Thoretical approaches in organizational scandal research: Invitation to linguistic approach

Sho Nakahara
Osaka Sangyo University
Osaka, Japan
nakaharasho@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Organizational scandal has conventionally been defined as an instance where an organization inflicts objective harm on others. This article treats this as "the normative approach to organizational scandal." On the other hand, when someone feels unhappy without the presence of objective harm, this can also be defined as organizational scandal. Some people would lodge a complaint to the organization when they feel some kind of displeasure or anxiety, even without the presence of illegality or mistakes. This article treats this as "the cognitive approach to organizational scandal." However, what the article mainly focuses on is not only objective harm inflicted by the organization and actors' subjective perception, but also the ways in which language creates the reality of organizational scandal. This article refers to this as "the linguistic approach to organizational scandal" and develops a theoretical prospect for future research into organizational scandal.

Keywords: organizational scandal, corporate scanal, normative approach, cognitive approach, linguistic approach

INTRODUCTION

Conventionally, organizational scandal has been defined as objective harm inflicted by an organization on others. This is a definition based on the so-called "no harm principle (the principle to exclude harm to others)." In this case, objective harm (i.e., fraudulent accounting or collective food poisoning) is understood to have violated certain norms (i.e., organizational or social norms). As a result, preceding studies focus on identification of causes of objective harm as a theoretical challenge (e.g., Higuchi, 2012; Inoue, 2015). This perspective, in which organizational scandal is defined as a violator of certain norms, is referred to as "the normative approach to organizational scandal" in this article.

On the other hand, when someone feels unhappy with an organization, this can also be defined as organizational scandal (Murakami, 2011; Nakatani, 2007). In this case, organizational scandal is created by actors who are dissatisfied with the organization or with individuals, and who lodge certain complaints (e.g., Beenen & Pint, 2008; Jàvor & Jancsics, 2013). In other words, what creates organizational scandal is not objective harm inflicted by the organization, but the actors' subjective perception. In dealing with organizational scandal created through subjective perception, it is required that reasons and interests behind the creation of organizational scandal should be worked on, instead of identifying the cause of objective harm. This is referred to in this article as "the cognitive approach to organizational scandal" and, as in the case of the normative approach, it is

subjected to theoretical examination. Conventionally, the normative and cognitive approaches have been the main approaches in the study of organizational scandal.

However, this article focuses on the perspective called "the linguistic approach to organizational scandal" (cf. Breit, 2010; Fukuhara, 2012; Fukuhara & Che, 2012). This approach focuses on the language (words and text) used to discuss organizational scandal, and examines how it is talked about. Consequently, this approach does not attribute causes of organizational scandal to objective harm inflicted by the organization or the actors' subjective perception. Rather, by examining how organizational scandal is talked about, it critically examines the taken-for-granted power relationship in the subject. The major theoretical feature of the linguistic approach is that it employs analytical methods such as discourse analysis, content analysis, and narrative analysis in examining organizational scandal. This article investigates some early works on the linguistic approach to organizational scandal and explores its utility.

Following this, the aim of this article is to identify the theoretical limitation of the normative and cognitive approaches and to unpack the theoretical perspective of the linguistic approach. More concretely, this article first examines the normative and cognitive approaches and identifies their theoretical limitations. The normative and cognitive approaches have theoretical limitations in that they cannot deal with issues put in a black box, because they focus on the mechanism through which organizational scandal is generated. This is, however, the focus that represents their contribution to the field. The theoretical significance of the linguistic approach is to salvage voices hidden by power by focusing on the language used to talk about organizational scandal and by critically examining the ways in which organizational scandal is talked about, under what power relationship it is talked about, described and recorded. Since the study is not a piece of hypothesis testing research but of hypothesis generating research, it does not present a clear hypothesis.

The article proceeds as follows: Section 2, which follows the Introduction, deals with the normative approach to organizational scandal and theoretically examines preceding studies that fall in this category. Section 3 deals with the cognitive approach to organizational scandal and, as in the case of Section 2, theoretically examines preceding studies that fall in this category. Section 4 deals with the linguistic approach to organizational scandal and examines early works that employ discourse analysis, content analysis, and narrative analysis in examining organizational scandal. Section 5 compares the three approaches and explores the utility of the linguistic approach in particular. The conclusion describes the theoretical perspective of future research into organizational scandal.

THE NORMATIVE APPROACH OF ORGANIZATION SCANDAL

This section deals with the normative approach to organizational scandal and theoretically examines preceding studies that fall in this category. As mentioned earlier, organizational scandal has conventionally been defined as objective harm inflicted by the organization on others. Objective harm is judged to have violated certain norms (social or organizational norms), which are listed as cases of organizational scandal. For instance, food poisoning caused by Snow Brand Milk Products Inc., the exhaust gas fraud by Volkswagen, and the derailment of the JR Fukuchiyama Line train are still fresh in our memory. In these cases, an organization clearly inflicted (or had the potential to inflict) objective harm to others and as such, these represent "action that infringes public interest

or social norms; a dishonorable and undesirable phenomenon which could lead to the loss of trust of society in the corporation" (Inaba, 2014). In other words, organizational scandal is reported and studied not only because of the objective harm inflicted, but also because it has violated norms.

This section now turns to an examination of cases of analysis. For example, according to Ogawa (2009), who defines organizational scandal as "action that goes against compliance" which prioritizes self-righteous rules of the organization that do not match law and social norms, organizational scandal happens through the following mechanisms. First, there are concrete legal (rules and regulations) and social norms that we reference when we live our organizational lives. However, according to Ogawa, organizational scandal happens when the law (rules and regulations) and these social norms are violated by other "dominant norms." Ogawa (2009) considers this as a clash between legal (laws and regulations) and social norms on the one hand and the dominant norms on the other. In other words, what Ogawa (2009) lists as dominant norms are "the rules of the organization." The rules of the organization are the totality of "organizational culture and corporate climate" (Ogawa, 2009: 59), and organizational scandal occurs when these rules of the organization violate law (rules and regulations) and social norms. What Ogawa (2009) refers to in exploring causes that lead to this violation (in other words, in exploring the causes of organizational scandal) is Nakamura (2007); he defines "six moral traps" that invite anti-moralistic behavior in which the rules of the organization are prioritized, and Ogawa (2009) describes these as the direct causes of organizational scandal.

In addition, Inaba (2014)—who defines organizational scandal as "fraudulent behavior by the corporate executives, significant facts that contravene articles of incorporation or behavior which contravenes social norms, and which are dishonorable and undesirable phenomena leading the loss of trust of society in the corporation"—argues that the causes of organizational scandal lie in the closed nature of the organization or the intensity of cohesiveness. According to Inaba (2014), organizational scandal "is likely to happen in a more closed organization in general. In particular, a closed organization with a high degree of cohesiveness is likely to produce scandal by more serious deviation from the norm, but a closed organization with a low degree of cohesiveness is also likely to have scandal caused by failures related to the product." Inaba (2014) further shows that this hypothesis has validity, and concludes that organizational scandal is influenced by the closed nature of the organization and its cohesiveness.

The major feature of the normative approach is therefore its explanatory framework in which there are causes for organizational scandal such as moral traps, the closed nature of the organization, or its cohesiveness. These causes then bring about objective harm, which in turn violates social norms (causes → objective harm → violation of social norms). Obviously, the normative approach can be questioned in regards to its "social norms," in that the researcher could defined them in terms of what many people would believe. However, its contribution is the theoretical implication of generalizing the process by which organizational scandal occurs. On the contrary, perhaps we should look at this from the inverse perspective. In other words, in the study of organizational scandal, the theoretical examination of organizational scandal as the violator of social norms becomes possible precisely because the existence of social norms is analytically assumed. Although there is still a room for discussing the existence of social norms, the normative approach has brought theoretical and practical insights to the study of organizational scandal. The next

section investigates the approach in which organizational scandal is examined through actors' subjective perception.

THE COGNITIVE APPROACH OF ORGANIZATION SCANDAL

This section deals with the cognitive approach to organizational scandal and theoretically examines preceding studies that fall in this category. As examined in the preceding section, organizational scandal has been conventionally understood to be objective harm's violation of certain norms. However, when an actor feels unhappy, it could be defined as organizational scandal. In this case, actors who have found certain issues to be undesirable create organizational scandal. In other words, "organizational scandal which is triggered by a corporation (or an organization) making actors unhappy does not necessarily constitute clear illegal or unlawful behavior, unlike the cases of the violation of the no harm principle, but it can become a huge scandal depending on the time and place and can attract a lot of attention from the media" (Nakatani, 2007: 340-41; author's addition in brackets). Since "clear illegal or unlawful behavior" cannot be identified, and since it is the actors who find something unhappy that define organizational scandal, the corporation or organization can only react to the claim; in other words, because there is no clear objective harm, the corporation or organization can only act in reaction to the actor's subjective perception of something undesirable.

Let us now examine concrete cases of analysis. For example, a consumer, who bought a video tape player made by a certain manufacturer in 1998, felt unhappy with how the person in charge dealt with his/her complaint when he/she asked for repair of an initial failure (Nakatani, 2007). The purchaser discussed product failure with a representative of the manufacturer when the video tape player was purchased, and he/she felt unhappy with the representative's response and judged the other party as "abusive." The purchaser, in fact, recorded the conversation in question and uploaded it to the homepage. The tape was accessed more than 10 million times partly due to media reporting and partly due to the consumer's unhappiness in the end that forced the president of the manufacturing company to apologize. As this case study shows, an organization can be seen as problematic even if it does not violate the no harm principle and is forced to react to the event. This is not the case of organizational scandals "being there" *a priori*, but of organizational scandals "becoming" one after the event. This process is referred to as "the making of organizational scandal" (Nakahara, 2014, 2015, 2016a, 2016b).

Furthermore, some argue that even in the case where "clear illegal or unlawful behavior" has been recognized, the situation is defined as organizational scandal by the actors' unhappiness. In this case, the "clear illegal or unlawful behavior" is not clear before the event, but is judged as such thereafter. For example, Gohara (2013)—who investigates the accidents with Paloma's boiler—states that there was no product failure with Paloma's indoor boilers that caused death by carbon monoxide poisoning. This is a case in which many deaths due to carbon monoxide poisoning across approximately twenty years, from January 1985 to November 2005, were partly attributed to the boiler that Paloma manufactured. It is fair to reason that all these deaths could directly be attributed to product failure of the indoor boiler.

However, Gohara, who chaired the investigation committee, concludes that there was no product failure. Despite this, Palma was held responsible for deaths because the victims' families lodged complaints against them. The boiler had a built-in safety device in order to

prevent carbon monoxide poisoning. The device would be automatically switched on to stop the boiler from burning if it was used with insufficient ventilation.

However, the safety device started to malfunction after a service life of about ten years. Consumers were demanding repair in order to correct the safety device's malfunction. The repairer modified the safety devise by removing its power supply. As a result, the safety device stopped malfunctioning and was switched on when the consumer wanted; however, many deaths due to carbon monoxide were reported among the consumers who did not know of this feature. Due to this, Paloma maintained that there was no product failure. However, as the victims' families were unhappy with a situation in which Paloma did not admit responsibility for the accidents caused by their boilers, they then made the issue a case of organizational scandal for Paloma through lodging a complaint.

Let us now examine the background against which the complaint was lodged; this helps us to understand the importance of the cognitive approach as well as clues to the behavior of the corporation organization. According to Okamoto (2016), there are five factors in the background to the making of the claim. First, there is "an improvement of the consumers' status and an enhancement of their awareness of their rights." The implementation of Product Liability Act (PL act) in 1995, the revision of Consumer Basic Act (formerly known as Consumer Protection Basic Act) in 2004, and the establishment of Consumer Affairs Agency in 2009 have contributed to the development of law and systems for consumer protection, which in turn encouraged the consumer. Second, there is "an increase in mistrust in the corporation." Fraudulent labeling and cheating with the use-by date has made consumers mistrustful of the corporation. Third, there is "the spread of the Internet." The speed and scope of receiving and sending relevant information has drastically improved. Fourth, there is "the increased use of toll-free calls and the spread of mobile phones." Together with the spread of the Internet, it has encouraged the consumer to lodge a complaint there and then. Fifth, there is "a lowering of the complaint barrier due to the lowering of normative awareness." In contrast to the past when there was an unspoken rule to try to avoid confrontation, there is now less resistance to lodging a complaint. Okamoto (2016), who lists these five factors, argues that there are interests other than simply lodging a complaint, such as restoring fairness or resolving dissatisfaction.

The major feature of the cognitive approach over the normative approach is that it does not presuppose norms, and it examines organizational scandal based on the actor's subjective perception. As a result, it can overcome the theoretical limitation of the normative approach and can focus on the actor's complaint. In other words, the cognitive approach to organizational scandal takes a view that the actor's subjective perception is conveyed as a complaint, which is then spread through the media's reporting and references (subjective perception → complaint → media's reporting and references). Of course, there is room for questions such as what the process of subjective perception is, that is being reported and referenced by media, and why it is then identified as organizational scandal. Still, the cognitive approach has its own theoretical/practical implications.

THE LINGUISTIC APPROACH OF ORGANIZATION SCANDAL

This section deals with the linguistic approach to organizational scandal, and theoretically examines preceding studies that fall in this category. In doing so, the section

deals with cases of analysis that focus on discourse, content, and narrative related to organizational scandal in order to review concrete examples of analysis in the linguistic approach. What is a linguistic approach to organizational scandal in the first place? In short, the linguistic approach with which this article is concerned is an approach that defines organizational scandal as language (words) and investigates the ways in which it is talked about.

The linguistic approach has also been used in the field of business management. For example, the Japan Society for Information and Management (2014) produced a special issue on "the linguistic approach to information management" and explored ways in which the diverse linguistic expressions that are used in information management influenced our use of information technology. In the special issue, Wakuta (2014) speculates, "the ways to perceive and think about the world depends on the mother tongue" and suggests that our perception is formed by language. This is not limited to information management. In the institutional theory of organization, which is "one of the theories most frequently referred to in a variety of fields in Management Studies today," (Kuwata, Matsushima, & Takahashi, 2015: vii), the "institution as language" (e.g., Urano, 2009, 2015) is discussed. For example, Urano (2015), drawing from J. P. Butler's work makes the case for language as an actor that works on people to find new interests. In other words, because we refer to the institution as language, we either use or betray that institution.

The major theoretical feature of the linguistic approach is found in its analysis of meanings and relationships of language using "the languages of meanings and relation" (Noe, 1990: 162) as a clue, quite unlike the examination of subjective perception. This theoretical feature stems from the fact that the approach refers to a philosophical movement called the linguistic turn in its theoretical base. The linguistic turn is a philosophical movement started by the linguistic philosopher, R. M. Rorty (cf. Rorty, 1992), who argues that reality is formed by language (rather than by human beings) (cf. Noe, 1990; Wakuta, 2014). As a result, the significance of the linguistic turn resides in the view that "it is not that human beings are the subject and language a medium; it is that language is the subject and human beings a medium" (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000). This may appear as a perspective in which language determines everything (linguistic determinism) (cf. Hasegawa, 2015). However, it is not the case, for we can constitute diverse realities precisely because of language. In other words, we can find diverse interests and satisfy them precisely because we refer to language (or language as an institution) (e.g., Kuwata, Matsushima, & Takahashi, 2015). Language does not restrict; language creates reality.

The linguistic turns enables us to capture organizational scandal differently. In normative and cognitive approaches, the theoretical challenge is the ways in which organizational scandal is produced (or how to prevent it after the event) because of the organization's objective harm or the actor's subjective perception. However, if organizational scandal is language, why it happens and why it is prevented is not conducive to theoretical deliberation—we "can" only analyze the cause of organizational scandal because we have the term "(organizational) scandal." Rather than questioning why it happens and how it can be prevented, we need to examine the ways in which (the language of) "(organizational) scandal" have been talked about, and ask questions such as what is talked about and what is no longer talked about.

Some early works on cases of organizational scandal that employ discourse analysis, content analysis, and narrative analysis are examined below as examples of analyses in which the focus is placed on the ways in which organizational scandal is talked about. The

article explores the ways in which organizational scandal can be understood differently from the conventional understanding, according to each analytical method. It therefore explores the potential of the linguistic approach to organizational scandal by examining these early works.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

First, let us examine the discourse analysis of organizational scandal. To start with, discourse is defined as "organizational rules that enable the production, transmission, and connection of text" (Uda & Takahashi, 2014). When discourse analysis is applied to the study of organizational scandal, it intends to describe organizational rules that are at work when text concerning organizational scandal is produced, transmitted, and connected. In this regard, what is important is not to determine the meaning of "(organizational) scandal," but to describe the ways in which it has been talked about. Let us look at one example. Murakami (2011), who analyzes the discourse of "scandal," argues that the term "scandal" suddenly emerged in 1991 through reporting by the press. Obviously, the press had been reporting on numerous cases (such as the Lockheed bribery incident or the Recruit incident) involving civil servants, the police, the university, and the finance industry between the 1970s and 1980s. However, these cases were not reported as cases of "scandal."

However, the situation dramatically shifted. Since a securities company's preferential treatment of major investors and post-factum loss compensation were reported as "scandal" in 1991, the use of "scandal" as a term to refer to so-called "securities scandal" started. In other words, around this time, the term "scandal" came to mean "securities scandal." The frequency of the use of this term is in the background, and particularly increased from June to September 1991. About 200 mentions were recorded in June, but the frequency jumped to about 1,100 in July and about 1,050 in August. Based on this, Murakami argues that the public started to understand "scandal" as "securities scandal."

The meaning of the term "scandal" was not fixed there. As the public started to see "scandal" as "securities scandal," other actors (mainly the press) tried to attract more attention to particular issues by assigning a different meaning. Consequently, "scandal," which had been used to mean "securities scandal" until then, came to mean "food scandal," including Snow Brand Milk Products' food poisoning and fraudulent labeling of meat using the anti-BSE measures from 2000 to 2002; "railways scandal" such as the JR Fukuchiyama line train derailment in 2005; and "construction scandal," including the falsification of the structural calculation sheet and the fraud in piling since 2010.

In other words, it is not the case of that the unfolding problem is being changed (for example, as discussed later, Komabashi (2012) points out that fraudulent labeling of food products had been found in the past); rather, because the press (and other media) used "scandal" in a number of ways, our perception of the concept has been shaped (Murakami and Yoshizaki, 2008). These examples show that the meaning of "scandal" is not fixed and that the term can be used in a number of ways. Discourse analysis enables us to describe change the meaning of the term "scandal."

CONTENT ANALYSIS

Let us now turn to content analysis of organizational scandal. Content analysis focuses on the ways in which items (content) thrown into "scandal" changes, rather than on changes in the meaning of the term "scandal." For example, Komabashi (2012), who

examines items associated with "food scandal," presents the following findings: (1) items such as fraudulent labeling of food products which are included in "food scandal" have long been in existence, but they were not referred to as "food scandal"; and (2) items identified as "food scandal" are not primarily determined and change as time goes by. What does this mean at all?

Komabashi (2012) states following with regard to point (1): "fraudulent information on the product origin and ingredients, and problems with hygiene, are the most frequent scandals in the food industry of late. These include food poisoning caused by contaminated milk, the inclusion of foreign objects in minced meat, fraudulent information regarding the origin of meat, and cheating on the use-by date, neglecting cleaning manuals at the factory, and re-using of meals. However, these did not begin recently. They have been happening across the world since a long time ago" (Komabashi, 2012: 68). Although this is a very old example, bulking up of food products by adding foreign objects was a widespread practice in Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and while adding good quality ingredients signaled wealth, the addition of poor quality ingredients led to many deaths through poisoning. Nevertheless, it was after 2000 that these incidents became to be referred to as "food scandal" in Japan.

As for (2): the term "food scandal" started to circulate after 2000, and its content has kept changing since then. In order to confirm this, the fastest way is to list incidents that have been reported as "food scandal": food poisoning by Snow Brand Milk Products Inc. (in 2000), fraudulent labeling of meat by Snow Brand Milk Products Inc. (in 2001), fraudulent labeling of domestically produced beef by Nippon Ham (in 2002), the use of milk beyond its sell-by date by Fujiya (in 2007), fraudulent labeling of meat by Meat Hope Inc. (in 2007), changing the sell-by date of *shiroi koibito* by Ishiya Co. Ltd (in 2007), changing the sell-by date of *akafuku* (in 2007), fraudulent labeling of *hinaidori* (a native poultry, in 2007), fraudulent labeling and re-use of dishes by Senba Kiccho (in 2007) and fraudulent branding of *hidagyu* by Maruaki (in 2008). In other words, the content changed from food poisoning to fraudulent labeling of meat, to the expiry of the sell-by date, and to changing of the sell-by date to fraudulent labeling and branding and re-use of dishes.

As shown above, while the category of "food scandal" only emerged after 2000, its content is not primarily fixed and has kept changing. It is likely that it will keep changing. The point here is that, despite the fact that the incident has happened before, we deal with the incident each time it occurs and according to its content. This is not necessarily bad, and "food scandal" has to be dealt with by focusing on *only* the specific incident that is happening among many others (for example, in the case of food poisoning, the implementation of disinfection and frequent hand washing; in the case of fraudulent labeling of meat, the implementation of appropriate quality labeling). We cannot dismiss Koyama (2011), who defines this as "issue myopia (myopic approach to a certain issue or the lack of insight)"; since the content changes, we have no other choice than to adopt appropriate measures to the incident within the local context. For there is no measure that is appropriate for all contents—content analysis shows us this.

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

Third, there is narrative analysis of organizational scandal, which examines changes (differences) in the narrative of "(organizational) scandal" and can capture the difference in the narrative even if similar incidents are under examination. For example, Kruvand & Hwang (2007) examine the fabrication incident in embryonic stem cell research of 2005

and show that the ways in which the "cloning scandal" was narrated were very different between South Korean and American press. The fabrication incident emerged when it was reported that a biologist working for Seoul University, South Korea, at that time succeeded for the first time in the world to copy embryonic stem cells from a cloned human embryo. The biologist had submitted articles on this finding to a very authoritative journal, *Science*, and two research articles were published in February 2004 and May 2005. This research finding was reported widely in and beyond South Korea, and researchers and practitioners from across the world came to revere him. In particular, he was revered as a "national hero" (Kruvand & Hwang, 2007: 177) in South Korea.

Then, things took a dramatic turn. On January 10, 2006, those who were concerned voiced some doubt that both published research articles were fabricated. The investigation committee of Seoul University, which was established afterwards, reported that both were fabricated after carrying out an investigation. Upon this, the biologist in question publicly apologized at a press conference on January 12, 2006 and resigned from his post. The biologist, now labeled as an "international disgrace" (Kruvand & Hwang, 2007: 178), was now reviled widely.

In regards to this incident, Kruvand and Hwang point out that the narrative of the "cloning scandal" vastly differs between the *Chosun Ilbo* and the *New York Times*. While the *Chosun Ilbo* enthusiastically reported the publication of the first article in *Science* in 2004 as "the first step towards the longed-for goal," the *New York Times* simply reported that "medical and ethical concerns over therapeutic cloning is on the rise." As for the 2005 article: while the *Chosun Ilbo* ran the headline, "God's hand: can he cure those suffering from pain?," the *New York Times* was much calmer with "South Koreans are easy going towards stem cell cloning." As for the press conference on January 12, 2006, while the *Chosun Ilbo*'s reporting was sympathetic to the biologist, the *New York Times* branded the biologist "a stem cell researcher who has lost his authority" and concluded that this was "a disappointing conclusion of his career." As Kruvand et al. point out, the *Chosun Ilbo* was consistently supportive of the biologist, while the *New York Times* was skeptical from the beginning.

The narrative analysis examined above shows that the narrative of the "(cloning) scandal" differed even when handling similar cases, and that different realities were constructed based on different narratives. W. R. Fisher, an expert in narrative analysis, points out that while the narrative has a mythic aspect (as seen in the reputation of the biologist in South Korea), it also has a moral aspect (as seen in the reputation of the biologists in the US) (Fisher, 1989). Therefore, narratives need to be compared through narrative analysis.

DISCUSSION

Here, we would like to discuss the differences among the three approaches. The first involves the normative approach. As it has been already noted, the normative approach understands organizational scandal as objective harm and examines the ways in which it exerts influence on others in the organization. In this case, the cause of objective harm is considered to be located within the organization and the cause of a certain incident or accident is identified. Since if a cause can be identified, logically speaking, objective harm can be prevented beforehand; this would also naturally mean that the violation of the social norm can be prevented as well. On the other hand, the cognitive approach defines organizational scandal using subjective perception such as other people's feelings of

dissatisfaction. In the cognitive approach, organizational scandal is understood to be subjective perception and is the approach that examines the ways in which it problematizes the organization and, conversely, the ways in which the organization should deal with this problem. In this case, the cause is understood to be located outside the organization and even when there is no clear objective harm such as an incident or accident, claims made by the actor involved would create organizational scandal. Consequently, the important aim here is to negotiate interests of those who want to problematize the organization and those members of the organization that attempt to prevent it. In addition, since it is impossible to identify what may be perceived as unsatisfactory, these countermeasures can only be taken after the event. The following table summarizes what has been discussed so far.

Table 1. *Comparison of the normative and coginitive approaches*

	Normative approach	Cognitive approach
What is organizational scandal? Direction of influence	Objective harm From organization to others	Subjective perception From others to the organization
The cause Research objective The timing of response	Within the organization Elimination of objective harm Can be done before the event	Outside the organization Negotiation of interests Has to be after the event

Lastly, the linguistic approach, so far we have compared the normative and cognitive approaches, but is organizational scandal something that is to be prevented before or after the event? Obviously, objective harm should be prevented and subjective perception also has an important role. However, with these two approaches, it is not clear why it has to be discussed as organizational scandal. This is because we can regard them as an incident, accident or claim and think about how it has happened and what countermeasures are to be taken. In other words, there is theoretical limitation with these two approaches that the theoretical significance peculiar to the study of organizational scandal leaves unclear. Thus the current article has focused on the linguistic approach and reviewed research, which becomes possible when organizational scandal is perceived as language (words). In the linguistic approach, the 'prevention' of organizational scandal is out of its scope. In other words, by examining the ways in which organizational scandal has been or has not been talked about as language (words), it becomes possible to carry out critical examination such as how the power gap between the speaker and the spoken has emerged. The linguistic approach enables such theoretical expansion, which is of major significance. The current article examined discourse analysis, content analysis and narrative analysis as concrete analytical methods in this approach and it is expected that more research should be carried out using these methods.

CONCLUSION

The article has focused on three approaches to organizational scandal and has theoretically examined these approaches. In particular in the discussion section, it has

identified theoretical limitation of the normative and cognitive approaches and has further explored the utility of the linguistic approach. More concretely, in the normative and cognitive approaches, the ways in which organizational scandal is talked about or not talked about is put in a black box. Consequently, the current article focuses on the linguistic approach and examined initial research in reference to each analytical method in order to open up a new theoretical perspective. These approaches are only preliminarily evaluated in this article and further research is required. In particular, the linguistic approach requires urgent theoretical development, and methodological examination of the analytical method is also needed.

REFERENCES

Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000). Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research: Challenges, responses, consequences. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *36*(2), 136-158.

Beenen, G., & Pinto, J. (2008). Resisting organizational-level corruption: An interview with Sherron Watkins. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *8*(2), 275-289.

Breit, E. (2010). On the (re) construction of corruption in the media: A critical discursive Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *92*(2), 619-635.

Fisher, R. (1989). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value and action*. University of South California Press.

Fukuhara, K. (2012). *Various dimensions of the study of organizational discourse*. Material provided at the first regular research meeting of the Graduate School of Business Management, Senshu University, 2012-13.

Fukuhara, K., & Che, I. (2012). Perspectives and methods of the study of organizational scandal: Re-evaluation of the micro approach. *Senshu Management Journal*, *1*(1-2), 99-113.

Gohara, N. (2013). *Why do corporation fail to respond to crises? The core of ensuing 'mega scandals'*, Mainichi Shimbunsha

Hasegawa, T. (2015). The linguistic turn and the study of western history: the context of acceptance. In M. Okamoto, T.Kashima, T., Hasegawa, & K. Watanabe, K. (Eds.), *Shooting history: the linguistic turn, cultural history, public history, national history*. Ochanomizu Shobo.

Higuchi, H. (2012). *A study into organizational scandal: Potential causes of organizational scandal*. Hakuto Shobo

Inaba, Y. (2014). The relationship between the corporation's structure and scandals in regards to social capital. *Seikei Kenyu 51*(3), 707-739.

Inoue, I. (2015). *A study of corporation scandals: The manager's perspective to scandals*, Bunshindo.

Jàvor, I., & Jancsics, D. (2013). The Role of power in organizational corruption: An empirical study. *Administration & Society*, 0095399713514845.

Komabashi, K. (2012). Challenges for public relations in regards to structural factors of corporation scandals: A case study of scandals in the food industry. *The Journal of Communication Studies*, *35*, 63-92.

Kuawta, K., Matsushima, N., & Takahashi, M. (2015). *Institutional entrepreneurship*, Nakanishiya Shuppan

Koyama, I. (2011). *Management of CSR: Corporations trapped in issue myopia*, Hakuto Shobo

Kruvand, M., & Hwang, S. (2007). From revered to reviled: A cross-cultural narrative analysis of the South Korean cloning scandal. *Science Communication*, *29*(2), 177-197.

Murakami, N. (2011). An observation on the construction of the concept of scandal in reporting: a case study of 1991 "securities scandal", *Annual Proceeding of Graduate School of Sociology*, 18, 46-61.

Murakami, N., & Yoshizaki, S. (2008). *The reason why corporation scandals never end*. Fuyoshobo Shuppan.

Nakahara, S. (2014). The making of organizational scandal by voiceless actors: A shift from research into causes for the eradication of organizational scandal to the study to describe relationship to capture unavoidable social processes. Second dissertation submitted to Graduate School of Management Studies, Kobe University.

Nakaraha, S. (2015). The researchability of the study of organizational scandal: the quest for dialogical practice of researchers and actors. Collected Draft Papers to Be Presented at the 23rd Convention of the Society for the History of Management Theories, 84-90.

Nakaraha, S. (2016a). The constructionism to organizational scandal: Political researchability accompanied by dialogue with informants. Doctoral Thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Management Studies, Kobe University.

Nakahara, S. (2016b). Political researchability of the study of organizational scandal: from confirmation to generation of social problems. *Annals of the Society for the History of Management Theories*, *23*, 133-143.

Nakamura, A. (2007). The moral trap in the organization, Nippon Academy of Management (ed.) *Study into Management Education 10: The New Axis in Management Education* (pp. 139-153). Gakubunsha.

Nakatani, J. (2007). Corporation scandals. In Kato, N. (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Applied Ethics* (pp. 340-341). Maruzen Shuppan.

Japan Society for Information and Management (ed.) (2014). *Special issue: The linguistic approach to information management*. Japan Society for Information and Management.

Noe, K. (1990). What "the linguistic turn" means. *Kanagawa Daigaku Gengo Kenyu*, *12*, 161-164.

Okamoto, S. (2016). *The psychology of malice: Speaking ill of others, lies, hate speech*. Chuko Shisho.

Ogawa, T. (2009). The mechanism of corporation scandals and challenges to management education: The existence of negative organizational learning and how to overcome it. *Studies into Management Education*, *12*(1) 57-68.

Rorty, R. (ed.) (1992). *The linguistic turn: Essays in philosophical method*. University of Chicago Press.

Uda, T., & Takahashi, M. (2014). Institutionalization as (re) connection and severance among discourse: discourse on knight, servants and heroes in freelance studies. *The Journal of the Japan Society for Information and Management*, *35*(1), 33-45.

Urano, M. (2009). Institution as language: the management of interest through hoisting of and reference to symbols. *Journal of the Japan Society for Management Information, 18*(3), 271-286.

Urano, M. (2015). Institutional leadership as linguistic control: critical decision to co-ordinate interests sparked by organizational goals. In Kuwata, K.; Matsushima, N. & Takahashi, M. (Eds), *Institutional entrepreneurship* (pp. 110-136), Nakanishiya Shuppan.

Wakuta, Y. (2014). On the special issue, the linguistic approach to information management. *The Journal of the Japan Society for Information and Management*, *35*(1),1-3.