studies of courage examining the social context within which courageous behaviour is enacted.

Courage is regarded as a polysemic concept in management studies, and has several but related connotations (Detert & Bruno, 2017; Harbour & Kisfalvi, 2012; Klepousniotou et al., 2008). Such concepts have different meanings in different contexts for different people. Thus courage in the case of top management could be illustrated by the boldness of the decision, a soldier is courageous because he/she is risking his/her life for the nation, or women in a small village are courageous because they are resisting the everyday patriarchy of their society. Therefore the very nature of the concept is fluid and people ascribe idiosyncratic meaning to it in a given context. This quality of the concept not only makes it difficult to investigate the phenomenon, it has given rise to various courage related definitions and conceptions, and contradictory findings on a variety of issues such as whistle blowing, positive deviance, speaking up and taking charge. This has hampered empirical work on the construct and also poses a big challenge towards building a coherent courage scholarship. However, some scholars have proposed that there is a core element that links the various meanings attributed to the given polysemic concept.

Given the inherent subjectivity in the experience and perception of courage, the construct has been defined as a moral decision, a personality trait or a quality of behaviour. Despite the unorganized nature of courage scholarship, scholars have come to agree that courageous actions have two core components in any given context: facing

the participation of others. Therefore rather than conceptualizing courage as a trait contained within an individual that makes him/her fearless present work is interested in capturing the fluid relational process of courage (McNamee, 1998; Koerner 2014, Shilpzand et al., 2014). The widely accepted definition of courage proposed by Goud (2005) serves as the framework hqt" vjg" fkuugtvcvkqp0" Jg" fghkpgu" kv" cu" *acting intentionally in the face of risks, threat and obstacles in the pursuit of morally worthy goals*0" Wpnkmg" vjg" gctnkgt" yqtm" qp" eqwtcge in management, such as managerial decision making, or professional moral courage, the dissertation does not limit itself vq" gzcokpg" qpn{" vjg" *kornkekv" vjgqtkgu*" qh" cp" c

property, and at times human lives. The animals caught in the crossfire are often injured and sometimes killed in retaliation, and the whole process increases the hostility towards wild animals, in the minds of the community. The wild life rescue officers are entrusted with the responsibility of safe rescue and translocation of wild animals and also of protecting the interests of the human population affected by the encroachment of the animal. The rescue narratives of the officers reveal interesting insights about the process of courageous work, by bringing out the multifaceted nature of threats that they have to confront, and how they negotiate with them. The rescue operations make an interesting case for the exploration of courage as the actors face a complex mix of challenges and threats, which are too large to handle individually, and thus the setting reveals the courage dynamics inherent in organizing in a situation of crisis.

The s

eqwtcig" vjcv" uwiiguv" vjcv" eqwtcig" iqgu" dg{qpf" vjg" kpfkxkfwcnøu" fkurqukvkqp" vq" vcmg" tkumu0"

Study 1 (Rescue operations) highlights the role of various narratives and their interactions, as the precondition for courage enactment. My analysis emphasizes the under-examined role of space and collaboration narratives in explaining courageous work. The case of SHG women

eqwtcig" vjcv" uwiiguv" vjcv" eqwtcig" iqgu" dg{qpf" vjg" kpfkxkfwcnøu" fkurqukvkqp" vq" vcmg" tkumu0"

Harbour, M., & Kisfalvi, V. (2012). Looking desperately for courage or how to study a polysemic concept. Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 7(2), 166-188.

Harbour, M., & Kisfalvi, V. (2014). In the eye of the beholder: An exploration of managerial courage. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *119*(4), 493-515.

Klepousniotou, E., Titone, D., & Romero, C. (2008). Making sense of word senses: The comprehension of polysemy depends on sense overlap. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 34(6), 1534.

Koerner, M. M. (2014). Courage as identity work: Accounts of workplace courage. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(1), 63-93.

McNamee, S. (1998). Re-inscribing organizational wisdom and courage: The relationally engaged organization. Organizational wisdom and executive courage, 101-117.

Quinn, R. W., & Worline, M. C. (2008). Enabling courageous collective action: Conversations from United Airlines flight 93. *Organization Science*, *19*(4), 497-516.

Schilpzand, P., Hekman, D. R., & Mitchell, T. R. (2014). An inductively generated typology and process model of workplace courage. Organization Science, 26(1), 52-77.

Sekerka, L. E., Bagozzi, R. P., & Charnigo, R. (2009). Facing ethical challenges in the workplace: Conceptualizing and measuring professional moral courage. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *89*(4), 565-579.

Srivastva, S., & Cooperrider, D. L. (Eds.). (1998). *Organizational wisdom and executive courage*. Lexington Books.

The Global Gender Gap Report 2018 - WEForum - World Economic Forum www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf.

Vadera, A. K., Pratt, M. G., & Mishra, P. (2013). Constructive deviance in organizations: Integrating and moving forward. *Journal of Management*, *39*(5), 1221-1276.