson et al., 2008, p. 6).

A more nuanced understanding of how OI is enduring is required. While this research
provides evidence that stakeholders re-negotiate OI over time, it also provides evidence
that consistency over time is an important element of OI. Beta interviewees were better
able to re-form their OI because they believed it was consistent over time, i.e. 'we are and always have been a community first and foremost.' Conversely, in Alpha, there was a lack of consensus around a re-formed OI, and thus fragmentation and conflict, because stakeholders believed that OI was inconsistent, mentioning hypocrisy and a lack of integrity, and exhibiting excessive conflictual differentiation. So, while OI does not remain unchanged, but is dynamic and malleable, stakeholders at any given time claim that there is a consistency between past, present and future in terms of OI (Gioia et al., 2000). This revised understanding of how OI is enduring parallels the "uniqueness paradox," proposed by Martin, Feldman, Hatch and Sitkin, which states that while organisations claim their OI is unique, they do so by stating elements that are shared by other organisations and actually quite common (1983). Therefore, the important aspect of OI being distinctive is that stakeholders believe it is so, not that is can be shown to be so. Similarly, one could talk about the 'enduring paradox,' in which stakeholders claim that OI is enduring, while actually renegotiating its meaning over time in response to external changes.

The OI 'enduring paradox' was elucidated by combining a social constructionist and social actor approach and closely analysing the ways in which organisational stakeholders discursively negotiate identity claims. The population and field level study showed that OI was threatened by deinstitutionalisation, and that organisational stakeholders could react defensively, but it did not show how they proactively renegotiated and reiterated their identity claims as a way of surviving deinstitutionalisation. The OI study shows how institutional level change is expressed and experienced on the organisational level, and that the 'enduring paradox' of OI enabled Beta to survive major institutional change. I return to survival below.

Extant literature argues that dualities in organisational identities lead to conflict and a pulling away from the collectivity (Glynn, 2000; Golden-Biddle & Rao, 1997). This comparative case provides evidence that plurivocity in identity does not necessarily equal fragmentation. I have shown two plurivocal organisations, one very fragmented with members identifying with one identity claim at a time while rejecting others (Alpha); and the other very cohesive, with the majority of members embracing different and even potentially conflicting identity claims (Beta). The case of Alpha suggests that excessive use of conflictual differentiation corresponds with and perhaps fosters fragmentation. Alpha's members turned away from its founding identity claim and values, looking outside the organisation for primarily financial solutions to overcome
mission loss. On the contrary, Beta’s members employed plural differentiation, enabling the co-existence of multiple, even conflicting, claims. Therefore, I argue that the presence of multiple, even conflicting identity claims, does not necessarily lead to identity fragmentation, but the type of identity work, or differentiation, used by organisational actors does significantly influence the amount of OI cohesion and consensus.

### 10.2.3 Identity work as a response to deinstitutionalisation

Embedding the OI study in the context of deinstitutionalisation further extends the understanding of deinstitutionalisation and its impact on individual organisations as explained above. While other studies have noted a connection between institutional change and OI (Creed et al., 2010; He & Baruch, 2010; Lok, 2010; Pedersen & Dobbin, 2006), this research is the first to argue that deinstitutionalisation catalyses identity ambiguity and identity work. In short, if an institution is the structure, set of beliefs and cognitive assumptions that give meaning to social life (Scott, 2008) then the fading of an institution understandably catalyses a breakdown in understanding “who we are” as an organisation, or OI ambiguity.

Conceptualising identity work as a response to deinstitutionalisation provides insight on the structure-agency debate within institutional theory (Heugens & Lander, 2009). The concept of identity work, that organisational actors can deliberately re-negotiate OI claims, is part of a new area of research that includes other areas of ‘work’ such as boundary work (Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2009), institutional work (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Zietsma & Lawrence, 2010) and values work (Gehman, Treviño, & Garud, 2013) reflecting an increased understanding of organisational actors expressing embedded agency, i.e. making a conscious effort to manipulate their social context through symbolic media such as language (Phillips & Lawrence, 2012). This new direction reflects the fact that researchers are considering more critically the role of agency. This research develops theories in line with that new direction by providing a process model of organisational identity work in response to deinstitutionalisation that combines multiple levels of analysis including both individual agency and contextual structural pressures. This research extends the existing understanding of the influence of institutional change on organisations: even in the face of deinstitutionalisation, actors can adapt not only their activities, but their very core, their OI, in order to survive environmental change.
Combining the OI and institutional studies in this research results in a model of two interconnected nested processes: deinstitutionalisation and identity work. Several conclusions regarding how the levels interact follow from the analysis in chapter 9 of this embedded, multi-layered, complex process. Firstly, using an OI framework to analyse an institutional process has illuminated the plural and various ways that institutions are expressed and experienced by actors, and the different ways actors can respond discursively to institutional pressures. The institution of peacebuilding does not have one identity claim associated with it. PBO actors said in a variety of ways, "we are a peacebuilding organisation," which means: we are a community, a business, a place, a mediator and an educator. In the same way, the institution of the family includes multiple identity claims, for example, carer, place, breadwinner, etc. The way in which identity claims are expressed and interact both reflects and creates meaning at higher levels, beyond the individual actors. So, the conflictual differentiation between PBO identity claims and the frequent references to mission loss, reflect a breakdown in meaning at higher levels, at the level of the population and field. If institutions survive because actors reproduce their meanings and structures through their actions and language (e.g. Scott, 2008), institutions die when actors fail to successfully reproduce those meanings and structures. Actors perpetuate institutions, but they can also end them. Conversely, institutions are the source of meaning for actors, and when those meanings break down, try as they might, actors struggle to be able to continue reproducing them. This reciprocal institutional process has been discussed by other researchers (Battilana et al., 2009; Dacin et al., 2002; Pedersen & Dobbin, 2006; Wright & Zammuto, 2013). What is unique here is that this context of deinstitutionalisation has illuminated specific processes by which institutions fade, which are the organisational identity work processes that are combinations of conflictual, neutral and plural differentiation. In other words, organisations and their stakeholders can influence the meaning of institutions through how they promote and reject identity claims.

Other research uses the concept of institutional logics to explain how institutions are expressed and enacted by individual actors (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). An institutional logic is "a set of material practices and symbolic constructions" that are the organising principles that are available to actors to express and elaborate (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 248). The institutional logics model, associates one comprehensive and cohesive logic with an institution. Institution is defined as a set of practices, beliefs and values (Scott, 2008), but it does not
necessarily follow that those practices, beliefs and values are homogenous and can form one cohesive and coherent logic. Using an OI framework to analyse institutions has further illuminated the plural and various ways that institutions are expressed and experienced by actors. While on the surface, Alpha and Beta look like very similar organisations, and they express a similar group of identity claims; however, they display very different discursive strategies, and thus very different versions of the institution of peacebuilding. Of course, because a field is influenced by multiple institutions (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006), it is challenging to separate out one institution, and there are certainly blurry overlapping areas between institutions that influence any given field. Nevertheless, this research shows that institutions, and possibly the logics that flow from them, are expressed and enacted in different ways by different organisations.

The institutional logics approach also points out multiple conflicting logics within an organisation or field (e.g. Knutsen, 2012; Reay & Hinings, 2009; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; van Gestel & Hillebrand, 2011), but there is a permanence and homogeneity about each logic that is perhaps overstated. This research shows that institutions, at least when they are fading, can have weak logics that mean very different things to different people. Similarly, Dacin, Munir and Tracy argue for a more fragmented understanding of institutions in their study of ritual micro-process in maintaining institutions (2010). The implication of this research for the concept of institutional logics is that the concept of a logic could be dimensionalised as weak or strong, waxing or waning, or fragmented versus coherent in the way it is expressed. Current research focusses on interaction between logics and the presence or absence or dominant or alternative logics (Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; van Gestel & Hillebrand, 2011), more than qualities of the logic itself, and with the assumption that each logic is a coherent whole. Returning to the ‘enduring paradox’ of OI, such that OI is perceived as enduring while it is being re-negotiated, I extend this notion to the concept of logics. Actors may express institutional logics as coherently enduring over time, but a closer examination of language might reveal that they are much more malleable than actors like to believe. Future research could explore this possibility.

10.2.4 Organisational survival

This research has two key implications for the study of organisational survival. Firstly, it reconciles contradictory findings in the extant literature, and secondly, it provides
support for the argument that strategic consistency and integrity are important for organisational survival.

In the literature review, chapter 2, I presented extant literature on organisational survival as highly diverse, including different levels of analysis, with conflicting conclusions. This study provides a multi-layered analysis of the process of OI work in response to deinstitutionalisation, bringing together agency and structure, and also bringing together some of the contradictory literature. For example, the finding that inertial organisational responses, such as turning inwards and denying mission loss, enhance survival prospects contradicts the NPO survival literature which often equates survival with the ability to adapt, (Lune, 2002; Mulroy & Tamburo, 2004; Tschirhart, 2012), but supports the population ecology literature, which argues that change is disruptive and does not aid survival (Hannan & Freeman, 1984; Singh & Lumsden, 1990). Analysing identity work processes as a response to deinstitutionalisation elucidates how inertial responses, like resisting OI change, enhance survival. By turning inwards, using plural and neutral differentiation to re-negotiate identity claims, organisations are better able to re-form their OI in response to deinstitutionalisation. This finding reconciles the agency-oriented NPO survival literature with the often deterministic ecology literature by providing a role for agency, organisational actors turning inwards, to explain a population level process and finding. Reconciling these two contradictory areas of literature contributes to the agency-structure debate in institutionalism (Heugens & Lander, 2009) by taking a position that involves bringing together agency and structure.

This research supports extant literature that suggests that organisational survival prospects are enhanced by strategic consistency over time (Lamberg, Tikkanen, Nokelainen, & Suur-Inkeroinen, 2009), and consensus between organisational stakeholders (Reger et al., 1994). The case of Beta indicates that OI work in response to deinstitutionalisation that reflects a turning inwards, relying on plural and neutral types of differentiation, leads to higher consensus around a reformed OI, and one which is aligned with the organisation’s past. These conclusions resonate with existing research on organisational survival. In a context of dynamic change and competitive actions, “strategic consistency,” which refers to coherence between past and future actions, internal and external change, has been shown to enhance survival (Lamberg et al., 2009). A weak or fragmented administration or a contested strategic direction might result in a lack of strategic consistency, paving the way for organisational demise and
death (Hambrick & D’Aveni, 1992). Cognitive consistency, stakeholders’ understandings of coherence between organisational values and actions, also enhances survival (Reger et al., 1994). Therefore, while the malleability of OI enabled adaptation to a changing context, the perception of an enduring OI allowed for a sense of continuity, consistency and integrity, which enhanced survival prospects.

Other areas of literature corroborate the relationship between stakeholder consensus and organisational survival. For example, agreement between organisational stakeholders who align with organisational values and moral standards leads to solidarity, which contributes to survival (Donnelly-Cox, 2001). Similarly, Hatch and Schultz combine concepts of OI, brand, and culture to argue that aligning values, practices and mission for internal and external stakeholders alike contributes to survival and success (2008). Thus, in several areas of literature, alignment around an organisation’s values and practices is shown to contribute to survival.

Coherence between strategic actions, values, history and environmental change are important to survival, particularly for NPOs (Frumkin, 2002; Twersky & Lanzerotti, 1999). Both Alpha and Beta struggled with integrity versus hypocrisy in terms of acting in ways that are in harmony with their values. In contrast to Beta, Alpha decouples its focus on meeting (donor) market expectations from the values and routines that are internally held, which is particularly damaging for value-based organisations such as NPOs. This decoupling might ultimately lead to a “legitimacy façade,” when the organisation makes symbolic gestures to maintain legitimacy, allowing it to conduct its core business in ways that are not consistent with its external image, which ultimately can lead to organisational failure (MacLean & Behnam, 2010).

10.3 Minor theoretical contributions

In addition to the major theoretical contributions outlined above, I draw out, below, three minor theoretical contributions on peacebuilding, non-profit management and managerialism.

10.3.1 Peacebuilding

While peacebuilding was the context of this study, rather than the theoretical focus, nevertheless, the research presented here contributes to understandings of peacebuilding. In chapter 4, mapping, I turned to the peacebuilding literature to provide a definition of peacebuilding: a set of activities that aim to bring about peace after
violent conflict (Björkdahl & Höglund, 2013; Lederach, 1997). Within the peacebuilding literature on theory and practice there is a critique that peacebuilding can lead to “frozen” conflicts (Höglund & Kovacs, 2010; Paris, 2010), “unending peace processes” (Aggestam & Björkdahl, 2011), “conflict-in-transformation” (Mitchell, 2009), or negative instead of positive peace (Mac Ginty, 2006). While extant literature provides several explanations as to why peacebuilding efforts stagnate, such as due to new frictions or structural conflicts within the peacebuilding efforts (Björkdahl & Höglund, 2013; Mitchell, 2009), the tenacity of institutions, the institution of peacebuilding in this case, helps explain why peacebuilding becomes the new reality for societies in conflict, instead of a means to an end. The institutional lens applied in this research provides a new explanation for how and why peacebuilding tends to self-perpetuate, and how it might diffuse. This doctoral research elaborates on those self-perpetuating processes, which include inertial responses to institutional pressures, barriers to institutional change, and the micro-processes of organisational identity work. The contribution can be outlined in three parts.

Firstly, understanding peacebuilding as an institution helps explain why it self-perpetuates. Björkdahl and Höglund say as much: “Our understanding of peacebuilding also includes a recognition that peacebuilding has become a powerful norm institutionalised into the discourses and practices of international organisations, states and NGOs.” (2013, p. 291). However, they do not go on to elaborate the implications of an institutional approach in a context of peacebuilding. This doctoral research has taken an organisational lens and interprets peacebuilding as an institution. This approach provides an explanation of how peacebuilding as an institution self-perpetuates, and how PBOs respond to the fading of that institution through organisational identity work.

Secondly, this research helps to distinguish between two phenomena by highlighting the difference between the institution of peacebuilding, and a transition to peace. Well intentioned actors set out to build peace, and invest much time, resources and efforts to that end, as is clear from the activities of PBOs outlined in this research. This effort is described as follows, “Metaphorically, peace is seen not merely as a stage in time or a condition. It is a dynamic social construct. Such a conceptualization requires a process of building, involving investment and materials, architectural design and coordination of labor, laying of a foundation, and detailed finish work, as well as continuing maintenance” (Lederach, 1997, p. 20). In short, while the purpose of peacebuilding is
defined as efforts to build ‘sustainable’ and ‘durable’ peace (e.g. Lederach, 1997; Paris, 2010); instead peacebuilders have unwittingly created sustainable and durable institutions of peacebuilding, which has given rise to frustration and criticism of peacebuilding efforts (e.g. Aggestam & Björkdahl, 2011; Björkdahl & Höglund, 2013; Höglund & Kovacs, 2010; Mitchell, 2009).

And thirdly, this research contributes to understanding how different levels interact in a way that is neglected by peace studies. Peacebuilding studies tend to include the level of the state or nation and international community, because they play an important role in conflict. In contrast, I have included the organisational level, which is often neglected by peace studies. This point is further elaborated within the methodological contribution of mapping, below.

**10.3.2 Nonprofit management**

This research makes a significant contribution to understanding of non-profit management by illustrating how PBOs are able to survive the deinstitutionalisation of their mission because they are able to inter-subjectively re-negotiate their identity claims. This finding contributes to the understanding of NPOs as tenacious (Wollebaek, 2009) even in the face of serious external threat (Lune, 2002). I extend the idea that NPOs are tenacious by elaborating on how they are tenacious, by re-negotiating their OI in response to mission loss. I argue that strategic consistency, between past, present and future actions (Lamberg et al., 2009), as well as cognitive consistency, between values and actions (Reger et al., 1994) are an important part of the survival of NPOs.

While I did not review the non-profit management literature that relates to practitioner leadership, because it is outside the realm of organisational studies, I did include a brief review of non-profit management literature that speaks to academic audiences, see chapter 2. This literature emphasises the importance of understanding and focussing on the organisational environment to enhance survival changes (e.g. Mulroy & Tamburo, 2004; Schmid, 2004; Tschirhart & Knueve, 2000), which suggests that turning outwards is essential for organisational success and survival (Wollebaek, 2009). The research presented here gives evidence for the contrary, turning inwards and reflecting on values and mission gives a survival advantage. From a practitioner point of view, when the external context is changing and posing a significant threat, and the organisation goes into survival mode, ‘circling the wagons’, organisational actors would do well to remember their values, particularly in the process of re-inventing their identity. The
importance of values and mission to organisational survival supports Frumkin's model of NPOs having an expressive role that needs to correspond with its instrumental role, as well as with public values (2002). Interestingly, there is a growing body of literature on leadership and integrity that emphasises turning inwards and focussing on inner direction, rather than outwards indicators, for success and survival (e.g. Bauman, 2013; Leroy, Palanski, & Simons, 2012). This research provides support for those claims.

10.3.3 Managerialism

Research on managerialism (Dart, 2004; Kreutzer & Jäger, 2011; Maier & Meyer, 2011) and marketisation (Hwang & Powell, 2009) shows how business practices and management fashions (Abrahamson, 1996; Abrahamson & Fairchild, 1999) have a hegemonic influence on NPOs. My findings contribute to the understanding of the dissemination of management concepts in other sectors (e.g. social or public) by pointing to limitations of the introduction of such tools and practices. In Alpha, the business claim, which embodied managerialist discourse, was brought in to save the organisation, but ended up negating its expressive role. Also in Beta, interviewees expressed a tension between the business and other claims but to a lesser extent. Thus while managerialism is adopted to enhance survival, it also has the capacity to damage survival prospects in NPOs.

10.4 Methodological contribution

This research stands to make three methodological contributions: mapping, using qualitative data analysis software, and insider-outsider research.

10.4.1 Mapping

Despite the fact that other NPO mapping projects have been conducted in Ireland, north and south (Acheson et al., 2004; Donoghue et al., 1999; Donoghue, Prizeman, O'Regan, & Noël, 2006; InkEx, 2012; The Wheel, 2012), this study is the first one that identifies the field of peacebuilding in Ireland. Furthermore, I argue that even though there are studies of Irish peacebuilding organisations (e.g. Cochrane & Dunn, 2002; Hemmer, 2009), the methodological considerations relevant to organisational studies (Grønbjerg, 1989) have not been fully considered as the sample group for these studies has been compiled with a political science logic, with more interest in peacebuilding than in
organisations. I have applied these considerations to the case of PBOs. Because this is the first time that these steps have been taken for the field of peacebuilding in Ireland, I thus refer to the ‘hidden PBO landscape’ in chapter 4.

I have used an organisational lens to identify the field of peacebuilding and the core population of PBOs. I have demonstrated how clearly defining and mapping the units of analysis, organisational field and core population, is valuable and challenging. Drawing clear boundaries around the focal population in this context was challenging, in contrast to existing studies that present core and peripheral populations as fairly distinct (Rao et al., 2003; Wright & Zammuto, 2013). I have found that there is a core population central to the field of peacebuilding. The ambiguous cases, like organisations that seem to fit the definition of PBO but focus on and represent a specific neighbourhood, indicate that there is a spectrum rather than a clear discontinuity between core and periphery (Hannan & Freeman, 1986, p. 54) supporting a model for mapping nonprofits based not on distinct breaks between categories of activity, but rather on a continuum of practice (Crossan, Ibbotson, & Bell, 2011). I have delineated a theoretically constructed category: PBOs that are a core organisational population in the field of peacebuilding.

10.4.2 Qualitative data analysis software

Another interesting methodological reflection is that the deinstitutionalisation study presented in chapter 5 relied on data that was manually coded, while the OI study presented in chapters 6-8 relied on data that was coded using NVivo software. The findings from both studies corresponded with each other and did not produce very different results, although the questions asked were slightly different. This suggests that the method of coding did not significantly alter the results. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the use of software to facilitate coding encouraged and enabled more quantitative approaches to the data than would otherwise be pursued in a qualitative study. Early drafts of the findings sections began with numbers, which I subsequently re-wrote so that the numbers played a support role, providing information on the weighting of various codes, rather than as the first insight into the meaning of the data.

10.4.3 Insider-outsider research

A unique aspect of this research is the insider-outsider perspective, which changed throughout the research journey. I was an employee at a PBO for the first two years of
this study, thus was researching from the inside. For the remainder of the study, I was not an employee, but still had personal contacts with many of the research participants. The benefit of this vantage point was that I had excellent access to individuals and organisations, which greatly facilitated data gathering. Some of the interview participants were colleagues or former-colleagues, and some interviews were conducted at peace centres. I was able to go back to the research participants very easily with follow up questions. I had the privilege of being invited into one of Beta’s closed ‘cell’ groups. I also had the experience of not being granted access to staff by their managers. I was able to gain some insight into this denied access through other contacts within the organisation. In short, beginning the research as an insider provided access and insights that I might not have otherwise had. My approach differs to Gioia et al’s insider-outside approach in that they engaged an insider to work with them for the duration of the research (2010), whereas I served as insider and outsider at different times during the research journey. I also collaborated on papers with ‘outsiders’.

Interviews took place in a variety of contexts and combinations of insider-outsider. Several of the interviews were conducted at the business school by myself, as a former employee of a peace centre, and my PhD supervisor, while others were conducted by a peace centre member who is also a Reverend in the Church of Ireland. It is interesting to note that, while it is not analysed in this thesis, the location and the interviewer might have an effect on the responses given by the interviewee, and the direction and tone of the interview. It is possible that responses given at the business school were considered to be more appropriate within the context of a business school, referring to brand, for example, while responses given to a reverend at a peace centre were of a more religious orientation, with more overtly Christian references. While I had no evidence that these insider-outsider perspectives impacted the interviews, it would make for interesting future research.

10.4.4 Operationalising deinstitutionalisation

Because there is so little research on deinstitutionalisation, there is practically no information on how to operationalise the concept. Existing studies rely primarily on historical records (Ahmadjian & Robinson, 2001; Davis et al., 1994; Delacour & Leca, 2011; Greve, 1995; Maguire & Hardy, 2009; Rao et al., 2003; Wright & Zammuto, 2013). In this study because I discovered that deinstitutionalisation was taking place during the research, I had to find a way to operationalise the process in real time. I
chose to map the field and population out of necessity, because there was no complete picture of peacebuilding in Ireland, and then conduct interviews and field work, to get live insight into changes in that field. Combining that data with secondary data, websites, books, annual reports, and brochures, provided an account of current and recent changes in the field and population, at multiple levels. I am not aware of any other research on a current deinstitutionalisation process, which implies an empirical contribution, see next section. Future research could include repeating the mapping process several years after the first one in order to analyse how the field composition has changed over time.

10.5 Empirical contributions

This research has provided data on peacebuilding organisations in Ireland by mapping the organisational field and population. Despite efforts by researchers in political science (Cochrane & Dunn, 2002; Hemmer, 2008, 2009), non-profit studies (Donoghue et al., 1999, 2006), as well as by practitioners (e.g. CMI, 2006), data on the field of peacebuilding in Ireland was patchy and incomplete. By taking an organisational lens to peacebuilding, and by following the mapping method of Grønbjerg (1989, 2002), I was able to create a more complete map of peacebuilding in Ireland.

This research has provided empirical support for several understudied research areas: deinstitutionalisation, defensive institutional work, and organisational identity work. In particular, it has provided data on a current deinstitutionalisation process for the first time, which has led to methodological innovation in order to operationalise the concept. Furthermore, this is the first study that provides data on identity work at the level of the organisation. Other empirical studies, focus on how individuals use identity work to negotiate shared values and meanings and express who they are (A. D. Brown & Toyoki, 2013; Creed et al., 2010; Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010; Petriglieri & Stein, 2012). While this one extends the concept of identity work to the level of the organisation.

10.6 Practical contributions

Finally, this research also provides contributions to practice and policy. For organisations and governments involved in an area of work, related to a social need, such as peacebuilding, emphasis is usually placed on measuring and evaluating impact
and efficiency. What is not measured is the impact of deinstitutionalisation on organisations and individuals, when a field fades, ceases to exist or is replaced by a new one. This research provides some insight for policy makers and practitioners: what are the implications of withdrawing funding and pulling back on existing funded programmes? And what is the best way to respond? From a macro-perspective, winding up significant and long-term programmes creates a deinstitutionalisation process to which organisations feel pressure to adapt. Responses to changes in the field range from adaptation to inertia, and inertia, counter-intuitively, seems to aid organisational survival. Integrity and consistency between values and actions, between past and present are important factors for organisational survival as they help retain key stakeholders, such as staff, volunteers and private donors, and they are encouraged by a turning inwards response, reflecting on values, beliefs and mission.

10.7 Limitations

Mission loss is a very instrumental way of understanding an organisation’s mission, as if it only something to be accomplished. A religious community most likely does not see their mission as something they can accomplish, and then disband. Their mission is as expressive as it is instrumental; they exist to represent certain values or way of life, as much as they exist to accomplish any particular task, or deliver any particular service. As Beta is a faith-based community, the concept of mission loss does not fit with the language they use. Both Beta and Alpha talk about adapting their missions, but not of mission loss. Thus, the term “mission loss,” particularly in the identity work process model, is problematic as it is presented as a structural feature, when it is more a matter of interpretation for the organisational actors to debate. Furthermore, the concept, “denying mission loss,” does not fit will with the social constructionist approach because it implies that the researcher knows there is mission loss and the interviewees are in denial of that objective fact. While I struggled with the concept of mission loss, particularly “denying mission loss,” I decided to use those terms as they emphasised the extreme environmental challenge that PBOs face. The terms, acknowledging, rejecting and denying mission loss, helped me interpret how participants’ understandings of mission were changing, which was key in understanding NPO survival as well as the impact of deinstitutionalisation on PBOs. Mission loss is
'denied' in relation to the fact that interviewees mostly 'acknowledge' mission loss. Thus, I provided a rational for terms that did not seem to fit perfectly.

One limitation to phase two of the research, presented in chapter 5, documenting deinstitutionalisation, is that five of the fifteen PBOs were only researched via their websites. For ten of the PBOs, interviewees spoke of first-hand experience and several documents for these organisations were included in the data. This imbalance weighted findings towards those PBOs that were better represented. Furthermore, neither of the PBOs in Great Britain were interviewed directly, and these organisations which are both in a different legal jurisdiction may face quite different field-level disruptions. Despite this limitation of the sample group, I am satisfied that because the informants whom I consulted were so familiar with all 15 PBOs that the changes taking place in the population and field were accurately captured.
10.8 Future Directions

Some future directions for research have been indicated in previous sections of this chapter, such as conducting longitudinal research that would include a second mapping project in order to document how the field of peacebuilding has changed over time. A longitudinal study would contribute to further understanding the deinstitutionalisation process. I have divided this section into extensions of the existing research, and new areas of research.

10.8.1 Extension of this study

The process model presented in chapter 9 reflects an institutional shift that is experienced on the levels of field, population and organisation. The next step of the process would be to reflect on how the organisational and population level changes might, in turn, influence the institutional level, and thus complete a cyclical process. This presents a new research question that logically flows from this study: how do organisational and population responses to deinstitutionalisation subsequently influence institutional level shifts? I illustrate this question by reproducing the process model and adding the next two steps of the sequence.
Diagram 10.8. Future research: Process of OI work and institutional change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous identity (structure/social actor)</th>
<th>Identity work catalyst (agency/social constructionist)</th>
<th>Outcomes (structure/social actor)</th>
<th>Identity change (structure/social actor)</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deinstitutionalisation: Functional, social and political pressures</td>
<td>Identity threat and ambiguity: who are we now?</td>
<td>Survival:</td>
<td>- Low consensus OI.</td>
<td>- Identity evolves as fragmented and conflctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission loss</td>
<td>- Conflictual and neutral differentiation</td>
<td>- Short term planning with goal of survival</td>
<td>- Unable to successfully adapt to institutional change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rejection and replacing founding goals with new logic of managerialism</td>
<td>- Sense of hypocrisy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Acknowledging mission loss</td>
<td>- Convergence around new cohesive reformed identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rejection/denial mission loss = defensive custodian role</td>
<td>- Able to adapt to institutional change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>Turning outwards:</td>
<td>- High consensus on OI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Plural and neutral differentiation</td>
<td>- Long-term planning with goal of consistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Embracing multiple claims, retaining founding values</td>
<td>- Sense of integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turning inwards:</td>
<td>- Convergence around new cohesive reformed identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Plural and neutral differentiation</td>
<td>- Able to adapt to institutional change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level: Field/Institution | Population | Organisation | Population | Institution
In this diagram, I have labelled the last two steps as 'hypothesis' and they refer to how organisational responses (OI work in particular) might influence higher levels of analysis (field, population and institution). Oliver’s explanation of the antecedents of deinstitutionalisation suggests that the organisational responses to the pressures of deinstitutionalisation serve as drivers and barriers of institutional change (1992). A fragmented OI with low levels of consensus contributes to entropic pressures on the population level, thus driving the dissipation of the institution (Oliver, 1992, p. 567). Consensus around a coherent OI contributes to inertial pressures on the population level, serving as a barrier to the advance of deinstitutionalisation (Oliver, 1992, p. 567). It is possible to speculate that if the organisations in the population maintained coherent and clear OIs, they could maintain their taken-for-granted legitimacy, and thus preserve the cognitive elements of the institution, at least at a low level. There is evidence in the literature on social movement organisations that formal organisations help to keep the flame of interest in a cause alive during times of waning public interest (Staggenborg, 1988). At this point in time, it is unknown in this case whether the current time is a period of decreased interest, or the end of the institution of peacebuilding. Nevertheless, it is possible to speculate that PBOs with consensus around their OI could continue to maintain at least a cognitive pillar of the institution for quite some time after the normative and regulative pillars (Scott, 2008), such as assumed need, funders and policies, have disappeared. While the process model is presented as linear movement, it starts and ends with institutional change, thus reflecting the iterative nature of institutional change, leading to population and organisational responses, which in turn influences institutional change.

If organisations and their stakeholders can influence the meaning of institutions by promoting and rejecting identity claims, then, it is possible that organisations and their stakeholders can accelerate or delay the process of deinstitutionalisation. This hypothesis could be explored by conducting comparative research including more than one example of deinstitutionalisation, rapid versus drawn out deinstitutionalisation processes. It would be very difficult to tease out cause and effect in terms of how organisational identity work impacts deinstitutionalisation. However, consistent with the approach in this and other research, and as presented in Diagram 10.8, reconciling agency versus structural accounts would suggest an iterative process. I have included this diagram in a conceptual paper on organisational identity work in response to institutional complexity, accepted for a conference in July this year (Cannon, 2014).
10.8.2 New areas of research

While the dynamics of identity work including different types of differentiation in self-other talk might be specific to the context of deinstitutionalisation and mission loss, the findings are also relevant to other contexts in which identity is threatened. The urgency and critical need to survive and save the organisation is conducive to more emphatic differentiation, which is more likely to be conflictual. Stakeholders do not only promote and reject claims but in response to a dire situation they attempt to save the organisation by asserting and negating claims in a more extreme way. This more emphatic degree of differentiation results in hurt feelings, frustration and defensiveness resulting in more conflictual differentiation. Further research could explore identity work in response to different types of identity threats.

Future research could investigate the link between identity work, strategic consistency and organisational survival on a large scale, particularly in organisations with strong expressive roles. This study suggests that organisations, not only with strong expressive roles, but specifically faith-based organisations, have a survival advantage. Further research could explore that proposition.

Considering the scarcity of research on deinstitutionalisation, further research could explore institutional changes through Oliver's framework of antecedents of deinstitutionalisation (1992). For example, He and Baruch look at the impact of demutualisation of building societies (2010). This is an example of a context that could be analysed in terms of deinstitutionalisation, shedding further light on the impact of fading institutions on organisations, and how those organisations respond. Examples of secularisation could be studied as the deinstitutionalisation of religion. Furthermore, peacebuilding in Ireland is a unique context to some extent, but there are other contexts with PBOs engaged in post-violent conflict work in other parts of the globe that could also be framed as deinstitutionalisation. Some evidence shows that there are similar processes taking place and that organisational survival and integrity becomes salient issues (Bilic, 2012). International, collaborative research could compare how PBOs in different contexts adapt to the outbreak of peace.

In NPO research the expressive and instrumental roles often appear to be in conflict with one another (Frumkin, 2002), and more specifically managerialist and community rationales, discourses (Kreutzer & Jäger, 2011; Maier & Meyer, 2011), or logics (Knutsen, 2012). Research on a larger scale could explore the range of interactions.
between these two discourses, or logics. Furthermore, while this research included an organisation with a religious expressive role, further research could more explicitly look at the role of religion, as an organisational expressive role, in facilitating OI reformation.

10.9 Conclusion

Organisations exist in dense matrices of institutional structures that can shift and change, with some institutions fading away while others coming to the fore. This research provides an interesting and rare case documenting organisational responses to deinstitutionalisation of their mission from two levels: the population and individual organisations. From the level of the population, I have highlighted the deinstitutionalisation process in real time. The macro-level change process of deinstitutionalisation involves numerous actors, has fuzzy boundaries, and has no clear beginning and end. By first transparently delineating the population of organisations most affected by the deinstitutionalisation of peacebuilding, their primary activity, I have illuminated the deinstitutionalisation process and population responses to it. Have PBOs become dinosaurs, not needed and about to be made extinct by deinstitutionalisation? Or will they emerge as players in a new area of work, such as integration or international peacebuilding? The PBO story is not over and, assuming that deinstitutionalisation progresses, only further observation will reveal whether PBOs can overcome external and internal barriers and be part of a new institutionalised set of practices and beliefs.

From the level of the individual organisation, I have argued that the organisations which do more turning inwards than turning outwards, i.e. engage in neutral and plural differentiation in processes of identity work, will be better able to survive institutional changes as they will more successfully re-form a coherent OI. The different levels of analysis - institution, field, population and organisation – are brought together by nesting the OI study in the deinstitutionalisation study. By embedding OI work in the context of deinstitutionalisation, I have shown how agency and structure interact and interrelate. I have elucidated how organisational inertia might enhance organisational survival. And finally, I have explained how PBOs might best survive the complex and dynamic process of deinstitutionalisation of their mission, and thus ‘survive the peace.’
References


162


Appendices

Appendix 1. Interview confidentiality form

Confidentiality Agreement and Interview Consent Form

Background
This interview is part of research undertaken by Sheila Cannon, a PhD candidate at the Centre for Nonprofit Management in the School of Business at Trinity College Dublin, supervised by Dr Gemma Donnelly-Cox. The information gathered will be included in the PhD research and several related articles that will be submitted to academic journals for publication. Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. We ask you to read the following statements of our confidentiality protocol and to sign indicating your consent to this interview.

Confidentiality Protocol

The identity of each participant and the information provided by each participant will remain strictly confidential. The organisations involved will be listed in the research, but no quotes will be attributed to any particular organisation, and case studies will be anonymised. All named individuals will be anonymised via field codes. Any potentially identifying information will be removed from interview transcripts. Once anonymised, the identification key will be stored separately from the main data, and it will be stored securely via encryption and password protection. The study location will be kept confidential. Electronic copies of data will be stored in password-protected and encrypted files in password-protected computers in encrypted format according to the Data Protection Commissioner guidelines, with access strictly restricted to members of the research team. Only anonymised data will be published. No named individual participants will be linked to any of the published findings, nor their identities be disclosed to anyone outside the research team. All members of the research team will adhere strictly to the terms and conditions of the confidentiality agreement.

Declaration:
I have read the confidentiality protocol and I understand the contents. I freely and voluntarily agree to be interviewed. I have received a copy of this agreement.

Participant’s Name: .................................................................

Contact Details: .................................................................

Signature: ................................................................. Date: .................................

Statement of interviewer's responsibility: I believe that the participant has read and understood the confidentiality protocol and has freely given informed consent to this interview.

Interviewer’s Name: .................................................................

Contact Details: cannonsh@tcd.ie  Interviewer’s advisor: gdnnllyc@tcd.ie

Interviewer’s Signature: ................................................................. Date: .................................
Appendix 2. Interview protocol

Semi-formal interviews conducted at Alpha and Beta case organisations

PhD research, phase three. The overarching question is: how organisations survive environmental change. In phase three of the research we are specifically interested in organisational identity work.

Conducted by Sheila Cannon and Gemma Donnelly-Cox

To the interviewees: Given that the context in which NGOs are working seems to be changing rapidly, we are interested in how nonprofit organisations are responding to these changes. Changes in the organisations' environment might impact the organisation in a number of ways - we are exploring what changes are happening, why and how. We are conducting interviews with as many people as possible from a few peacebuilding organisations in order to get a snapshot of how the organisation is changing or has changed. We plan on drawing out the themes that emerge from the individual interviews in order to write up a case study of the organisation.

Questions for semi-formal interviews at two case organisations.

The questions are organised around the various factors that appear in the literature that relate to organisational survival. As the interviews are semi-formal, this protocol provides an outline to guide questioning, rather than a rigid set questions that must be asked.

General

Tell us your Beta story - how you joined, when, why? What was the org doing then?

- How has the organisation changed or stayed the same in terms of:
  - Programme work
  - Finances
  - Collaborating with other organisations
  - Adapting to changes in the environment
  - Strategic planning
  - Leadership
- How would you describe your organisation's current challenges?
- What is your organisation currently doing really well?
- What is your organisation not doing well right now?

Mission

- Given the mission as it is stated on the organisation’s website, has it changed over the past 10 years and if so how?
- Has it changed in response to a changing context for your work?

Organisational environment

- What are the changes in the operating environment for your organisation? (Donors, political interest, members, participants, other organisations doing similar work)
- What is the current role of the organisation? Has that role changed over the past few years and if so how?
• Is there a changing demand for the services you offer?
• Do you encounter the perception that there is no longer a need for peacebuilding, and, if so, how are you responding to that?
• What do you see as the threats to the organisation in the next year or two?
• What do you see as the opportunities for the organisation in the next year or two?

**Legitimacy and impression**

• What is Beta’s reputation?
• What do different people in your network say about the organisation?
• What would outsiders say about your organisation?
• Would outsiders consider your organisation important?

**Expressive role**

• Who is drawn to your organisation and why?
• What keeps Beta community together? Once people have joined, why do they stay?
• Why are people so committed to Beta? OR Why aren’t people more committed to Beta? OR, Why aren’t more people committed to Beta?
• Does the organisation encourage and link in to this interest and energy effectively?

**Organisational identity**

• In what way is Beta different to Alpha? How is your org different/unique?
• When you think of Beta what first comes to mind? How has that changed in the past 5 years?
• What were the last three major changes in the org in the last few years?
• If Beta were an animal, what would it be?
• How are you different to Amnesty International?

**Survival/Demise** (These questions might be a bit sensitive; they might have to be asked in response to other questions above. If they do not come up, then they could be asked at the end):

• Is organisational closure a real possibility in the next few years?
• Will your organisation ‘weather the storm’? Why and how? What will keep it alive?

For admin staff – those who are perhaps not comfortable talking about the organisation’s strategy: What is it like to work here? What are the positive and negative aspects? What are the values of the organisation? How are they expressed in the day to day operations? (for other perspectives on expressive role and org id)
Appendix 3. List of organisations in Irish peacebuilding field

Alphabetical listing of all organisations (289) included in the Irish field of peacebuilding, 2008-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 174 Trust</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1825 Young Men’s Project</td>
<td>Craigavon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Alternatives to Violence</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Altnaveigh House Ltd</td>
<td>Newry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 An Teach Ban, Donegal Peace Centre</td>
<td>Downings/L'Derry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ardboe Literary, Photographic and Historical Association (ALPHA)</td>
<td>Co Tyrone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ardmonagh Family and Community Centre</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ardoyne Focus Group</td>
<td>Ardoyne, North Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ardoyne Youth Providers Forum (AYPF)</td>
<td>Ardoyne, North Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Armagh Church Forum</td>
<td>Armagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Armagh Unemployed Group</td>
<td>Armagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Artability (NI) Ltd</td>
<td>North and West Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Arts Across Borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Arts for All</td>
<td>North Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ashton Community Trust/ Mount Vernon Community Forum</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Atlantic View Community Development Partnership Ltd</td>
<td>Ballyshannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Atlas Women’s Centre</td>
<td>Lisburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Autism NI</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ballinran Resource Centre</td>
<td>Kilkeel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Ballybeen Women's Centre</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Ballykeel 11 Residents Association - Community House</td>
<td>Ballymena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Ballymoney Community Resource Centre (BCRC)</td>
<td>Ballymoney, NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ballynafeigh Community Development Association</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ballynafeigh Community Development Centre</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ballyroan and Crumcree Parishes Group</td>
<td>Co Armagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Ballysillan Youth for Christ Drop-In Centre</td>
<td>Ballysillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Balor Development Community Arts Group</td>
<td>Strabane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Beechfield Primary School and St Bernadette's Primary School</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Beleek and District Community Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Belfast Community Sports Development Network (BCSDN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Belfast Interface Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Blackwater Regional Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bogside Artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Boyne Fishermen's Rescue and Recovery Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Broughshane and District Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bush Old School House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Business in the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bytes Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Caledon Playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Carswell Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>CAW 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Centre for Contemporary Christianity in Ireland (CCCI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Changing Attitude Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Civil Rights Commemoration Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Clonard Monastery (and Youth Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Coexist Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Coiste na nlarachimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Columba Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Columbanus Centre of Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Community Action for Locally Managing Stress (CALMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Community Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Community Foundation for Northern Ireland (formerly, Northern Ireland Voluntary Trust, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Community Relations Council (CRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Community Relations in Schools (CRIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Community Restorative Justice Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Community Technical Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Conflict Trauma Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Co-operation Ireland (formerly, Cooperation North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Corner House Cross Community Family Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Cornerstone Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Corpus Christi Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Corrymeela Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Counteract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>County Armagh Grand Orange Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>County Monaghan Community Network (CMCN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Creggan Country Park Enterprises Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Creggan Youth Drop-In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Cross Border International Arts, Cultural and Sports Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Cross Border Orchestra of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Crossfire Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Cumann Culturtha Mhic Reachtain / McCracken Cultural Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Cumann Spoirt an Phobail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Cunamh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cushendall District Development Group Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Deanby Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Dennett InterChange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Department of Employment and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Donaghmoyne Youth Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Donegal School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Donegall Pass Community Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Dooneen Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Dove House Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Downpatrick Listowel Linkage Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>DrugWiser Family Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Dunfanaghy Workhouse Heritage Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Early Year - the Organisation for young children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>East Belfast Community Focus (EBCF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>East Belfast Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>East Ireland Open Bridge Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>ECF links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Enniskillen Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Evangelical Contribution on Northern Ireland (ECONI)/ Centre for Contemporary Christianity in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ex-Prisoners Interpretive Centre (EPIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Families Acting for Innocent Relatives (FAIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Families Against Intimidation and Terror (FAIT). Possibly closed in 1999, but still included in listings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Farset Inishowen and Border Counties Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Farset Youth and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Fellowship of Messines (International School for Peace Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Fermanagh Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Finaghy Crossroads Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Football 4 Peace (F4P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Forthrivers Royals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Forthspring Inter-Community Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Gaslight Productions Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Gasyard Wall Feile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Gig 'n The Bann Cross-Community Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Gleanarm Village Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Gleann Amateur Boxing Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Glenshane Community Development Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Glentoran Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Google Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Guild of Uriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Hard Gospel Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Harmony Community Trust at Glebe House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Healing Through Remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Highfield Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Holiday Projects West (HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Holy Family Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Holywell Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Horizon Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Imeall Tra Teoranta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>INCORE: International Conflict Research Institute, University of Ulster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Inishowen Women’s Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Initiative '92 (contribution to the Opsahl Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Institute for British Irish Studies (IBIS), University College Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Institute for Conflict Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>InterAction Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Intercomm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>International Fund for Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Irish Congress of Trade Unions City Bridges Project (ICTU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Irish Network for Nonviolent Action Training and Education (INNATE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Irish Peace Institute, University of Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Irish School of Ecumenics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kilcooley Women's Education and Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Kilcranny House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Kilkeel Parish Bridge Association (JIMS Youth Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Laurencetown, Lenaderg and Tullyish Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Ledley Hall Boys and Girls Club Trust Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Leitrim Design House, Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Lenadoon Community Counselling Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Lifford/Clonleigh Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Limavady Somme Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Linfield Ladies Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Little Acorns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Lower Castlereagh Community Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Maiden City Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Manorcunningham Community Development Association Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Markets Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Meath Peace Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Mediation Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Mediation Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Messines Peace Projects, International School for Peace Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>National Union of Students/ Union of Students in Ireland (NAS/USI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Network Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>New Belfast Community Arts Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>New Border Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>New Lodge Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Newcastle Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Newhaven Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Newhill Youth &amp; Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Newtownabbey Community Relations Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>NICHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>North Belfast Community Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>North Belfast Interface Network (NBIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>North Leitrim Glens Development Company Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NIACRO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Children's Enterprise (NICE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Council for Integrated Education (NICIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Mixed Marriages Association (NIMMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Trade Union Educational &amp; Social Centre Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Northern Ireland's Children Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Northern Ireland voluntary Trust (NIVT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Northside Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Omagh Ethnic Communities Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Omagh Support and Self Help Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Opportunity Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Orana Children and Family Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Parents and Kids Together (PAKT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Pat Finucane Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Peace and Reconciliation Group, Derry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Peace People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Playzone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Pobal (until 2005 called ADM, Area Development Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Protestant and Catholic Encounter (PACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Public Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Quaker Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Queens University Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Randalstown Arches Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Rathcoole Friends of the Somme Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>REACH Across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>REACT: Reconciliation Education and Community Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Reconciliation Fund, Anglo Irish Desk, Department of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Regional Trade Union NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Restoration Ministries (Dr Ruth Patterson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Restorative Justice Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Riverstown Enterprise Development (Sligo) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Roden Street Community Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Rural College and Derrynoid Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Rural Community Network (RCN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Rural Development Council (RDC) - public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Saints Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SAVER/NAVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Second Chance Education Project for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Select Vestry of Muadain's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Serenity Active Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Shalom House Community Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Shankill Parish Caring Association, SPCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(founded by The Jethro Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Shankill Surestart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Shankill Women's Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Shaylyn Group Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Short Strand Community Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Skegoneill Glandore Common Purpose (SGCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Sliabh Beagh Cross Border Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Something Special Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>South Armagh Rural Women's Network (SARWN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>South Lough Neagh Regeneration Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Special European Union Programme Body, European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Special Olympics Ulster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Speedwell Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Spirit of Enniskillen Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>St Bernard's Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>St Ethelberga's Centre for Reconciliation and Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>St Louis House Youth Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>St McCartan's Pipe Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>St Patrick Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>St Peter's Immaculata Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>St Teresa's Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>St. Columbs Park House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Star Neighbourhood Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>STEER Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Strathfoyle Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Strawberry Tree Playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group (SLIG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Summer Madness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Survivors of Trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Tara Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Terry Enright Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>The Clogher Valley Rural Development Centre (CVRDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>The Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>The David Ervine Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>The Forge Family Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>The Forgiveness Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>The Foy Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>The Ireland Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>The Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>The Link Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>The Mummers Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>The Organic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>The Peace Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>The Playhouse (formerly, NW Play Resource Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>The Springfield Inter-Community Development Project (SICDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>The Training Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Tim Parry Jonathan Ball Foundation (formerly Warrington Peace Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Tiny Tots Playgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Tipperary Peace Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Top of the Rock Healthy Living Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Training for Women Network (TWN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Trauma Recovery Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Tyrone Donegal Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Tyrone, Derry and Donegal Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Ulster Community Action Network (UCAN Londonderry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Ulster Community Investment Trust Ltd (UCIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Ulster People's College (UPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>ULTACH Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Upper Ardoyne Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Victims and Survivors Trust (VAST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Village Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Vine Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Vineyard Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Waterside Development Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>West Tyrone Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Wexford Garden and Flower Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Widows Against Violence Empower (WAVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Willowfield Parish Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Windsor Women’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Women into Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Women Together for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Women’s Information Group (WIG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Workers Educational Association (WEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Youth Action Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Youth Initiatives (YI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Youth Link NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Youthcom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Youthworks CIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. NVivo Screenshots

The following two images illustrate what the coding looks like using NVivo software, which uses the term, ‘nodes,’ rather than codes. In Screenshot 1, on the left of the screen, the 7 phases or steps of data analysis are listed, 1.A to 5.A analysing Alpha, and 1.B to 5.B for Beta. Phase 6 is the cross-case analysis and Phase 7 consists of further working with the data to produce different charts, diagrams and illustrations.

In Screenshot 1, below, Phase 1.A is selected, so the field on the right shows the first step, open coding for Alpha. This presents the first attempt at coding the data in many small units of meaning. Phase 2.A involves clustering the codes, as is explained in the methodology chapter, and 3.A is coding on. In Screenshot 2, I have selected Phase 4.A, data reduction, which shows how I homed in on the main themes of identity claims and differentiation. The last type of differentiation listed is ‘conciliatory’. I later changed the label of this node/code to plural differentiation, which I felt better described the content of the node.

In both screenshots, the field on the right lists the name of the node/code, the number of sources it appears in, and number of references, or units of meaning assigned to each node/code. There also appears a short description next to each node. Attached to each node/code, but not visible in the screenshots, is a memo, a paragraph describing the content and summarising the quotes included in that node/code.
Phase 1. A Open codes

- **Name**: Business
  **Sources**: 18
  **Refer**: 124
  **Description**: Alpha as a commercial business that employs staff, has to balance its budget, and fundraise.

- **Name**: Place
  **Sources**: 17
  **Refer**: 88
  **Description**: History of Ireland: tragedy, troubles, operation shamrock, nature, hills

- **Name**: Volunteer community
  **Sources**: 16
  **Refer**: 76
  **Description**: Community, international volunteer programme. Described by interviewees as the human face

- **Name**: Talking about I or me
  **Sources**: 15
  **Refer**: 68
  **Description**: Some interviewees referred to themselves frequently, their experience, background and role.

- **Name**: Mediator
  **Sources**: 13
  **Refer**: 65
  **Description**: Role in troubles, talking to terrorists, peacebuilder

- **Name**: Organizational environment
  **Sources**: 15
  **Refer**: 56
  **Description**: How do interviewees describe the org environment

- **Name**: Frustration
  **Sources**: 11
  **Refer**: 53
  **Description**: Interviewees refer to frustration directly and indirectly. Indirectly they talk about how the reality

- **Name**: Talking against them or they
  **Sources**: 13
  **Refer**: 48
  **Description**: Even though many people are hurt by the organization, many people are deeply committed to

- **Name**: Expressive role
  **Sources**: 14
  **Refer**: 48
  **Description**: This is an identity claim. Alpha provides facilitation, nonformal education, life-long learning or

- **Name**: Facilitator
  **Sources**: 14
  **Refer**: 47
  **Description**: Interviewees talk about routes out of the organizational crisis, referring to increased efficiency

- **Name**: Solutions ways forward
  **Sources**: 15
  **Refer**: 44
  **Description**: interviewees talk about personal loss, death in the family or in the org, as well as trauma and

- **Name**: Disgrundred exit
  **Sources**: 12
  **Refer**: 42
  **Description**: Many stakeholders leave Alpha very unhappy, angry, hurt, burntout.

- **Name**: Alpha talking about Alpha
  **Sources**: 11
  **Refer**: 39
  **Description**: Alpha talking about itself - I used this category when I wasn't sure what id claim speaker was r

- **Name**: Temporal change
  **Sources**: 11
  **Refer**: 31
  **Description**: past vs present

- **Name**: Differentiation Neutral
  **Sources**: 8
  **Refer**: 29
  **Description**: Interviewees contrast in a neutral way what the org is versus what the org isn't

- **Name**: Changes in leadership
  **Sources**: 13
  **Refer**: 29
  **Description**: The CEO has changed several times in the recent past. The Policy Council was fired and rep

- **Name**: Entering org
  **Sources**: 17
  **Refer**: 28
  **Description**: interviewees describe how staff and board join the organization. It is mostly by personal conn

- **Name**: Org ld claims - overt
  **Sources**: 12
  **Refer**: 28
  **Description**: interviewees state directly what the org is.

- **Name**: Internal vs external
  **Sources**: 11
  **Refer**: 27
  **Description**: external reputation vs internal reality

- **Name**: Alpha talking about itself
  **Sources**: 10
  **Refer**: 27
  **Description**: Alpha used to be a Christian organization, and now does not have a religious component. Peo

- **Name**: Alpha talking about Gamma
  **Sources**: 7
  **Refer**: 21
  **Description**: Alpha describes Gamma as different to Alpha because it is a conduit for funding, rather than as

- **Name**: Talking about we or us
  **Sources**: 9
  **Refer**: 16
  **Description**: Interviewees talk about we or us, a collective understanding of the people in the org

- **Name**: Alpha talking about Beta
  **Sources**: 8
  **Refer**: 12
  **Description**: Alpha compares itself with Beta. Beta is Christian while Alpha is not. Alpha does political me

- **Name**: Metaphors
  **Sources**: 6
  **Refer**: 10
  **Description**: Interviewees use metaphors to describe the organization

- **Name**: Saviour
  **Sources**: 5
  **Refer**: 10
  **Description**: Many people refer to the fact that they were brought in to save the organization, or that a certa
Phase 4.A Data reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity claims</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>Participants assert, reject, defend different claims that are part of the org id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Alpha as a commercial business that employs staff, has to balance its budget, and history of Ireland, tragedy, troubles, operation shamrock, nature, hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>This is a claim that focuses on specific programme work: the organization's role in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>This is an identity claim. Alpha provides facilitation, nonformal education, life-long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Distinguishing between two things, us and them, two identity claims, two organizat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Differencing between two identity claims in a conflictual way. Calling the other cli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Differentiating between two things (id claims) in a neutral way. We are X, we are no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Differentiation implying I wish we were X, or I think we should be X, but we have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliatory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>