FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS

2ND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PATH DEPENDENCE

March 3-4, 2011

Un-locking Changes:

The Discursive Electrification of the Automobile in California

This is a work in progress. Please do not cite without permission of the author.

Daniel Haussmann

Freie Universität Berlin
School of Business and Economics
Path Dependence Research Center
Garystr. 21
D-14195 Berlin

Tel.: +49 (0)30 838-57184
Fax: +49 (0)30 838-57186
Email: daniel.haussmann @ fu-berlin.de

Abstract

Drawing on neo-institutional theory emphasizing discourse and the notion of path dependence, this ongoing dissertation project explores the role different types and constellations of actors and different kinds of "discursive work" play during periods of un-locking institutional change and transformation through a case study that traces the recent "electrification" of widespread, taken-for-granted understandings and practices associated with the automobile and its use within the Californian context.

1. Introduction

> "*Well, no one saw it coming. I mean, cars always used to be gas-guzzling, V8-powered, and kind of big. The sports car and SUV thing - powerful, secure and so on, you know. Nobody cared about damn electrics. But now - but now, everybody seems to be into EVs: Car manufacturers, venture capitalists, soccer moms and dads, you name it. Hell, even I ordered a Tesla last week!*"

<div align="right">

(Reid R. Heffner, Booz Allen Hamilton,

Interview with author 03/23/10)

</div>

> "*... no one is directly responsible for that. I mean, in fact, a lot of people are.*"

<div align="right">

(Bradley Berman, hybridcars.com,

Interview with author 03/11/10)

</div>

This dissertation project examines how diverse actions of various types and constellations of actors in producing, distributing, and consuming texts can lead to radical change and transformation in a locked-in institutional field. Specifically, it examines the discursive dynamics associated with the recent "electrification" of the highly institutionalized, taken-for-granted understandings and practices concerning the automobile and its use within the Californian context. It focuses on the "electrification discourses" within the Californian automotive field, a social domain that has variously been referred to as "the world's public battleground when it comes to the electrification of the car [and] [...] the abandonment of the gasoline path" (Shnayerson 1996, p.12; see e.g. Sperling & Gordon 2010; Hard & Knie 2000), and traces their development, main drivers and struggles in the face of prevailing "self-reinforcing processes" and "lock-in" (David 1985; David 1994; David 2007; Arthur 1989; Schreyögg et al. 2003; Sydow et al. 2009).

While this research is still going on, the remainder of this working paper will present an abbreviated overview of the theoretical perspectives, questions and methods of this dissertation project and is structured as follows. First, I conceptualize the specific understanding of institutions and institutional fields that forms the basis of this project.

Second, I present a discursive view on institutions and path dependence. Third, I outline the main research questions of this dissertation project, and finally, I summarize quite briefly the methodology employed.

2. Institutions and Institutional Fields

In the broadest sense, scholars depict institutions as social conventions that are self-policing (e.g. Douglas 1989). In line with neo-institutional theorists, within this dissertation project institutions are furthermore defined as "social constructions" (Meyer & Rowan 1977) i.e. "historical accretions of past practices and understandings that set conditions on action" and cognition within a social domain (Barley & Tolbert 1997, p.99). According to such a view, institutions "provide stability and meaning" (Scott 2008, p.48) to social life and the objects within it through the way in which they "gradually acquire the moral and ontological status of taken-for-granted facts which, in turn, shape future [thinking], interactions, and negotiations" (Barley & Tolbert 1997, p.99; see also DiMaggio & Powell 1991; Jepperson 1991; Leblebici et al. 1991; Meyer & Rowan 1977; Zucker 1977). They make up local "webs" (Caronna 2004) or "fields" (Bourdieu 1993; Bourdieu 1990; Wooten & Hoffman 2008) of meaning, that form around certain social "issues", like for instance "automobility" or "climate change" (Hoffman 1999), and in which are embedded communities of individuals and "organizations whose participants interact more frequently and fatefully with one another than with actors outside" the community (Scott 2008, p.56).

Institutions govern behavior and thought within such "fields" because, once established, departures from them "are counteracted in a regulated fashion, by repetitively activated, socially constructed controls" that make nonconformity to the institutional status quo and deviations from the accepted institutional order costly in one way or another (Jepperson 1991, p.145). In other words, nonconformity and deviance are associated with increased costs in several different ways: "economically (it increases risk), cognitively (it requires more thought), and socially (it reduces legitimacy and the access to resources that accompany legitimacy)" (Phillips et al. 2000, p.28).

The institutional controls through which legitimacy is established and conformity is secured are composed of cognitive, normative, and regulative elements, or "pillars" as Scott (2008) calls them. The "regulative pillar" refers to the authority of certain actors within a field to formally constrain other actors' behavior (Caronna 2004). It involves the ability to establish rules, police conformity and, if necessary, coerce compliance in a multitude of ways (Scott 2008). The "normative pillar" influences behavior and thought within a field by defining what is appropriate or expected in a given social situation (Wicks 2001). It consists of values and norms that produce conformity (Caronna 2004) as a result of social expectations and moral obligations (Scott 2008). The "cognitive pillar" is based on "shared conceptions that constitute the nature of social reality" and define the prevailing field-wide orthodoxy (Scott 2008, p.57). Conformity in this case may be automatic and unconscious (Maguire & Hardy 2009) because of a "culturally supported […] basis of legitimacy which becomes unquestioned" (Hoffman 1999, p.353). In these ways, institutions help to reproduce behavior and thought within a field (Scott 2008) and therefore "provide enduring stability […] and meaning" to various aspects of social life (Scott 2008, p.48).

3. Discourse and Lock-in

The idea that institutions are social constructions, produced through meaningful interaction, forms the foundation of the neo-institutional literature (e.g. Meyer & Rowan 1977; Powell & DiMaggio 1993; Jepperson 1991). Extending and refining this observation from a discursive perspective (e.g. Phillips et al. 2004; Heracleous 2006), institutions are not just social constructions but social constructions constituted and maintained through "discourse" (Parker 1992).

Discourses are collections of interrelated texts (Parker 1992) that are produced, distributed and consumed within a social domain or field and "cohere in some way to produce both meanings and effects in the real world" (Carabine 2001, p.268). "Texts are symbolic forms of representation (e.g., documents, books, media accounts, interviews, speeches, committee reports, etc.) that are inscribed by being spoken, written or otherwise depicted" (Maguire & Hardy 2009, p.150; see Phillips & Hardy 2002), thus "taking on material form and becoming accessible to others" (Taylor et al. 1996, p.7). Through texts, discourses provide a field with

"a language for talking about a topic and […] a particular kind of knowledge about a topic" (Du Gay 1996, p.43). Discourses thereby define "who and what is 'normal', standard and acceptable" (Meriläinen et al. 2004, p.544), as well as what is considered an appropriate way to think, talk, and act within a social domain (Hall 2001; see Phillips & Hardy 2002).

Though emerging, and therefore incoherent and unstructured discourses may still allow for a multitude of ways to think and talk about various aspects of social reality and "warrant voice" (Potter & Wetherell 1987) to a variety of actors, thus are 'open' and contingent in a way, discourses that are becoming increasingly "'structured' – that is, the texts that comprise the discourse draw on one another in well-established and understandable way" – and 'coherent' – that is, these texts converge in their descriptions and explanations of social reality" (see Maguire & Hardy 2009, p.150; see Phillips et al. 2004) – display a more and more unified and narrow view of specific aspects of social reality. They form shared "bodies of knowledge" (Covaleski et al. 1998) that a) normalize certain ways of believing, speaking, and behaving (Barge & Oliver 2003) and b) "convey messages, for example, 'good' and 'bad', morality and immorality, and acceptable and inappropriate behaviors" (Carabine 2001, p.269). Additionally, they establish specific "subject positions" for actors within a field, including bureaucratic positions that warrant regulative authority, as well as certain "categories of identity" (Bourdieu 1990; Oakes et al. 1998) that "warrant [field-wide] voice" (Potter & Wetherell 1987) and "are understood as meaningful, legitimate, and powerful" (Hardy et al. 2005). In other words, discourses institutionalize certain understandings and practices within a social domain, create positions of power (Fairclough & Wodak 1997), and establish related regulative, normative, and cognitive controls.

However, in this way discourses are not only socially constitutive, but at the same time also socially conditioned (Fairclough & Wodak 1997). As Fairclough (1993) has noted, through the discursive process of institutionalization discourse constructs its own controls and conditions. When practices and understandings are becoming more and more institutionalized (i.e. taken-for-granted and repetitively reproduced), subject positions tend to increasingly privilege dominant field incumbents who support the status quo; "and bodies of knowledge tend to 'construct' practices [and understandings] as effective, beneficial, appropriate, inevitable, and so on" (Maguire & Hardy 2009, p.151). In effect, texts that don't conform in their descriptions and explanations of social reality are getting costly to produce, distribute or consume in a way or another (Putnam et al. 2005), i.e. they seem increasingly odd, loose legitimacy, or are

not even noticed by the majority within a field, whereas the arising discursive mainstream further and further strengthens the institutionalization of the prevailing practices and understandings and, in turn, is further and further strengthened by it.

Such a conceptualization of discursive institutionalization thus highlights the 'tapering' and "self-reinforcing character" (Philipps & Malhotra 2008, p.716) of the latter, and ultimately points towards a possible 'lock-in' situation within a social domain, two notions integral to path dependence theory (e.g. David 1985; 1994; 2007; Arthur 1989; North 1990; Sydow et al. 2009). Withal, it also problematizes the possibility of changing local discourses and initiating (non-isomorphic) institutional change or transformation once the self-reinforcing dynamics are at work – at least when the highly stable lock-in state is achieved.

4. Research Questions

The main theoretical puzzle in that respect concerns actors' agency when it comes to initiating and pursuing change (e.g. Schreyögg et al. 2003; Sydow et al. 2009; Hardy & Maguire 2008). In discursive terms the twofold theoretical puzzle scholars are confronted with once a field displays self-reinforcing dynamics and characteristics of lock-in can be outlined as follows[1]:

While dominant actors are favored by existing "subject positions" (Oakes et al. 1998), thus are "meaningful, legitimate, and powerful" (Hardy et al. 2005) enough to influence discourses in a way that fosters institutional change or transformation, they also deeply inherit the field's "bodies of knowledge" (Covaleski et al. 1998) and are subject to the field's regulative,

---

[1] This theoretical puzzle has often been referred to as "the paradox of emebedded agency" within neo-institutional theory (e.g. Holm 1995; Seo & Creed 2002; Garud et al. 2007; Battilana & D'Aunno 2007). However, it is more than that. It also involves the paradoxical situation of actors that are peripheral or new to a field, i.e. dis-embedded actors, as outlined below. Therefore speaking of the "paradox of (dis-)embedded agency" or "the twofold paradox of agency in locked-in fields" would be more accurate.

normative and cognitive pressures. Hence, as Maguire (2008, p.674) points out, "actors who are truly embedded" and locked-in to the dynamics of an institutional field are not supposed to imagine, desire, propose or realize alternative ways of doing things because highly institutionalized arrangements, practices, and understandings "structure cognitions, define interests and, in the limit, produce actors' identities". Resource-rich central players thus are often unable "to see beyond prevailing 'recipes'"; are committed to existing technologies; are "exposed to normative processes"; and have interests "aligned with current practices and understandings" (Greenwood & Suddaby 2006, p.29; see Hardy & Maguire 2008). In sum, although actors central to a field would in theory be able to champion institutional change, they also appear highly unlikely to discursively initiate and pursue change and transformation or to come up with novel ideas in the first place because they are a) deeply locked-in to the dynamics of a field, and b) advantaged by existing institutional arrangements.

In contrast, those actors that are most likely to imagine and desire change seem to be more often than not new to a field or located at its periphery (see e.g. Battilana 2006; Leblebici et al. 1991; Suddaby & Greenwood 2005). By being less embedded in and less locked-in to an institutional field – i.e. being less subject to the prevailing bodies of knowledge and being less privileged by existing subject positions and institutional arrangements – they have far more to gain from change and far more ideas for what it might look like. However, whilst these actors might actually be in favor of change they are also very likely to lack the necessary power and resources to influence the field wide discourses in a substantial way, and are therefore unable to really foster the desired change or transformation process in a locked-in institutional field (Maguire 2008).

While concentrating on either central *or* peripheral actors thus doesn't seem to hold much promise, one possible answer to this unsolved two-sided puzzle lies in applying a more "process-centric" (Hardy & Maguire 2008) and "relational" (Battilana 2006) perspective on change and transformation. According to such a view, change and transformation are not the outcome of "heroic" acts of lonesome, isolated actors (Levy & Scully 2007) or "solitary operators" located either at the center or at the periphery of a field (Ogbor 2001), but are in fact interpersonal and interactional endeavors (Fairclough 1993), involving "spatially dispersed, heterogeneous activity by actors with different kinds and levels of resources" (i.e. central *and* peripheral actors), at different points of time (Lounsbury & Crumley 2007, p.993; see Canales 2008). In other words, such a view not only shifts our attention from the mere

individuals to their interplay in collectivities, but also from "critical, individual entrepreneurial characteristics" to the specific "work" (see Lawrence & Suddaby 2006; Lawrence et al. 2009) done by certain parts of these collectivities at different points of time. Depending on the latter, such "work" might include different types of discursive "problematizations" of the status quo (Maguire & Hardy 2009), aiming to undermine core assumptions and beliefs (Leblebici et al. 1991; Wicks 2001) or disassociate understandings and practices from their moral foundations within a specific cultural context (Ahmadjian & Robinson 2001), while it also might include discursive "translations" (Czarniawska-Joerges & Joerges 1996; Zilber 2006) of these mere problematizations, potentially leading to their field-wide "normalization" (Maguire & Hardy 2009) and integration. However, so far, there's little research that explores the interplay between different types and constellations of actors and different types of discursive work when it comes to initiating and pursuing change and transformation, especially when self-reinforcing mechanism and lock-in are at work. Accordingly, the main research questions of this dissertation project are:

Research Question 1: *What role do different types and constellations of actors play during discursive un-locking processes?*

Research Question 2: *What role do different types of "discursive work" play during such un-locking processes?*

5. Methodology

5.1. Research Design, Site Selection, and Method

Studying discursive processes leading to un-locking change and transformation in an institutional field requires a) a suitable case study design that allows to trace such dynamics at the level of the latter and b) a methodology that enables us to thoroughly investigate them.

I therefore opted for a single, longitudinal, and exploratory case study, following a common research method for building theory (Dyer & Wilkins 1991; Yin 2009). Studies in which researchers have used single cases to study change processes include research in which a deep, interpretive, and holistic understanding was required (e.g. Munir 2005; Munir & Philipps 2005; Phillips et al. 2000; Zilber 2006; Suddaby & Greenwood 2005). I selected the particular California case because it is a clear, well-documented example of an interactional and interpersonal "discursive endeavor" (Fairclough 1993), involving diverse types of actors and diverse types of discursive "work" (Maguire & Hardy 2009; see Lawrence et al. 2009; Lawrence & Suddaby 2006) at different points of time and leading to un-locking change and transformation within a locked-in institutional field. Furthermore, the discursive changes were all "transparently observable" as they were located in the public sphere (Eisenhardt 1989).

To investigate the dynamics of changing discourses and to capture the field level changes, I employ a variety of "discourse analysis" (Phillips & Hardy 2002; Keller 2007; Keller et al. 2006; Keller et al. 2008; Fairclough & Wodak 1997). Discourse analysis looks at the way in which a set collection of texts is produced, disseminated and received (Phillips & Hardy 2002), which actors are involved and in what way. This allows the researcher to trace and investigate the development and dynamics of a discourse over time and see how field-level change and transformation unfolds.

5.2. Data Collection and Analysis

The ongoing data collection and analysis of this research project is organized in three steps:

1. *Step: Event History Database*

   The first step focuses on building a summarizing "event history database" (Van den Ven & Poole 1990), that chronologically orders the main milestones within the process of interest and captures what happened and "who *did* what and when" (Maguire & Hardy 2009). This database is grounded on the juxtaposing and contrasting analysis of various secondary source accounts on the process of interest (i.e. movies, documentaries, doctoral thesis, magazine articles, books and papers), search engine statistics, and 26 explorative interviews with key personalities

(conducted in California between February and May 2010) to ascertain convergence and triangulation on events.

2. *Step: Discursive Event Database*

The second step focuses on building an enriched database, a so called "discursive event database" (Maguire 2004), that chronologically orders the most relevant and influential texts that were produced during the time span of interest, relating them to specific events, and capturing "who said what and when". These texts are identified based on the ongoing analysis of the 26 expert interviews, the analysis of circulation figures from the Audit Bureau of Circulations and the Newspaper Association of America, by buzzword-scanning the media databases LexisNexis, ProQuest and archive.org, and by an abbreviated form of content analysis of the forming "corpus" of texts (Keller 2007).

3. *Step: In-Depth Analysis*

The third step first and foremost focuses on the in-depth analysis of all the collected texts regarding authorship, their main propositions and the specific linguistic-rhetorical ways these texts draw on each other and on certain events to "make specific meaning" (Phillips & Hardy 2002), i.e. it focuses on the question "who did when what kind of discursive work".

Based on that, a synoptic 'narrative discursive landscape' is 'drawn', displaying all in all how the Californian automotive discourse over time has "ruled-in" certain ways of talking about automobiles and has "ruled-out", limited and restricted other ways of talking about them or constructing knowledge about them (Hall 2001, p.71), thus leading to the "electrification" of the institutionalized and taken-for-granted understandings and practices regarding this four-wheeled means of transportation in California over the last years.

References

Ahmadjian, C.L. & Robinson, P., 2001. Safety in numbers: Downsizing and the deinstitutionalization of permanent employment in Japan. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(4), pp.622–654.

Arthur, W.B., 1989. Competing technologies, increasing returns, and lock-in by historical events. *The Economic Journal*, 99(394), pp.116-131.

Barge, J. & Oliver, C., 2003. Working with appreciation in managerial practice. *The Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), pp.124-142.

Barley, S. & Tolbert, P., 1997. Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, 18(1), pp.93 -117.

Battilana, J., 2006. Agency and institutions: The enabling role of individuals' social position. *Organization*, 13(5), pp.653-676.

Battilana, J. & D'Aunno, T., 2007. The paradox of embedded agency: Straw man argument or central epistemological issue? In International Workshop on Institutional Work 2007, Segal Graduate School of Business at Simon Fraser University. Vancouver, pp. 1-37.

Bourdieu, P., 1993. Some properties of fields. In *Sociology in question*. London: Sage, pp. 72-77.

Bourdieu, P., 1990. *The logic of practice*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Canales, R.(.J.)., 2008. *From ideals to institutions : institutional entrepreneurship in Mexican small business finance*. Thesis. Cambridge, MA: MIT. Available at: http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/44810?show=full [Accessed November 21, 2010].

Carabine, J., 2001. Unmarried motherhood 1830-1990: A genealogical analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates, eds. *Discourse as data: a guide for analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 267-310.

Caronna, C.A., 2004. The misalignment of institutional "pillars": consequences for the U.S. health care field. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 45, pp.45-58.

Covaleski, M. et al., 1998. The calculated and the avowed: Techniques of discipline and struggles over identity in big six public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(2), pp.293-327.

Czarniawska-Joerges, B. & Joerges, B., 1996. Travel of ideas. In B. Czarniawska-Joerges & G. Sevón, eds. *Translating organizational change*. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 13-48.

David, P.A., 1985. Clio and the economics of QWERTY. *The American Economic Review*, 75(2), pp.332-337.

David, P.A., 2007. Path dependence: a foundational concept for historical social science. *Cliometrica*, 1(2), pp.91-114.

David, P.A., 1994. Why are institutions the `carriers of history'?: Path dependence and the evolution of conventions, organizations and institutions. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 5(2), pp.205-220.

DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W., 1991. Introduction. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio, eds. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp. 1-38.

Douglas, M., 1989. *How institutions think*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Du Gay, P., 1996. *Consumption and identity at work*, London: SAGE Publications.

Dyer, W.A. & Wilkins, A.L., 1991. Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), pp.613-619.

Eisenhardt, K., 1989. Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), pp.532-550.

Fairclough, N., 1993. *Discourse and social change*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R., 1997. Critical discourse analysis. In T. Van Dijk, ed. *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.

Garud, R., Hardy, C. & Maguire, S., 2007. Institutional entrepreneurship as embedded agency: An introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), pp.957-969.

Greenwood, R. & Suddaby, R., 2006. Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The big five accounting firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), pp.27-48.

Hall, S., 2001. Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates, eds. *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*. London: Sage, pp. 72-81.

Hard, M. & Knie, A., 2000. Getting out of the vicious traffic circle: Attempts at restructuring the cultural ambience of the automobile throughout the 20th century. , (00-103), p.20.

Hardy, C., Lawrence, T.B. & Grant, D., 2005. Discourse and collaboration: The role of conversations and collective identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), pp.58-77.

Hardy, C. & Maguire, S., 2008. Institutional entrepreneurship. In R. Greenwood et al., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London: Sage, pp. 199-217.

Heracleous, L., 2006. *Discourse, interpretation, organization*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffman, A.J., 1999. Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the US chemical industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), pp.351–371.

Holm, P., 1995. The dynamics of institutionalization: Transformation processes in Norwegian fisheries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), pp.398-422.

Jepperson, R., 1991. Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio, eds. *The new institutionalism in organizaitonal analysis*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Keller, R., 2007. *Diskursforschung: Eine Einführung für SozialwissenschaftlerInnen*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Keller, R. et al. eds., 2006. *Handbuch sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse - Band 1: Theorien und Methoden*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Keller, R. et al. eds., 2008. *Handbuch sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse 2: Forschungspraxis*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Lawrence, T.B. & Suddaby, R., 2006. Institutions and Institutional Work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & Lawrence, eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies, 2nd Edition*. London: Sage, pp. 215-254.

Lawrence, T.B., Suddaby, R. & Leca, B., 2009. *Institutional work: actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leblebici, H. et al., 1991. Institutional change and the transformation of interorganizational fields: An organizational history of the U.S. radio broadcasting industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3), pp.333-363.

Levy, D. & Scully, M., 2007. The institutional entrepreneur as modern prince: The strategic face of power in contested fields. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), pp.971-991.

Lounsbury, M. & Crumley, E.T., 2007. New practice creation: An institutional perspective on innovation. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), pp.993 -1012.

Maguire, S., 2008. Institutional entrepreneurship. In S. Clegg & J. Bailey, eds. *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 674-678.

Maguire, S., 2004. The co-evolution of technology and discourse: A study of substitution processes for the insecticide DDT. *Organization Studies*, 25(1), pp.113 -134.

Maguire, S. & Hardy, C., 2009. Discourse and deinstitutionalization: The decline of DDT. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(1), pp.148-178.

Meriläinen, S. et al., 2004. Management consultant talk: A cross-cultural comparison of normalizing discourse and resistance. *Organization*, 11(4), pp.539 -564.

Meyer, J. & Rowan, B., 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), pp.340-363.

Munir, K.A., 2005. The social construction of events: A study of institutional change in the photographic field. *Organization Studies*, 26(1), pp.93-112.

Munir, K.A. & Philipps, N., 2005. The birth of the 'Kodak Moment': Institutional entrepreneurship and the adoption of new technologies. *Organization Studies*, 26(11), pp.1665-1687.

North, D., 1990. *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oakes, L., Townley, B. & Cooper, D., 1998. Business Planning as Pedagogy: Language and Control in a Changing Institutional Field. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(2), pp.257-292.

Ogbor, J.O., 2001. Critical theory and the hegemony of corporate culture. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 14(6), pp.590-608.

Parker, I., 1992. *Discourse dynamics: critical analysis for social and individual psychology*, London: Routledge.

Philipps, N. & Malhotra, N., 2008. Taking social construction seriously: Extending the discursive approach in institutional theory. In R. Greenwood et al., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London: Sage, pp. 703-720.

Phillips, N. & Hardy, C., 2002. *Discourse analysis: investigating processes of social construction*, Sage Publications.

Phillips, N., Lawrence, T.B. & Hardy, C., 2004. Discourse and Institutions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), pp.635-652.

Phillips, N., Lawrence, T.B. & Hardy, C., 2000. Inter-organizational collaboration and the dynamics of institutional fields. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(1), pp.23-45.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M., 1987. *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*, London: Sage.

Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. eds., 1993. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, Chicago Univ. Press.

Putnam, L.L. et al., 2005. Discourse and resistance. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), pp.5 -18.

Schreyögg, G., Sydow, J. & Koch, J., 2003. Organisatorische Pfade - Von der Pfadabhängigkeit zur Pfadkreation? In *Strategische Prozesse und Pfade*. Managementforschung. Wiesbaden: Gabler, pp. 257-294.

Scott, W., 2008. *Institutions and organizations: ideas and interests*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Seo, M.G. & Creed, W.E., 2002. Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), pp.222–247.

Shnayerson, M., 1996. *The car that could: the inside story of GM's revolutionary electric vehicle*, New York, NY: Random House.

Sperling, D. & Gordon, D., 2010. *Two billion cars: Driving toward sustainability*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Suddaby, R. & Greenwood, R., 2005. Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* pp.35–67.

Sydow, J., Schreyögg, G. & Koch, J., 2009. Organizational path dependence: Opening the black box. *The Academy of Management Review (AMR)*, 34(4), pp.689–709.

Taylor, J. et al., 1996. The communicational basis of organization: Between the conversation and the text. *Communication Theory,* 6(1), pp.1-39.

Van den Ven, A.H. & Poole, M.S., 1990. Methods for studying innovation development in the Minnesota innovation research program. *Organization Science*, 1(3), pp.313-335.

Wicks, D., 2001. Institutionalized mindsets of invulnerability: Differentiated institutional fields and the antecedents of organizational crisis. *Organization Studies*, 22(4), pp.659 -692.

Wooten, M. & Hoffman, A.J., 2008. Organizational fields: Past, present and future. In R. Greenwood et al., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London: Sage, pp. 131-147.

Yin, R., 2009. *Case study research : Design and methods*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zilber, T.B., 2006. The work of the symbolic in institutional processes: Translations of rational myths in Israeli high tech. *The Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)*, 49(2), pp.281–303.

Zucker, L., 1977. The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review*, 42(5), pp.726-743.