Welcome to the Fall Edition of the SAP newsletter! Looking back, it feels as if the AoM meeting in Anaheim was just a moment ago. In this newsletter, you will find many traces of this conference, including reflections on our very first SAP Doctoral & Early Career Program, on Jean Bartunek’s keynote and many pictures from our scholarly and social activities.

Looking ahead, we focus our attention on a key turning point in the SAP history at the Academy: moving from the status of an Interest Group to a Division. We hope you support us in applying for Division status by staying an active member of our IG, submitting your paper & symposium proposals for the Atlanta meeting and completing the membership survey. You can find more details on the road ahead on p.2 of this newsletter.

Preparing for the future, this newsletter also provides you with a collection of announcements relevant for our SAP community: the call for papers and symposium for the AoM meeting in Atlanta, three tracks at EGOS focusing on various themes in SAP research and a track at SMS and EURAM. You might also be interested in learning about the Call for Papers for two special issues, the companion website for the book “Practicing Strategy” and the new Standing Working Group on Process Research at EGOS.

Lastly, the newsletter also features emerging scholars in the SAP community and a new line of research: historical approaches to strategy process and practice research.

So, get a coffee, sit back, and enjoy catching up on the Strategizing Activities and Practices Interest Group!
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THE ROAD AHEAD: MOVING FROM AOM INTEREST GROUP TO DIVISION!

The Strategizing, Activities and Practices community, as represented by the SAP interest group at the Academy of Management, has had tremendous success both in terms of the number of AOM members attracted to this group as well as impactful scholarly work with the ability to change practitioners’ practices. Our interest group has also seen substantial growth in membership and the number of submissions over the past five years. From humble beginnings, we have grown our membership to **652 members**, representing a **33% increase** in members since 2011. Paper submissions also show a steady increase, with a record number of **132 submissions** in 2015!

In the coming year, we have an opportunity to cement our position within the AoM community by transitioning our status from an Interest Group to a **Division**. This is an important inflection point for our SAP group and one that we hope members will support.

We think it is very important for SAP to have a presence at the AoM because it is the world-leading association for management scholars; it is thus central to facilitating our research and community engagement goals. As a division, we will make better progress toward these goals through numerous advantages currently unavailable to us. One advantage of being a division is **more stability and permanence** in the Academy, as division status brings a five-year horizon as opposed to more frequent reviews for continuance. Obtaining division status for SAP also **puts us on par with other divisions** and gives us the same rights and responsibilities. It also changes the formula for funding allocation and will provide **additional funding for community activities**.

We are thus reaching out to you, our members, to support our group’s ambition for division status and to inform you of upcoming steps toward this change. In 2017, we are required to provide a review of SAP activities over the past few years in order to renew SAP as an Interest Group. As part of this upcoming review, AoM bylaws provide us with a window of opportunity to apply for an upgrade to division status. Initial conversations with AoM Officers have been favorable; our growth in members and scholarship puts us in a strong position to apply for division status.

For us to become a division in AoM, we need your help! Please **stay an active member of our group, send in papers to the Atlanta meeting, and complete the survey when your receive it** (February 2018 – yes, we believe in preparing ahead!).

Please support our efforts to secure division upgrade, so that we can continue to serve you as effectively as possible. If you have questions or comments, please don’t hesitate to contact the SAP leadership team.

Thank you for your active support and encouragement!

*Paul Spee & Jane Lê*
INTRODUCING YOUR PROGRAM TEAM 2016

IG Chair: Jane Lê

Chair-Elect: Paul Spee

Program Chair: Sotirios Paroutis

PDW Chair: Rajiv Nag
SAP-IG 2017: CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

Program Chair: Sotirios Paroutis – Warwick Business School (Sotirios.Paroutis@wbs.ac.uk)
PDW Chair: Rajiv Nag – Drexel University (pdwsap17@gmail.com)

August 5 – 9, 2017 in Atlanta, Georgia

The primary purpose of the Strategizing Activities and Practices Interest Group is to advance knowledge and understanding of strategy as something people in organizations do rather than only something that organizations have. This body of knowledge is focused primarily on who organizational strategists are, what they do, how they do it, which practices and materials they draw on, and what the consequences of their activities are. This interest group is concerned with the strategy work involved in strategy development and strategic change, and it seeks to advance understanding through theoretical pluralism and methodological innovation.

The general theme of the 2017 Atlanta Meeting is “At the Interface”. That definition highlights the dual nature of interfaces. Interfaces establish boundaries that differentiate and separate; they mark a space where insiders can jointly define an organization’s mission, develop an organizational identity, and participate in organizational activities. But interfaces also develop connections that facilitate communication, negotiation, and exchange across organizational boundaries. Interfaces are increasingly relevant to today’s organizations, as information, people, and other resources cross organizational boundaries at unprecedented rates. Interfaces create “interstitial spaces” in which information, people and resources are situated neither inside nor outside, but somewhere in between. Organizations leverage these interstitial spaces as they develop alumni networks for former employees, encourage family and friend referrals to job openings, ask customers to bag their own groceries, and crowdsource ideas for new products and markets. These activities are designed to benefit the organization, but society might benefit as well. For more information on the general conference theme please visit: http://aom.org/annualmeeting/theme/.

The SAP Interest Group is well positioned to address a number of questions related to the theme of the 2017 meeting, for example: How is strategy work associated with efforts of organizations and their actors operating at the interfaces? What are the mechanisms through which organizations develop and grow at the interfaces? How do individuals in organizations appreciate and construct these interfaces and with what effects?

How do organizational structures, identities, discourses and cultures contribute to the emergence and decline of these interfaces? How do strategy artefacts and technologies enable or hinder efforts of organizations to become more interconnected at the interfaces? What are the implications of the changing nature of strategy work for the way organizations are becoming more (or less) connected at the interfaces? In short, how strategy work is carried out at the interfaces warrants closer theoretical, methodological and empirical attention and this can be the basis for scholarly and symposia submissions to the SAP IG.
CALL FOR PAPERS, SYMPOSIA AND PDWS

Scholarly Program: We encourage submission of conceptual and empirical papers and symposia that focus on the specific conference theme. We welcome papers that address other issues within the general domain of the SAP Interest Group and papers that explore the intersections of SAP with other closely related areas such as BPS, OMT, ODC, RM, TIM and MOC. We also warmly invite symposia that propose integrative lenses or new methodologies that challenge current organizational and theoretical perspectives. The 2017 AOM program is held from **Sunday, August 6 through Tuesday August 8 in Atlanta, Georgia.**

PDW Program: We invite submissions for PDWs at the 2017 Annual Meeting in Atlanta, USA. The PDW sessions will be held between **8:00am Friday, August 4th, and 8:00pm Saturday, August 5th.** Keeping the importance of “interfaces” in mind, we strongly encourage PDWs that appeal to wider audience beyond the SAP community by building linkages with other divisions and interest groups. Please indicate potential co-sponsors in the submission document (e.g., OMT, BPS, ODC, MC, RM, TIM).

Submitters can request a minimum duration of 1.5 hours if they feel it would better serve the workshop, session flow, and attendee engagement. The 1.5 hour duration request must be documented in the uploaded proposal document itself at the time of submission. NOTE: When submitting the PDW in the online submission system, it will still need to be submitted with a minimum duration of 2 hours. If the proposal is accepted, the PDW Chair will reduce the duration to 1.5 hours on the submitter’s behalf. Please feel free to discuss potential PDWs with SAP PDW chair, **Rajiv Nag** (pdwsap17@gmail.com).

Details for Submission: The submission deadline for the 77th AOM Meeting is **January 10th, 2017 at 5:00 pm ET (NY Time).** All submissions must be made through the AOM submission website at [http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/](http://aom.org/annualmeeting/submission/) (submission system opens on November 15). Please carefully review all the submission guidelines and formatting instructions before submitting and indicate potential co-sponsors (e.g., BPS, OMT, ODC, RM, MOC, TIM etc.) in the submission document. For more information on Strategizing Activities and Practices, please visit the SAP Interest Group website ([http://divisions.aom.org/sap/](http://divisions.aom.org/sap/)).

If you are submitting to the SAP Interest Group this year, please also consider reviewing for us!

---

**PLEASE REVIEW FOR SAP (AGAIN)!

We need the SAP community to support us in these activities if we want SAP to continue thriving at the Academy of Management. An important part of that is helping us establish the best possible program, and we want your help in reviewing submissions. Please sign up to be a SAP reviewer at [http://aom.org/annualmeeting/review/](http://aom.org/annualmeeting/review/).

Thank you for signing up to review!**
AOM 2017 – ATLANTA – WORTH THE TRIP!

Cy Parks, Doctoral Student – University of Houston

In my U.S. travels, one of the my favorite destinations is Atlanta. A diverse, comfortable city with a rich history in the U.S. South, a beautiful environment and a global impact on today’s economy, Atlanta is a great place for the annual Academy meeting. So submit your papers, organize your PDWs, and make your plans for Atlanta! I’ve collected a few highlights you may want to consider visiting when you are here – Cheers! Cy

Stone Mountain Park – You can have a good hike or a scenic gondola ride to catch the great view from this mammoth igneous intrusion. Try to catch the laser light show!

Atlanta Botanical Garden – My personal favorite, here you can view Chihuly glass sculptures throughout a huge garden while enjoying wine and conversation. Great after a day of academic focus!

World of Coca-Cola – A fun look at a global drink brand – and you can make up your own drink recipe...

Centennial Olympic Park - Situated in the middle of the downtown area, the park is the nucleus of the city, with lunchtime concerts and the Fountain of Rings.

CNN Studios – Starting with the world’s largest escalator, you can visit the many studios CNN uses for its TV programming and see yourself in front of a green screen.
SAP’S FIRST DOCTORAL & EARLY CAREER PROGRAM – A SHORT REPORT & SOME IMPRESSIONS

Christina Wawarta – Doctoral Researcher, Warwick Business School, UK
Katharina Dittrich – Assistant Professor, University of Zurich, Switzerland

The AoM Annual Meeting in Anaheim this year demarked the first time that the SAP interest group organized a specific program for Doctoral students and Early Career Scholars.

It was an intense one-day event which balanced SAP content sessions with career advice, individual mentoring meetings and networking. The overwhelming positive feedback that we received for the program showed that this mix of activities as well as the PDW selection were well suited for the target group. Furthermore, it confirmed our plans to establish the Doctoral & Early Career Program as a valuable permanent addition to the existing SAP membership activities.

We would like to thank all participants and PDW organizers, facilitators, mentors, sponsors, and our patron Saku Mantere, once again!

We could not have done it without you!

Participant feedback

I will recommend the program to my peers
6.8 out of 7.0

The PDWs were useful & interesting
6.6 out of 7.0

Overall the program was suited to my needs & preferences
6.3 out of 7.0
SAP’S FIRST DOCTORAL & EARLY CAREER PROGRAM – AN OVERVIEW OF THE DAY

Christina Wawarta – Doctoral Researcher, Warwick Business School, UK
Katharina Dittrich – Assistant Professor, University of Zurich, Switzerland

1) Joint Breakfast: Program participants together with established scholars

2) Three diverse PDWs: From content nuggets to career advice

3) Individual mentoring sessions: Feedback from experienced scholars

4) Meet & Greet with the sponsor: Information on the IG from Saku Mantere

5) Official SAP Dinner: Networking event with the whole IG

“Being part of AoM research community was an outstanding opportunity to learn, engage, and contribute to the growth of organization and management scholarship. I was particularly pleased to attend the SAP Doctoral & Early Career Program and interact with leading and young scholars, all dedicated to share useful knowledge and practical experiences. This event was also a platform to create an intersection of theory & practice, and to make strategy and organization meaningful in the real world.”

Abderaouf Bouguerra - Doctoral Researcher, Warwick Business School
SAP’S FIRST DOCTORAL & EARLY CAREER PROGRAM – THROUGH THE EYES OF A PARTICIPANT (1/2)

Reva Bond Ramsden - Doctoral Student, Athabasca University, Academic Chair, School of Construction, SAIT

Thanks to the SAP Doctoral and Early Career Program (SAP DECP), my first AoM Conference experience began long before the actual conference dates in Anaheim. I was lucky enough to be assigned Dr. Robert Wright as my mentor. We skyped a few weeks before the conference and he provided very useful writing and publication tips along with some great advice on how to make the most of my AoM conference experience.

I was so looking forward to the SAP DECP day and I was not disappointed. The presentations we had that morning definitely answered the three questions that Dr. Robert Wright had suggested to consider when crafting a great presentation:

- Why is this interesting?
- Why is this important?
- What does this presentation tell me that I didn’t already know?

One of the first presentations of the day was on Bridging Strategic Practices and Information Systems for Real Time Strategic Management. The highlight for me was hearing from Donald Farmer, VP Innovation for Qlik. The information he provided had everyone reflecting on how business intelligence changes strategic practice. Regardless of the computer analytical power the implementation is still a very human activity and the gap that exists between predictive analytics and strategy practice is an opportunity for early career doctorates such as ourselves. “Persuasion through visualization” was a powerful phrase that has stuck with me.

The round table discussions, “So you finished your dissertation…now what?” were incredibly valuable. I can’t say enough positives about them. The expert panel consisting of Julia Balogun from Liverpool, Paula Jarzabkowski from City University and Anne Smith from University of Tennessee were each amazing. Our hosts Rebecca Bednarek and Katharina Dittrich facilitated a lively discussion. As a woman, I was smiling proudly on the inside to see such strong role models all in one room.
Some of the great advice I received and jotted down in my journal:

- Know the system and protect yourself
- Understand the playbook of that institution
- Know the informal workload of that institution
- Know what’s valued so you spend your time wisely
- Have a publication strategy
- Have good teaching mentors
- Have good research mentors
- Form a strong peer network
- Know your context and know what you want to achieve
- Write, write, write
- Find an institution that supports your research
- Look for a chair that shoots straight but doesn’t shoot to kill (I smile, hoping this is how my faculty sees me, another mental pat on the back)
- Few people turn down a cup of coffee
- Think about how much service you want to take on
- Don’t become a “Wife to the Organization” (interesting discussion later that evening that points out some very good benefits when you do make this sacrifice temporarily early in your career)
- Do not leave your career for industry, you can observe industry without becoming industry
- Good to have lots of industry experience before your PhD – afterwards you should only focus on publications
- When looking for a co-author, ask yourself what you want from this person; famous no, but hard work yes
- Make sure you have something you want to say
- Make sure you know the message that you want to deliver (without this you will tank every time)
- Make the data “sing” – maybe the better story is leaving out something

And if this all wasn’t enough we then had a Coding in the Trenches: Qualitative Boot Camp session in the afternoon. Dr. Davide Ravasi provided some very useful advice, “You just make sense of the data in an intellectually honest way. You continually question your interpretation of the data until you are confident that it makes sense”. We then had a lively dinner at Zov’s Restaurant. More rich discussions with our fellow colleagues. This was a wonderful way to cap off a great day. The SAP Doctoral and Early Career Program was most definitely a positive transformative experience. I hope this program continues for many years as its value is so immense it is difficult to measure.

Forever Grateful - Reva
A toaster, two lightly-cited academic papers, daytime television show Dr. Phil, and the creation of a new federal agency... What do these have to do with academic relevance?

Professor Jean Bartunek (Boston College) gave a riveting 2016 Strategizing Activities and Practices keynote address. She made clear the connection between scholarship and its impact on practice – academic relevance. If you missed this important talk, you are in luck because it is available on the SAP YouTube channel (found here https://youtu.be/ cBvB80s4KGA), and it is a talk you absolutely need to watch!

Professor Bartunek’s keynote address was unconventional, interesting, rigorous AND relevant. She used the work of one law professor – Elizabeth Warren – to connect scholarship and practice in a way seldom seen! To those of you outside the U.S., Elizabeth Warren is a U.S. Senator, who is known for her work protecting consumers from abuse by financial institutions. Just last month in a Congressional hearing, Senator Warren excoriated the CEO of Wells Fargo, one of the largest U.S. banks, about financial abuses at his bank and the audacity of him taking a bonus in light of these abuses; he resigned several weeks later. Elizabeth Warren is extremely well known in the U.S.

Prior to her career in politics, Elizabeth Warren was a law professor for decades, with a focus on bankruptcy. Two of Elizabeth Warren’s academic papers, which were lightly-cited, led to the creation of a new federal agency: The U.S. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), a watchdog group for consumers and financial institutions. As Dr. Bartunek stated, “I don’t know how many of your academic papers have led to a new government agency or the equivalent. I can assure that none of mine have.... This is one occasion where we could say that scholarly work really did lead to relevance.” Touché!

Professor Bartunek weaves the tale through the era of risky home loans, a housing bubble, and defaults on home loans, leading to the near collapse of the U.S. and other economies in the early 2000s. Elizabeth Warren’s academic work provided a way forward to protect consumers from the financial abuses of this period. Her fundamental question was: “Why are consumers safe when they purchase tangible consumer products with cash [such as a toaster], but when they sign up for routine financial products like mortgages and credit cards they are left at the mercy of their creditors?” Warren’s work suggested an alternative situation – where consumers would be protected through the creation of a new consumer protection institution. But how to get these academic ideas put into practice?

After reading Elizabeth Warren’s autobiography, Jean Bartunek identified how Warren’s academic ideas, so needed at this time, tipped into the mainstream – beginning with an appearance on the daytime self-help television show Dr. Phil and then escalating through her writing for a wider non-academic audience (e.g., op-ed pieces in...
newspapers), connecting with powerful Congressmen, and other visible mainstream activities. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was created, but not without costs to Elizabeth Warren. She suffered many personal attacks and, despite her efforts to create the agency, was not appointed to lead it once it was created. (However, she won a seat in the Senate shortly thereafter!)

The tale is a riveting one, and Professor Bartunek tells it with such passion and conviction, that the audience takes note. At the same time, she clearly connects this story with themes found in the SAP literature such as framing (Kaplan, 2008), using biographic methods (Rouleau, 2010), and performativity (Abrahamson et al, 2016), to name a few.

There are many takeaways for SAP scholars and academics more generally interested in the transformation of academic scholarship towards practical impact. I dare say others might also enjoy the talk!

The keynote event ended with Professor Julia Balogun (University of Liverpool) reflecting on the career and impact of Jean Bartunek, to our profession and beyond. Professor Balogun stated (full comments can be viewed at https://youtu.be/VtrW8aK3NtE):

So what of Elizabeth Warren and practical relevance? She was indeed an influential academic. And I would like to say that using Elizabeth Warren as an example to focus our attention on the role academics can and should have in influencing practice is typical of Jean’s thoughtful approach to scholarship – and I use the word scholarship deliberately because of what it implies beyond “research”, since Jean is more than an academic, she is a scholar. And Jean carries her scholarship into everything she does.

A fitting ending to one of the best speeches I have heard in my career. Thank you Jean Bartunek for your compelling talk that SAP members and management scholars will return to for insights and inspiration! It is a talk that will not be forgotten.
CONGRATULATIONS AND THANKS!

**Best Paper Winner:**
Eric Knight – The University of Sydney Business School; Matthew Grimes – Indiana University

“CEO Sensegiving and Legitimacy Projection Across Multiple Strategic Change Episodes”

**Best Student Paper Winner:**
Lisa Day – London Metropolitan University; Julia Balogun – The University of Liverpool Management School

“Identity in the Making: how Organisation Identity Change is Facilitated in a Business Unit Merger”

**The SAP “Pushing the Boundary” Award:**
Charlotte Cloutier – HEC Montreal; Jean-Pascal Gond – CASS Business School

“Is This a Worthy Strategy? Critique, Justification and Evaluation in the Practice of Strategy”

**Outstanding Reviewers:**
Julia Balogun, U. of Liverpool
Gustavo Birollo, HEC Montreal
Giovany Cajaíba-Santana, Kedge Bus. School
Leonhard Dobusch, Freie U. Berlin
Vern Glaser, U. of Alberta
Stephanie Hurt, Meredith College
Marko Kohtamäki, U. of Vaasa
Jane Lê, U. of Sydney
Sotirios Paroutis, U. of Warwick
Mauricio Umana Ramirez, Glasswing Int’l
Christopher Steele, U. of Alberta
Ruifang Wang, Manooth U.
Angelina Zubac, Central Queensland U.

THANK YOU!
A NOTE FROM THE PROGRAM & PDW CHAIRS

Paul Spee, Program Chair and Sotirios Paroutis, PDW Chair

In Anaheim, alongside the Early Career Program (ECP) on Friday, we had four Saturday PDWs with the SAP IG as the primary sponsor on: the intersections of strategy process and practice research; a practice-based perspective on paradox: studying strategic tensions; opportunities for integrating discourse analysis into strategy research; and social practice theory: uncovering large-scale, systemic risks in financial markets. The design of these PDWs, particularly around hands-on interactions in round-tables, sparked some very exciting exchanges during the day. We would like to thank all organizers, panellists, contributors and participants for generating such stimulating sessions.

Building on the success in 2015, we continued session innovations to instil a more dynamic, engaging and constructive discussion between authors and the audience. Thank you again, session chairs, for driving the innovations that were appreciated by authors and participants. Despite competing with Disney characters, sessions were well attended and continued to attract scholars from other divisions to partake in debates that continue to push the disciplinary boundaries of the strategy field.

The program was supported by generous donations from the University of Queensland and the University of Berne. The wheels are turning fast to attract and lock-in another very prominent SAP Distinguished Keynote speaker for the 77th AoM Annual Meeting. A large audience at key events provides a great opportunity to raise the profile of YOUR school. Thus, please consider SAP to fund particular activities such as our keynote event and to support our offering for doctoral candidates and early-career researchers.
A NOTE FROM THE PROGRAM & PDW CHAIRS
Paul Spee, Program Chair and Sotirios Paroutis, PDW Chair

We also continued with the Meet & Greet sessions which were hugely popular. Listening to feedback from last year, we tailored each Meet & Greet session to discuss burning issues related to “Publishing SAP research” (featuring Julia Balogun & Jane Lê), “Qualitative methods” (featuring Paula Jarzabkowski) and “Quantitative methods & SAP research” (featuring Tomi Laamanen). Café Biscotti provided a cosy hide-away from the buzzing conference centre to enable intimate conversations. The success of this initiative was enabled by the enthusiasm of Rebecca Bednarek & Katharina Dittrich, who organized the sessions, and the support of our leading scholars who offered constructive albeit frank advice.

More intimate conversations were also possible during the SAP Friday Dinner – a long-standing tradition that has successfully run for the 6th year in a row. Over 50 participants used the opportunity to reconnect with old SAP members and meet new ones whilst enjoying the contemporary cuisine with some Eastern Mediterranean influences of Zov’s Anaheim.

We then moved on to the SAP reception and extended conversations. After four days in freezing meeting rooms with little to no sunlight, we exchanged (bad) coffee for more pleasant drinks and enjoyed the Californian sunset.
Emerging Scholars

Mustafa Kavas (mustafa.kavas@cass.city.ac.uk)
Topic: Exploring the Role of Islamic Spirituality in the Strategizing Process of Anatolian-based Family Firms

Mustafa Kavas is a PhD Candidate in the Strategic Management department at Cass Business School, working under the supervision of Professor Paula Jarzabkowski and Dr Amit Nigam. His main research interests lie in the nexus of spirituality and strategy practices within family firms. More specifically, his PhD research focuses on how religious beliefs inform and shape the strategizing process of profit-seeking organizations selected from the Anatolian part of Turkey where religion penetrates both business and non-business activities. Mustafa recently attended the 11th Organization Studies Summer Workshop on Spirituality, Symbolism and Storytelling in Mykonos, Greece. He also presented one of his working papers at the 32nd EGOS Colloquium in Naples, Italy. In addition, he has won the outstanding reviewer award from the SAP division of AoM in 2015. Since the Fall of 2014, Mustafa has been working as a Bibliography Coordinator of the SAP-IN Website (http://www.s-as-p.org), and he expects to complete his PhD in the Fall, 2018.

Lisa Day (lisa.day@liverpool.ac.uk)
Topic: Managing Strategic Change and Strategy as Practice: an investigation into sensemaking and identity

Lisa Day is a PhD candidate studying part-time with the University of Bath. She recently joined University of Liverpool as Director of Studies for their Online MBA. Lisa has taught strategic management on Masters and undergraduate programs for over 10 years and has a background as a strategy practitioner in the telecoms and retail banking sectors. For her PhD research Lisa followed a merger between an Art & Architecture faculty in real-time for two years. She is exploring the change from a sensemaking perspective, focusing on meetings as a forum for sensegiving and for sustaining the change process over time. In separate chapters she also considers the merger as a process of deliberate organizational identity change and explores identity regulation and identity work. Lisa attended the first SAP Doctoral and Early Career Program in Anaheim, and her submissions garnered ‘best student paper’ awards in the SAP track in both Vancouver 2015 and Anaheim 2016. Lisa will complete her dissertation in 2017.

Krista Pettit (k.pettit2@liverpool.ac.uk)
Topic: Exploring the relationship between strategic renewal and occupational identity

Krista Pettit is post-doctoral research associate in strategy-as-practice at the University of Liverpool Management School. She previously earned her PhD in General Management and Strategy from the Ivey Business School at Western Ontario University in Canada in August 2016. Her dissertation was a one-year case study exploring the relationship between strategic renewal and occupational identity in the news media industry. Prior to joining academia, Krista worked in Canada and Japan, holding senior level positions in the financial services, software and real estate industries. Krista attended the first SAP Doctoral and Early Career Program in Anaheim and her paper was nominated for the Best Division Paper. Krista is looking forward to becoming actively involved in the SAP community and meeting other SAP scholars.
EMERGING LINE OF RESEARCH: HISTORICAL APPROACHES TO ADVANCE STRATEGY PROCESS AND PRACTICE RESEARCH

In the latest issue of the Academy of Management Review, Eero Vaara and Juha-Antti Lamberg discuss the close ties between business history and strategy research and how much we have to gain from a historical perspective.

The very beginning of strategic management research was closely linked with historical analysis (Chandler, 1962, 1977), and later landmark studies were based on longitudinal case studies (Burgelman, 1983; Pettigrew, 1985). However, it is fair to say that strategic management research and business, economic, and social history have remained largely separate areas of research with few intersections. Thus, strategic management research, like management research more generally, has lacked historical comprehension and sensitivity. This has hampered our understanding of key issues, such as the historical embeddedness of strategic processes and practices. We know little about how historical conditions shape strategic processes or their causal effects, how strategic practices are linked to their sociohistorical contexts and enacted in situ, and how strategic discourses are products of historical evolution with implications for what is seen as important or appropriate in the strategy field and profession.

The purpose of this article is to explicate how historical research can contribute to our understanding of the historical embeddedness of strategic processes and practices and our conceptions of them. By historical embeddedness, we mean the ways in which strategic processes and practices and our conceptions of them are embedded in and defined by sociohistorical environments. We argue for a strong emphasis on historical embeddedness: one should not merely place processes and practices in context but also understand their inherent historical nature and construction. Thus, like Kipping and Usdiken (2014), in their overall review of history in management research, we strive for a “history-in-theory” approach by focusing on how history can be a key part of our theoretical understanding of strategy, rather than serve “merely” as empirical evidence of context.

We propose and elaborate on three approaches that can be used to add to our understanding of the historical embeddedness of strategic processes, practices, and discourses: realist history, interpretive history, and poststructuralist history.

First, we focus on historical realism, which can enhance our understanding of the historical embeddedness of strategic processes. Historical realism is based on a realist ontoepistemological understanding of social reality that aims to reconstruct past events and to provide explanations of historical processes and mechanisms. Historical case studies have played a key role in strategic process research (Burgelman, 1983, 2002a,b; Pettigrew, 1973, 1985), thus bringing context-specific understanding into strategic process research. To provide an example of a useful but largely untapped method in historical realist analysis, we point to comparative historical analysis, which has become an increasingly popular perspective in economic history and historical sociology (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003). Comparative historical analysis aims at a systematic analysis and comparison of historical events and processes to elucidate patterns and causality in them (Mahoney,
Emerging line of research (continued)

2003). It can help to identify the historical conditions, mechanisms, and causation in strategic processes and, thus, can contribute especially to strategy process research.

Second, we introduce **interpretive history** (Collingwood, 1946) as an approach that helps us understand the historical embeddedness of strategic practices. Interpretive history emphasizes the role of the historian-researcher in interpreting the importance of historical events in situ (Collingwood, 1946; White, 1975) and, by so doing, usually reflects a constructionist understanding of social reality. In particular, we focus on **microhistory** as a useful but largely ignored method in management research (Magnusson & Szijarto, 2013). Through the close analysis of specific events, actions, and practices, microhistorians seek to identify larger sociohistorical patterns and their characteristics (Ginzburg, 1993; Peltonen, 2001). We argue that microhistory can explicate the historical construction and enactment of strategic practices in context and, thus, can specifically add to strategy-as-practice research.

Third, we present the **poststructuralist historical approach** as a way to increase understanding of the historical embeddedness of strategic discourses and their implications. Poststructuralist history is based epistemologically on radical constructionism and aims at a deconstruction of generally held assumptions. In this case we focus on **genealogy** (Foucault, 1977) as a methodology that uncovers and problematizes conventionally held assumptions of knowledge and their power effects in strategic discourses. We argue that this method can elucidate the construction of historical truths and subjectivities, as well as their implications, and, thus, can add especially to critical studies of strategic management.

Our analysis contributes to theory building in strategy process and practice research by highlighting the historical embeddedness of strategic processes, practices, and discourses. In particular, it shows how, in their specific ways, historical methods can add to our understanding of various forms of strategic processes and practices and the variations in them, the historical construction of organizational strategies, and historically constituted strategic agency. By so doing, this article helps to theoretically advance strategy process and practice research, as well as research on strategic management more generally. Furthermore, by highlighting the value of specific approaches and methods, it contributes to the discussion of new forms of management and business history (De Jong & Higgins, 2015; Jones & Zeitlin, 2008; Wadhwani & Bucheli, 2014).

This sub-theme explores the impact of tensions between various aspects of identity on organizational strategizing processes and strategy work. Different understandings of organizational identity (commonly defined as the characteristics that members see as central, distinctive and enduring about the organization) are likely to influence competitive strategy in ways that may diverge from a simplistic focus on profit and efficiency. The “Good Organization” balances values and aspirations to create meaning with which individuals can identify. Strategizing activities, such as strategic planning, strategic change, strategic renewal, and reversal of strategic changes (Mantere et al., 2012) can have implications for the way people think and feel about themselves in relation to their organization, with important consequences for motivation, commitment, and trust (Huy, 2011; Pratt & Foreman, 2000; Voss et al., 2006). Strategy-related events and their associated identity struggles thus appear to be good opportunities to study how organizations balance profits with the greater good, and the tensions that arise when such ambitious goals are at play.

The strategy-as-practice perspective connects to the processual view on identity, which examines ways in which identity is constructed as a form of ‘work’ carried out by organizational members at times in tension with each other and with other stakeholders (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2013; Schultz et al., 2012). Identity rhetoric has been linked to strategy through notions of time and agency (Sillince & Simpson, 2010), with identity work considered a strategic practice integrating past, present and future temporal orientations (Oliver, 2015). Such a practice involves tensions of various degrees of intensity and control concerning who and what is involved with identity-related strategic decisions (Hatch et al., 2015).

We invite strategy scholars with a variety of theoretical, methodological and empirical persuasions to join us in the exploration of identity tensions and strategizing. A few questions that we would find of interest include:

- What is the role of multiple identities in strategizing processes?
- What practices related with identity and strategy are used in organizations in order to balance tensions, logics or resistances?
- In what ways are strategy and identity construction constrained or “regulated” (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002) by others’ attempts to influence them both internally and externally?
- How do strategy narratives draw on and (re)construct the identities of the organization and of different internal and external organizational stakeholders over time in the face of identity tensions related to strategizing?

For more information, see: http://www.egosnet.org/jart/prj3/egos/main.jart?rel=de&reserve-mode=active&content-id=1442567999321&subtheme_id=1442568069987
Many organizations in public, private and non-for-profit sectors are becoming more transparent about their strategies, while also including a wider range of actors in strategy development. These moves involve a variety of strategy practices, for example strategy jamming (Bjelland & Wood, 2008), strategy crowdsourcing (Stieger et al., 2012), strategy blogs and wikis (Dobusch & Kapeller, 2013) or strategy simulations in online games (Aten & Thomas, 2016). Although involving many different practices, this phenomenon has been described most comprehensively as ‘open strategy’ (Chesbrough & Appleyard, 2007; Whittington et al., 2011).

Building upon these studies, recent works on open strategy have begun to look at open strategy from an increasing variety of perspectives such as impression management (Whittington et al., 2016), middle-management inclusion in strategy-making (Wolf et al., 2014) or the inter-organizational explorations of strategic issues (Werle & Seidl, 2015). However, systematic cross-fertilization between the emerging open strategy literature and other areas and concepts of organizational openness are still rare.

The sub-theme thus seeks to situate open strategy within broader shifts towards greater openness of various kinds (open innovation, open source, open government, open science/citizen science and similar). By adopting this broader orientation, the sub-theme aims to access theoretical and empirical insights from other domains capable of informing expectations about organizational strategy in particular (e.g. Dobusch, 2014; Spaeth et al., 2014; von Krogh et al., 2012). The sub-theme will empirically examine various practices of open strategy, consider different theoretical perspectives for understanding this phenomenon, and address potential problems for those involved (employees, managers and other stakeholders).

This sub-theme, therefore, seeks to advance our understanding of strategy openness in different fields. Questions include, but are not limited to:

- How does open strategy manifest and operate in different contexts (sectors, national institutions, organizational structures or ownership forms)?
- How can related and overlapping phenomena (open innovation, open source, open science, open government, etc.) inform our understanding of open strategy?
- What can be learnt for open strategy from more established fields of relevant research (e.g. worker participation, co-operatives, procedural justice, dynamics of online communities, middle management inclusion, organizational learning)?
- What theoretical perspectives are most illuminating for our understanding of open strategy (e.g. practice theory, discourse theory, critical theory, information theory, sensemaking, dialogical, power or technological change theories, behavioural theory, resource-based theory, knowledge-based theory)?

Over the last few years, there has been an increasing interest in studying the micro-activities and interactions of actors involved in strategy making. Although this research has generated valuable insights on different types of strategy actors, such as middle managers (Balogun & Johnson, 2004; Rouleau & Balogun, 2011), we believe that there is room for more concerted attention to the roles and activities of top managers in this process. While there is a vast literature on the links between top managers and strategy, most studies focus on the demographic or personality composition of top management teams (TMTs). As a result, our understanding of what top managers actually do in the strategy process is still relatively limited (Jarzabkowski, 2008). Given the prominent role of top managers in strategizing, there is clearly a need to investigate their activities and interactions in order to more fully understand how strategy is shaped in organizations. In recent years, a number of such studies have begun to appear (Balogun et al., 2015; Jarzabkowski, 2008; Jarzabkowski & Wilson, 2002; Kisfalvi, Sergi, & Langley, 2016; Liu & Maitlis, 2014; Ma & Seidl, forthcoming; Ma et al., 2015; Samra-Fredericks, 2003), and it is the goal of this subtheme to focus on the activities of top managers and TMTs in strategizing to encourage the development and integration of emerging research in this area.

Studies on top managers and strategizing can advance strategy research in at least four areas. First, by exploring the activities and interactions of top managers inside and outside TMTs, studies can provide rich insights into the contextual, interpersonal, processual and temporal dynamics of strategizing at the apex of an organization (Denis, Lamothe, & Langley, 2001). Such insights can enrich our understanding of strategy as a dynamic phenomenon and help resolve the “black-box” problem frequently raised in connection with demographic research on strategic leadership (Lawrence, 1997). Second, scholars can generate insights into the intervening mechanisms linking strategy work and outcomes. For example, existing studies have shown the importance of certain TMT processes (e.g., behavioral integration) but we know little about how they can be managed to ensure the effectiveness of decision-making. Third, such studies can also provide a better understanding of the co-evolution between characteristics of top managers as strategists (e.g., identity or legitimacy) and their strategizing activities, a topic that is important but has been underexplored. Finally, we need to know more about the interactions between top-level managers and other managers as responsibility for strategic change spreads outwards and downwards and how this influences strategizing.

In order to explore the topics discussed above, we call for papers that deal with the various aspects of strategizing activities in which top managers and TMTs are involved. Possible topics for contributions include, but are not restricted to the following issues: (1) Front-stage and back-stage activities of top managers in forming and realizing strategies; (2) Different types of top managers and their roles in strategizing. (3) Interplay between top managers as strategists and their activities. (4) TMT processes in strategizing and intervention. (5) TMT formation/evolution and its relation to strategy; and (6) Strategizing of top managers and TMTs in various contexts.

A NEW STANDING WORKING GROUP AT EGOS: “DOING PROCESS RESEARCH”

Process is an alternative and very fruitful perspective for studying organizing because it speaks to a whole range of topics that interest organization scholars. Anchored in process philosophy, this approach invites scholars to engage with organizational phenomena as ongoing and immanent flows. Process also offers a coherent theoretical foundation for many research fields such as practice-based approaches, performativity and sociomateriality amongst others, helping scholars to bring new perspectives to topics such as strategic management, leadership, innovation, entrepreneurship, creativity, etc.

In recognition of the potential of process thinking for both researchers and practitioners, a new Standing Working Group (10) called Doing Process Research will be launched at EGOS next year. From 2017 to 2020, the aim of the SWG will be to promote and foster empirical studies based on process thinking by clarifying the methodological implications of empirical process research. The SWG will focus on the “doing” rather than “thinking about” process research. The coordinators of this SWG invite scholars to submit their empirical research and to participate in the development of research methods consistent with the assumptions of process philosophy. These are the planned subthemes for SWG 10:


2019 – Progress and Process Research. To be announced.

2020 – Power and Process Research. To be announced.

This Standing Working Group is coordinated by:

Barbara Simpson – Professor of Leadership and Organizational Dynamics in the Department of Strategy & Organisation at Strathclyde Business School, Glasgow

Henrika Franck – Post-doctoral Researcher at the Aalto University School of Business, Finland

Anthony Hussenot – Associate Professor at Université Paris-Dauphine.
EGOS 2017 SUB-THEME 10: “BECOMING GOOD: HOW TO STUDY THE EMERGENCE OF ETHICAL PRACTICE IN ORGANIZING”

Convenors:
Anthony Hussenot – Université Paris-Dauphine, France
Silvia Gherardi – University of Trento, Italy
Caroline Ramsey – University of Liverpool Management School, U.K.

Deadline: January 9, 2017

Practice-based inquiries are increasingly prevalent in the organization studies domain, as evidenced for instance by growing literatures in strategy-as-practice (Jarzabkowski, 2005), leadership-as-practice (Raelin, 2016), practice as knowing (Nicolini et al., 2003), and entrepreneuring (Steyaert, 2007). Many of these studies draw, either explicitly or implicitly, on assumptions taken from process philosophy, which is the underpinning orientation of the Standing Working Group sponsoring this sub-theme. This year’s EGOS Colloquium offers an opportunity for participants in this sub-theme to focus on the as yet underdeveloped implications of process thinking for ethical practice in organizations. By asking what it might mean to become good, this sub-theme directs attention towards the ethical practices of goodness, and how goodness might emerge in day-to-day practice. The notion of ‘good organization’ often evokes its opposition, ‘bad organization’, but this dualistic formulation is problematic for process scholars, who seek to transcend dualistic thinking in order to better appreciate the fluidity of organizing as it emerges in the flow of becoming. The challenge then, is to find ways of doing research that can adequately engage with this fluidity.

The lack of methodological sophistication in this area is already well recognized (Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas & Van de Ven, 2013; Sandberg et al., 2015; Hussenot & Missonier, 2016), but as yet, few solutions have been forthcoming. There is, therefore, an urgent need to re-examine the assumptions underpinning empirical inquiries that seek to bring about fresh insight into how to experience / describe / transcribe the becomingness of organizing. This sub-theme invites processual responses to the ethical dimensions of ‘goodness’ in organizations. Whilst we are interested in empirical accounts that draw attention to the unfolding processes of becoming good, we are also interested in the methodological practices that enable us to engage with such processes in moment-by-moment organizing. We invite contributors to embrace the methodological and empirical implications of a process-based approach to studying the emergence of organizational goodness by addressing questions such as, but not limited to:

- How to explore empirically the emergence of organizational practices that are changing the goodness of work and life?
- What methodological sensibilities allow us to follow the emergence and evolution of ethical practice?
- How is the notion of ‘becoming good’ constructed in particular categories of organizational practice, such as strategy, leadership, making, governance, operations, quality management, etc.?
- Where is power and agency in the creation of ‘goodness’; not only in the sense of certain practices, positions and people exerting power over, but also in the processes by which power with is expressed in certain ways of going on?

For more information, see: http://www.egosnet.org/jart/prj3/egov/main.jart?rel=de&reserve-mode=active&content-id=1442567999321&subtheme_id=1442568080580
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STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT SOCIETY: UNCONVENTIONAL STRATEGIES FOR EMERGING COMPLEXITY AND INTENSIFYING DIVERSITY

Track J: Strategy Practice
Track Chair: George Tovstiga - EDHEC Business School

The thematic scope of the Strategy Practice Interest Group encompasses all aspects relevant to the practice of strategy in real business environments, regardless of whether in the sensemaking, formation or execution stages. This year’s conference theme - Unconventional Strategies for Emerging Complexity and Intensifying Diversity - is particularly relevant to the theme of the Strategy Practice Interest Group, given that complexity and diversity increasingly reflect the nature of real business contexts. These contexts, ambiguous, difficult and imperfectly understood though they might be, nonetheless, demand strategic decision-making in real time. So, how is strategic sensemaking approached in ambiguous circumstances? How is strategy formulated in contexts that are at best imperfectly understood? How is strategy then executed in dynamic and difficult environments? The Strategy Practice Interest Group welcomes empirical and conceptual papers that explore these and other important questions that probe the relevance and impact of strategizing in the practice field. We are particularly keen to invite the contributions of practitioners of strategy to this year’s submission round.

Timeline:
February 23, 2017 Submission Deadline for Proposals
March 2, 2017 Co-Author Confirmation Deadline
Mid-April, 2017 Notifications of Program Review Committee Decisions
Mid-July, 2017 Conference Program Available Online
October 29–31, 2017 SMS 37th Annual International Conference in Houston

For more info, see: http://strategicmanagement.net/houston/overview/overview
In the SPP track, we aim at bringing together organizational and micro levels of analysis to advance our understanding of strategy in the making. Indeed, organizational dynamic is endogenous per se (Hernes, 2014), investigating strategy processes implies focusing on what people do (Whittington 2003) and the role of organizational actors in formulating and implementing strategy (Vaara & Whittington, 2012). We specifically intend this year to explore the relationships between strategic practices and routines. Practice refers to human activity were human agency does not stand for itself but is embedded “within a web of social practices” (Vaara and Whittington, 2012). Routine in turn is defined as a recurrent pattern of interdependent actions (Feldman and Pentland, 2003) that are situated, produced by reflective and conscious actors and appear to be stable on the short term.

The SPP track also aims at drawing from theoretical streams novel to the study of strategy such as sociology, social psychology, linguistics, and political science. Consistent with Tsoukas and Chia’s (2002) call to delve into organizational processes, methods such as participant observation, ethnography, video ethnography and discourse analysis, formerly rarely used in conventional strategy research, we believe that such disciplines can enhance our theorizations about strategic processes and we therefore welcome innovative methodological and theoretical contributions.

Proposals can respond, but are not restricted, to the following themes:
• Opportunities and challenges of employing different practice lenses in understanding routines and their embeddedness within strategic processes.
• The role of mundane routines in strategic processes and practices.
• Whether strategic practices imply specific socio-material arrangement of routines.
• The role of power and hierarchies in change and stabilisation of organizational routines.
• The relationship between strategic practices and the emergence and development of routines and vice versa.
• Whether a flat/tall ontology of practice theory allows different kind of relationships between strategy and routines.

For more information, please contact the proponents:
Aura Parmentier – Université Côte d’Azur, France GREDEG CNRS (aura.parmentier@unice.fr)
Isabelle Bouty – Université Paris-Dauphine (isabelle.bouty@dauphine.fr)
Mehdi Safavi – University of Edinburgh Business School (mehdi.safavi@ed.ac.uk)
Omid Omidvar – Coventry Business School (Omid.Omidvar@coventry.ac.uk)

Submission Deadline: 10 January 2017 (2 p.m. Belgian time)
The companion website for Practicing Strategy (2nd Edition) has just been launched! It features author videos further explaining key topics covered in the book, as well as a combination of the following resources for each chapter: chapter summaries, additional resources and SAGE journal articles. For instructors, the companion website provides: presentation slides, teaching notes and a comprehensive instructor manual with details on how to design a course/module on the topic of strategy-as-practice.

https://study.sagepub.com/paroutispracticingstrategy2e

Chapter Overview:
1. Practicing Strategy: Foundations and Importance
2. Chief Executive Officers
3. Chief Strategy Officers
4. Strategy Teams
5. Middle Managers
6. Strategy Consultants
7. Strategy Tools
8. Influencing Strategy through Discourse
9. Strategic Alignment: The ESCO Model
10. Practicing Strategy across Firms: Insights from M&As
11. Strategic Ambidexterity: Dealing with Tensions
12. Teaching Strategy using the Strategy-as-Practice Approach
13. Strategic Leadership and Innovation at Apple Inc.
14. Centrica: Strategizing in a Multi-Utility
15. Narayana Health: Bringing Quality Healthcare to the Masses
16. A “Reliable” Recovery? The Turnaround of the Reliant Group
17. Marconi: When Strategists Hit the Perfect Storm
18. Lafarge vs. Blue Circle: Practices in a Hostile Takeover
19. Room for Improvement? Relocating a Business School
20. Strategy-making 2.0: Strategy Development Process at the Wikimedia Foundation
How can the global problem of climate change be connected to the actions of individuals and organisations? This special issue builds on the topic of a symposium within the British Academy of Management 2015 Sustainable and Responsible SIG track, which comprised a chaired panel discussion focusing on how scaling can contribute to future business and management research on sustainability. We invite a broad range of theoretical and empirical contributions focusing on the scaling of sustainability initiatives, connecting supranational regulation, sponsored by intergovernmental bodies, via regional, community, and organisational projects, to localised and individual activities. Discussions may explore forms of sustainability across different levels of analysis, examining the hinge elements articulating the movement and translation of action between scales, but we also encourage investigations of how we can understand the movements of action across scales for example: from individual activism to organisational change; from intergovernmental regulation to community action; from community action to regional and national initiatives; and from organisational action to institutional change. We also invite explorations of how researchers understand the mechanisms and processes that enable environmental sustainability initiatives to move between scales, as well as deriving practical implications for the management of sustainability across scales and how these may be translated into sustainability-driven managerial initiatives across scales.

In terms of climate change, there is a clear mandate for considering how notions of individual and collective decisions are reflected at each level of analysis and how actors can drive change through each level. Rather than focussing on just one level of analysis, this special issue seeks to explore the connections and movements between them by working with the concept of scales, adopted from human geography (see Spicer, 2006; Adger, 2005). In this, we would like to locate the idea of scales not only in terms of spatial, or even temporal, scales, but also in terms of institutional scales, ranging from relatively micro-social, sub-cultural scales, through meso-level organisational scales, to more macro-social and field level scales. As such we are interested in how institutional scales might be used as a model for locating and analysing managerial sustainability initiatives and discourses.

Indicative topics are:
- Facilitating sustainable consumption and supply chains at varying organisational scales
- Developing performance management/measurement across scales to reduce climate change impacts
- The impact of action across scales in not-for-profit organisations on climate change
- Adapting organisational behaviour within or across scales to address climate change

Paper submission deadline: December 1, 2016
See the links for more information: [https://www.bam.ac.uk/news-story/8883](https://www.bam.ac.uk/news-story/8883)

For further information, please contact
Mike Zundel,
Management School,
University of Liverpool,
M.Zundel@liverpool.ac.uk
SPECIAL ISSUE CALL FOR PAPERS
“RE-CONCEPTUALIZING GOOD RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES”

Journal: Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management

Guest Editors:
Nadia deGama – Anglia Ruskin University, UK (nadia.degama@anglia.ac.uk)
Sara R. S. T. A. Elias – University of Victoria, Canada (selias@uvic.ca)
Amanda Peticca-Harris – Grenoble Ecole de Management, France (amanda.peticcaharris@grenoble-em.com)

Criteria for evaluating the rigor and trustworthiness of qualitative research were popularized with Guba’s (1981) focus on credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. These guidelines, however, have been criticized not only for stemming from positivist research—mirroring reliability and validity measures—but also because of the attempt to universally apply these criteria to justify what constitutes good research (e.g. Amis & Silk, 2008; Brinkmann, 2007; Devers, 1999; Johnson, Buehring, Cassell, & Symon, 2006; Tracy, 2010). In this Special Issue (SI), we play with the “virtual cult of criteria” (Tracy, 2010, p. 838), aiming to provoke a conversation about what makes good qualitative research, from different theoretical traditions.

We seek paper submissions that problematize what is good research by revealing dilemmas and choices that we, as researchers, are forced to navigate, some arising from the hegemonic, institutionalized pressures that blanket and silence the political landscape of academia (see Koning & Ooi, 2013). We aim to render the invisible aspects and vulnerabilities of research visible while creating a space for greater methodological pluralism (e.g. Harley, 2015). We invite submissions that advance qualitative inquiry, either theoretically or empirically, by exposing and exploring researchers’ “blind wanderings” (Van Maanen, 2011, p. 153) and the emotional baggage that they carry as they navigate the research process. Overall, paper submissions should aim to answer the following question: How can we problematize and re-conceptualize good research in organization and management studies?

Anticipated Deadlines
Submission deadline - March 31, 2017.
There will be a pre-submission 2-day paper development workshop for interested authors at Grenoble Ecole de Management in Grenoble, France January 25 – 26, 2017.
Deadline for paper proposals for the writing workshop – November 30, 2016.
See the link for more information: http://emeraldgrouppublishing.com/products/journals/call_for_papers.htm?id=6923
YOUR SAP INTEREST GROUP OFFICERS!

IG Chair: Jane Lê – The University of Sydney (jane.le@sydney.edu.au)
Past IG Chair: Anne D. Smith – University of Tennessee (asmith51@utk.edu)
IG Chair-Elect: Paul Spee – University of Queensland (p.spee@business.uq.edu.au)
Program Chair: Sotirios Paroutis – Warwick Business School (Sotirios.Paroutis@wbs.ac.uk)
PDW Chair: Rajiv Nag – Drexel University (rn362@drexel.edu)
Secretary: Gary Burke – Aston Business School (g.burke@aston.ac.uk)
Membership Chair: Katharina Dittrich – University of Zurich (katharina.dittrich@uzh.ch)
Treasurer: Carola Wolf – Aston Business School (c.wolf@aston.ac.uk)
Webmaster: Leonhard Dobusch, Universität Innsbruck (Leonhard.Dobusch@uibk.ac.at)
Representative-at-Large: Rebecca Bednarek – Birkbeck, University of London (r.bednarek@bbk.ac.uk)
Representative-at-Large: Robert P. Wright – The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (robert.wright@polyu.edu.hk)

PLEASE GET IN TOUCH & VISIT US @
http://sap.aomonline.org
http://strategizingblog.com/