

THESIS

MAINTAINING EMPLOYMENT IN TURBULENT TIMES:
THE BRIDGING OF RESILIENCE AND RESISTANCE IN HOTEL EMPLOYEES

Submitted by

Eliza Amy Wagner-Kinyon

Department of Communication Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2018

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Ziyu Long

Elizabeth Williams
Samantha Conroy

Copyright by Eliza Amy Wagner-Kinyon 2018

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

MAINTAINING EMPLOYMENT IN TURBULENT TIMES: THE BRIDGING OF RESILIENCE AND RESISTANCE IN HOTEL EMPLOYEES

Previous communication scholarship has studied resilience and resistance separately, but researchers had not often studied them in tandem, especially in the organizational change context. Specifically, this study uses Buzzanell's (2010, 2018a) five resilience processes and Mumby's (2005) dialectical approach to resistance to complicate organizational communication scholarship and current understandings of resilience and resistance in the workplace. Furthermore, this research illustrates how both resilience and resistance are utilized within the organizational change context in addition to how resilience and resistance inform one another, providing a more nuanced approach to understanding and articulating employee experiences. This research utilizes a case study approach to examine employees' communication and experience in the face of multifaceted change—the changes including a new corporate company, on-site leadership turnover, and a full renovation. Using semi-structured interviews, the study implicates connections between resilience processes and types of resistance. The findings in this study encourage organizational communication scholars to further develop and explore how resilience and resistance are enacted in unique, meaningful ways that enliven employee experiences in a turbulent workplace.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude for the people who made this project and degree possible. Without your love, support, and kindness, this thesis and overall experience would not be as meaningful, successful, or fruitful for my personal and professional evolution. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to thank and acknowledge those who guided me, pushed me, and encouraged me throughout this fulfilling time in my life.

First and foremost, my eternal gratitude belongs to my wonderfully patient and kind advisor and mentor, Dr. Ziyu Long. Dr. Long, since the first organizational class I took with you to the completion of this project, you have been such a positive, supportive influence in my life. Thank you for the endless conversations about theory, process, and even daily frustrations. I owe so much of this project and my graduate school experience to your patience and temperament. Quite simply, this thesis and my sanity would not both exist today if it weren't for you. I admire your brilliance, your unique insights, and your selflessness. Thank you! It was an honor to be your first official advisee!

Dr. Elizabeth Williams, you are so much more than an inside member. From engaging in your classes, to being your TA, to being honored by your engagement on this committee, you have truly shaped my graduate school experience. Your humor and authenticity were a reprieve from academic struggles, and I admire your astute tenacity. Thank you for your incredible feedback and support. Thank you for your kindness and understanding. Thank you for making graduate school feel more and more possible with each passing day.

Dr. Samantha Conroy, your exceptional expertise in identity work in organizations has been invaluable to this project. Thank you for being a part of this thesis in spite of your already-

hectic schedule. Your perceptive feedback and critical eye brought this thesis to a deeper level of nuance and polish. I am so grateful you were a part of this work.

To my family, who inspire and support me. Mom, thank you for those long, rambling phone calls and your (reluctant) understanding when the calls were sporadic. You have always inspired me. You taught me how to be an independent, smart woman—just like you. This degree and thesis is a testament to all the values you’ve instilled in me—always encouraging me to be creative, true to myself, and diligent. Thank you for all this, and so much more.

Kayla, thank you for encouraging me and reminding me not to take myself too seriously. I admire your spontaneity and laughter, putting what’s important into perspective. I grew up wanting to be as smart, beautiful, and fun-loving as my big sister. I think this gets me closer the “smart” part. I love you, Kay.

Ashlynn, you’re my world, babe. I loved being able to talk about “what we did in school today” together, and I want you to know that you are my inspiration. You’re as smart, beautiful, and fun as your mother, and I hope you know that your “Atah” did this to show you that you can do anything you set your mind to. Follow your dreams and call your mom (and me) when you don’t know what to do. I know I did.

Dad, thank you for all your love and support these many, many years. You’ve always encouraged me and my education. You made the impossible possible so many time these last few years. Thank you for the giggles at poker. Thank you for the hearty food I so desperately needed. Thank you for the occasional happy hour on your back porch or the breaks playing Space Invaders. Most of all, thank you for encouraging me to think deeply, live authentically, and to smile.

I am lucky to have been welcomed and encouraged by so many bright minds and hearts in this program these last years. Jed, thank you for being a sounding board for all my academic and personal inquiries. You helped me see what to take seriously and what to let go. Your friendship is invaluable to me and I hope we're stuck with each other for years to come. Hayley, your determination (some might call stubbornness) and use of extended metaphors always brought me joy. Kristina, you showed me what even-temperament and sound judgement looks like; thank you for showing me and thank you for still being my friend when I didn't listen. Carly, you are great at existing...and being one of the most sincere friends I've ever had (even out of all the robots). To Hailey and Jordin, your brilliance, authenticity, and humor guided me and kept me sane (even if your humility leads you to deny these virtues). Torin, thank you for always being such real and raw human being, even when it wasn't fashionable. Your friendship is as comforting as the womb. Ava, your direct sincerity continues to amaze me, as does your obsession with doughnuts. Garrison, you are undoubtedly the most positive, supportive, understanding person I've ever met. Thank you for showing me that kindness can persist.

For the hotel employees that gave me their time and shared their experiences, thank you. Thank you for being honest and for sharing part of your life with me. Thank you for helping me understand how you cope with organizational struggle and for enlivening this research.

Finally, thank you Ryan for making my priorities your priorities. This experience honestly would not have been possible without you. You helped me laugh, you let me cry. You fed me, kept the house from becoming a disaster zone, and always finished that beer I thought I wanted even though I always fell asleep after two sips. Honestly, you reminded me to be happy and showed me how to smile. Your understanding and support kept me sane, and I simply could not have done this without you.

DEDICATION

For Ryan

Your love and laughter mean the world to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE	7
Change processes	8
Communication of change	10
Responses to change	12
RESILIENCE	14
Defining resilience	14
Resilience as communicative processes	17
Crafting normalcy	18
Affirming identity anchors	19
Maintaining and using communication networks	20
Emotion work	21
Alternative logics	22
RESISTANCE	25
Foundational premises	26
Types of resistance	30
BRIDGING RESISTANCE AND RESILIENCE	34
Research Questions	35
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	36
THE CASE	37
The organizational changes	38
POSITIONALITY OF THE RESEARCHER	39
PARTICIPANTS	40
Recruitment	40
DATA COLLECTION	41
Interview	41
Procedures	42
Interview protocol	42
DATA ANALYSIS	43
Grounded theory	43
Procedures	43
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	45

EMPLOYEES' RESILIENCE DURING MULTIFACETED ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE	45
Crafting normalcy.....	45
Identity anchors.....	46
Organizational loyalty.....	48
Prioritizing work identity.....	49
General "work ethic."	49
Communication and support networks.....	51
Line-level internal networks.....	52
Managerial internal networks.....	53
Emotion management.....	53
Situating in past-experience.....	54
Future-orientation.....	55
Alternative logics.....	56
EMPLOYEES' RESISTANCE DURING MULTIFACETED ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE	57
Individual infrapolitics.....	57
Verbal.....	58
"Minimum."	58
Manipulation.....	59
Collective infrapolitics.....	60
Insubordination.....	61
Non-adherence.....	61
Challenging.....	62
RESILIENCE AND RESISTANCE INTERSECTIONS DURING MULTIFACETED ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE	64
Resilience and resistance intersection: Strategic networking.....	65
Resilience and resistance intersection: Alternative logics.....	68
Resilience and resistance intersection: Identity work.....	71
Resilience and resistance intersection: Emotion management.....	73
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	77
CONTRIBUTIONS TO RESILIENCE THEORY	77
CONTRIBUTIONS TO RESISTANCE THEORY	80
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERSECTION OF RESILIENCE AND RESISTANCE.....	82
Strategic networking.....	82
Alternative logic.....	83
Identity work.....	84
Emotion management.....	84
PRAGMATIC IMPLICATIONS: APPLIED THEORY	85
LIMITATIONS.....	86
DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	87
CONCLUSION.....	88
REFERENCES	90

APPENDICES	105
APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT SCRIPT	105
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM.....	106
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	107

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

I think that's what eventually broke them. Maybe if they did push back a little bit? It would have helped them keep their sanity. But, because they took on so much and so much was requested of and demanded of them that they... It broke them. (Interview Two, p.8)

As illustrated in the introductory quote from an organizational member, resistance can even be fruitful to carve agency and enact resiliency in turbulent times. Complex change occurs frequently in organizations with advancing technology and ever-competitive markets. Yet, according to global management consulting firm McKinsey & Company, over 70% of organizations fail at implementing change (Bucy, Finlayson, Kelly, & Moye, 2016). Even more remarkably, IBM found that while change is projected to increase, leaders—CEOs in particular—are reporting a decline in feeling capable of managing these changes (Jorgensen, Owen, & Neus, 2008). In the contemporary moment, organizational change is a constant, but the complexities of these alterations leave employees in a turbulent workplace where they negotiate a variety of tensions in their experiences. In the organizational context, change is framed as *innovation*, defined as “an entity such as a new technology, idea, product, or program that is introduced to potential users in the organization” (Lewis & Seibold, 1993, p.324). Either due to planned or unplanned changes, work can—and often does—shift dramatically, bringing into question notions of meaning, authenticity, and identity. Through these organizational changes, we can become resilient, apathetic, or resistant to change—leading to struggles and opportunities within the workplace and potentially seeking alternative organizations. Some common tensions include adapting to a new leadership style, shifting changes in company culture, and unclear role expectations, among others.

Those who maintain employment in times of turbulence react within these sites of struggle, undergoing unique tensions and negotiations. Employees can be both resilient (e.g.

performing stable work to craft “normal”) and resistant (e.g. choosing not to adapt to new procedures) towards change simultaneously. Scholars must consider *both* to better understand employees’ experiences, especially in how frequent and prevalent changing workplaces have become. Organizational changes are frequent, though our reactive strategies are unique to the person, context, and culture. This project aims to enhance understanding of communicative processes during organizational change through lenses of resilience and resistance by analyzing a rich case study of an organization that underwent multifaceted changes.

Taking a communicative stance, this project defines resilience as “constituted in and through communicative processes that enhance people’s abilities to create new normalcies” (Buzzanell, 2010, p.9). Multifaceted organizational change inherently upheaves “normal,” challenging employees experiencing change to enact resilience processes to create these “new normalcies.” These processes include: (a) crafting normalcy; (b) affirming identity anchors; (c) maintaining and using communication networks; (d) downplaying negative feelings while foregrounding positive emotions and productive action, and (e) putting alternative logics to work (Buzzanell, 2010). These five enactments overlap and intertwine with one another in constituting resilience. Resilience had yet to be studied within the context of organizational change, despite resilient communicative processes that employees endure during times of turbulence.

Organizational change often affects identity anchors in particular (S. A. Conroy & O’Leary-Kelly, 2014), but all five processes are relevant to organizational members’ sensemaking and narrative processes. In addition, scholars had yet to explore the relationships and overlap between resilience and resistance theory.

Though organizational change can challenge employees to overcome struggle, complex changes are also an exertion of power and control that are met with resistance. To explore

employees' holistic experiences in relation to change, resistance can be a communicative process that has the power to shape and articulate agency and engage sensemaking. Resistance scholarship stems from the critical approach, acknowledging Foucauldian (1980) rhetorics of power in relation to resistance. Mumby (2005) defines resilience as:

an effort to engage in some form of praxis—individual or collective, routine or organized—in the context of ‘established social patterns and structures’ (including mechanisms of control), such that these patterns and structures are, at some level, dereified and their ‘identity logic’ interrogated. (p. 23)

This definition highlights resistance's ability to challenge power structures and the status quo.

Yet, control and resistance are inherently intertwined as a *communicative process* as a reaction to one another. To this end, this project employs Mumby's (2005) dialectical approach to resistance studies, focusing on “the ways in which [acts of control and resistance] intersect in the moment to moment to produce complex and contradictory dynamics of control and resistance” (p. 21).

With this understanding, resistance can be hidden or public, individual or collective, even intentionally or unintentionally effective. Resistance is common within hierarchical organizational structures, especially in times of turbulence or change (Agócs, 1997; Fleming, 2017; Harding, Ford, & Lee, 2017).

Resilience and resistance come from different ideological approaches within organizational communication research, yet they both are present during organizational change. Much like resilience, resistance can be a reaction to change affecting meaning, authenticity, and identity. These communicative processes directly and indirectly overlap with resilience communication processes, though little research had analyzed these connections.

To respond to this research gap, this project employs a qualitative case study to understand employees' experiences of change and analyze the ways in which resistance processes can overlap with resilience processes. This research utilized an in-depth qualitative

case study of an internationally branded, large hotel in the west that has undergone numerous changes, including changes in ownership, leadership, and a complete renovation. Between security concerns, branding capitalization, and increased globalization, international hotel chains will seemingly always have a demand in contemporary capitalism and will also require constant evolution to survive against escalating competition. This hotel in particular provides a rich context for organizational change, as it transformed dramatically in multiple ways simultaneously.

These changes are contextualized as “multifaceted” due to their dynamic layers and intersections, acknowledging the complex ways multifaceted changes can affect employee experiences. For example, employees were challenged by the corporate shift as the daily procedures and audits required additional tasks while their incentive pay was cut, leading to more work for less pay. To further complicate matters, the corporate office also required more from the middle-managers, including having minor budget, ordering, or evaluation paperwork to be approved by the corporate office. These negotiations with middle-management trickled down to additionally affect the line-level employees’ experience and relationship with their leadership. Though a line-level employee may be resistive to being charged with more work and less pay, seeing their leaders struggling can also lead to resilience through supporting one another, building a network that included their direct management. As this example illustrates, resilience *and* resistance strategies are employed in complex ways in the face of multifaceted change.

This case study contributes to both theory and praxis by exploring how employees enact resilience and resistance within multifaceted organizational change. This case study contributes to Buzzanell’s (2017) call to utilize and evolve scholarship on resilience processes. Specifically, the current study contributes conceptualizations of resilience within organizations, offering

insights about resilience in the workplace as the performance or enactment is informed by intrinsically situated power relations. In addition, answering Mumby's (2005) call, this research approaches resistance dialectically to acknowledge the inherent relationship between control and resistance as the heart of struggle. In this vein, the research regarding resistance connects resistive acts to the site of domination and the context which informed resistive performances. Developing new understandings of how resilience and resistance processes overlap, the study provides more nuanced and holistic understandings of employees' everyday negotiations under organizational change.

On a pragmatic level, this study informs the complicated nature of being an organizational member in times of turbulence—both as a line-level employee and as members of lower to middle management. Perspectives from varying degrees of hierarchy, experience, and department allowed for a more holistic view of coping and resisting mechanisms at play, providing insights and suggestions for contributors or designers of planned organizational change. This study contributes to enhanced understanding employees' perspectives and actions to afford suggestions for improving organizational life.

In summary, the goals of this thesis include understanding resilience within multifaceted organizational change and exploring its relationship with resistance through a rich, qualitative case study. The thesis is organized in the following manner. The next chapter elaborates on foundational constructs by first presenting previous research regarding organizational change—including processes, change communication, and responses to change. Then, I expound on Buzzanell's (2010) conceptualization of resilience and the five processes of resilience enactment. Next, I discuss Mumby's (2005, 2017) dialectical approach to resistance and control, including foundational premises and the four types of resistance. From my exploration of resilience,

resistance, and their potential intersections, I propose three research questions that guide this study.

Chapter Three showcases the methodology used to address those research questions. I provide details about the specific case and the changes the organization incurred as well as establish my positionality as the researcher. I then describe the participants, including how they were recruited and the data collection procedures. Then, I discuss the particulars of how grounded theory ways employed and what procedures were used when analyzing the data.

The fourth chapter reveals the findings of this study. In particular, it highlights how all five resilience processes were found and enacted in particular ways due to the organizational change context. Then, the chapter showcases how resistance was enacted and communicated in relation to particular people and changes. Lastly, this chapter discusses the three primary intersections that emerged between resilience and resistance: strategic networking, alternative logics and identity work, and emotion management—which complicate our understanding of the relationship between resilience and resistance.

Finally, Chapter Five focuses on the contributions and future directions of this research. The chapter begins by first detailing theoretical contributions to resilience, resistance, and their intersections. In relation to resilience, this research suggests that the workplace constrains specific types of resilience from being enacted. For resistance, I connect how the site of struggle and power informed performances of resistance. I then discuss the implications of the three previously mentioned intersections between resilience and resistance processes within multifaceted organizational change. The chapter also highlights pragmatic contributions before suggesting future research directions. Finally, the thesis will conclude after acknowledging limitations.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The following chapter outlines organizational change, including common processes, communication within change, and responses to change. Then, we define resilience and detail the frequent five communicative processes the exemplify resilience. Finally, we explore the foundational premises and types of resistance. This chapter concludes with bridging resilience and resistance and proposing research questions.

Organizational Change

Change is inevitable, especially in contemporary organizational contexts. Specifically in the United States, increased emphasis is being placed on organizations being efficient, successful (financially), and socially responsible (Allagui, 2017; Yang & Liu, 2018). With these competing tensions come constant new standards of operation, upheaving once seemingly-stable ways of performing work. In corporations, organizations attempt to prioritize financial stability, managing their image, and capitalizing on branding, to name a few (Shamsollahi, Amirshahi, & Ghaffari, 2017; Wong & Dhanesh, 2017).

Organizational change presents itself in many forms, including planned change and unplanned change. Unplanned changes are considered “crisis” situations (see Coombs, 2012; Ulmer, Sellnow, & Seeger, 2010) where an organization is affected by a variety of circumstances such as natural disasters, financial crises (stock market crash), industrial accidents, and disease outbreaks. Largely, these situations are out of the organizations’ direct control and coping with these unplanned changes involve organizational resilience.

The focus of this project, however, is planned change—when organizational leaders decide to implement disruptions in an effort to improve the organization (Miller, 2015). These changes can involve changes in leadership, such as new ownership or management companies

and changes in procedures, affecting “how things are done.” Altered procedures could be a product of new management who have differing visions for the company, rearranging what focus the organization will have. Organizational change can also come as a change in physical space, including location or arrangement/remodeling. Though these changes are described as “planned,” leaders cannot plan for everything, leading to surprises or unintended consequences (Jian, 2007). These changes are typically both positive and negative, while directly affecting the employees of the organization.

The hotel foregrounded in this study underwent three simultaneous changes regarding ownership, space, and leadership. While the current study looks specifically at resilience and resistance *primarily* post-planned multifaceted change (as changes are always occurring), it is essential to have a basic understanding of change processes, how change is communicated, and potential responses to change. By outlining these basic tenets, we can begin to understand the effects multifaceted change may have on organizational members who maintain employment in turbulent times.

Change processes. Studying organizational change can be approached in a variety of ways (Jian, 2007; Van de Ven & Poole, 2005). Broadly, any significant organizational change involves multiple processes at the organizational, group, and individual levels. Whelan-Berry and colleagues (2003) outlined the natural “change steps” involved at each level of analysis, functioning as a rubric from which to analyze how successfully an organization implements change. At the organizational level, change is implemented through the following steps: (a) motivating the change, (b) creating a vision, (c) developing political support, (d) managing the transition, and (e) sustaining momentum. Change usually begins with motivation from the decision-making leaders implementing the change, fostering commitment and readiness for

change. Then, they sell a vision to the workforce, advertising how the changes will result in a better future. When fostering support, communication across hierarchies increases; then, leadership will draft a plan for change, transitioning from current to desired position. Finally, the change is officially implemented, and the final stage remains “sustaining momentum” as communication and adaptability are at an all-time-high while everyone is adapting to change. As the primary flux of planned changes have occurred within the hotel this project is concerned with, this case study is entering the dialogue in the final “sustaining momentum” phase.

At the group level, change moves through: (a) introduction, (b) adoption decision, (c) continuation, and (d) maintenance or decline (Whelan-Berry et al., 2003). The group acquires information about the change and decides whether to enact the new required behaviors. Internal communication may influence this decision. The third stage is continually performing the new behaviors until the final stage of either maintaining or dropping-of the continuation. Though group communication can change behaviors and attitudes throughout the various phases, the case at hand is primarily concerned with the final stage involving maintaining or discontinuing certain behaviors.

Finally, at the individual level, change is enacted as (a) precontemplation, (b) contemplation, (c) preparation, (d) action, and (e) maintenance (Whelan-Berry et al., 2003). Initially, employees may not have any knowledge or intention on performing change. Once they are aware of a problem, they may seriously contemplate changing or being open to change. In the preparation stage, they acquire the intention and start taking steps to support the transition. Then, they modify their behavior and maintain the new behaviors by consolidating gains and avoiding relapses. Again, individuals may fluctuate between stages depending on frequency or degree of

changes, but this case attends to the final stage of how individuals are maintaining behaviors related to changes, whether that be supportive or resistive.

Though organizational change is more complex and dynamic than these simplified steps, a basic understanding of how change can and is processed provides a framework to conceptualize change from a multifaceted process perspective. As this study is primarily concerned with the aftermath of organizational change, it is important to discuss how change is communicated. This research involves both individual and group processes as individuals express their experience of change and how that is articulated and affecting the larger group. The informal and formal communications performed throughout the change process can affect employees' attitudes and behavior concerning change. Shared narratives can affect the overall change outcomes and goals of the organization.

Communication of change. The way in which change is communicated can have critical effects on the change process and organizational members. Much of Lewis' work has focused on strategic communication and its effects on organizational change (Lewis, 1997, 2006, 2007; Lewis & Russ, 2012). In particular, Lewis and Seibold (1993) frame change as *innovation*, defined as "an entity such as a new technology, idea, product, or program that is introduced to potential users in the organization" (p.324). With this definition, innovation includes changes in ownership, management, leadership, or other decision-making entities that have the potential to ripple out additional changes.

When communicating change, the relationship between the information giver (typically management) and the information receiver (line-level employees or middle-managers) can determine how change is enacted (Allen, Jimmieson, Bordia, & Irmer, 2007), though the relationships are more complex than linear. The level of trust within the relationship can affect

understanding and acceptance of information regarding change (Ford & Ford, 1995). Trust is built and maintained when the information-giver provides ideological accounts, addressing the values and underlying reasoning behind the change in addition to the projected benefits the change will provide (Tucker, Yeow, & Viki, 2013). That said, strategic ambiguity is also effective in this information exchange, as being intentionally vague on content with a higher emphasis on value-laden language leads to the information receiver filling in the gaps with their own sensemaking. Crafting ambiguous organizational goals allows for the plan to change without upsetting employees who have a clear, concrete vision regarding the change, lending them to be more flexible in their understanding. Specifically regarding organizations in turbulence, Eisenberg (1984) states, “ambiguous goals can preserve a sense of continuity while allowing for the gradual change in interpretation over time” (p. 237).

When change is competently communicated to employees, organizations have a higher probability of support and a lower probability of resistance (Lewis, 2006). When employees are treated as stakeholders within the conversation, they have more of a “buy-in” to the process and are emotionally invested to support the change and the subsequent vision of what that change will bring (Lewis, 2007). Additionally, planned changes with employee input are more action-oriented and are more likely to fit the “local-situational rules of practice” regarding how the changes would actually affect employees (Jian, 2007, p. 19). Most organizations do not follow this participatory approach, allowing space for organizational members to respond to change rather than being asked to participate in change. There are several barriers that prevent this participatory approach, including time to make decisions, resources to explain and enact the group ideal, and the potential of sharing power resulting in challenges to leadership. The current study further explores how those included as stakeholders within change communication at the

decision-making level reacted to change differently than those whose voices were not included or heard.

Responses to change. One of the most common responses to change is a heightened level of uncertainty (Allen et al., 2007; DiFonzo & Bordia, 1998; Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001). As changes occur, the individual is increasingly unsure of how to proceed; these feelings of uncertainty are compounded based on the frequency and rapidness of the compounding changes. Individuals process change differently based on where they seek information concerning implementation of changes and what the overall strategy of these changes are; the relationship with the information-giver will affect the information appraisal based on established trust (Allen et al., 2007). Additionally, change is shown to be more effectively managed by employees if they are openly communicated with, included in collective planning, and [again] if trust is built and maintained between those providing and receiving communication (DiFonzo & Bordia, 1998).

Organizational change presents unforeseen obstacles and unintended consequences that are critical to the success of the organization and the well-being of those employed there. For example, frequent organizational change occurs through the design, implementation, and enforcement of new processes communicated top-down from upper-management to employee. Organizational change creates an influx of communication both at the managerial and employee level as sensemaking and uncertainty-management take place. Upper-management focuses on formal communication of initiating change through texts and presenting the information. Employees are then tasked with implementing change—“to translate these texts into social practices” (Jian, 2007, p. 13). These distinctions illustrate two communication processes: one of formal, text-focused communication and the other [more informal] action-oriented communication. Unintended consequences of these interaction include tensions between power

positions, types of information, and how that information can be translated into action.

Employees enact collective sensemaking through past experiences both within and outside of the organization. Through reflective action, employees reconstitute the meaning of the formal change, which leads to a tension of interpretation between the ‘change announced’ and the ‘change enacted’.

Through managing change and uncertainty, individuals reflect on how changes align or contradict their identity both internally [self] and in relation to the organization. Scholars study how organizational change affects identity both internally and in relation to the organization (Alvesson & Willmott, 2001; Mangen & Brivot, 2015; Rooney et al., 2010; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003; Weick, 2011). Depending on context, employees manage uncertainty surrounding these changes and what communicative tactics they employ either to support or resist changes (Rooney et al., 2010). Organizational change affects turnover and the internal or external motivations that influence these decisions. Leader-employee relations can shift, or leadership styles can influence an employee’s attitude during organizational change. Broadly, scholars seek to understand how the effects of change influence the individual and the overall organization.

Organizational members react differently to change, but all reactions are performed through communicative processes. Although organizational change has been studied extensively from the organization or implementor perspective (Chewning, Lai, & Doerfel, 2013; Lewis, 2000), studying resilience in this context focuses on the employee experience and their responses to change. Though organizational change is an organizational and group process, it is also very much an individual process, creating impetus to more deeply study how individuals enact resilience and resistance communicative processes when reacting or responding to change. To

better understand the role of resilience and resistance within organizational life, one must first explore the scholarship crafting how these theories are used within the context of this case study.

Resilience

Resilience is “the ability to ‘bounce back’ or reintegrate after difficult life experiences” (Buzzanell, 2010, p.1). Difficult life experience can come in varying sizes and shapes, but resilience is a process that individuals use to manage change, uncertainty, or hardship. Scholarship has historically focused its attention on resilience in trauma or burnout occupations (Gayton & Lovell, 2012; Pietrzak, Johnson, Goldstein, Malley, & Southwick, 2009; Strumpfer, 2003). Only recently is organizational communication scholarship addressing resilience on the smaller, more mundane level, evidenced by special issue journals surrounding personal resilience like the February issue of the *Journal of Applied Communication Research* (Afifi, 2018; Buzzanell, 2018b; Buzzanell & Houston, 2018). We have accepted organizational change to the point where we forego the evidence of resilience within individuals who maintain employment, who fluctuate in how they enact resilience and why in the face of change. To understand resilience within the context of organizational change, one must first understand scholarly conceptualizations of resilience. The following pages aim to define resilience and discuss its relevance as communicative processes within organizational life.

Defining resilience. Historically, resilience has been viewed as a psychological trait, as something innate, as a process, and as a learned behavior. Organizational scholars focus on resilience as the act of “bouncing back.” Others view resilience as experiencing three waves: identifying resilient qualities, assessing these qualities as a “disruptive” and “reintegrative” process, and the spiritual or emotional force that internally motivates an individual to grow through adversity (G. E. Richardson, 2002).

Resilience has been used to explain how individuals cope in the aftermath of trauma or traumatic news. In this capacity, resilience is defined as “the adult capacity to maintain healthy, symptom-free functioning...following PTEs [potentially traumatic event]” (Bonanno, Galea, Bucciarelli, & Vlahov, 2006, p. 181). This definition sprang from a study concerning those directly involved with the 9/11 attacks. These scholars frame resilience as the ability to sustain “normal” without psychological fallout. This definition lacks the subjective and complex nature of “normal” and fails to account for the dynamic process of trauma.

Resilience is also applied to extreme situations in which resilience is called upon as a coping mechanism. Agarwal and Buzzanell (2015) interviewed disaster relief workers through identification and resilience lenses to discuss resilience labor that works to overcome emotional and physical challenges. They found that disaster-relief workers exhibit resilience through identification with networks: familial and community, ideological through values, and through the spiritual/emotional aspect of disaster-relief work. In this, resilience labor was defined as “the dual-layer processes of creating resilience in others and themselves through connections to identity/identification networks” (p.422). Within this emotional work, identification with the cause, the values associated, and with fellow workers are critical to enacting resilience within crisis situations.

Resilience is frequently analyzed in contexts regarding emotional work and potential burnout. Though implicitly, Buzzanell and Turner (2003) discuss resilience through emotion work and how individuals use communicative processes to be resilient through job loss. In their 2003 study, these scholars found evidence that those who experienced job loss performed resilience through three emotion work themes: foregrounding-backgrounding of emotions, constructing normalcy, and (re)instituting traditional masculinities. When coping with crisis,

participants would foreground positivity while backgrounding defeating narratives. By removing anger and focusing on positive emotion displays, they performed “self-preservation,” saved face, and focused on problem solving. Participants would constitute normalcy by speaking “normal” into being. To achieve “normal,” they would play down the effect job loss had on their daily lives and families and promote a narrative of “Things didn’t really change much” (p.34). Finally, the participants (re)instituted masculinities by reaffirming gendered identity anchors; men would retain their identities of leaders of the household and breadwinners while women minimized their financial contributions to reaffirm their husbands’ role within the family. These findings begin to illuminate the transition from resilience as a trait to resilience as communicative processes.

Within social work, resilience is linked to health and well-being, most associated with exhibiting “emotional and social competencies,” “positive emotions, optimism and hope,” and “hardiness and stress-resistant qualities” (Rajan-Rankin, 2014, p. 2427). Resilience is seen as especially needed in potential burnout occupations such as social work (Rajan-Rankin, 2014; Skovholt, Grier, & Hanson, 2001), emergency services like firefighting or policing (Gayton & Lovell, 2012; Vogelvang, Clarke, Sperna Weiland, Vosters, & Button, 2014), and healthcare work (Skodova, Lajciakova, & Banovcinova, 2017). In these settings, resilience is spoken almost as an antidote to burnout; “There are psychological variables, subsumed here under the generic heading of resilience, that...create tendencies contrary to those that produce burnout, or favourable to its antipode of engagement” (Strumpfer, 2003, p.69). Within disasters, resilience is used to examine general crisis communication through narratives and metaphor uses (Olsson, 2014), accenting an element of identity construction and authenticity.

Resilience is additionally implemented as a process when facing the tension between living authentically and feeling subjected to societal or group expectations. Dorrance Hall (2016)

studied how marginalized family members [“black sheep”] enact “resilience” defined here as the ability to “come to terms with their position in the family, repair family relationships, and/or create a new sense of normalcy” (p.1). In essence, this scholar defined resilience as either accepting the situation, building understanding or respect, or redefining what “normal” is in this context to resume daily life after disruption. Yet, scholars must acknowledge that “normal” is highly subjective and contextual. Though these previous conceptualizations of resilience contribute pieces of what defines resilience, resilience is first and foremost a *process*.

Communication scholarship resituates resilience as a compilation of communicative processes. Resilience is situated in, and related to, interpersonal interaction, power relations, hegemonic structures, and cultural context. Resilience reflects the individual, the community, the organization, and the society. This process reflects aspiration and heartbreak. It encompasses the unique awareness the “self” captures when challenged to be reflective and authentic. Resilience encapsulates authentic humanity and how messy, dynamic interactions ripple out to affect perceptions and people. While acknowledging the previous, interdisciplinary scholarship that contributed to defining resilience, this project understands resilience to be “constituted in and through communicative processes that enhance people’s abilities to create new normalcies” (Buzzanell, 2010, p.9).

Resilience as communicative processes. Buzzanell (2010) exemplified this conception when she identified five primary processes of enacting resilience: (a) crafting normalcy; (b) affirming identity anchors; (c) maintaining and using communication networks; (d) downplaying negative feelings while foregrounding positive emotions and productive action, and (e) putting alternative logics to work. Buzzanell’s theoretical framework is foundational to understanding resilience as communicative processes within organizational communication. This theoretical

lens is fundamental to understanding this study moving forward, in part, because the five processes encapsulate much of the micro-processes and internal work that evidences resilience. The following sections will explore each process and the additional literature that informs and supports the processes as active components to performing resilience.

Crafting normalcy. When faced with difficulty or adverse events, many individuals try to enact or portray a sense of “normal.” Achieving “normalcy” involves engaging in daily rituals and trying to gain a sense of comfort as a result of—and in spite of—upheaval. In this sense, “‘normal’ is both an ongoing process and a perceived desirable outcome” (Buzzanell, 2010, p. 3). Normalcy is sought out through discourse and performance by enacting or conversing about the mundane. Instead of focusing solely on the issues, the weight of the issues, or detrimental effects, individuals purposefully engage in habitual behavior and discourse, such as running errands, going to work, helping the kids with their homework, etc. This enactment gives a sense of “fake it until you make it” and successfully insulates the individual from the harshness and turmoil of adversity. Acting “normal” provides stability and creates *new* normalcies “embedded in material realities and generated by talk-in-interaction” (Buzzanell, 2010, p.4), expanding upon Buzzanell and Turner’s (2003) piece regarding job loss within bread-winners of the household. In this study, the authors discovered that “creating normal” for these families included maintaining rituals like still going to family dinner on Fridays, even if the restaurant was not as nice. The spouses talked normal into being by restating notions such as “nothing really changed” and, “I don’t think [the job loss] affected us deeply,” etc. Within organizational change, some employees focus on reenacting tasks that remain the same throughout change or denying how the change affected them. In these instances of turmoil, creating normal crafts comfort and allows individuals to “get through” the tough times until normal is redefined.

Affirming identity anchors. In times of strife, individuals hold onto and perform the labels that help them confirm who they are and what roles to perform. Buzzanell (2010) defines identity anchor as “a relatively enduring cluster of identity discourses upon which individuals and their familial, collegial, and/or community members rely when explaining who they are for themselves and in relation to each other” (p.4). In this context, identity is formed and performed within larger societal discourses surrounding what it is to “be,” including but not limited to gender, organization membership, occupation, age, race/ethnicity, familial roles, etc. Identity anchors allow the individual to make sense of who they are. During challenging times, the individual may cling to their identity anchors to make sense of their self-perception both within and through the difficulty. Within organizational change, the individual may identify more with their profession (“consultant”) over the organization which they are employed (Cheney & Ashcraft, 2007).

When encountering times of difficulty or change, people typically experience a change in their identity or what they thought that identity meant. This is considered a liminal, transitional state in which someone is “betwixt and between” positions or identity markers (the term “liminal” was coined as meaning “betwixt or between” by Victor Turner, 1987). This phase of upheaval involves identity negotiation and competing identity narratives while the individual makes sense of either a) their change in position, or b) which identity they will hold onto more tightly. For example, a male breadwinner who loses their job may pedestal their role as a father, husband, community member, or religious member as “true” markers of his identity to maintain a strong sense of self (Buzzanell & Turner, 2003). A major identity loss, like occupational marker, can cause the individual to undergo grieving with their loss of self, initiating

renegotiation of identity narratives until a new self is solidified (S. A. Conroy & O’Leary-Kelly, 2014).

Part of renegotiating through narratives involves aligning with certain discourses and value structures. Those who must look outside of their occupation for identity anchors expand outward, looking for common narratives to align with to build, grow, and renew (Seeger & Ulmer, 2002). These adjustments vary depending on the type of identity loss both in the workplace [organization versus profession] (Conroy, Becker, & Menges, 2017) and in the personal sphere (e.g., losing a child and the role of “mother”). Though this can be an internal process, identity work is performed, negotiated, and crafted through communication.

Maintaining and using communication networks. We communicatively develop resilience through the “building and utilizing social capital” (Buzzanell, 2010, p.6). Typically associated with a “rebuilding” phase, people enact resilience by trying to move forward productively. When in flux, people tap into their social network to obtain resources and to confirm perceived networks are intact (Chewning et al., 2013). This time and energy is used to sustain old and new network relationships, first stabilizing their core network (romantic partnerships, family, close friendships), then expanding outward towards larger communities or formal institutions (Dorrance Hall, 2016). In a study regarding post-deployment and PTSD risk, those who exhibited high levels of resilience (measured through high personal control and positive acceptance of change) also illustrate high utilization of social networking; the reverse is also true of those who do not seek out social support who experienced increased difficulty with exhibiting resilience (Pietrzak et al., 2009). These support-seeking behaviors can bring comfort and reassurance to the individual while opening avenues that guide future action. Support seeking and maintaining of support networks function as coping strategies, exhibited in research

regarding parents of children with life-threatening illness (Norberg, Lindblad, & Boman, 2006) and in adolescent studies (Dumont & Provost, 1999). These networks can produce resilience talk, bringing resilience attitudes and behaviors into reality as both “short- and long-term resiliencies” (Lucas & Buzzanell, 2012, p.193).

Within the workplace, employees exhibit resilience to organizational change by crafting “in” networks within the organization to perform information-seeking and sensemaking processes (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005) as coworkers enduring the same changes can be a meaningful sense of support and understanding in times of change. As most change can begin abstractly, these support seeking behaviors can enable the individual to converse and reflect, shifting the abstract change into concrete behaviors (Weick, 2011). Additionally, workers may reach out to their families and close friends seeking support when they may not be comfortable seeking such support within a professional context. Both internal and external support can lead to adaptive behaviors towards organizational change, improving uncertainty management and increased satisfaction (Cullen, Edwards, Casper, & Gue, 2014). Support-seeking behaviors involves discursive techniques for sensemaking and uncertainty management.

Emotion work. Buzzanell (2010) discusses emotion work as both legitimizing or downplaying negative feelings while simultaneously foregrounding both positive emotions and productive action. This emotion work is a communicative process enacted when the individual is (re)framing their situation both to an external audience and as reflective internalizing. In junction with the previously mentioned identity work, this emotion work of foregrounding the positive is (in part) an identification process to reach deep authenticity post-disruption (Buzzanell & Turner, 2003). This strategy centers on the *embodiment* of resilience and involves “conscious decision-making and support of others” (Buzzanell, 2018a, p.104). In an effort to be distinctive,

backgrounding negative emotions is not simply ‘putting on a happy face’ and focusing on the positive is not unconditional optimism. In this communicative context of resilience-as-strategy, these are conscious choices to maintain productivity through—and despite—disruption. After describing the near-loss of her twins, Buzzanell (2010) explains: “Backgrounding is a conscious decision to acknowledge that one has the legitimate right to feel anger or loss in certain ways but that these feelings are counterproductive to more important goals” (p.9). The decision is often identity-driven and performed through purposeful reframing and perpetuated through narrative and dialogue. This “make over rhetoric” reflects the person’s ability to portray themselves as maintaining “control” and “self-respect” (Hallqvist & Hydén, 2013).

Within organizations specifically, the relationship between organization and employee is not always voluntary; numerous workers do not have options for employment or pay, resulting in an involuntary tie between the organization and the employee. When change occurs within an organization, an employee may have to stay regardless of agreement with the changes, resulting in a backgrounding of frustration or anger and a foregrounding of productivity. In this, employees can be resilient against organizational change to maintain employment, despite the challenges planned organizational change presents. Though emotion work embodies discursive strategies, individuals also illustrate resilience by putting alternative logics to work.

Alternative logics. Alternative logics are nontraditional or creative ways of sensemaking or reframing semi-ambiguous situations. *Logics* refer to reasoning or argumentation that align internally with personal values and are applied externally through discourse or decision-making processes. As defined by Messick (1999), “a consistent internal logic includes prescriptions for appropriate action for one’s self and others, shared norms and ethical values, and rules for

making inferences (or not) about other persons”(p.12). Logics are affected by appropriateness, identity, and rules (March, 1994).

Putting alternative logics to work are creative ways that individuals make sense of disruption or change. Sensemaking intertwines the features of the other four communicative processes in that it involves relation to identity, managing emotion work, and purposefully articulating normalcy [or creating new normalcies] to social networks. Sensemaking is future- and action-oriented, informing and constraining identity and “next-steps” (Weick et al., 2005). When making sense of disruption or change, individuals use narratives, foregrounding certain actors and utilizing discursive devices to create and provide linkages (Weick, 2012). Sensemaking involves both internal reflection and external articulation, framing disruption and applying heuristics (i.e., “conceptual hunches”); in this sense, change acts as intervention and the individual oscillates between concrete realities and abstract “hunches,” each cycle further informing the next (Weick, 2011). Sensemaking in crisis situations are particularly complicated because “action that is instrumental to understanding the crisis often intensifies the crisis” (Weick, 1988, p. 305). Thirty years ago, Weick argued that commitment, capacity, and expectations were the leading variables that affected sensemaking within crisis situations—much of which can be filtered through the lens of resilience. Sensemaking informs identity, agency, and communicative strategies.

Narratives are particularly important to the sensemaking process, enacting identity, and emotion work. In a study regarding families of military members in rapid deployments cycles, qualitative methods revealed narratives (as communication seeking) functioned to craft resilience by trying to “reconcile the often contradictory realities” of difficulty due to separation from spouses (Villagran, Canzona, & Ledford, 2013, p.778). Communal narratives serve to unite

under constitutive rhetoric and ideological metaphors. Richardson and Maninger (2016) interviewed victims of Hurricane Ike and found evidence of communal coping within disaster recovery as it impacts a larger community. Community members co-constructed an encompassing narrative that drew on Americanized ideals of “*bootstrap* mentality” highlighting “we” as the productive builder and “us” as the value-laden community (p.114). As indicated, narratives also inform our identity in relation to others. Another study looked at whistleblowers and how their identities were more or less robbed from them with this label. The disruptive event—whistleblowing on the wrongdoing of an organization—shifted the locus of identity from the self to the other community members who used narrative to *place* new identity frameworks (“needing attention,” “bad mom,” “unethical member”) on the whistleblowers, recrafting the logics surrounding the event and people involved (Gravley, Richardson, & Allison Jr, 2015).

Where narratives and sensemaking theories help illuminate particular logics, Buzzanell’s conception of *putting alternative logics to work* answers to resilience directly. We employ alternative logics when adjusting to disruption or change *and* our typical response patterns fail to work (Buzzanell, 2018a). Organizational change is rife with ambiguity, uncertainty, and challenges while forcing organizational members to be resilient to change, resist the change (and risk losing employment), or leave their positions. Though these options seem comprehensive and definitive, resilience and resistance coalesce in numerous ways. The present case focuses on those who maintain employment throughout turbulent times. These employees may enact processes of resilience while making sense of change but, scholarship had yet to address how resilience processes are being implemented when employees are faced with multifaceted, organizational change. Thus, this study aims to answer the following research question:

R1: How do employees enact resilience processes during multifaceted organizational change?

Now that we have discussed the communicative processes of resilience and their need to be explored in the context of organizational change, we will explore resistance processes and their role within organizational change.

Resistance

Resistance is:

an effort to engage in some form of praxis—individual or collective, routine or organized—in the context of ‘established social patterns and structures’ (including mechanisms of control), such that these patterns and structures are, at some level, dereified and their ‘identity logic’ interrogated. (Mumby, 2005, p. 23)

This definition highlights the “pushing back” of power structures—the questioning and challenging of systems. Resistance is both personal and collective, active and discursive, simultaneously sending a message while being a recipient. Resistance is common within changing organizations—creating an impetus in its relevance. As organizations constantly shift, they face challenges in the changes and with employee maintenance. As resistance can be prevalent in this context, research regarding resistance is increasingly important work.

Resistance theory stems from the critical perspective, most focused on power, agency, and the ability to enact attempted change. A slight departure from the interpretivist approach highlighted within resilience theory, resistance and power simultaneously comprise *struggle* (Fleming & Spicer, 2008). At its core, resistance within the workplace is largely defined as “reactive opposition to oppressive forces” (Anderson & Englehardt, 2001; Ashcraft, 2005, p. 69). But, organizational scholars strive to move past this binary, highlighting the discursive acts within control and resistant dynamics as co-constructing culture, identity, and structure—prioritizing authenticity, meaning, and outcomes when defining what constitutes resistance (Deetz, 2008). To this end, I use Mumby’s (2005) approach to resistance studies as adopting a

dialectical approach, focusing on “the ways in which [acts of control and resistance] intersect in the moment to moment to produce complex and contradictory dynamics of control and resistance” (p. 21; see also Putnam, Grant, Michelson, & Cutcher, 2005). The following pages outline the foundational premises and types of resistance within the context of organizational change.

Foundational premises. Based on an extensive review of resistance research in the past 15 years, Mumby and colleagues (Mumby, Thomas, Martí, & Seidl, 2017) proposed six guiding principles of resistance theory. First, resistance is largely rooted in Foucault’s (1980) conception of power: “where there is power, there is resistance” (p.95). Succinctly, we assume that power and control will be met with some form of resistance. They are inherently linked—not as a binary—but as one entity woven in itself. Organizational communication scholars are most interested in where power and resistance intersect dialectically, as they co-constitute each other and meaning (Mumby, 2005). The hotel in which this case study focuses uses a typical, hierarchical power system, relying heavily on top-down communication and masculine managerial styles. When power from the top is exerted over those below, this principle of resistance assumes the inception of resistive reactions whether deep or superficial, enduring or momentary. Scholars interested in organizational change more broadly interrogate the real or perceived interactions resulting from these moments

Resistance’s second principle prescribes resistance as inherently contradictory—it is both a reaction to change while attempting to create change. Resistance can also challenge power while reproducing that same power structure simultaneously (Mumby et al., 2017), creating a more complicated, nuanced notion of what resistance is and what its role can be. Within changing organizations, members of the organization may resist a threat to their identity through

demotion or job-loss but may resist by holding onto that identity marker (“I am a _____ professional”) more adamantly, thus resisting their changing identity by perpetuating the powerful system at play (the importance of work as an identity marker). Additionally, as workers resist traditional, hierarchical organization structures, they may seek other forms of employment through self-employment, “gigs,” and “on-demand business models” [like Uber]. Though this resistance may seem to challenge current workplace structures, Fleming (2017) argues this strategy is “radical responsabilization” of the workforce—a product of the larger power structure that perpetuates “growing economic insecurity, low productivity, diminished autonomy, and worrying levels of personal debt” (p.691). In this, resistance can also perpetuate the rooted systems that threaten autonomy, financial stability, independence, and productivity.

Third, resistance is *always situated* within a specific time, place, and physical and metaphysical conditions; resistance scholars must situate and explicate their research within the larger political, socioeconomic contexts. In relation to contemporary research within the United States, critical studies must acknowledge the political and economic context of reifying capitalism and its powerful structures, evidenced by the election and presidency of Donald Trump. This political context deeply affects corporations as potential justification of specific priorities involving economic growth, power, and strict management of hierarchies. Within the hotel, for example, this study is situated within turbulence as the organization has recently undergone multifaceted change which directly affects its workers. In the larger economic, political, and cultural context of capitalism, multifaceted changes like acquisitions and leadership turnover are increasing due to capitalist values and globalization. Corporations seize expansion, and employees have increased options to shift their workplace more readily. Within organizational change, power and control is typically exerted from the top-down, which can

erupt in resistant behaviors when the employees' autonomy or agency is threatened (Ashcraft, 2005; Harding et al., 2017; Rhodes, 2002; Scott, 1990; Tracy, 2000). As resistance and control are symbiotically linked, so too are the contexts in which they form and how they turn and also evolve the context.

Fourth, resistance constitutes work itself. Traditional hierarchical organizations typically involve abstract direction or goals from upper management being translated to middle-management and to line-level employees. In this sense, the line-level employee interprets the abstract direction and puts the idea into concrete production, crafting “how to work” or “how to produce.” Through this performance and production, the workers' resistance constitutes and produces “work” itself. This concept is rooted in Marx's (1976) notion of the “indeterminacy of labour” as the abstract nature of this communication can serve as opportunity to instill colored interpretations, subtle shifts, or outright disobedience (Pieterse, Caniëls, & Homan, 2012). As contemporary workplaces focus on knowledge work [indeterminate labor and production], they increasingly highlight “non-work themes” like lifestyle to increase identification and “task-engagement” (Fleming, 2014, p.879), providing more nuanced opportunities for resistance. Within organizational change, for example, employees who are rhetorically persuaded to identify with an organization might find opportunity to carve agency by vocally disagreeing with change and insisting on being made part of decision-making, as opposed to quietly enduring the potential costs of such changes or becoming ambivalent (Piderit, 2000).

The fifth principle involves the nature of contemporary work shifting from Fordism [industrial, factory work] to primarily Post-Fordism [producing knowledge and technology over manufacturing]. This shift in the *type of most work* also shifted the *type of resistance*. Under Fordism, resistance was displayed through more collective, public displays like strikes and

boycotts. Under Post-Fordism, work is much more individual, intimate, and a larger part of our identity structures (Mumby et al., 2017; see also Thornborrow & Brown, 2009; Trethewey, 1997; Watson, 2008); thus, resistance is a more individual and hidden process. Corporate organizations' recent emphasis on branding, for instance, capitalizes on crafting worker identities into what it means for the employee to fit the company's "brand" (Mumby, 2016). In an example of countermeasure, Fleming (2005) studied how workers employed *cynicism* to resist corporate cultures from controlling identity through the reproduction of subjectivity. As contemporary work involves struggles over meaning and identity, work and resistance both become more personal in its effects as workers struggle over meanings and alternative work identities, leading to the sixth and final principle.

Resistance now more necessarily involves "the complex relationship [with] autonomy" (Mumby et al., 2017, p. 1162). As work shifts into more autonomous roles, commonsense might lead us to think that levels of resistance would decrease as we move from strict hierarchical structures into "being your own boss" or at least being able to manage your own time. In reality, this "autonomous" structure bleeds work life into personal life, demanding the worker be responsible past the 9-to-5 traditional hourly structure and preventing them from actually separating their time and identities. Organizations capitalize on this structure as the final frontier—expecting employees to turn their entire lives into a form of human capital. Ironically, increased autonomy in work assumes a *higher* identification with work identity within these "post-work" politics (Alvesson, Lee Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008; Cheney & Ashcraft, 2007; Mumby et al., 2017; Watson, 2008). As discussed within resilience, identity work is immensely personal to the individual and of great concern to organizational communication scholars. It is

said that “identity is understood through a dance of resistance and domination” (Tracy, 2000, p. 99).

Within traditional hierarchical structures, middle-management typically have more autonomy over their work and are increasingly entrusting more and more autonomy to line-level workers. In addition to autonomy, the employee’s level of identification with the organization can also have detrimental effects; overidentification with an organization can lead to unethical behaviors and/or resistance (Conroy, Henle, Shore, & Stelman, 2017) just as resistance within leadership can influence a larger resistive movement (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007). Though these lines blur, we recognize different types and effects of resistance.

Types of resistance. With the previous six guiding principles in mind, Mumby and colleagues (2017) articulate four general types of resistance. These types are by no means discrete or mutually exclusive, as many resistive acts can fall into multiple categories or may expand past the “types” listed here. Instead, these categories serve to better articulate the ambiguous nature of resistance. Resistance can be described as either hidden or public, individual or collective—creating four permeable quadrants.

Mumby and colleagues (2017) label resistance that is individual and hidden as “individual infrapolitics,” which involve “a wide variety of low-profile forms of resistance that dare not speak in their own name” (Scott, 1990, p. 19). These “low-profile” forms of resistance can be seen within organizations [both during change and not], and include gossip, rumor, feigned ignorance, and idle threats categorized as “hidden transcripts” (Murphy, 1998; Scott, 1990). These behind-the-scenes acts are common within organizations and can have alternative motivations, like saving-face, building relationships, and “venting.” Due to their common nature, scholars debate whether hidden, individual resistive behaviors “count” as resistance, or if they

should just be seen as dissent or disgruntlement. Contu (2008) labels these behaviors “decaf resistance” as they lack purpose and are performed “without the risk of really changing our ways of life or the subjects who live it” (p. 367). However, these “backstage” strategies (Ybema & Horvers, 2017) have the power to influence thoughts and behaviors into larger changes, becoming more collective and public (Courpasson, 2017; Ford, Ford, & D’Amelio, 2008). As Mumby (2017) asserts, we must not only consider “what counts as resistance,” but also “when resistance counts” (pp. 1162-1163).

Individual and public resistance is considered “insubordination” (Mumby, 2017, p. 1169). This form of resistance is an overt attempt to challenge or change the power structure or the situation which incited the reaction (Barnes, 2007; Courpasson, 2016). Though it may be presented in varying degrees, those witness to the communicative act may have little room to doubt that resistance is taking shape. Within an organization, this can be as simple as talking back to the boss, refusing to perform certain tasks, or performing work in overtly alternative manner (Gravley et al., 2015). During organizational change, this could be seen when an employee openly expresses disapproval or disobedience at articulated top-down changes, resulting in potential termination or discipline (if unsuccessful) or increased changes with the employees’ input (if successful).

In larger collectives, resistance can still be hidden, referred to as “collective infrapolitics.” Examples of this resistance is typically seen before a rebellion or in a larger attempt to mock a system. The political activists called “Anonymous” discretely critique political, social, and economic issues while remaining hidden. Though this is a larger collective that makes its resistance known publicly, the group itself maintains a low profile. Within an organization, collective infrapolitics can be precursors to larger, more public action. Online chat

groups can serve as collective, hidden sites of resistance which, through identification and support, can lead to larger pursuits of legal action. Similar to the individual infrapolitics, the collective version might still involve gossip and rumors when a few coworkers meet inside or outside of the organization to complain. These communications can take place when having a beer or a coffee with a coworker outside of work, resulting in complaining conversation that works to validate negative emotions or concerns. As these resistive behaviors may or may not lead to more public forms of resistance (Ford et al., 2008), they can discursively function to affect employee morale, identity work, and future organizational adherence. As Courpasson (2017) argues:

everyday politics do change power relations, in ways that proceed through the multiplication of moments where minds shift away, hands are used for something else than typing on a computer, bodies are going for a while in a different direction and in other places than those prescribed by management (p.845, emphasis added).

In this, both collective and individual infrapolitics can act to influence behaviors, and the simple ‘misusing’ of organizations’ time or resources can resist the power structure of organizations’ expectations. Collective infrapolitics can work to affect other quadrants as a precursor for increased individual infrapolitics, outright insubordination, or ignite insurrection.

Insurrection, the last type of resistance, involves public collectives. They are seen in rebellions and protests with a clear goal to enact social change, actively working against set systems of power (Ganesh, Zoller, & Cheney, 2005). Within the workplace, these can be strikes from the employees or boycotts from the consumers (Cloud, 2005). To be an organized collective, these groups will typically have a clear issue they are attempting to resolve (such as a pay increase or demanding transparency), and they will fight to change the current systems of power, carving out their own agency against the “system” to achieve their goals. Again, these types overlap and influence one another, rarely solely staying in one type over time. Resistance

within leadership roles can also lead to these larger, organized public collectives (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007).

In returning to the original aim to define resistance, organizational scholars study resistance as a site of change. Resistance as communicative events are more than power and fighting against power; they are “locally produced, discursive processes of self-formation that is always ongoing, always tension-filled” (Mumby, 2005, p.38). “What counts” as resistance becomes more convoluted in situ as resistance is certainly not isolated instances nor are they linear in progression. The embers of resistance can ignite in disagreement but may never progress. If these thoughts and feelings do progress to action or discourse, they may be curved by counter-resistance—denoting resistance as multidimensional (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2009). Some scholars discredit acts like foot-dragging or using company time for personal tasks as resistance because these acts resemble disagreement, but no intention to change or challenge the system at play (Contu, 2008). Meanwhile, scholars such as Prasad & Prasad (2001) note that workplace resistance also emerges out of “more spontaneous and non-calculative types of action,” arguing that intentionality, though important, should not be a direct indicator of whether something is considered “resistance” (p. 105). In this, “what counts” as resistance can be justified by either *intention to* or the *result of* change or challenge. Though the resistive act may have one or the other, either have the power to constitute resistance.

The goal of organizational communication scholars is to explore how these tensions and contradictions can create possibilities for organizational change and transformation. Though resistance has been studied within the context of organizational change, these communicative acts have not been studied though a case study of multifaceted organizational change, which led to interesting results regarding how line-level employees, lower, and middle-management

enact resistance in various ways within this turbulent context. Therefore, this study also aims to answer this research question:

R2: How do employees enact resistance processes during multifaceted organizational change?

Though power and control structures are inherent in hierarchical organizations, organizational communication scholarship must also approach organizational change holistically by combining critical and interpretivist approaches to better understand moments of resilience and resistance bridging.

Bridging Resistance and Resilience

This study works to bridge the gap between resilience and resistance theory, expanding the communication processes of resilience to also include resistant ways in which individuals may craft normalcy, anchor identity, build networks, perform emotion work, and apply alternative logics. Some employees may not overcome obstacles (resilience) as much as they try to push the changes in their favor (resistance). In this fashion, the individual is being resilient to organizational change by crafting agency and resisting larger structures. “Alternative logics,” as discussed by Buzzanell (2010) are “adaptations to nonsensical situations (the ‘craziness’ of it all) require[ing] an ongoing and concerted effort to alter the organizing system itself” (p.6). Being resilient to change is not mutually exclusive from actively challenging or attempting to change the systems at play, as employing resistive communicative tactics to remain resilient to organizational change. As previously stated, resilience and resistance theory had yet to be studied in tandem. The communicative processes involved in both overlap, especially concerning identity work, networking, emotion work, and reframing. The current study aims to identify evidence of this overlap within a multifaceted change context, positing that these theories and

approaches can be bridged to exemplify theoretical and pragmatic contributions. Therefore, the current study explores the following research question:

R3: How do resilience and resistance processes intersect with one another during multifaceted organizational change?

Research Questions. I explore the intersections of resilience and resistance communicative processes. Through a qualitative, case study approach, I interviewed twelve organizational members who have experienced two years of intense, simultaneous changes in an effort to illuminate the following research questions:

R1: How do employees enact resilience processes during multifaceted organizational change?

R2: How do employees enact resistance processes during multifaceted organizational change?

R3: How do resilience and resistance processes intersect with one another during multifaceted organizational change?

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

To explore the relationship between resilience and resistance within organizational change, this study employed a qualitative case study approach. According to Stake (2005), “a case study is both a process of inquiry about the case and the product of that inquiry” (p.112). Stake (2005) also notes that the more the object of study is a “specific, unique, bounded system,” the more useful the epistemological rationales are (p.113). I consider this case study to be *instrumental*, as the goal is to provide insight into a larger issue—how employees enact resilience through resistance within organizational change. Other organizational scholarship uses the case study approach to look at organizational policy (Medved & Novak, 2013), identification (Kuhn, 2017; Williams & Connaughton, 2012), or communication patterns (Ulmer & Sellnow, 2000), but have yet to address multi-theoretical lenses in multifaceted change. Though elements of identification and communication patterns are relevant to the current study, this project is the first to use a case study approach to study resilience’s intersection with resistance.

Case study approaches help organization scholars gain deeper insight into communicative processes and provide depth in a broader trend. This case in particular aims to better understand the nature of organizational change, bridging two theories to build a more holistic understanding. I do not wish to generalize findings from a case study approach, but rather interrogate the possibility of resistance being used as a form of resilience within a common phenomenon: planned organizational change. Therefore, a deeper analysis using a case study approach supports grounded theory-building to analyze potential areas of theoretical intersections. Building theory from the ground-up allows authentic narratives to emerge from the lived experience of the employees, further exploring nuances and complexities within resilience and resistance constructs.

In what follows, I first describe the case. Next, I discuss my positionality with the organization, the participants, and the methodological approach. I then unpack the procedures and rationales for data collection and data analysis. These methods were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at Colorado State University.

The Case

The Hotel [all names redacted to protect participant confidentiality] is an internationally branded, full service hotel in the west. Standing nine stories tall, this structure houses hundreds of sleeping rooms and over 20,000 feet of meeting spaces. The Hotel is a few miles from an international interstate that stretches from Canada to Mexico and is in close proximity to a large university. Since becoming an international brand in 2005, management at the Hotel focuses specifically on the university and strengthening their relationship by hosting workshops and talks, providing discounts for sleeping rooms, and accommodating special events such as home football games, move-in weekend, parents/homecoming weekend, and graduation weekend.

This full-service establishment includes an array of amenities such as a restaurant and bar open daily, indoor pool and hot tub, and a coffee shop serving Starbucks' products. The Hotel embodies elegance as the sleeping rooms wrap around the perimeter of the building, all overlooking the nine-story atrium that allows natural light to flood the common areas, descending on the water features and faux foliage below.

As an organization, the Hotel employs approximately sixty year-round employees with an additional twenty to thirty temporary employees in the housekeeping department (hired through a staffing "temp" agency) and an additional fifteen to twenty hired per event in the banquet department. Though the temporary employees may not have loyalty to the company directly, the

permanent staff includes some thirty-year veterans of this establishment. Most middle-management, including department heads, had been there for over a decade.

The Hotel structure was originally built in the mid-80s as under a different brand, but still as a full-service property. For most of its life, the company that managed the Hotel was legendary for setting the standard for premier, full-service hotels. The founder always built and sought out hotels in university towns for a smart reason: bigger universities would ensure an influx of travelers year-round and universities are typically long-standing, creating a strong partnership for years to come. In 2013, the founder passed away, and his company has since shifted and been consolidated.

The organizational changes. Though organizational change is typical, this case is unique in that the organization incurred three types of simultaneous, multifaceted change mostly in two short years. First, their management company changed in August of 2015, though its effects would take hold some months later. From August of 2015 well into 2017, the Hotel experienced a flood of new Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), policy changes, additional, detailed inspections, and increased control from corporate over the Hotel. The new management company required communication and approvals for daily purchases, daily revenue reports, budget expansions, and any raises and/or promotions to name a few. These shifts had a direct effect on the company's day-to-day operations and constrained on-site manager authority.

Second, this tired, thirty-year old Hotel had not seen much in renovations since it became an international brand over ten years prior. In October of 2016, the Hotel began its full, \$11 million renovation that would modernize sleeping rooms, meeting spaces, and common areas cosmetically. Though this overhaul was necessary, the Hotel did not cease operations at any point during the construction, leaving employees and guests in a loud, messy environment. Some

particular struggles during this time included jack-hammering, fire alarms setting off, chunks of time without water or electricity, and daily rearrangement of amenity locations such as the fitness center, pool, bar, restaurant, and front desk.

Lastly, many of the on-site, middle-management who had been in their positions for roughly a decade pursued other career options from November of 2016 to August of 2017. Five of the key department heads had been leading the company since its inception as an international brand left during this turbulent time, resulting in the departments struggling with inconsistent leadership and expectations. The remaining managers are referred to as the “final four” as the primary managers (not including assistants or supervisors) who maintained employment during this turbulent time. This brief overview exemplifies the Hotel as a rich case study in which to study organizational change and its effects its members.

Positionality of the Researcher

While completing my undergraduate degree, I began my employment at the Hotel as the Assistant Front Office Manager (AFOM). In this position, I gained intimate knowledge on the meso-to-micro innerworkings of Hotel. I gained professional and personal connections that I have maintained and fostered since starting graduate school. In the summer in between my first and second years in the master’s program, I returned to the Hotel to work full time at the front desk, reinvigorating relationships and rebuilding trust.

I discontinued my employment at the Hotel at the end of summer to fully dedicate myself to learning and teaching within the academic setting, transitioning my relation to the participants from colleague to researcher-student. My previous experience as a peer allowed for heightened access to interviewees and pre-established trust allowed for comfortable communication where probing questions were welcomed. I balanced the space between trusted confidant and

professional researcher, which was beneficial in data collection. Biases were reduced in the analysis by using memos and reflexive coding. All interviews were recorded and transcribed for accuracy, avoiding any immediate subjective deciphering. These processes are discussed in more detail below.

Participants

Participants in this study included twelve (out of approximately twenty-five) current employees who have been steadily employed (part-time or full-time) with the organization since at least July of 2015, including both management (n=4) and line-level employees (n=8) spanning most departments. This sample population was targeted as they have experienced the multifaceted changes that have occurred rapidly in the last two [plus] years, best representing consistent exposure to multifaceted change. The participants included both men (n=4) and women (n=8) ranging between the ages of 21 and 53. I interviewed persons from a variety of departments and hierarchical levels to best capture resilience and resistance within organizational change across power and task-related structures. The interviewees included line-level employees, lower management (supervisors), and middle management (assistant managers and department heads) from the following departments: restaurant (n=2), banquets (n=2), sales (n=1), front desk (n=2), reservations (n=1), engineering (n=1), accounting (n=2), and human resources (n=1).

Recruitment. After gaining IRB approval, I contacted participants to arrange the interviews. Due to my previous history with the organization, I recruited participants by visiting the organization and requesting participation informally, in-person. For many participants, I already had their contact information (cell phone number, personal email address, social media messaging) and I requested organization members to provide my contact information to anyone who would qualify and be interested in the research. The semi-structured recruitment script is

attached, including information about privacy protection and consent per IRB (see Appendix A). I was the primary contact, providing my personal cell phone as well as my professional university-affiliated email address. I used pseudonyms throughout this thesis and removed any identifiable details in the interview transcripts to ensure confidentiality. Once the participants agreed to the interview, they were provided a consent form (see Appendix B) and were advised of recording and data collecting procedures to ensure informed consent. To further protect confidentiality, only verbal consent was obtained, and the participants were given the option to keep the consent form for future reference.

Data Collection

Interview. With this study's pointed interest in discursive enactments of resilience and resistance, I conducted face-to-face, semi-structured interviews. In contrast to informant interviews where interviewees would be commenting on their observations and opinions of the organizational change, these participants were respondents—speaking to their own experiences, how they express these experiences, and how they construct conceptualizations of their experiences (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011).

Stemming from the phenomenological tradition, respondents offer their unique positionality to their construction and enactment of communicative strategies. Aligning with Lazarsfeld's (1944) expressed goals of these open-ended interviews, I worked to (a) clarify meanings, (b) single-out the decisive aspects of an opinion/perspective, (c) determine influences on the opinion/perspective, (d) classify complex attitude patterns, and, (e) discover motivations behind these conceptualizations. For example, when a participant would bring up a frustration concerning the renovation, I asked several probing questions to delve deeper into where their struggle was rooted, which revealed their aggravations not only with the dust and noise, but

additional dissatisfaction in how the renovation was managed, what aesthetic choices were made, how day-to-day challenges were communicated with them, how their voice was ignored despite previous construction experience, and ethical concerns surrounding their working conditions. Following Lazarsfeld's (1944) recommendations led to deeper insights with participant's attitudes, influences, and motivations.

Procedures. The twelve semi-structured interviews averaged 61 minutes with the shortest interview being 29 minutes and the longest 107 minutes (1 hour and 47 minutes), resulting in 730 minutes of interview material and 126 pages of single-spaced transcripts (an average of 10.5 pages per interview). The interviews were all face-to-face in a location of the participants' choosing, most often a coffee-shop. This was ideal as coffee shops are noted to "afford as much privacy as one's own home" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p.188). All interviews were audio-recorded and destroyed after transcription.

Interview protocol. The interviews were both structured and semi-structured using an interview protocol (See Appendix C). Following Lindlof and Taylor's (2011) recommendation, the more formal, structured interviews best fit respondent interviews to restrict the researcher's discursive influence on the respondent's answers. I emphasized consistency in my questions and language-use to more accurately interpret and characterize the subjective understandings within the data across the sample. The semi-structured questions allowed probing questions needed to understand the participants' experiences and how they discursively framed these reflections. This approach allowed me to collect the participants' stories while being structured enough to perform cross-comparisons to draw results from.

Data Analysis

Grounded theory. After the interviews were completed, I transcribed and masked the audio recordings, further immersing myself in the data. Throughout data collection and analysis, I applied grounded theory. Glaser & Strauss (1967) prescribe grounded theory as constructing analytic codes and categories from the data first instead of initially applying the theories previously discussed. Their introduction of grounded theory entails simultaneous involvement in data collection and analysis, which I used to make notes throughout data collection and enliven probing questions as data collection continued. This “constant comparative technique” involved making comparisons in the data during each stage of the analysis, to refine data collection and better engage and develop theory in relation to the research questions (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 1990) . Specifically, I used Charmaz's (2008) coding process, which (a) highlighted themes in connection to current resilience and resistance literature and (b) allowed emergent themes to come to the forefront. I used open and focused coding in addition to memo-writing techniques, further detailed below.

Procedures. Though there are many approaches to coding, Charmez (2006) recommends following the two primary phases: initial and focused coding. The initial coding is “an initial phase involving naming each word, line or segment of data” (p.46). This process allowed me to stick closely to the data, to interpret the information from the participants’ perspectives. Here I broadly viewed trends within their communication and created memos regarding insights and general categories of information (e.g. “future-oriented” or “past-experience”). For example, a line from the data was: “I’m really great at my job. I’m really clean, efficient, neat, and organized, and considerate, and all the things you need to be...” This was coded as “work identity” as this participant articulated her perceived value and contribution to the organization.

To stay true to the participants' experiences, I used in-vivo coding, creating codes from their own language to restrict biases of the researcher (see sample codes in Appendix D)

Once the initial categories were made, I followed them up with the focused coding process: "a focused, selective phase that uses the most significant or frequent initial codes to sort, synthesize, integrate, and organize large amounts of data" (Charmaz, 2008, p. 46). At this stage, I synthesized the data and explained larger segments, making analytic decisions on categorizing. Then, I created a chart (see Appendix D) by categorizing initial codes into "resilience," "resistance," "both," and "new/questions." I printed and cut this table into strips for each of the participants, so I could physically and visually reorganize based off the theoretic framework to allow findings to emerge. I then engaged in reflexive coding, engaging in conversations with my advisor, revisiting the literature, and rearticulating the data. As will be discussed further in the results chapter, "work identity" was present in numerous transcripts and frequently, so this coding translated to results.

Throughout the analysis, I conferred with my advisor regarding findings and insights to validate or challenge my initial understandings. I conducted informal membership checks of the findings both after some interviews and again during data analysis. I asked participants to provide feedback about whether my findings were authentic to their experience and if they had anything else to offer or clarify. The process of coding, categorizing, revising, and conferring (both with my advisor and the literature) while maintaining memos throughout the process served to refine data codes and to engage reflexively to relate findings and their meaning to previous literature. Only then could I attempt to understand and articulate the role of resistance in resilience within multifaceted organizational change.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The qualitative data collected through twelve interviews resulted in a complex data set that further develops theory and understandings of resilience and resistance enactments in an organization undergoing change. The purpose of this case study was to examine how employees managed their communication and behavior in a turbulent work environment through resilience and resistance. Furthermore, this research aimed to illuminate how resilience and resistance may inform one another within the organizational change context. The following chapter provides an overview of the results in connection with the previously noted research questions. To enliven the participants' voices and enhance understanding, I provide excerpts of the interview data to support the findings. All names provided in these examples are pseudonyms.

Employees' Resilience During Multifaceted Organizational Change

Within the scope of this case study, all twelve participants enacted at least one of Buzzanell's (2010) five processes of resilience. This section will detail out how participants performed resilience within the context of multifaceted organizational change with suggestions of complications and specificity within each resilience process. The following section is organized by the five processes: (a) crafting normalcy, (b) identity anchors, (c) communication and support networks, (d) emotion management, and (e) alternative logics.

Crafting normalcy. The participants crafted their own versions of normalcy during turbulent times in a variety of ways. Primarily, the respondents focused on their day-to-day work while attempting to provide exemplary service in a construction zone. They encountered noise, dust, and regular relocation of their workspace, which led to heightened stress for the employees in addition to increased complaints from the guests. To be resilient during these constant shifts and challenges, participants repeated tasks and expectations from previous non-turbulent work.

Natalie, a line-level worker, stated “I just kind of showed up, did my work, and got out on time” (Interview Eleven, pg. 7). Denise, another line-level employee, used phrases such as “focus on what’s at hand.” She elaborated, “I compartmentalize things, get the job done even if things are bugging me” (Interview Seven, p. 9). While explaining how she looked at these changes, especially during the renovation, Margaret noted, “while it’s happening it’s like, okay, I can do this” (Interview Seven, p.11). Michelle in particular was frustrated with the quality of the renovation. Though she voiced her opinion repeatedly about what would work best for her department and the physical set-up, her voice was ignored. When asked how she coped with not feeling heard, Michelle shared, “I mean, you just have to try and adapt to what you’re given honestly” (Interview Nine, pg. 4-5). She continued:

It’s just a matter of learning how to adapt to [the changes] and continuing on and there’s really not much more you can do about it. I mean, if you don’t like it that much, then you leave, and I haven’t left so I feel like I’m dealing with it as best as I can. (Interview Nine, p.5)

Here Michelle normalizes the drawbacks of the renovation and her communication treatment by accepting the workplace and its constraints on her. Framing this lack of autonomy or voice as normal allowed Michelle, and others, to be resilient by focusing on day-to-day operations or what was in their control (such as individual duties or the guest experience) as the shifting larger structure constrained their openness to embrace the changes fully. For Michelle, the new normal included accepting reduced agency and voice within the changes; having a new normal to accept current realities allowed her to recalibrate and move forward in this newly-understood structure.

Identity anchors. Participants also struggled with the high turnover in leadership, as the expectations for their work changed with differing visions from management. Buzzanell’s (2010) articulation of identity anchors included foregrounding a different identity anchor when one is threatened or redacted. These participants, however, altered from this articulation by holding

more tightly to their work identity. Seven of the participants negotiated the tension between the work identity and the changing shifts that complicate our understanding of “identity anchors” within organizational contexts, especially in relation to unclear role expectations.

Unclear role expectations primarily emerged as a past-present-future tension in relation to the multifaceted changes, especially with the profound loss of leadership. Middle-managers struggled with their role as a manager when they encountered high-turnover with both their subordinates and superiors while also navigating a new company culture, headed under a new general manager. Robert’s biggest frustration was a lack of vision or direction from the general manager about his and/or corporate’s leadership: “Let us know what you expect from us, what we should expect from you, from corporate, stuff like that” (Interview One, p.14). Other managers noted the stresses of learning the new corporate culture and then trying to instill that in their associates (Interview Six). Line-level employees noted how their work identity was stable and cherished before turbulent times, but changes in leadership forced negotiation of work identity with their new leaders, establishing boundaries with them (Interviews Two, Three, Eight, & Eleven).

Primarily with the corporate and leadership changes, identity, roles, *and* agency were continually renegotiated and reconstituted. One of the biggest challenges for management was the corporate shifting and adapting to new standard operating procedures (SOPs) and policies that required management to “check-in” with corporate more and obtain their approval for even day-to-day, regulatory operations such as ordering uniforms or giving staff evaluations. When comparing the previous management company to the new one, Robert shared, “...most of the departments think, you know, the old management was better... I think the [previous company] worked better since the manager could do whatever they want, you know” (Interview One, p.12).

Robert recognized that management lost autonomy as the expectations of his role shifted. Brian also expressed his frustrations: “I make the most money I have in my entire life, and I have the least amount of power in my entire life” (Interview Twelve, p.7). Many managers reacted to this increased control by leaving the organization, leading to a trickle-down effect to line-level employees needing to renegotiate their work identities with new leadership. Participants navigated unclear role expectations and work identity by holding tightly to identity anchors, which revealed three notable aspects: (a) organizational loyalty, (b) prioritizing work identity over other identities, and (c) general work ethic.

Organizational loyalty. Organizational loyalty resulted in a “buy-in” mentality. Those who identified strongly with the specific organization or the overall brand tended to see their work identity as an *investment* that would pay off. Kyle, a line-level employee, focused on the opportunity to be a “leader” during this time and focused on wanting “... a better working hotel in general” (Interview Three, p.4). When explaining why she did not pursue other employment opportunities, one manager emphasized her feeling that the company and employees *needed* her and illustrated her investment: “...at the end of the day, from what I tell myself is okay, you know what? I... trust that they’re doing this for a reason. I’m going to put faith in my employer. I agree with their overall culture and everything like that” (Interview Six, p. 9). Here, Julie’s loyalty extended to the organization and their vision. Another employee was more aligned with the Hotel chain, and when asked why she stayed with the organization, Denise responded, “I want to promote the brand!” (Interview 10, p.8). The brand is packaged as putting the guests first and ensuring they feel valued, cared for, and respected. Denise aligned herself with the brand identity, transcending the muddy organizational turmoil and rectifying her identity anchor as

being attached to the brand instead of the organization. This component of organizational loyalty also leads to costs associated with prioritizing work identity over other identities.

Prioritizing work identity. Four of the participants clearly and consciously prioritized their work identity over other identities during the multifaceted change, resulting in a heroic narrative situated in sacrifice. These employees enhanced the meaning and resonance of *struggle* when emphasizing the time and energy the organization pulled from their personal time, otherwise used for socializing or family. Some noted missing family functions or overall “family time” (Interview Six, pg.11). Angela, a line-level worker, revealed her struggles with the corporate office changing incentive programs and management not being forthcoming about impending changes. When asked about her reaction to the changes, she explained how she took these slights personally and strongly stated, “...I have a passion for the fucking¹ hotel because I worked there at a different time and had a passion for the hotel because it’s my time away from my family” (Interview Four, p. 6). Although Angela certainly accrued more stress in conceding time from her family, she also highlights that—due her personal contributions and sacrifice—she became even more invested in the Hotel. Since she had already given so much, Angela maintained resilience as her prioritizing work identity needed to be meaningful to justify how much she devoted to an organization that (at that moment) was not reciprocating as the Hotel revoked incentive pay and expected flexibility in the renovation and leadership changes.

General “work ethic.” The final subcategory for identity anchors includes those who associated themselves with a generally commendable work ethic. These participants highlighted their positive qualities and contributions to the company as a way of detailing their naturally virtuous and resilient nature. As discussed in the literature, resilience can be something acquired

¹ The researcher purposefully kept strong language within the quotes to exhibit authenticity in presenting participants’ experiences and articulations.

during times of crisis, but also as an innate quality that one simply possesses (Rajan-Rankin, 2014; Strumpfer, 2003). This subtheme foregrounded the *innate* qualities of resilience within these participants' work identities. Manager-participants foregrounded just the "type of manager" they are as being comprised of a strong "work ethic" (Interview Nine, p.6). In response to coping strategies, some line-level employees pulled on qualities they possess such as being "dedicated or "hardworking" (Interview Five, p.11) or having a "friendly, positive personality" and "integrity" (Interview Seven, p.5). In fact, the data revealed that the four managers *only* communicatively performed resilience, and discursively navigated away from resistance.² When discussing struggle or sites of change, Julie shared:

The biggest thing for upper management here was, I think that [the new management company] is so involved. And you know for me I don't mind that, you know, I mean I've found so many times where I've gotten the opportunity to learn more and to change certain things that I do because you know [corporate member] is so like willing to help. And willing to talk and willing to say "okay, well why did you do that?" and then I can answer why and then she'll be like "okay, I understand that but if you did this, you know, this could be a better outcome." You know, it was a lot of really learning from someone whose had years and years of experience, you know, in the company. (Interview Two, p.2)

This excerpt highlights how management might be more resilient and trained in foregrounding the positive of a situation or performing resilience discursively. As the quote demonstrates, Julia foregrounded her superior's general work ethic and aligned her identity with values such as "willing[ness] to help," open communication, decorum, dedication, and upward mobility. These values were represented in her communication with corporate, her internalization of the communication, and the vision of the company's values—all representing the rewards of a generally commendable work ethic.

² Explored further in the discussion section, managers may have only exhibited resilience due to (a) their training as a manager, (b) their innate qualities that led them to management, or (c) the agency they are afforded within the organization allows them to make changes *with* instead of *against* the organization.

Julie also noted the opportunity to “change certain things,” which may indicate that questioning or challenging a system [resistance] may be considered “creative problem-solving” [resilience, alternative logics] when the organizational member is afforded the agency to make changes to the system. The next chapter will further explore potential implications for this finding.

Participants who held tightly to their work identities would react negatively if management or coworkers did not acknowledge (Interview Four) or respect the investment in maintaining this identity in turbulent times (Interviews Four, Seven, Nine, Ten). For example, after explaining how she navigated some ambiguous situations, Denise said, “It’s my job to do the best I can under any circumstance or in the circumstance I’m in. If I’m doubted about that, I’m offended” (Interview Ten, p. 5). This quote illustrates the shift from crafting normalcy through articulating her daily tasks, to her work identity as being deeply personal and something she expects to have autonomy and trust in performing. Denise additionally explained, “...I don’t say quit because to me that’s quitting. I mean quit is not just quitting your job. Quitting is quitting on yourself and your principles and I don’t believe in that” (Interview 10, p. 6). The participants who primarily used their work-identity anchors to maintain resilience did not frequently utilize a communication or support network (Interviews Three, Seven, & Ten).

Communication and support networks. Many of the participants relied on communication and support networks both in and out of the workplace. Externally (outside of the workplace), personal networks such as family and/or friends were utilized to take a break from the turbulent workplace (Interview Three, Seven, & Ten). Internally (inside the workplace), the support network with colleagues fulfilled the need to be understood and share mutual investment in the workplace (Interview Two, Four, & Eleven). The new management company

changed policies, incentives, and standard operating procedures (SOPs) on how to perform certain work and to what standard. These employees were affected financially by the loss of incentives and were impacted emotionally by the shifting expectations and prescriptions of how to perform once-stable and familiar work. Line-level and management participants approached internal support networks differently.

Line-level internal networks. Four of the eight line-level participants noted that they “wanted a team” during this time and did not feel the Hotel was operating as such (Interview Four, Seven, Ten & Eleven). Another four employees had more “traditional,” smaller support networks internally that assisted them in making sense of ambiguous information or situations and additionally provided overall emotional support (Interviews Two, Five, Eleven, and Twelve). Andrew explained, “...in our immediate department, we...lost our leaders. And so, we grew closer than we ever had been before. And we were always there for each other. If we weren’t on a shift, our phones were always available...” (Interview Two, p. 4). For Andrew, the lack of leadership forced the department to rely on one another as teammates, which developed into more personal ties. They went above and beyond to ensure their coworkers were prepared to handle the next work shift, encouraged contacting each other outside of work if anything came up, and considered each other first (not calling in sick, not allowing other departments to overutilize their department, etc.). Natalie also conveyed the emotional resonance of her support network, “...all the people there that I love are what made that job... what made that job bearable when I hated it...” (Interview Eleven, p. 6). For both Andrew and Natalie, their close connection with and loyalty to their coworkers motivated them to maintain resilience by being there for each other when they could not rely on the organization. These quotes detail how the internal network became so vital for some of these employees to maintain their resilience.

Managerial internal networks. Most of the interviewed managers viewed support networks as what support they received from their superiors (Interviews Five, Six, Eight, and Nine). Other interviewed managers focus on creating and fostering the communication and support networks needed to nurture resilience within their subordinates (Interviews One & Six). One manager, Robert, noted, “I mean we shared our thoughts with our regular employees but not with our manager because it was mostly... most of them quit” (Interview One, p.11). During changes in upper management, this manager explained his reliance on his team as being a more stable source of networking. Another manager, Julie, expressed early in the interview, “I think the biggest challenge for me was the communication with the other associates that were struggling during the renovation and making sure that they felt comfortable coming and talking to me...” (Interview Six, p.1-2). As managers were expected to create this network within their department, they were unclear as to if this network served them to also be resilient or if this construction was inauthentic. Interwoven with other processes of resilience, all the participants reframed their experience through foregrounding the positive and backgrounding the negative aspects of the multifaceted changes.

Emotion management. The physical, leadership, and company shifts left many employees struggling with how to perform their work while managing their emotions. Five of the participants primarily performed foregrounding positivity by reframing struggle as having a silver lining (Interviews Two, Six, Seven, Eight, & Ten). The participants frame challenges as “opportunity,” “experience,” “learning,” or as a “refreshing” new start (Interview Six, p.2). Additionally, some would focus on the guest and their experience in the moment and broaden to reflect on their overall status within the organization as a “good ride” or a “good career” (Interview Seven, p.8). Participants explicit about backgrounding negativity noted that they

needed to “suppress” or “push aside” their frustrations for the sake of the guest (if on the customer service side) or for their own mental emotional well-being (Interviews Seven, p.6). When asked how she stayed resilient, one participant explicitly shared, “I just buried the feelings that I had” (Interview Four, p.5). The participants who foregrounded positivity throughout would focus on the “big picture” and emphasize how their current situation has vastly improved from the crux of the multifaceted organizational change that was months before interviewing. In relation to foregrounding positive as a resilience process, two salient subthemes surrounding *experience* emerged from the case study: (a) situating challenges in relation to past-experience and (b) viewing this experience as valuable for their future and career.

Situating in past-experience. Participants regularly situated challenge or turmoil in relation to a negative, previous experience. They reframed their struggle by pulling on the narrative “it could always be worse” (Interviews Two, Three, Five, Seven, Nine, Ten, and Twelve). By contrasting their current experiences against more pronounced hardship, these participants were able to foreground positivity during the longer, multifaceted changes. For Robert, “...you know I’ve been through a lot through this hotel. I did see a lot of accidents in this hotel, so I’ve been like... I’ve had tougher times here than this” (Interview One, p.9). Robert then provided details about suicides, human trafficking, and general violence in the Hotel as crisis situations that were relatively worse than the turbulence of multifaceted change. In this vein, Kyle contrasted experiences to another suicide and a “bar fight” that broke out in the restaurant. Crystal told a story of the bride who came to the Hotel for her wedding with no forewarning that the Hotel was under heavy construction for the renovation. These participants were able to be resilient by situating current struggles in contrast with grander, more memorable instances that

make the long-term, multifaceted changes pale in comparison. These reframing techniques served to reimagine their current struggle as positive.

Future-orientation. Participants who related their situation to past-experience also saw current struggles as positive work experience to advance their careers. Kyle shared, "...I just kind of took it in and I was like you know maybe this will help me grow one day, and it has. It has helped me grow. Now, I'm definitely a lot more leader-ish...*laughs*" (Interview Three, p.4). Here, Kyle is illustrating how the difficult challenges are providing him with experience and skills to grow in his career. During particularly rough times, Kyle also shared that he would remind himself: "...this isn't going to be the first time it's going to happen. Like, this is isn't going to be the last time ... and so you know just get yourself prepared for the next time it'll happen" (Interview Three, p. 4). In this example, Kyle viewed challenges as a learning tool to recalibrate his perspective on the situation and be resilient during and after struggle by recognizing its value for future situations.

A manager, Brian, saw his current struggles as a necessary experience for "the next step in [his] evolution" (Interview Twelve, p.1). Angela was also explicit about these challenges in relation to her future career-goals:

I feel kind of resilient now. I mean, I survived this. I survived this and moved into a situation that I feel like now I'm going to move up in, and I'm going to be a badass at it one day. (Interview Four, p.5)

For Angela, this "survival" included the emotional resilience and tactical knowledge to gain the confidence and navigation possible to move forward with her career at this organization. This quote highlights the "buy-in" mentality that she had already given X-amount to the company and expected some type of return on her investment. Simultaneously, Angela is exemplifying her new-found strength and her second-wind of resilience while looking towards a fruitful and

hopeful career. When foregrounding positive emotions was not enough, some employees enacted alternative logics to navigate ambiguous situations.

Alternative logics. As a reminder, alternative logics are creatively navigating or superseding the structure to move forward from an ambiguous or difficult situation. As we will explore further with the third research question, alternative logics intersect with resistance when considering if a communicative act is a creative pathway (when permissible) or insubordinate (when not given the authority to make changes). Additionally, it is difficult to consider the middle area of a line-level individual who has a fair amount of autonomy/control in their own work; when are their actions against the system viewed as creative versus resistant? Let us first consider the clear connections to alternative logics as a resilient process.

Andrew and his team used alternative logics to navigate ambiguous situations when they lost their leadership and were left in difficult situations without prescribed direction. He stated:

In a way, we became supervisors of the construction so that we weren't getting...screwed over. Specific leaders of the construction group were happy with that, and they worked with us really well. So, we knew what was happening. We helped them out, they helped us out... and it did eventually get better. It was the beginning and the middle of the renovation that was... pretty ... bad *laughs*. (Interview Two, p.5)

Here, Andrew identified how his team worked outside of the typical framework during the renovation to be in contact and communication with the construction crew directly. This was a creative avenue that transcended typical protocol, so he and his team could be more resilient in coping with the daily challenges that accompany renovation and bettered the system overall. In a different example, Crystal used technical loop-holes at her disposal to make her daily work-life more bearable. When asked how she stayed resilient, Crystal replied:

So, for like training I sometimes would try to push it on somebody else because I've trained so many people... which is not the best. With the parking, I was more likely to waive it, especially during the renovation. Like, I'm not charging for parking if they have to stay during the renovation... and, if you're gonna waive it then they're gonna come

back...it's more just reading the customer, just reading the situations. (Interview Eight, p. 5-6)

Pushing off training responsibilities and waiving fees could be resistive to the structure as it undermines the expectations for that position. However, Crystal viewed this as transcending the structure to cope with the already difficult challenges the multifaceted change presented. Instead of incurring the stress to train others or to get into a potential argument with already-frustrated guests, she elected to relieve herself of that burden to make that workday—or that moment—more bearable. Though all interviewed participants shared multiple resilience processes, they also shared resistive acts during this turbulent time.

Employees' Resistance During Multifaceted Organizational Change

Within the scope of this case study, resistance was primarily found in the eight line-level associates as the four managerial participants showcased their resilience. Of Mumby's (2017) four types of resistance [individual infrapolitics, insubordination, collective infrapolitics, and insurrection], all but insurrection was present.³ This section will detail out how these three types of resistance were enacted within the context of multifaceted organizational change by line-level employees.

Individual infrapolitics. All the eight line-level associates used individual infrapolitics, and these hidden transcripts bled into either collective infrapolitics or insubordination. As a reminder, individual infrapolitics are hidden and individual resistant communicative behaviors that are “low-profile” and can include gossip, rumor, feigned ignorance, and idle threats (Murphy, 1998). Within the data set, individual infrapolitics were highlighted in three ways: (a) verbal, (b) “minimum,” and (c) manipulation.

³ Further explored in the discussion section, this finding is consistent with Mumby and colleagues' (2017) argument that Post-Fordism work is less likely to come with overt, collective forms of resistance as our work lives become more personal and autonomous.

Verbal. Six participants enacted verbal resistance through complaining, gossiping, and “venting” (Interviews Three, Four, Five, Seven, Eight, & Eleven). Additionally, some participants elaborated on “bitching” or engaging in rumors (Interviews Four & Eleven). For example, when speaking about supervisors, Margaret shared, “I’m really kind of flabbergasted that these people are in charge of anything because they can’t even take care of themselves let alone ...*laughs*... anybody else” (Interview Seven, p.5). Margaret’s words highlight elements of complaining or gossiping as well as engaging in rumors; she shared that these conversations were not uncommon among trusted coworkers. Interestingly, nicknames were employed both for managers and for guests. About a manager, Kristin shared, “We just called somebody the Queen Bee because they acted like it. When he first came I was like oh the Queen Bee is coming down the hallway everybody!” (Interview Five, p.13). This nickname was an insult to the subject’s portrayed status by using a gendered, alpha-term. Kristin went on to explain that this manager demanded respect and control since he began employment with the company. Kyle also noted that he would use nicknames for “really naughty or interesting guests” (Interview 3, p. 6). Although this may not seem directly resistive to the power structure, the organization expects for guests to be valued, cared for, and respected; using subversive nicknames for guests may indirectly challenge the corporate culture. Aside from verbal infrapolitics, some participants also engaged in doing only the “minimum” of their job.

“Minimum.” In recognizing that struggle is comprised of resistance and control, participants who did not have the flexibility or availability to find other employment needed to be strategic in how they carved their own agency to push against the structures of the organization. For Angela, that meant deliberately doing the “minimum” to keep her job. In her words:

I just fucking went from being an awesome employee to being a mediocre average employee and doing just the minimum of my job and not going above and beyond and fucking bitching about it behind everybody's back. And I was pissed off. (Interview Four, p.5)

Angela's form of individual infrapolitics shows her intention to be resistive. By only performing the minimum of her job, Angela and other participants were retaliating against the structure that caused struggle and difficulty in their work-life (Interviews Three, Four, & Eight). Other participants argued that the organization did not invest in them or care about them as members of the organization, leading to a bad attitude or foot-dragging as their way returning the sentiment (Interviews Three & Five). Another employee took to manipulating management to reestablish her own agency.

Manipulation. Manipulation could be interpreted as individual infrapolitics or as insubordination. In this specific case, the participant shared her manipulation as something hidden and private that no one else realized its occurrence, especially the managers who are being manipulated. As Denise explained,

As long as people think they're in charge, but I know I'm in charge? It's a win-win for both of us because I care about you. So, I'll let you think you're in charge and you think I'm going to let you decide. You've chosen the option [for the renovation] that you want. That you decided this option, even though I gave you that option. I'm good...I don't say no ever. I just give you three options. (Interview Ten, p.9)

In context, Denise told her manager that he had three options of what to do in her workspace during renovation that would benefit herself and the guests. She gave three options knowing that two were unrealistic and framing the final one that she wanted as doable and ideal. Denise was strategic in her communication to manipulate her manager, and he (aligned with her prediction) chose her ideal option. This "hidden transcript" was blatantly intended to be resistive and was successful to give control to the line-level employee without the structure approving or even being aware. Although Denise exhibited the only overt case of manipulation, this finding

implicates complex ways employees may enact resistance. As previously noted, individual infrapolitics can also lead to collective infrapolitics.

Collective infrapolitics. Verbal, hidden transcripts are often collective as well as individual, as it involves others in the resistive conversation. The resistance lies then in either intent [blatantly pushing against the power structure] or in outcome [when change effectively occurs due to this collective nature]. In this, collective infrapolitics mirrored the individual with results of “bitching,” gossiping, and complaining to others regularly and at-length (Interviews Three, Four, Five, Ten & Eleven). Natalie explained, “...there’s a lot of shit-talking and bitching, but it was... I mean there just wasn’t anything to be done. There was nothing we could do about it” (Interview Eleven, p.5). In this example, the verbal, collective resistance was more-or-less a last resort—the employees were depleted and frustrated by the changes and simply did not know where else to go other than through their support networks in a resistive way. These networks and routines lead to deeper gossip and frustration. As Angela expressed,

Definitely a lot of venting but because I was the first one to realize a lot of this stuff was happening and... People were saying hey did you hear this did you hear that... and I’m like I don’t know...and then I would find out something and it’s like fuck. (Interview Four, p.4)

Angela’s words highlight now the collective infrapolitics network created stability during the turbulence while contributing to the contagion effect of spreading resistive attitudes—a finding that will be further explored with the third research question results. The previously mentioned nicknames [for managers and guests] were also shared and supported within collectives (Interviews Three, Four, Five, & Eleven). Some participants also formed small in-groups that would serve as pockets of collective infrapolitics in their communication and behaviors. For example, some employees would have a “ritual” of marking the calendar whenever a specific manager “got sick” (Interview Eleven, p.7). This act of monitoring a superior indicated a

disconnect between management and line-level employees in terms of respect, leading to behaviors and conversations that challenged the power structures and the people representing the structure. The individual and collective infrapolitics, in some cases, led to insubordination.

Insubordination. Insubordination was a frequent finding among the line-level participants. The results regarding insubordination in this case study can be subcategorized into two themes: (a) non-adherence to the structure, and (b) overtly challenging the structure.

Non-adherence. Participants who were insubordinate acknowledged the tasks or responsibilities they were assigned and purposefully refused to perform certain duties. Some noted not training other associated or trying to “push it on somebody else” (Interview Eight, p.4, Interview 4). Others refused to wear more formal parts of their uniform, like a blazer or tie (Interview Three); This resistance led to change and presently no employee is required to wear a tie (Interviews Three & Seven). Some participants did not follow certain policies on where to eat their lunch on break (Interviews Three & Eight). Kyle also expressed not engaging in regular, online training and shared: “I would bring down the score [in the department] so eventually she just kicked me off [that training system] and ended my membership” (Interview Three, p. 7). Again, not performing those tasks led to the individual not being responsible for them any longer so his tracking percentage did not interfere with the success of the department. Other participants noted a lack of incentive to charge people for certain things.

Due to the stresses of the changes, especially the renovation, line-level employees accrued significant challenges not only in their workspace but also with guest-related interactions. As customers were also frustrated with the dust, noise, and changes in their short visits during the renovation, their irritations fell on those they had face-to-face contact with—the line-level employees. In response to these struggles, line-level participants operated against the

system and outside the organization's interests by consistently giving away free items and options. Some would waive seemingly "additional" fees such as parking, upgrades, and early arrival or departure fees (Interviews Three, Four, & Eight) and would refund guest rooms or give the guests free food or beverages (Interviews Four & Eleven). In the interview with Angela, we discussed all the changes and her frustrations. When asked how she showed support or disapproval with the changes, Angela shared:

I stopped doing anything extra.... I never charged anybody for anything unless I had a manager standing there watching me. I literally gave everybody anything free I could. I'm not going to waste my fucking time bullshitting people to get money for something when like you guys just cut my fucking paycheck. So yeah, they lost a lot of revenue. There's no way they did not lose a lot of money... from me. Just from me. (Interview 4, p.4)

As this quote highlights, giving away free items was not simply dealing with the day-to-day struggles of multifaceted change. This was blatant resistance to the power structure—the new management company—that took away incentives that helped some line-level employees support their families financially. Angela recognized her own agency in hurting the organization by minimizing the revenue she was contributing. This excerpt also illustrates how non-adherence can transform into challenging systems and structures.

Challenging. While line-level employees experienced multifaceted change, many of the participants disagreed with and challenged the changing and existing structures that imposed on them. Natalie, for example, "resented" her coworker's direct manager, and she expressed her insubordination directly: "... I just got to be like outright bitchy towards her ... I'm not going to lie... I was like supper catty...and every time I was just like, this is fun" (Interview Eleven, p.6). That manager left shortly after this insubordinate phase began, and Natalie did not incur costs associated with this behavior. Another participant demanded communication from their manager

when they did not feel respected or heard (Interview Seven & Ten). Some employees navigated this tension by challenging the system network.

Crystal, another line-level employee, also “really didn’t like” one of the managers and challenged the hierarchy by going around the manager and speaking to corporate directly. Crystal noted that she “avoids” this manager because the manager “wasn’t doing her job” (Interview Eight, p.6). During the renovation, some employees were concerned the Hotel was not following legal procedures for adequate working conditions. Though many participants cited this struggle, one interview revealed an employee who went above the managers and corporate to call the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) directly to prompt a surprise inspection. OSHA still gave the Hotel warning of their arrival, so the Hotel worked to get “up to code” before the inspection (Interview Four). Though this resistance did not result in the organization incurring legal repercussions, that communication incited more manageable working conditions for the organization’s members. In another example of challenging the chain of command, one interviewee directly challenged the corporate office for how they were managing the changes by “flat-out asking them” how long they were going to be operating within a specific grey area (Interview Eleven, p. 5).

Another interview revealed an employee who was upset about the quality of coworkers’ work and the disparity between standards held in other departments. She challenged the structure by ignoring the official protocol for filing complaints and sent an email to the entire Hotel berating the anonymous individual for an unprofessional job, accompanied with a photo of the poor work. The employee who sent the email was marked down on their next evaluation due to the backlash from others claiming, “lack of professionalism.” Though the direct manager and general manager supported the employee’s attention to detail and concern for the organization,

this communication protocol transgression ultimately restricted the employee's raise, affecting them financially.

Denise, who was noted earlier to engage in individual infrapolitics through manipulation, also performed strategic insubordination. Denise would give unsolicited advice to her superiors while being careful about her discursive tactics. When confronting a new manager about undermining her work, Denise was strategic in inviting a human resources representative and another manager to join the conversation and record it. She began the conversation with the new manager by explaining, "This is how you *could* look at it. This is how I *think* you looked at it, and this is *how it was*." She recognized the risk involved in this communication because, as she describes, "I mean this is dicey, this is tricky. And then you can't have one manager's always going to back up the other manger because that's just what they do. I understand that" (Interview Ten, p.5). She explained how she drew on narratives of empathy and first explained her understanding of the manager's perspective, colored in the best terms, and then requested they do the same. In addition to this strategic communication, Denise noted "But will that person ever forget that conversation took place? No. Do I understand that? Yes. So, am I respectful of that? Yes. *Because it can still come back and bite me*" (Interview 10, p. 5, emphasis added). These quotes emphasize an awareness of the system and the politics involved in management [supporting each other] in addition to her position [always-present risk]. These complications are even more relevant when considering resistance in conjunction with resilience.

Resilience and Resistance Intersections During Multifaceted Organizational Change

Though resilience and resistance processes were identified within this rich data set, this case study further exhibits how resilience and resistance can inform one another during multifaceted organizational change. The following section will detail findings related to the third

research question. When analyzing the intersections between resilience and resistance in the data, three categories emerged: (a) strategic networking, (b) enacting alternative logic and identity work, and (c) emotion management.

Resilience and resistance intersection: Strategic networking. Internal networks are strategically crafted within the organization, and these support groups can lead to both collective infrapolitics and insubordination. The groups engage in collective infrapolitics as they complain, vent, and gossip to each other in resistive ways. The connections fostered in disclosing resistive emotions can lead to alliances and empower the confidence necessary to engage in insubordination.

Organizational members conceptualize their communication and support networks internally, distinct from Buzzanell's conceptualization of support networks. Structurally, organizational members are constrained in their networking and are *strategic* in forming relationships and trusting information to others, as "you wanna be on good terms with everybody" (Interview Two, p.8, Four & Eleven). In this, employees are careful in sharing resistive information to the "right person" (Interview Three, p. 4 & Interview Ten). Additionally, managers are expected to foster a communication and support network within their department and interdepartmentally within their employees (Interviews One, Six, Nine, & Twelve). These networks are built for support, then extend into modes of resistance.

Networks intertwine with both collective infrapolitics and insubordination in intriguing ways. With collective infrapolitics, the resistive act of gossiping, complaining, or "venting" is seen as a cathartic release or "relief" (Interviews One, p.12 & Three). Others reported being "less stressed out" after a "shared venting session" that is "beneficial" to those involved (Interview Nine, p.7). This perspective highlights the positive side of sharing resistive thoughts or struggles,

which work to unite and build up the support networks into a “little community” (Interview Five, p.11). The interview process also revealed emotion-management as participants would discursively reframe negative terms like complaining into something seemingly necessary like “venting.”

Collective infrapolitics also created some form of group identity. As Angela described, “I think we all very much cared about each other still even though we all talked behind each other’s backs. When push came to shove, we all had each other’s backs” (Interview Four, p.2). Although this group performed verbal resistance by speaking about one another in a seemingly counterproductive way, Angela described their bond as being like a family’s—even if you disagree, we all look out for each other and put each other first in the end. This distinctive bond may have been created, in part, by trust-building.

The collective infrapolitics lead to trust through self-disclosure. As Kristin noted, “...we gossip around the hotel—I’m not going to lie—but I think ... I only talk to people that I know are in the same zone, or they’re not going to repeat what I’m going to say” (Interview Five, p.14). Strategic Networking then also drives disclosure and trust-building among in-group members. Though collective infrapolitics informs support networks, these networks also have intersections with insubordination.

Insubordination can inform and be informed by communication and support networks. Verbal insubordination can force communication that can strengthen networks. Both Margaret and Denise shared experiences of confronting their boss about an issue of integrity; they did not feel their work or work identity was being valued and forced a conversation, holding *their superiors* accountable through a third party by inviting a Human Resources Representative to moderate and record the conversations. Both participants acknowledged the continued risk of

that communication but marked an increase of perceived respect from their superior and increased autonomy in their work (Interviews Seven & Ten). The example including the hotel-wide email also increased perception of support from their managers (Interview Four). Andrew viewed challenging superiors and communication as necessary both for the individual's sanity and just to force logistical communication that superiors may not be considering and may be open to. Andrew also described his perception on why many of the employees left during this turbulent time, indicated in this thesis' introductory quote. When asked if he saw these individuals being resistant before they left, he answered:

Not really. And I think that's what eventually broke them. Maybe if they did push back a little bit? It would have helped them keep their sanity. But, because they took on so much and so much was requested of and demanded of them that they... It broke them.
(Interview Two, p.8)

This quote illustrates how resilience and resistance may need to operate in tandem to explain some individuals' experiences. Creating boundaries and being moderately vocal may be a middle ground negotiated between these approaches. Though these are some potentially positive outcomes of insubordination, close networks may also lead to insubordinate behaviors.

One interview, in particular, revealed a close friendship between coworkers in different departments. They supported and vented to one another regularly, engaging in collective infrapolitics support network. Due to their relationship intimacy, Natalie would be protective and/or defensive of her friend and how she was treated at work:

Um, so she would leave Stacy all by herself all the fucking time which drove me fucking insane because she would be getting her ass kicked and she kind of had this attitude of oh, it's Stacy, she's fine... And there were times where I would go up and I would work with Stacy for like forty-five minutes. And then I would come into the back and her manager would be like oh, have you finished this for me yet? Like something I needed to do for her, and I'd just be like oh, I'm sorry I've been helping Stacy because she was swamped. And just throw shit in her face like that... That was way worse... For me to like watch her shit on Stacy. (Interview Eleven, p.6-7)

In this example, Natalie explains how her network drove her to be insubordinate and disrespectful to management. Though communication and support networks are vital to enacting resilience, these networks can also cause friction when work-related struggles become personal. Work becoming personal is an important aspect in studying how identity anchors weave through both resilience and resistance processes.

Resilience and resistance intersection: Alternative logics. The data set revealed interesting areas of intersection and overlap between alternative logics and resistance—both insubordination and individual infrapolitics. As noted earlier, alternative logics and insubordination can differ based off who is performing the communicative act and how much agency they are afforded within the power structure. For example, one manager expressed how she challenged policy changes from the corporate office and challenged rules, regulations, and SOPs regularly during this turbulent time (Interview 6). Though direct questioning and challenging of a structure would typically be considered insubordination, her level of access and accepted input regulated these behaviors instead into creative problem-solving. Conversely, line-level employees asking the same questions and challenging the same policies were either intentionally insubordinate or perceived to be insubordinate (Interviews Three, Four, Eight, Ten, and Eleven). To complicate matters further, a line-level employee did perform alternative logics instead of insubordination primarily because he was lacking direct leadership. As noted earlier, Andrew and his team ignored the communication hierarchy and used alternative logics to work directly with the renovation crew to avoid unnecessary burdens, despite his lack of legitimate power in managing either the renovation crew or his coworkers. However, although he was challenging the system structure and networking, his behavior was not perceived or acknowledged to be resistive as he was also creatively problem-solving due to the lack of

structured leadership (Interview Two). Though alternative logics and insubordination seem distinct, some communicative acts can be both.

As mentioned in previous results, some line-level employees broke some rules to cope throughout the changes, especially during the renovation. Some employees refused certain tasks, like training, wearing the uniform, or eating outside designated areas. Others gave away free options to guests regularly, like waiving fees, giving complimentary upgrades, or refunding room charges. In discretion, these are all insubordinate acts that work against the power structure that employs them. Simultaneously, the participants noted that although some acts were out of their frustration at the changes and overall organization (Interviews Four & Eleven), some acts were also meant to make the workday more bearable and functioned to alleviate some overload during a time of increased responsibility and challenges (Interviews Three, Four, Eight, & Eleven). Even when an employee circumnavigated the hierarchy to request a raise, she was insubordinate to purposefully ignore the proper channels but simultaneously being creative in her communication pathways to problem-solve when she did not have faith in the management (Interview Eight). Additionally, the data asks us to consider if an alternative logic is more likely to be considered insubordination if the alternative logic was unsuccessful.

A communicative act is considered resistance if it was either intended to be resistive or if it *resulted* in resistance. The concept of result implied that other parties perceived the act as resistance. Michelle, for example, shared a situation where she voiced concern to her superior about their inventory for guests. She made suggestions for changes to current inventory and what the organization should or could be offering for guests. At first glance, this would be considered alternative logics—being creative to supersede the current system. This could also simply be

logics—a more typical reframing of the current situation. Michelle shared how her supervisor reacted:

He reamed me for that one. He said that it was basically bullshit that I was texting him being so negative and I ruined his night and um that I needed to focus on the positives of the situation and I'm like I'm missing...what's positive about not having [this] product because now [the guests] don't want to be here, and that's a lot of business we're losing. (Interview Nine, p.3)

In this example, Michelle was attempting to change the system for the better of the organization and for the guests' benefit. She failed at attempting alternative logics due to how she communicated with her supervisor in timing, mode of communication, and word choice. Due to this failure in delivery, her supervisor responded to her communication as insubordination and applied dismissive and corrective counter-communication. In other interviews, line-level participants noted this type of response from management if managers encountered differing levels of complaining (Interviews Three, Four, Seven, & Eight). Alternative logics also parallel and overlap instances of individual infrapolitics.

Alternative logics and individual infrapolitics primarily intersected within work-identity contentions. When an employee felt their identity was not being acknowledged or respected, they carved their agency by maintaining autonomy and “doing [their] own thing” (Interview Ten, p.5). In a way, this self-proclaimed autonomy is hidden and individually resistive; these participants purposefully stayed “under the radar” (Interview Ten, p.5), resisting the structure and where the power is designed to reside within the organization. Simultaneously, this performance indicates a creative superseding of the structure to cope with the tenuous nature of new leadership and corporate expectations.

In another example, Margaret describes her manager: “...he busted into that property and was very demanding and rude and arrogant... it turned me off...he's been insulting to me a

couple times and those things, I don't forget" (Interview Seven, p. 4). She perceives her boss as treating her, "...like [change] is not my business and it is. You know. It is. *scoffs* It totally is" (p.4). When she was asked how she coped with these pressures and leadership changes, Margaret shared, "He is my boss...I can let a lot of things go ...because it's my survival...I do my job and at least with my job...I'm running my own little area and I have...my clientele, so it doesn't involve...other people" (p.4) Margaret's relationship with her superior illustrates how an employee who is resistive to the leadership can recognize the risks and need to maintain employment and operate outside of the system to cope with those specific challenges and pressures. Margaret resisted the power structure by avoiding her superior and focused on maintaining as much autonomy as she could. Although the organization is not designed for line-level employees to bypass their superiors, Margaret is creative by transcending the prescribed structure to enact resilience in multifaceted changes. Interestingly, when the organization lacks resilience structures, organizational members were more resistant.

Resilience and resistance intersection: Identity work. Identity negotiation revealed one of the ways that positivity was foregrounded during the communicative act of collective infrapolitics. While complaining and "bitching" to coworkers about the renovation and ownership changes, Brian realized, "I don't want to be that angry person. I don't want to be that negative person" (Interview Twelve, p.8). Kristin echoed, "I was calling people stupid, or an idiot, why am I dealing with a bunch of morons here...And I'm like woah... that's when you have to really take a step back, like hey, that's not you" (Interview Five, p.8). These quotes highlight how collective infrapolitics can simultaneously be an act of backgrounding the negative and foregrounding the positive when the individual can recognize those moments to reflect on their actions and intentions.

Bouts of new leadership prompted long-standing employees to renegotiate their work identity under a new system and style of control. During this time, some employees enacted resilience by holding onto their work identity as an anchor. These employees had relative autonomy in their positions and would compare current turbulence with an ideal past, situating their perceptions or struggles with the changes in the context of who they are as an employee (Interviews Seven & Ten). They would “focus on what is in [their] control” (Interview Ten, p.7). Most often in customer-facing roles, they would concentrate on the guest and provide a good experience (Interviews Four, Seven, Ten). Margaret found it difficult to work with her new manager because they “had a different vision” (Interview 7, p.6). She went onto to explain how she felt like a pawn or a commodity in the system, and shared, “I still look at the emotional. I think it’s kind of demeaning and again it’s an insult to my integrity” (p. 6). When asked how she stayed resilient, Margaret highlighted her agency and work identity simultaneously when explaining her focus on the guest-experience: “It’s what I can control. Even more than ever because *it’s my legacy*... I just... I wanna make a mark, you know” (p.6, emphasis added). This perspective highlights how resilience and resistance can overlap. By pushing against the prescribed power structure and carving her own agency from a differing leaders’ vision, Margaret, in fact, did enact resilience in her work-identity anchor. Another participant performed a similar approach without the same clear intention.

Michelle is a middle-manager who was also caught between shifting leadership while maintaining her network/staff. In her situation, she expressed the tension between her new leader and herself being centered around “my knowing a lot more about the job than him” (Interview Nine, p.2). Throughout the interview, she would resituate the conversation based off her work-identity as a middle-manager and her loyalty to her staff: “It’s always been a thing for me; I’m

not going to ask you to do anything I couldn't or wouldn't do" (p.3). The act of centering her work identity through the chaos led into even further tension with her superior as he viewed her approach as "acting busy" and he "was constantly telling me that I needed to slow down because I was stressing him out" (p.3). In Michelle's case, centering her resilience on her work identity led to *perceived*—not intended—insubordination. In general, management enacted resilience over resistance, distinct from the line-level employees.

Resilience and resistance intersection: Emotion management. This study found that emotions are managed differently between managers and line-level employees. Additionally, when emotions are not fostered to be resilient on the organizational level, there are resistive implications for the employees.

When considering how resilience and resistance processes inform one another, the data suggests that a lack of resilience processes within an organization can lead to resistance. All eight of the line-level participants noted their reasons for frustration or struggle were rooted in at least one of the five resilience processes being missing.

"Normal" was an independent variable in this case, as the multifaceted organizational change challenged the norms of daily work-life for the employees. These struggles rooted in shifting expectations from the managerial company and leadership changes, in addition to shifting "normal" physical spaces in where they were conducting business or facilitating day-to-day guest relations. Participants who attempted to craft normalcy through their previous experience with the organization were sometimes perceived to be challenging the evolution of the structure and power system. In this, continuing day-to-day operations to cope could be resistance to change.

Of the participants who tightly held onto their work identities to cope with the change, those who engaged in resistive acts noted missing acknowledgement or a misalignment between their work identities and the shifting expectations or perceptions from management (Interviews Two, Four, & Seven). Some even expressed a blatant disrespect or disregard from leaders regarding their work identities (Interviews Seven, Nine, and Ten). As the participants held tightly to their sense of self within this organization's context, they turned to resistance when management did not attend to respecting and acknowledging their expertise and identity anchors.

Directly related to the shifts in leadership, many participants reiterated a lack of clear communication or support network (Interviews One, Two, Three, Four, Seven, Nine, Ten, and Twelve). Those that engaged in collective infrapolitics cited substituting a desire to have a "team" on the organizational level with having a smaller in-group network fostered out of self-disclosure and trust as well as a safe space to air frustrations, complaints, and gossip (Interviews Four, Five, Ten & Eleven). Insubordinate individuals expressed specifically that their resistive actions were a direct result of not feeling support or heard (Interviews Two, Four, Seven, & Eleven).

As elaborated in the previous section, alternative logics can be confused or conflated with individual infrapolitics or insubordination. Depending on the individual's intent to be resistive (Interviews Three, Four, Eight, & Eleven), the interpretation of being insubordinate (Interview Nine), or the attempt to "do your own thing" (Interviews Seven & Ten), participants engaged in resistive acts as a means of coping with the ever-shifting structure. When the organization did not provide an alternative means to facilitate the changes in consideration with the employee's agency or previous sense of "normal," participants accidentally or purposefully resisted the (d)evolving changes through creative avenues.

Emotion management was achieved most often with those regularly foregrounded the positive, backgrounded the negative, and specifically looked towards the future of the organization and their careers, framing the multifaceted change as a learning or growing experience. Line-level participants performed this resilience processes discursively, but the data set presented this performance as primarily occurring at the end of the interviews. After sharing struggle, resilience, and resistance for (on average) an hour, line-level participants foregrounded the positive after the final question: “What else is important for me to know that we haven’t discussed yet?” As most of this emotion management occurred as a final impression, the implication is that emotion management can be a discursive *performance*—or face-saving tactic—rather than a regularly occurring resilience approach among line-level participants. If emotion management is not employed throughout the multifaceted change, the lack of this resilience process may further infer that the engaged communicative acts with coworkers may include more hidden transcripts or infrapolitics [gossiping, complaining, venting, bitching, etc.].

The relationship between resilience and resistance is not linear nor causal. The communicative processes and speech acts involved inform one another in rich, dynamic ways. Interestingly, one participant, Angela, noted the desire for her manager to be resistive and engage in infrapolitics as a symbol of solidarity. She explained that if her manager had also vented/complained/bitched about the changes and authentically acknowledged how it was negatively impacting the employees, she would have perceived that communication as support and would not have been as resistive/insubordinate. Angela elaborated:

I wouldn’t have been so angry. I would have felt better about the situation. I probably would have actually tried harder to keep my numbers up because I would have felt like yeah, she has my back...and I don’t want her to look bad because of what this company took away from everybody. But instead it just made me—her reaction to it—was like a “fuck you.” To me. And then I felt isolated. I did. And, if I could walk [in the back] and ever felt like I could just be like, “I’m so mad!” and had anybody above me expressed

that same frustration, I would have been able to go back [to work] and been fine. If I could have just let it out to somebody who I felt like heard me and had my back—not that they can do anything about it—but if I didn't feel like I had to pretend all the time, I would have been a completely different employee. 200%. (Interview Four, p.10)

In Angela's particular experience, a communication and support network that involved collective infrapolitics should also include managerial voices. So, while this data set exhibited how managers were primarily resilient, this excerpt illustrates that a tad of infrapolitics could positively impact line-level resilience.

In summary, the twelve interviews from this case study further explores how employees enact resilience and resistance during multifaceted organizational change. Regarding resilience, all five of Buzzanell's (2010) resilience processes were present while subthemes emerged. Under "Identity Anchors," this study revealed three subthemes—organizational loyalty, prioritizing work-identity, and work ethic. For "Communication and Support Networks," the data indicates that networks should be reconceptualized for organizational purposes. The participants more often noted networks associated internally with the organization. "Emotion management" also revealed specific subthemes in that organizational members foregrounded positive emotion through situating challenges in relation to past experiences and by focusing on the future, both in relation to the organization and their personal careers. Regarding resistance, three of the four types were present (individual infrapolitics, collective infrapolitics, and insubordination). Individual infrapolitics illustrated three unique subthemes: verbal, "minimum," and manipulation. The data revealed two subcategories for insubordination: non-adherence and challenging. In regard to the third research question—how resilience and resistance inform one another—three intriguing intersections emerged in relation to strategic networking, alternative logics and identity work, and emotion management. These findings have theoretical and practical implications, explored in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

This thesis began by citing research regarding resilience and resistance in relation to organizational change. Empirical research had yet to examine employees' application of resilience strategies during multifaceted organizational change. Although resistance has been applied in the change contexts, scholarship had yet to address how resilience and resistance may inform one another during change. This thesis contributed to the gaps in scholarship by using a case study approach within an organization that experienced change in company management, leadership, and physical changes in a renovation. Within the case study, twelve interviews were conducted with managers (n=4) and line-level employees (n=8) who maintained employment over the two years when the changes were most evident. The thesis explored the following questions: How do employees enact resilience processes during multifaceted change? How do they enact resistance processes during multifaceted change? And, how do resilience and resistance processes intersect and inform one another during multifaceted change?

Findings revealed complex, dynamic negotiations between what is considered resilient or resistant behaviors. The remainder of this chapter is organized as follows. First, I focus on the theoretical contributions from findings relating to resilience and resistance. Then, the practical contributions of this case study will be discussed. Finally, the chapter will conclude after acknowledging limitations of the study and proposing directions for future research.

Contributions to Resilience Theory

The findings contribute to existing research on resilience by nuancing how resilience strategies—(a) identity anchors, (b) networks, and (c) emotion-management—enact in the context of organizational change.

During turbulent times, some participants held more tightly to their work identity as their identity anchor. To sustain resilience, they tied their experiences to their work identity to make sense of their struggles in relation to the “I”—what “I” could do under these challenging circumstances. Work- “Identity Anchors” suggest this resilience process is even more interwoven with larger, cultural narratives regarding work in the United States. Buzzanell (2010) discusses identity anchors as an identity foregrounded when one is diminished or redacted. This research considers what effects identity anchors have when their work-identity is questioned and held onto more tightly as a resilience process, complicating scholarship’s perception of the role of identity anchors. Three related subthemes emerged: organizational loyalty, prioritizing work identity over other identities, and innate work ethic. Participants uniquely used their work-identity anchor to narrate their resilience through being loyal to the organization, needing to put work before family or personal, and simply ascribing themselves as diligent employees (“I’m not a quitter,” “dedicated,” “hard-working,” etc.). This foregrounding of work-identity additionally informed how they used networks.

Within the organizational context, communication and support networks were referenced internally—the networks they maintained within the organization. Aligned with Weick and colleagues (2005), communication networks were crafted within the organization to provide information-seeking and sensemaking support. These networks differed from Buzzanell’s (2010) articulation of networks, as the emergent theme of *strategic networking* became apparent. Participants were careful about who they confided in and sought-out for communication and/or support, with acknowledgement of hierarchy, indicating a more nuanced understanding of *constrained* networks’ effects on this resilience process. When networks are formed within the workplace, they are constrained by power structures and informed by trust, hierarchy-level, and

implications of their shared communication. Strategic networking shifts how this resilience process functions in an organizational context.

Additionally, “Emotion Management” was performed *temporally* in two specific ways in the organizational context: situating in past-experience and being future-oriented. When discussing challenges or struggles associated with the multifaceted changes, participants would foreground the positive by comparing the struggle to previous worst-case-scenarios. The “it could be worse” narratives revealed work experiences related to suicides, violence, prostitution, and human trafficking. By contrasting the longer-term, current challenges to acute, previous traumas, these employees were able to diminish the impact of the changes to remain resilient. Furthermore, participants would also equate current struggle with work experience, reframing their hardships as useful to their future careers or worth-while in the future of the organization. They articulated this experience as “opportunity” to “learn,” “grow,” and “keep moving forward.” These findings support previous research indicating that trust can be fostered with employees during multifaceted change through perceived future benefits of the changes (Lewis, 2007; Tucker et al., 2013). In this study, participants held onto both personal career benefits in addition to perceived benefit to their organization.

Furthermore, the data revealed that overwhelmingly, managers only communicatively performed resilience and discursively navigated away from resistance. There are three potential implications from this finding: 1) management is simply more resilient, 2) management is more adept at *performing* resilience, or 3) what could be regarded as resistance is instead deemed to be alternative logics. The first explanation denotes that management is expected to foster resilience in their team, so resilience is a learned skill that is enacted. Conversely, managers may possess resilient qualities that are more innate, which aided their career in becoming managers. The

second explanation acknowledges that managers are discursively savvy in how they frame struggle. Engaging in a recorded interview with a researcher formalizes their conversation and may have made them be careful in their word choice and framing. Additionally, this implication aligns with Whelan-Berry and colleagues (2003) in that managers act as representatives for the organization, especially during turbulent times. Lastly, resistance and alternative logics can be enacted similarly, and may differentiate, in part, based on *who* is performing the behavior.

Resistance is the questioning or challenging of the power structure or system. When a manager is a *part* of that system, challenging the structure could be interpreted as creatively superseding the structure, or—alternative logics. This implication further supports Lewis’s (2006) research on a participatory approach to organizational change; when voices are valued during change those employees engage in “buy-in” to support the change despite challenges. However, this participation is not afforded to all organizational members, indicated through resistance.

Contributions to Resistance Theory

This research sought to explore theoretical implications of using the dialectical approach to resistance in a multifaceted change context. When considering struggle as being comprised of control and resistance, this study demonstrated that different types or sites of power can relate to different sites of resistance performance. Participants who resisted corporate changes tended to perform non-adherence, where resistance to new leadership were performed in insubordination. This finding suggests that a dialectical approach to resistance fosters research that identifies relationships between resistance and control, which may lead to this theory being predicative.

The current study, in alignment with Mumby and colleagues (2017), also supported that insurrection may not be utilized in the workplace as often under Post-Fordism as it once was under Fordism. As discussed in Chapter Two, resistance literature acknowledges a shift in the

working landscape. Under Fordism, resistance was more often displayed through more collective, public displays like strikes and boycotts. Under Post-Fordism, work can be more individual, intimate, and a larger part of our identity structures (Mumby et al., 2017; see also Thornborrow & Brown, 2009; Trethewey, 1997; Watson, 2008); thus, resistance may be more individual and hidden process. Of course, strikes and boycotts are still relevant forms of resistance and protest today (note recent teacher strikes in Oklahoma, Kentucky, and West Virginia as of April 2018); however, the findings from this study indicate that more individual and hidden forms of resistance may also be increasingly pertinent in the workplace. Aligned with Mumby and colleagues' (2017) articulation of Post-Fordism work, this particular organization evidenced only three types of resistance: individual infrapolitics, insubordination, and collective infrapolitics—as resistance can be more frequently hidden and/or individual in nature.

Resistance is tied to organizational change specifically, understood in Whelan-Berry and colleagues' (2003) “change steps.” The change detailed in the case study did not exhibit “successful” organization change; at the organizational level, the Hotel motivated the change, but failed to create a cohesive vision through top-down leadership, leaving the employees to interpret and resist the vision both intentionally and unintentionally. This effected group-level communication, fostering collective infrapolitics in lieu of positive change language and support. On the individual level, employees struggled to “maintain” effective behaviors, as the change was multifaceted and lengthy. Without a clear vision and consistent leadership to enact positive change communication, individuals struggled to maintain the organizations' intended behaviors, resulting in resistance to change, power, and the obscure goals.

Lastly, this study complicated our understanding of resistance within hierarchies in relation to varying degrees of agency and control within the structure. Insubordination revealed

two subcategories in the multifaceted change context: (a) non-adherence to corporate change, and (b) challenging leadership change. Participants resisted change from the corporate management company through non-adherence—refusing to abide by certain policies or refusing to do certain work. They explicitly rejected some of the changes being implemented on the corporate level by refusing to change with the organization. Additionally, participants resisted change from new leaders by challenging their vision and authority. Through Mumby's (2005) dialectical approach to resistance and control, these findings illustrate that an organizational member's relationship to resistance and how they engage in resisting the structure must be recognized through the act's relationship to the site of power. The employees who engaged in non-adherence could have been influenced by perceived lack of contact or visibility to corporate. The employees who engaged in challenging leaders reacted to compounding frustrations and the availability of a leader, which led to impulsive resistance. More concretely, these themes indicate that multifaceted change in an organization can result in multifaceted resistance.

Contributions to the Intersection of Resilience and Resistance

The current study's primary theoretical contribution was to explore resilience and resistance scholarship to gain a more holistic and nuanced understanding of organization members' experiences during multifaceted change. This area of collaboration is fruitful for scholars to consider when approaching how resilience and resistance processes intersect, inform one another, and overlap. Three categories emerged: (a) strategic networking, (b) enacting alternative logic and identity work, and (c) emotion management.

Strategic networking. Communication and support networks are conflated with collective infrapolitics, as employees view resistive acts of venting, bitching, gossiping, etc. as acts of disclosure, which builds in-network trust. The resistive conversations also inform identity

negotiation and encourage reflection how individuals wish to behave in relation to multifaceted change. Resistive communication also informed in-group identity as an “in the trenches” mentality was constructed; they relied on one another and were “in it together.” Conversely, the deeper loyalties formed in-group led to insubordination in defense of the in-group members in addition to gaining confidence in resistive language that caused resistive behavior.

Alternative logic. Alternative logics can intersect or overlap with resistance, as challenging the structure can also be transcending the structure to maintain resilience. The connection between alternative logics and resistance is neither linear nor binary but must consider other mediating variables such as agency afforded by the structure, intention of the communicative act, and perception of the communicative act. This communicative act may be considered alternative logics based on who is performing the action and if they are already afforded agency in their position [e.g. manager] to question and make changes to the structure. Additionally, an insubordinate act intended to be resistive may in fact be an alternative logic, used maintain resilience while incurring a multitude of challenges.

Some resistive behavior can work to alleviate additional stress or burden during an already challenging time, acting as a resilient alternative logic. Some line-level employees refused to perform certain tasks like training others or enforcing fees to prevent additional challenges [responsibilities or resistance from customers] that could lead to over-burdening themselves. Perception of the act can also constitute it as insubordination instead of alternative logics. As Mumby and colleagues (2017) discuss, a communicative act is considered resistive when it is either intended to be resistance, or when it results in resistance. In this, an employee who attempts to apply alternative logics to transcend the structure, but *fails*, may have that communication interpreted as insubordination.

Identity work. Work-identity anchors an organization member's resilience, but the anchoring can cause further tension in relation to unclear role expectations, agency, and control. When an organization member held tightly to their work-identity, they were less adaptable to the changes, leading to intentional and/or perceived resistance to the new corporate structure and to individual leaders. This tension can be described as unclear role expectations, creating strain between the individual's perception of their role and work-identity and the shifting expectations from two sites of power within the structure. The data from this case study suggested that line-level employees encountered this tension changing leadership on-site as the new management carried differing visions. Existing managers encountered loss of agency with the new, more constraining corporate management company. To reconcile this tension, line-level employees would attempt to carve out more agency by crafting autonomy in their work, thus maintaining resilience by anchoring and sustaining their work-identity despite [at times, in opposition to] the shifting structure.

Emotion management. The final intersection between resilience and resistance revealed resistive employees who noted their site of struggle being rooted in a missing resilience process. Of the eight line-level associates, all of them revealed resistance in response to either their "normal" being disrupted, missing acknowledgment or alignment with their work identity, an organization communication or support network being absent, lacking direction in ambiguous changes, or the changes not being communicated [from management] or being spread through gossip [through the employees], making "foregrounding the positive" to be a discursive tool the many employees did not feel they had access to. When an organization does not provide the tools for individuals to be resilient, they may be more likely to resort to resistive behaviors during multifaceted organizational change.

Pragmatic Implications: Applied Theory

The organization used in this case study uniquely faced a multitude of large issues in a short span of time. The results from this study can better help employees make sense of their experiences and leaders to make effective changes that diminishes sites of frustration or struggle. Furthermore, this study provides insights that can assist the various organizations that are also incurring corporate and/or leadership changes.

First, this study highlights how organizations undergoing multifaceted change need to solidify communication and support networks outside of the hierarchical power relations. Especially when undergoing frequent leadership overturn, lacking a communication and support network outside of the prescribed department can lead to frustration, lack of loyalty, and resistance. Conversely, organizational leaders need to meet opposition with openness and readiness. Resistance is not always negative, and resistive acts are typically an indication of lacking resilient avenues within the organization. Leaders must actively invite a productive space for frustrated voices and identity negotiations. Most employees who resort to resistance do so because they care so much about their role within the organization and the future of the organization.

Leaders who are new to the organization or department must open conversation with the existing employees to understand what the team member perceives their job description and role within the organization to look like. One approach is treating this like a reverse-interview—allow the employee to run the conversation, share what is important to them, and have them ask questions of the leader to better understand the new leader's role and vision for the department or organization. The participants in this study indicated a profound desire to align their identity with the organization's vision and culture but lacked the communication and support to do so.

This study demonstrated that resilience must be fostered within the organization (not just the individual) and how resilience operates specifically in this context. Organization leaders and members can actively work to instill the five resilience processes in the workplace by negotiating what daily tasks, routines, or rituals are important to the employee and organization functioning (i.e., crafting normal). They can respect one another's identity priorities and allow space for negotiations when shifts in the culture occur (i.e., identity anchors). When ambiguity arises, members and leaders should have input from all interested members to work creatively as a team to navigate structural changes or barriers (i.e., alternative logics). Leaders also need to explain and discuss changes in a way that's both (a) doable and agreeable to the team, and (b) has relevant ties to what this change will do for the individual (emotion management). Because organization members most often foreground the positive in relation to the future of the organization or their careers, examples of "relevant ties" might be indicating how their work-life will improve in these three specific ways, or having this extra responsibility translating to "X" title or accomplishment on one's resume, or as a networking opportunity that relates to their larger career goals. Leaders need to understand and foster these resilience processes specifically within organizational contexts.

Limitations

Though this research advances two theoretical frameworks and provides practical suggestions for organizations, there are several notable limitations to this study.

First, approaching this research as a case study has inherent limitations. Though this methodological approach was necessary for depth and theory-building, these results are not generalizable with twelve total participants. The experiences captured in data collection are unique to multifaceted change at a hotel, which may not be representative of all organizations

that may not be used to similar challenges that the hotel industry has (note, the finding about comparing current struggles to stories of suicide, human trafficking, etc.). Despite this limitation, this research is still insightful for the multitude of U.S.-based organizations that experience shifts on the corporate level (bankruptcy, acquisitions, etc.) and see leadership-turnover as a result.

Second, my previous experience with the organization could have affected the data. Though methodical precautions were administered, it is still possible that my previous relationships with the organizational members affected the analysis. However, the access and honesty that occurred in data collection illustrated how a previous experience can increase interviewer-interviewee trust, leading to more authentic data with minimized hesitancy. Conversely, pre-established relations could have affected the finding of managers only exhibiting resilience. These managers could have discursively performed resilience throughout the interview despite the interviewer—but, they may have been more filtered in their communication if they viewed me as a future networking opportunity, meaning they would be more careful to be positive in their communication with me.

Directions for Future Research

This study proposed the use of resilience and resistance theories to be used jointly in future scholarship. The promising results from this case study indicate opportunities to confirm connections between these two theories in larger, qualitative studies in a variety of organizations.

This study demonstrated Buzzanell's (2010) five resilience processes may be able to work predictively in relation to resistance at the organizational level to possibly implement the processes as a checklist or a precursor to resistance. The data analysis revealed that all resistive participants noted their site of struggle being rooted in a missing or lacking resilience component that the organization did not provide or foster. This finding could inform on resilience theory's

praxis and implications for future utility. I propose future research explore this potential by developing a scale from the five processes and implement in an extended, quantitative context to test the validity of this hypothesis.

Future scholarship must explore the dynamic relationship of alternative logics and resistance further. This study presented questions of identity, agency, control, and power all in relation to these interacting processes. Tangentially, this research should explore if managers can be resistant. Due to my limitations as a researcher and the small sample size ($n=4$), more research needs to be conducted to confirm or challenge the finding that managers only discursively perform resilience. Additionally, more work needs to be done to tease out the implications of that performance. I suggest this work include managers who maintained employment in an organization undergoing significant change, but also include managers who sought other employment opportunities. In this additional sample population, this work can expand on notions of agency, identity anchors, and resistance.

Conclusion

When I began this project, I hoped to understand organization member's experiences more authentically and thought bridging two realms of engaging scholarship could illuminate tensions for future research. This exploratory work has proven even more fruitful than anticipated, begging future scholarship to attend to the increasingly changing and challenging intricacies of organizational life. This theoretical approach revealed poignant findings and subthemes previously unconsidered in these scholarships, which work to build theory to align scholarship with contemporary experiences to further inform how theory can improve organizational life.

The stories of the employees of this Hotel are distinct narratives on how they maintained their employment—and sanity—during turbulent times through both resilience and resistance processes. These organization members, like the millions of employees undergoing organizational change, seek to improve their organizational life through networking, identity work, and implementing strategy. Beyond challenging or reframing, these workers navigate their daily lives in intricate moments of resilience and resistance that comprise their organizational life, informing their sense of self and the bonds they sustain. Via continued research, these moments further develop resilience and resistance theory, and scholarship can then improve organizational members' work and personal lives.

REFERENCES

- Afifi, T. D. (2018). Individual/relational resilience. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46(1), 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2018.1426707>
- Agarwal, V., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2015). Communicative Reconstruction of Resilience Labor: Identity/Identification in Disaster-Relief Workers. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 43(4), 408–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2015.1083602>
- Agócs, C. (1997). Institutionalized Resistance to Organizational Change: Denial, Inaction and Repression. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(9), 917–931.
- Allagui, I. (2017). Towards organisational activism in the UAE: A case study approach. *Public Relations Review*, 43(1), 258–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.12.007>
- Allen, J., Jimmieson, N. L., Bordia, P., & Irmer, B. E. (2007). Uncertainty during Organizational Change: Managing Perceptions through Communication. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(2), 187–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010701563379>
- Alvesson, M., Lee Ashcraft, K., & Thomas, R. (2008). Identity Matters: Reflections on the Construction of Identity Scholarship in Organization Studies. *Organization*, 15(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508407084426>
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2001). Identity Regulation as Organizational Control: Producing the Appropriate Individual. *Institute of Economic Research (Working Paper Series)*.
- Anderson, J. A., & Englehardt, E. E. (2001). *The organizational self and ethical conduct: Sunlit virtue and shadowed resistance*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Ashcraft, K. L. (2005). Resistance Through Consent?: Occupational Identity, Organizational Form, and the Maintenance of Masculinity Among Commercial Airline Pilots.

- Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 67–90.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276560>
- Barnes, A. (2007). The construction of control: the physical environment and the development of resistance and accommodation within call centres. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 22(3), 246–259.
- Bonanno, G. A., Galea, S., Bucciarelli, A., & Vlahov, D. (2006). Psychological resilience after disaster: New York City in the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attack. *Psychological Science*, 17(3), 181–186.
- Bucy, M., Finlayson, A., Kelly, G., & Moye, C. (2016, May). The ‘how’ of transformation. Retrieved March 27, 2018, from <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/retail/our-insights/the-how-of-transformation>
- Buzzanell, P. M. (2010). Resilience: Talking, Resisting, and Imagining New Normalcies Into Being. *Journal of Communication*, 60(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01469.x>
- Buzzanell, P. M. (2018a). Communication Theory of Resilience: Enacting Adaptive-Transformative Processes when Families Experience Loss and Disruption. In D. Braithwaite, E. Suter, & K. Floyd (Eds.), *Engaging theories in family communication* (2nd ed., pp. 98–109). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Buzzanell, P. M. (2018b). Organizing resilience as adaptive-transformational tensions. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46(1), 14–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2018.1426711>
- Buzzanell, P. M., & Houston, J. B. (2018). Communication and resilience: multilevel applications and insights – A Journal of Applied Communication Research forum.

- Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46(1), 1–4.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2017.1412086>
- Buzzanell, P. M., & Turner, L. H. (2003). Emotion Work Revealed by Job Loss Discourse: Backgrounding-Foregrounding of Feelings, Construction of Normalcy, and (Re)instituting of Traditional Masculinities. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 31(1), 27–57.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Charmaz, K. (2008). Constructionism and the grounded theory method. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (Vol. 1, pp. 397–412). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Cheney, G., & Ashcraft, K. L. (2007). Considering “The Professional” in Communication Studies: Implications for Theory and Research Within and Beyond the Boundaries of Organizational Communication. *Communication Theory*, 17(2), 146–175.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00290.x>
- Chewning, L. V., Lai, C.-H., & Doerfel, M. L. (2013). Organizational resilience and using information and communication technologies to rebuild communication structures. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 27(2), 237–263.
- Cloud, D. L. (2005). Fighting Words: Labor and the Limits of Communication at Staley, 1993 to 1996. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18(4), 509–542.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318904273688>

- Conroy, S. A., & O’Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2014). Letting Go and Moving On: Work-Related Identity Loss and Recovery. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(1), 67–87.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0396>
- Conroy, S., Henle, C. A., Shore, L., & Stelman, S. (2017). Where there is light, there is dark: A review of the detrimental outcomes of high organizational identification: The Dark Side of Organizational Identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 184–203.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2164>
- Conroy, Samantha A., Becker, W. J., & Menges, J. I. (2017). The Meaning of My Feelings Depends on Who I Am: Work-Related Identifications Shape Emotion Effects in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3), 1071–1093.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.1040>
- Contu, A. (2008). Decaf Resistance: On Misbehavior, Cynicism, and Desire in Liberal Workplaces. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(3), 364–379.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907310941>
- Coombs, W. T. (2012). *Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing and Responding* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria. *Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie*, 19(6), 418–427.
- Courpasson, D. (2016). Impactful resistance: The persistence of recognition politics in the workplace. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 25(1), 96–100.
- Courpasson, D. (2017). The politics of everyday. *Organization Studies*, 38(6), 843–859.
- Cullen, K. L., Edwards, B. D., Casper, W. C., & Gue, K. R. (2014). Employees’ Adaptability and Perceptions of Change-Related Uncertainty: Implications for Perceived Organizational

- Support, Job Satisfaction, and Performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(2), 269–280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9312-y>
- Deetz, S. (2008). Resistance: Would Struggle by Any Other Name Be as Sweet? *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(3), 387–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907310943>
- DiFonzo, N., & Bordia, P. (1998). A tale of two corporations: Managing uncertainty during organizational change. *Human Resource Management (1986-1998)*, 37(3–4), 295.
- Dorrance Hall, E. (2016). The communicative process of resilience for marginalized family members. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 026540751668383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407516683838>
- Dumont, M., & Provost, M. A. (1999). Resilience in adolescents: Protective role of social support, coping strategies, self-esteem, and social activities on experience of stress and depression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 28(3), 343–363.
- Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51(3), 227–242.
- Fleming, P. (2005). Metaphors of Resistance. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276559>
- Fleming, P. (2014). When ‘life itself’ goes to work: Reviewing shifts in organizational life through the lens of biopower. *Human Relations*, 67(7), 875–901.
- Fleming, P. (2017). The human capital hoax: Work, debt and insecurity in the era of Uberization. *Organization Studies*, 38(5), 691–709.
- Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2008). Beyond Power and Resistance: New Approaches to Organizational Politics. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(3), 301–309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907309928>

- Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (1995). The Role of Conversations in Producing Intentional Change in Organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 541.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/258787>
- Ford, J. D., Ford, L. W., & D'Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to Change: The Rest of the Story. *The Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 362–377. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159402>
- Foucault, M. (1980). Volume 1: An introduction. In R. Hurley (Trans.), *History of Sexuality* (Vol. 1). New York: Vintage.
- Ganesh, S., Zoller, H., & Cheney, G. (2005). Transforming Resistance, Broadening Our Boundaries: Critical Organizational Communication Meets Globalization from Below. *Communication Monographs*, 72(2), 169–191.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750500111872>
- Gayton, S. D., & Lovell, G. P. (2012). Resilience in ambulance service paramedics and its relationships with well-being and general health. *Traumatology*, 18(1), 58–64.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1534765610396727>
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publications.
- Gravley, D., Richardson, B. K., & Allison Jr, J. M. (2015). Navigating the “Abyss” A Narrative Analysis of Whistle-Blowing, Retaliation, and Identity Within Texas Public School Systems. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 29(2), 171–197.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (2001). Anxiety, uncertainty, and perceived effectiveness of communication across relationships and cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(1), 55–71.

- Hallqvist, A., & Hydén, L.-C. (2013). Work transitions as told: a narrative approach to biographical learning. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 35(1), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2012.712037>
- Harding, N. H., Ford, J., & Lee, H. (2017). Towards a performative theory of resistance: Senior managers and revolting subject (ivitie) s. *Organization Studies*, 0170840616685360.
- Jian, G. (2007). Unpacking Unintended Consequences in Planned Organizational Change: A Process Model. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(1), 5–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907301986>
- Jorgensen, H. H., Owen, L., & Neus, A. (2008). *Making Change Work* (p. 48). Somers, NY: IBM.
- Kärreman, D., & Alvesson, M. (2009). Resisting resistance: Counter-resistance, consent and compliance in a consultancy firm. *Human Relations*, 62(8), 1115–1144.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709334880>
- Kuhn, T. (2017). Developing a Communicative Imagination Under Contemporary Capitalism: The Domain of Organizational Communication as a Mode of Explanation. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 31(1), 116–122.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1944). The Controversy Over Detailed Interviews-An Offer for Negotiation. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 8(1), 38–60.
- Lewis, L. K. (1997). Users' individual communicative responses to intraorganizationally implemented innovations and other planned changes. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10(4), 455–490.

- Lewis, L. K. (2000). “Blindsided by That One” and “I Saw That One Coming”: The relative anticipation and occurrence of communication problems and other problems in Implementers’ Hindsight. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 28(1), 44–67.
- Lewis, L. K. (2006). Employee Perspectives on Implementation Communication as Predictors of Perceptions of Success and Resistance. *Western Journal of Communication*, 70(1), 23–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310500506631>
- Lewis, L. K. (2007). An Organizational Stakeholder Model of Change Implementation Communication. *Communication Theory*, 17(2), 176–204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00291.x>
- Lewis, L. K., & Russ, T. L. (2012). Soliciting and using input during organizational change initiatives: What are practitioners doing. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(2), 267–294.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1993). Innovation Modification during Intraorganizational Adoption. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(2), 322. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258762>
- Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. c. (2011). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Productions.
- Lucas, K., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2012). Memorable Messages of Hard Times: Constructing Short- and Long-Term Resiliencies Through Family Communication. *Journal of Family Communication*, 12(3), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2012.687196>
- Mangen, C., & Brivot, M. (2015). The challenge of sustaining organizational hybridity: The role of power and agency. *Human Relations*, 68(4), 659–684.

- March, J. G. (1994). *A Primer on Decision Making: How Decisions Happen*. New York: Free Press.
- Marx, K. (1976). *The German ideology: Including theses on Feuerbach and introduction to the critique of political economy*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Medved, C. E., & Novak, D. R. (2013). The Ethics of the “Family Friendly” Organization: The Challenge of Policy Inclusiveness. In S. May (Ed.), *Case Studies in Organizational Communication: Ethical Perspectives and Practices* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Messick, D. (1999). *Alternative Logics for Decision Making in Social Settings* (Vol. 39). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681\(99\)00023-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681(99)00023-2)
- Miller, K. (2015). *Organizational communication: Approaches and Processes*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Mumby, D. K. (2005). Theorizing Resistance in Organization Studies: A Dialectical Approach. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 19–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276558>
- Mumby, D. K. (2016). Organizing beyond organization: Branding, discourse, and communicative capitalism. *Organization*, 23(6), 884–907.
- Mumby, D. K., Thomas, R., Martí, I., & Seidl, D. (2017). Resistance redux. *Organization Studies*, 38(9), 1157–1183.
- Murphy, A. G. (1998). Hidden transcripts of flight attendant resistance. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 11, 499–535.

- Norberg, A., Lindblad, F., & Boman, K. (2006). *Support-seeking, Perceived Support, and Anxiety in Mothers and Fathers After Children's Cancer Treatment* (Vol. 15).
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.960>
- Olsson, E.-K. (2014). Crisis Communication in Public Organisations: Dimensions of Crisis Communication Revisited: Dimensions of Crisis Communication Revisited. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 22(2), 113–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12047>
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes toward an Organizational Change. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 783–794. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259206>
- Pieterse, J. H., Caniëls, M. C. J., & Homan, T. (2012). Professional discourses and resistance to change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 25(6), 798–818.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09534811211280573>
- Pietrzak, R. H., Johnson, D. C., Goldstein, M. B., Malley, J. C., & Southwick, S. M. (2009). Psychological resilience and postdeployment social support protect against traumatic stress and depressive symptoms in soldiers returning from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. *Depression and Anxiety*, 26(8), 745–751.
- Prasad, A., & Prasad, P. (2001). (Un) Willing to Resist? The Discursive Production of Local Workplace Opposition. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 7, 105–125.
- Putnam, L. L., Grant, D., Michelson, G., & Cutcher, L. (2005). Discourse and Resistance: Targets, Practices, and Consequences. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276557>

- Rajan-Rankin, S. (2014). Self-Identity, Embodiment and the Development of Emotional Resilience. *British Journal of Social Work*, 44(8), 2426–2442.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bct083>
- Rhodes, C. (2002). Coffee and the Business of Pleasure: The Case of Harbucks vs. Mr. Tweek. *Culture and Organization*, 8(4), 293–306.
- Richardson, B. K., & Maninger, L. (2016). “We Were All in the Same Boat”: An Exploratory Study of Communal Coping in Disaster Recovery. *Southern Communication Journal*, 81(2), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2015.1111407>
- Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58(3), 307–321. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.10020>
- Rooney, D., Paulsen, N., Callan, V. J., Brabant, M., Gallois, C., & Jones, E. (2010). A New Role for Place Identity in Managing Organizational Change. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(1), 44–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909351434>
- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Seeger, M., & Ulmer, R. (2002). A Post-Crisis Discourse of Renewal: The Cases of Malden Mills and Cole Hardwoods. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 30(2), 126–142.
- Shamsollahi, A., Amirshahi, M., & Ghaffari, F. (2017). Brand name recall: A study of the effects of word types, processing, and involvement levels. *Journal of Marketing & Communication*, 23(3), 240–259.

- Skodova, Z., Lajciakova, P., & Banovcinova, L. (2017). Burnout Syndrome Among Health Care Students: The Role of Type D Personality. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 39(3), 416–429.
- Skovholt, T. M., Grier, T. L., & Hanson, M. R. (2001). Career counseling for longevity: Self-care and burnout prevention strategies for counselor resilience. *Journal of Career Development*, 27(3), 167–176.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Strumpfer, D. J. W. (2003). Resilience and burnout: A stitch that could save nine. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(2), 69–79.
- Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, 56(10), 1163–1193.
- Thornborrow, T., & Brown, A. D. (2009). 'Being Regimented': Aspiration, Discipline and Identity Work in the British Parachute Regiment. *Organization Studies*, 30(4), 355–376.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840608101140>
- Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotion labor, self-subordination, and discursive construction of identity in a total institution. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14(1), 90–128.
- Trethewey, A. (1997). Resistance, identity, and empowerment: A postmodern feminist analysis of clients in a human service organization. *Communication Monographs*, 64(4), 281–301.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759709376425>

- Tucker, D. A., Yeow, P., & Viki, G. T. (2013). Communicating during organizational change using social accounts: The importance of ideological accounts. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 27(2), 184–209.
- Turner, V. (1987). Betwixt and between: The liminal period in rites of passage. In *Betwixt and between: Patterns of masculine and feminine initiation* (pp. 3–19). Peru, Illinois: Open Court Publishing.
- Ulmer, R. R., & Sellnow, T. L. (2000). Consistent questions of ambiguity in organizational crisis communication: Jack in the Box as a case study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25(2), 143–155.
- Ulmer, R. R., Sellnow, T. L., & Seeger, M. W. (2010). *Effective Crisis Communication: Moving From Crisis to Opportunity* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (2005). Alternative Approaches for Studying Organizational Change. *Organization Studies*, 26(9), 1377–1404.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605056907>
- Villagran, M., Canzona, M. R., & Ledford, C. J. W. (2013). The Milspouse Battle Rhythm: Communicating Resilience Throughout the Deployment Cycle. *Health Communication*, 28(8), 778–788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2013.800441>
- Vogelvang, B., Clarke, J., Sperna Weiland, A., Vosters, N., & Button, L. (2014). Resilience of Dutch probation officers: A critical need for a critical profession. *European Journal of Probation*, 6(2), 126–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2066220314540570>
- Watson, T. J. (2008). Managing Identity: Identity Work, Personal Predicaments and Structural Circumstances. *Organization*, 15(1), 121–143.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508407084488>

- Weick, K. E. (1988). Enacted sensemaking in crisis situations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25(4), 305–317.
- Weick, K. E. (2011). Reflections: Change Agents As Change Poets – On Reconnecting Flux and Hunches. *Journal of Change Management*, 11(1), 7–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2011.548937>
- Weick, K. E. (2012). Organized sensemaking: A commentary on processes of interpretive work. *Human Relations*, 65(1), 141–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726711424235>
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409–421.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133>
- Whelan-Berry, K. S., Gordon, J. R., & Hinings, C. R. (2003). Strengthening Organizational Change Processes: Recommendations and Implications from a Multilevel Analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(2), 186–207.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886303256270>
- Williams, E. A., & Connaughton, S. L. (2012). Expressions of Identifications: The Nature of Talk and Identity Tensions Among Organizational Members in a Struggling Organization. *Communication Studies*, 63(4), 457–481.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2011.630439>
- Wong, J. Y., & Dhanesh, G. S. (2017). Communicating Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the Luxury Industry: Managing CSR–Luxury Paradox Online Through Acceptance Strategies of Coexistence and Convergence. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 31(1), 88–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318916669602>

- Yang, A., & Liu, W. (2018). Corporate Environmental Responsibility and Global Online Cross-sector Alliance Network: A Cross-national Study. *Environmental Communication*, 12(1), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2016.1249900>
- Ybema, S., & Horvers, M. (2017). Resistance Through Compliance: The Strategic and Subversive Potential of Frontstage and Backstage Resistance. *Organization Studies*, 0170840617709305.
- Zoller, H. M., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). Resistance leadership: The overlooked potential in critical organization and leadership studies. *Human Relations*, 60(9), 1331–1360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707082850>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Recruitment Script

Hello, _____!

This is Eliza (one of the previous AFOMs). I am currently a graduate student at Colorado State University working on my master's thesis regarding organizational change and resilience.

Because of the changes the hotel has undergone in the last few years and our previous experience together, I would like to arrange an interview with you to get your perspective on these changes and how they've affected you. If you're interested in participating, your information would remain confidential. The information I collect will not be connected to any individual names or identifiers, and when I share the information with others, I will share the combined information only. Participation is completely voluntary, and you are welcome to skip questions or quit the study at any time. I wouldn't be able to compensate you for your time, but, if you like, I would be happy to share my results with you once my research is complete. The interview would take place away from your work at a time and location that is convenient for you. Your time commitment for the interview is about 40-60 minutes.

There may be no benefit to you from this research, but your voice may benefit workplace communication in the future. Please contact me with any questions or if you would like any additional information regarding this study. If you have questions about your rights as a volunteer, please feel free to contact the CSU IRB at: RICRO_IRB@mail.colostate.edu; 970-491-1553. I have also attached the consent letter if you would like additional details on how your information would be protected.

I hope you're doing well and consider participating in this research! I look forward to hearing from you.

Best,

Eliza Wagner-Kinyon; CSU Graduate Student

[phone number redacted]

Eliza.Wagner-Kinyon@colostate.edu

Appendix B: Consent Form

Study Title: Resilience and Resistance within Organizational Change

Dear Participant,

My colleagues and I are conducting research on how resilience and resistance is enacted in the workplace after multilevel organizational change. The Principal Investigator is Dr. Ziyu Long, an assistant professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Colorado State University, and the co-principal investigator is Eliza Wagner-Kinyon, a graduate student in the Department of Communication Studies.

We are inviting you to participate in an interview. This interview will take approximately 40-60 minutes to complete and will take place at a time and location (away from the hotel) that is convenient for you. Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participation at any time without penalty. With your permission, the researcher would like to audiotape the interview. Only the research team will have access to the audiotape, and it will be destroyed once transcribed.

When we report and share the data with others, we will combine the data from all participants so that no one will be able to link your comments to you. While there are no direct benefits to you, we hope to gain more knowledge on how resilient and resistant communication affects employees enduring organizational change.

There are no known risks involved with taking part in this interview other than a possible breach in confidentiality. In order to minimize this potential risk, we will not record your name or keep a list that links you to your comments. When we share information with your organization and others in possible publications, only combined and summarized information will be shared so that no individual could be identified. It is not possible to identify all potential risks in research procedures, but the researchers have taken reasonable safeguards to minimize any known and potential (but unknown) risks.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact Ziyu Long at ziyu.long@colostate.edu or Eliza Wagner-Kinyon at Eliza.Wagner-Kinyon@colostate.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the CSU IRB at: RICRO_IRB@mail.colostate.edu; 970-491-1553.

Ziyu Long

Assistant Professor

Department of Communication Studies

Colorado State University

Eliza Wagner-Kinyon

Graduate Student

Department of Communication Studies

Colorado State University

Appendix C: Interview Protocol

1. Demographic data: department, position, years with the organization
2. What kinds of changes have occurred in the last two years at the organization?
3. How have these changes affected you?
 - a. What would you say was the biggest change for you here?
 - b. What did your day-to-day life look like before/during those changes?
 - c. How did you handle uncertainties that arose from these changes?
4. What is the most challenging part for you to go through this change?
 - a. How were/are you dealing with these challenges?
5. How do you talk about the changes (with coworkers, leadership, family, etc.)?
 - a. What conversations did you have regarding the changes here?
 - b. Did you give others' advice to cope? If so, what did you say?
 - c. Did you receive advice? If so, what?
6. How did you show support or disapproval with these changes?
 - a. Can you give me an example?
 - b. How did others react to your support or disapproval?
7. What did you do if/when you disagreed, and your voice was not heard? How did you cope with these instances?
8. Would you say you stayed resilient during this change?
 - a. Why or why not? What does resilience during change mean to you?
 - b. (give examples of everyday acts like reaching out to support networks, overcoming challenges, pushing through ambiguous challenges)
9. Would you say you somehow resisted the change?
 - a. (introduce to participants that resistance may not be explicit or revolutionary; give examples of everyday acts like gossiping; give time to reflect)
 - b. Can you share some examples with me?
 - c. What are your thoughts on your resistive acts?
10. After enduring all these changes, what are your main reasons for maintaining employment at this organization?
11. What else is important for me to know in this conversation? Is there anything else you would like to share?

Appendix D: Coding Table

Age/Gender/Position	Resilience	Both	Resistance	Question/New
Manager, Male, early 30s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -EM: future thinking, build support networks, build "normal"—deal with situation “at hand” -compare to worse past experience -reframe as positive experience to move forward in career with -“do my job” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Work Identity (holding onto company values despite role conflict), -network & collective infra- “relief” “venting” with other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ind & col infra: complain about \$ (wage, incentive) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“stay or leave” -Focus on future -Reframe past experience -“Do my job”
LL, Male, late 20s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -CN: “did what had to be done” -Net: work as a team -IA: previous exp with reno -AL: work outside construction crew to insulate self & others -EM: foreground positive at the end; reframe new people as positive additions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reframe complain into venting -pushback = keeping sanity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insubordination: rude, “retaliating” against guests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic networking: being on “good terms”
LL, Male, early 20s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -EM: could be worse; good for future career/XP -Backgrounding negative: not a complainer, no need to get angry; -IA: “leader”, concern for larger organization -CN: “went through”, “went along” -Network w/friends and coworkers -External network: shift identity helped “alleviate stress” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Resistance lead to real change; now that part of the uniform isn’t required; he isn’t asked to do that duty anymore -gossip/venting seen as strengthening support network -vent/complain to “right person”; self-disclosure=trust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Gossip, complain, vent -Nicknames for guests -Insubordination: refuse uniform; refuse certain duties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “become stricter”- shift in work identity? Or shifting “normal” through alt logics? -Could be worse -“come this far” buy in -strategic networking “voice to right person”

LL, Female, early 40s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -IA: wanted hotel to thrive; personal expertise; wanted leaders to acknowledge her strong work identity; held onto work IA as it forced sacrificing “Mom” IA -EM: good experience for path to move up; future- oriented - had buy in “I survived this much” -Background negative: “buried feelings I had” -Net: wanted “team”; wanted support from above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -forced communication was a release; supported by management -anger & support towards coworkers (“in the trenches” mentality) -Lack of acknowledged identity lead to resistance -network subbed for com/support net missing from org/leadership *wanted to see manager be resistive to show support -would have been less resistive -needed <i>authenticity</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bitching, gossiping, complaining, venting -rumors -strongly verbally resistive outside work -gave away free stuff (rooms/food) -only bare “minimum” to keep job (not above and beyond) -<i>Vengeful</i> in job performance (wanted to hurt org) -not training others (refusing work) -inappropriate email (call out others publicly) -forced communication -“See you next Tuesday” remark about management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is resistance framed outside of work? -how resistance caused actual positive change -perceived lack of options due to age -Buy in?- “survived so much” <u>Missing resilience lead to resistance</u> -missing support network -lack of leadership -fueled by work identity; not acknowledged for it -drone mentality “someone’s going to do the job”
LL, Female, early 20s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Net: com and support with boss; coworkers = community, (team)work -External network: “gets” work identity -Network validates work IA -Work IA: enhanced meaning when pulling from home/family; “dedicated”, “hardworking” -CN: get through day-to-day, “tough luck, it is what it is” -EM: situated experience- “it could be worse”, experience helps with future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -support through complaining: “safe space” “little community” -in-network trust is very important; acted as transformation from resisting (name calling and negative attitude) to foregrounding positive “who I want to be” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -complaining, venting -name-calling: “Queen Bee” -overall bad attitude -gossip & rumors (“nothing is sacred”) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -some in-group resisting can be cathartic, but it can cross the line into unhelpful -also where she recognized she didn’t want to be “negative” and transformed into a more positive, resilient person

	<p>-EM: front stage w/ guests</p> <p>-AL: focus on what she <i>does</i> have control over (guests and their experience) Positive: want “hotel to succeed”; “good ride”; “good career” BNeg: “suppressed”; “pushed aside”</p>	<p>Insulted (IA not respected); diminish her role/influence</p> <p>->AGENCY (“it’s my legacy”) -></p> <p>->leads to resistance when “vision” differs</p>	<p>Insubordinate: demand communication from boss, wants respect</p> <p>Hidden from superiors “can’t believe they’re in change of anything ... themselves” Feel like a pawn/pion</p>	<p>Situating in the past: this time it’s bad vs ideal past; others are situating in worse-case-scenarios</p>
LL, Female, late 30s	<p>-CN: “take it as it comes”; “be flexible”</p> <p>-AL: transcends changes to cope/make work more bearable</p> <p>-FP: look at different way; hold on to pos changes when it becomes evident</p> <p>-Net: boss has her back; external network</p> <p>AL: “reading customer”; “reading situation”</p>	<p>Fostered com & support-> <- Lying to guests -></p> <p>Help to not overload -> ->not following some policies to help guests (\$) & self (not getting yelled at)</p>	<p>Venting/complaining</p> <p>Not performing certain work/tasks (parking, not charging) didn’t agree with some changes so didn’t see them through Push training on other coworkers Not following policy Going over HR’s head (AL?)</p>	<p>When is it alternative logics instead of resistance (not following tasks)? Based on hierarchical level? Intent?</p> <p>Not performing some work (Resist) helped her cope and transcend barriers (alt logics)</p>

Sup, Female, 30s	<p>-IA: work ethic; “type of manager”</p> <p>-Pos: needed to be resilient for employees</p> <p>-B own N for their sake</p> <p>-CN: just stick with it; have to try to adapt to what you’re given honestly; continuing on</p> <p>Net: boss is supportive</p> <p>EM: situate in past experience</p>	<p>Identity seen as more resistance -> knew more than boss (“acting busy”)</p> <p><-Pressured/reprimanded to be “less stressed out”</p> <p>-Net: “shared venting session” as “beneficial”</p>	<p>Complain/insubordinate about work</p> <p><- was negative</p> <p><-venting</p>	<p>When is being vocal and voicing your opinions becoming insubordinate? When you’re reprimanded? (failed alt logic?)</p> <p>-situating in past exp (could be worse)</p> <p>-identity seen as resistance when doing better than your boss?</p>
LL, Female, 50s	<p>-EM: learn, grow, patience, positive attitude (“fake it til you make it”)</p> <p>-for the guests (front stage and “hidden” backstage)</p> <p>-CN or IA?: just do your job; “get the job done”; “keep your head down”; “focus on what’s at hand”</p> <p>-IA: experienced (knows best); authority; **with brand and larger hotel goals**; guest-oriented; NOT a quitter</p> <p>-Net: want a team; outside workplace</p> <p>-AL: focused what on what’s in her control (not officially, but what she can actually do with her agency)</p> <p>-situate in past experience</p>	<p>Identity struggle when treated as a pion; insulted when questioned; work identity “gives me meaning”</p> <p>-need autonomy</p> <p>AL & resistance: do your own thing outside the system</p> <p>->Resist when disrespected</p> <p>Infrapol & AL: **let managers think they’re in charge and manipulate them</p>	<p>“unsolicited advice” to boss = insubordination</p> <p>-carve autonomy when not given</p> <p>-strategic insubordination: careful about discursive tactics</p> <p>-insubordinate when work isn’t valued</p> <p><-***insubordination without their knowledge (very manipulative)</p>	<p>Issues with coworkers; stereotyped for age; restricted employment options due to age</p> <p>-situate in past experience</p>
LL, Female, late 20s	<p>-Net: “all the people there that I love are what made that job bearable when I hated it”</p>	<p>->net can lead to insub-></p>	<p>Insub. For friends: “bitchy”</p> <p>“catty” to another manager;</p>	<p>Is it resistance when insubordination fails to create change and</p>

	<p>-new management (positive turn towards end)</p> <p>-CN: "I showed up, did my work, and got out on time"</p>	<p>"she's like unflinchingly positive, but will also listen to you bitch"</p> <p>-insub & AL -></p> <p>Got results -></p>	<p>sarcastic, rude, refusing to help or prioritize</p> <p>-net w/ bitching, complaining, venting, "talked a lot of shit" = collective infra</p> <p>-tallying managers' "sick days"</p> <p>-name calling</p> <p>-give refunds</p> <p>Insub. To unethical leadership (sexism/disrespect)</p> <p>Insubordinate to corporate (verbally and blatant)</p>	<p>AL when it does work?</p>
M, Male, 30s	<p>"next step in evolution"</p> <p>EM: future oriented, take experience from it</p> <p>-"just try to keep it positive, keep moving forward, always growing, always learning" (making that choice every 10 minutes)</p> <p>-teaching, developing staff; focus on what is the best to come</p> <p>-Net: "amazing crew"</p> <p>-IA: previous construction experience; experience as another manager</p>	<p>Loss of agency: "I make the most money I have in my entire life and I have the least amount of power in my entire life"</p> <p>Identity struggle: I don't want to be that "angry person...negative person"</p> <p>-Frustrated w/lack of com network; "no group success, only individual"</p>		<p>More positive for staff</p>