



Article

# Voicing the Puppet: Accommodating Unresolved Institutional Tensions in Digital Open Practices

Organization Studies  
2018, Vol. 39(7) 923–945  
© The Author(s) 2017  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/0170840617695358  
www.egosnet.org/os  


**Claes Thorén**

Uppsala University, Sweden

**Pär J. Ågerfalk**

Uppsala University, Sweden

**Bertil Rolandsson**

Gothenburg University, Sweden

## Abstract

This paper examines managerial control and the tensions caused by digital open practices. Drawing on qualitative interviews with managers of a prominent Swedish newspaper corporation, we apply the theoretical lens of institutional logics to analyse the institutional tensions stemming from pressure to integrate user-generated content, and the strategies for managing multiple logics that emerge as a result. Specifically, by linking managerial control to the logics of ‘profession’, the ‘market’ and the ‘corporation’, we use the concept of ventriloquism to show how managers recreate professional legitimacy when handling digital open practices by letting the corporate logic mimic the values of the profession. The study at hand contributes to the understanding of how digital open practices leverage managerial and corporate control, and the consequences thereof, and how the newspaper industry still has not fully managed to reconcile with user-generated content. Prior research is inconclusive as to whether digital open practices increase or decrease managerial control. This study concludes that framing the market logic in digital media exerts pressure on managers to find a defensive compromise to cope with unresolved tensions between the corporate and professional logics.

## Keywords

digital innovation, digital journalism, digital open practice, digitalization, institutional logics, media convergence, new media

---

## Corresponding author:

Claes Thorén, Uppsala University, Box 513, Uppsala, SE-75120, Sweden.  
Email: Claes.Thoren@im.uu.se

## Introduction

Emerging digital practices are increasingly prompting businesses to engage more closely with external stakeholders (Chesbrough, Vanhaverbeke, & West, 2014; Yoo, Henfridsson, & Lyytinen, 2010). Such engagement requires significant changes on the part of adopting organizations (Fichman, Dos Santos, & Zheng, 2014). We refer to these practices, exemplified in crowd-sourced co-creation (e.g. Amazon Mechanical Turk at <http://www.mturk.com/>) and reader-contributed content creation (e.g. The Huffington Post at <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>), as *digital open practices*. These have been characterized as ‘neither market nor hierarchy’ (Powell, 1990; Benkler, 2006). Implementing digital open practices tends to result in difficult conflicts of interest that are not easily resolved, especially in traditionally hierarchical organizations such as newspapers (Lowrey, 2012). Previous research has on several occasions examined organizations’ struggles with conflicting demands that cannot be resolved using tried-and-tested, traditional organizational structures and practices (Siggelkow & Levinthal, 2005; Siggelkow & Rivkin, 2006). Understanding the institutional underpinnings of such conflicts is often emphasized as important for any organization struggling to reconcile issues of ownership, participation and gatekeeping – issues that are inclined to follow in the wake of an online presence and increasingly digitized practices (Aitamurto & Lewis, 2012; O’Reilly, 2005). Although this development is pervasive throughout western, industrialized society (Benkler, 2006; Frey & Osborne, 2013), it is particularly evident in the media industries where digitalization has impacted such areas as copyright and innovation (Greenstein, Lerner, & Stern, 2013), digitization of radio and public service (Kemppainen, 2012), and the music industry (Rogers, 2013). The newspaper industry is experiencing an unresolved and ongoing struggle with adapting to online news, resulting in declining circulation figures since the mid-1990s, and what has even been called ‘the death of newspapers’. Because of this exposed position, the newspaper industry emerges as a particularly conspicuous and relevant case when studying the consequences of digital open practices.

Prior studies of processes of institutional change have pointed to the centrality of institutional tensions stemming from the incompatibility of competing institutional logics (Akram, Bergkvist, & Akesson, 2014; Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). In this paper we particularly focus on newspaper organizations as we find that current research, although abundant in recognizing the change brought on by the advent of digital news, still tends to neglect the impact of institutional tensions on media management where managers in newspaper organizations are particularly exposed to change caused by digital open practices. Professional news creators in newspaper organizations do find themselves in troublesome dilemmas or tensions emerging in conjunction with the rise of ‘digital journalism’ (Siles & Boczkowski, 2012; Achtenhagen & Raviola, 2009), i.e. the publishing of news texts in an online context with more or less interactive features. Abundant previous scholarly inquiry into the difficulties experienced by an increasingly digital newspaper industry describes the emergence of a particularly contested space of control and professionalism vis-a-vis participatory and co-creative journalism (Siles & Boczkowski, 2012; Singer, 2003; Singer et al., 2011). At stake is both managerial control over production itself, and journalists’ sense of professional ownership of expert practices and the right to claim sole jurisdiction over the governing of a body of knowledge (Abbott, 1988). Digital journalism and its inherent participatory property challenges traditional notions of newswork by destabilizing the boundaries between consumers and content producers (Singer, 2003; Singer & Ashman, 2009). Against this backdrop, we apply a neo-institutional perspective to investigate how institutional logics are perceived, interpreted and enacted by managers in relation to the organizational setting and in the wake of digital open practices. Given the situation in the newspaper industry (and those charged with managing such organizations), our research question is formulated as: *How do managers cope*

*with the institutional tensions that are the result of digital open practices?* By pursuing this research question, the study (a) elucidates the coping patterns that result from how managers perceive, interpret and enact institutional logics, and (b) shows how legitimacy can be maintained in spite of unresolved institutional tensions.

Digital open practices facilitate and encourage a dialogic relationship between an organization and its external stakeholders (Thorén, Ågerfalk, & Edenius, 2014), i.e. an open and negotiated exchange of ideas and opinions (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Digital open technologies such as social media put digital open practices ‘into practice’. The openness and transparency that are hallmarks of such technologies easily reconfigure traditional institutional models by blurring the lines between dichotomies such as producer/consumer and professional/amateur, resulting in institutional tensions.

There is a large quantity of past research into how the newspaper industry has been, and still is, affected by digitalization. More recent studies such as Rothmann and Koch (2014) describe how online openness results in newspaper organizations spending most of their time on stabilizing efforts rather than reconceptualizing and innovating the organization. The study by Thorén et al. (2014) shows how one central material artefact – the printing press – can create and reinforce structures that mobilize against open technologies. Yet another study (Aitamurto & Lewis, 2012) focuses on the implementation of open application programming interfaces across different kinds of organizations, concluding that traditional news firms were less compelled to implement such technological innovations. These studies are indicative of how attempts to adjust to these developments have been kept superficial and non-invasive out of respect for the core practices and the function of newspapers, with mimicry as the preferred strategy to manage multiple logics, a claim supported by Lowrey (2012). Lowrey (2011, 2012) furthermore observed a relative lack of innovation due to institutional conflicts. Even though current, technological developments seek to increase openness and participation and bridge the producer/consumer divide, it seems that the continuous exposure of managers to extensive organizational challenges (Aitamurto & Lewis, 2012; Rothmann & Koch, 2014) causes managerial control over journalists’ professional practices to be tightened rather than loosened (Lowrey, 2011; Siles & Boczkowski, 2012).

Previous studies have furthermore described how the newspaper industry and the journalistic profession maintain control – exercise gatekeeping – over recruitment, reproduction and certification of standards to ensure an adequate, legitimate occupational practice (Singer, 2003; Soloski, 1989). To ensure this integrity (and by extension the fertile business) of journalism, managers of newspaper organizations are expected to follow the guidelines of the profession and its professional gatekeeping practices (Siles & Boczkowski, 2012). Managerial strategies for managing professionalism within organizations seem to be driven by a logic that exhibits demands on ‘bureaucratic managerialism’ or ‘market commercialism’ (Freidson, 2001). Paradoxically, the idea of autonomous professionalism may be increasingly combined with either a corporate pressure on organizational routines and technologies, or with increased stress placed on market procedures in which customers and opportunities to improve profit or status on the market are of prime importance (Evetts, 2011; Fournier, 1999).

The present study contributes to our understanding of institutional tensions that affect management of organizations in the throes of digital open practices. Specifically, it contributes to a theoretical understanding of how organizations are shaped by a plurality of institutionalized logics (McPherson & Sauder, 2013; Thornton et al., 2012) by conceptualizing how analytical manager stereotypes use different managerial voices in order to serve the dominant institutional logics. Tensions between these logics are managed using ventriloquism, by which any particular logic is constituted and reinforced by managerial action in order to validate the constraints and affordances of another logic. In identifying ventriloquism (Cooren, 2012; Cooren, Matte, Benoit-Barné, &

Brummanns, 2013) as a key institutional mechanism in this context, the study suggests how managers, through increased awareness of the interplay among different logics and potentially unresolved tensions, can improve contemporary strategic decision-making.

The paper is structured as follows. The present introduction is followed by an elaboration of the theoretical framework, including managerial implications of institutional logics and institutional tensions and an introduction to ventriloquism as a mechanism for managing tensions. The next section presents the research design with empirical details of the study. Subsequently we provide the empirical background and context of the study, followed by results and discussion of results. Finally, the paper concludes by revisiting the research question and discussing implications and opportunities for further research.

## Theoretical Framework

### *Institutional logics*

Within neo-institutional theory, the institutional logics approach constitutes a distinct line of inquiry into how actions of social actors are enabled and constrained. These actions follow certain predetermined patterns, so-called 'institutional logics', that are recursively influenced by the outcomes of these actions (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton et al., 2012). By their discursive and material performativity, these logics provide the organizing principles of the institution, and the vocabulary of motives used by and between social actors (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Lee & Lounsbury, 2015). Importantly, logics are the taken-for-granted assumptions that form the basis for what kinds of reasoning are considered legitimate (or illegitimate) at the managerial level and for rationalizing work practices. More specifically, institutional logics have been described as reflecting the socially constructed basis of 'historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values and beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality' (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 804).

By their nature, institutional logics affect organizational structures and processes (Greenwood, Diaz, Li, & Lorente, 2010). Often firms tend to exhibit multiple, more or less well-collaborating logics, that together affect institutional stability and propensity for change (Lounsbury, 2007; Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007; Purdy & Gray, 2009). Organizational actors draw upon specific institutional logics to guide their actions at any given moment, form their identities, and provide meaning to daily activities (Thornton, 2004). Introduced by Friedland and Alford (1991) as part of an attempt to emphasize the importance of social context, the concept of logics has become central to institutional theory. The vocabularies of logics provide a source of motive for actors and also facilitate the articulation of self within a particular social context. At the same time, logics constrain actors by designating what is valued, providing rules by which behaviour is evaluated, and setting limits to rationality. However, due to their tacit and generic nature, logics are also open to interpretation and manipulation; thus social actors will attempt to interpret, define and mobilize rules to serve their own interests (Friedland & Alford, 1991).

Organizational forms and managerial practices are 'manifestations of, and legitimated by, institutional logics' (Greenwood et al., 2010, p. 521). Legitimacy is not an input or process that transforms into some new or different output, but rather a symbolic value that is put on display in such a manner that it is visible to outsiders (Scott, 2001, p. 59). In this perspective, responses to changes in the environment are not merely proposed solutions to an environmental problem; responses are also resultant expressions of logics. This is one main reason to advocate institutional logics as a fruitful way to focus on specific issues of organizational dynamics, conditioning choices and

providing rationale for the organizational practices that emerge (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, 2008). The link between logics and practices is also well established, and is described by Glynn, Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2013, p. 493) as the way in which ‘logics become manifest in practices and, in turn, practices render logics transparent’.

### *Managing multiple logics*

We may conclude that logics are taken-for-granted principles that provide organizations with legitimacy. Adopting an institutional logics perspective enables the questioning of practices as incongruent or incompatible with established expectations and practices (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008; Lee & Lounsbury, 2015). This becomes a key feature of the theory as organizations are often exposed to, and have to respond to, multiple logics (e.g. Kraatz & Block, 2008; Reay & Hinings, 2009; Greenwood et al., 2010). Logics do not simply provide organizational actors with legitimacy, but function as an institutional yardstick for continuously maintaining legitimacy (van Gestel & Hillebrand, 2011; McPherson & Sauder, 2013) both internally, and externally towards customers and other stakeholders. Maintaining legitimacy is challenged by digital open practices where organizational members are confronted with increasingly deinstitutionalizing demands of openness. For instance, the ability to comment on news content forces newspapers not only to implement the required technical functionality but also to prepare for undesired implications (such as potential cyber bullying). Under such circumstances organizations are under pressure to manage what could turn into competing logics and forced to simultaneously employ several, sometimes conflicting, strategies for maintaining and protecting legitimacy.

Particularly relevant for the current study is identifying how and why emergent combinations of institutionalized logics facilitate the strategies that actors use to maintain a legitimate approach to digital open practices. In other words, our study intends to further an understanding of how cultural dispositions shape the legitimating strategies that emerge (Cloutier & Langley, 2013; Gawer & Phillips, 2013). This is in keeping with previous studies that have described schemas for handling multiple logics (Kodeih & Greenwood, 2014; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). Such schemas orchestrate compromises and the forging of new hybrid organizational terms (Battilana & Dorado, 2010), loosely coupled practices that promote legitimate coexistence of identities, or resolutions that allow one logic to dominate or be prioritized over another (Cloutier & Langley, 2013; Rolandsson, 2015; van Gestel & Hillebrand, 2011). While the mechanisms presented in these works mainly draw on the assumption that legitimacy is a direct result of resolved institutional tensions (Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011; Pache & Santos, 2010, 2013; Thornton et al., 2012), this study seeks to show how legitimacy can be maintained *in spite of* unresolved institutional tensions.

Only a handful of studies have so far examined the maintaining of legitimacy despite persisting tensions, and none of these in the context of digital open practices. Reay and Hinings (2009) identified mechanisms separating related identities, enabling organizations to take advantage of competing logics as parallel sources of legitimacy. Other studies have addressed organizational changes and how actors are able to promote specific interests and push forward despite unresolved tensions by introducing components from other logics (McPherson & Sauder, 2013; Pache & Santos, 2013). Common to these previous studies is an emphasis on the legitimacy of initiatives where management is striving for influence or organizational integration despite tensions (Greenwood et al., 2011; cf. Rolandsson, 2015). Although the present study draws on these insights, our empirical focus is the current digitalization of news production, which is a different type of phenomenon. Digital open practices represent a paradigmatic technological shift, a broader and more overarching change that cannot be easily pinpointed in terms of origin, and furthermore, control of this

change does not reside in or originate from one particular place or organization. It is a type of social, cultural and technological shift that is difficult to control and that does not easily conform to the established values, norms and practices of the formal organization. Contrary to previous studies, the organizational level of management in the present study is a recipient rather than orchestrator and catalyst of change, accommodating tensions that they cannot resolve or even easily comprehend using the resources of the organization. The actions undertaken by managers in order to preserve organizational legitimacy under such pressure will be discussed as ‘the ventriloquial approach’.

### *Tensions in digital open practices*

This paper adopts an empirical, managerial perspective on institutional tensions: what Thornton et al. (2012) describe as a corporate logic, in which legitimacy is achieved by the enactment of organizational efficiency and the chain of command. Previous research on how newspaper managers approach digital open practices implies that there is a guiding corporate logic that coexists with a professional logic (Freidson, 2001). The logic of profession relies on a set of interconnected beliefs and procedures that sustain the occupational control of work, as well as delineating and separating members of one profession from another (Larson, 2003, p. 459; Freidson, 2001). Under this logic, the professional community itself is allowed to define the nature of professionalism from the inside, and claims to be ‘the only legitimate arbiter of improper behavior’ (Johnson, 1972; Larson, 1977; Singer 2003, p. 142). Professionals further emphasize the importance of their expertise by referring to themselves as experts that fill a broader societal purpose, evident in how journalists see themselves as the pillars of democracy and stress the importance of ‘autonomy from forces that might seek to impose external control’ (Singer, 2003, p. 145). Professional journalism, for example, is very much an internally constructed and legitimated practice aimed at performing public good, with a long, and until recently undisrupted, historical legacy. The newcomer ‘online journalism’, seen as a potential vessel for digital open practice, challenges traditional notions of journalistic professionalism, and prompts managers to reconsider the essence of journalistic content and what readers are willing to pay for. Managers assert control by subordinating the professional sphere to a combination of a corporate logic, employing hierarchic control, and a market logic, focusing on corporate ability to successfully compete with other newspaper firms.

A detailed analysis of institutional tensions in a professional context requires an understanding of the anatomy of institutional beliefs and principles and how they act under pressure – in other words, of the very underpinnings of institutionalism and self-preservation. Cooren (2012) presents ‘the ventriloquial approach’ as a way of conceptually studying institutional tensions, highlighting ‘the constitutive role of communication by foregrounding the communicative practices through which enduring organizational tensions are co-produced by organizational members in the course of their work’ (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 7). Specifically, the approach deals with

the study of interactions [that] reveal how human interactants position themselves (or are positioned) as being constrained or animated by different principles, values, interests, (aspects of) ideologies, norms, or experiences, which operate as ‘figures’ that are made to speak to accomplish particular goals or serve particular interests. (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 2)

Analysing interactions using this lens allows for analysis of ‘the many voices of institutionalized structures of power (ideologies, discursive formations, realities, repertoires, registers, etc.)’ that express themselves in interactions (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 9). In other words, the perspective views ventriloquism as a manifestation of tensions, dilemmas, of conflicting opinions, reasons,

ideologies and passions, and as the accountable and legitimate character of what is being said or done (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 18). In particular, ventriloquism manifests as the way in which one ideology speaks ‘through’, or is masked by, another in order to further a particular agenda. In this study, we identify signs of these ventriloquisms in the verbal utterances of managers, particularly as we apply the lens of institutional logics to the data in order to shed light on the nature of the particular institutional tensions exhibited between particular logics.

Another strand of research implies that conceiving of a wider span of external actors producing online journalism, and the logics that drive them, may further complicate managerial circumstances. Digital news production based on citizen participation is claimed to destabilize the boundaries between amateur, corporate and professional news production. The assumption is that the cognitive base of production is being claimed increasingly by more actors, posing a challenge not only to the legitimacy of professional services, but also to the corporate methods used to provide them (Singer, 2003; Soloski, 1989; cf. Freidson 2001, p. 180). Customer expectations on free access to digital media also raises managerial concerns over the corporate capacity to maintain and increase profitability (Lowrey, 2011; Siles & Boczkowski, 2012).

We posit that managers in newspaper organizations, by virtue of their organizational title and position, come to represent and manifest a corporate logic. Thus, any actions taken by a person occupying the position of a manager are corporate actions, and any utterances by the same person represent corporate speech. Managers enact the corporate logic internally as well as towards external stakeholders using spoken words and actions. Thus, this managerial approach is very much one that is exposed and on display for a range of other internal and external actors, thus extending the managers’ corporate focus to additional logics, such as the market logic and professional logic.

## Research Design

Research on issues around coexisting institutional logics has previously been undertaken in several methodological ways. For instance, studies have investigated institutional logics in a grounded manner using discourse analysis (e.g. Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Thornton, 2004; Thornton, Jones, & Kury, 2005; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999) and grounded, qualitative analysis (e.g. Berente & Yoo, 2011). Other studies (e.g. Dyck, 1997; Thornton, 2002; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999; Townley, 2002) have adopted a Weberian typology or framework of logics, such as the one proposed by Doty and Glick (1994). Others, still, have proposed their own typologies of logics that focus on rationality in western society (Friedland & Alford, 1991). This paper aligns with studies of logics as discourse and typologies, and adopts an institutional logics approach to analyse a single case study that centres around how a prevalent, regional newspaper industry’s adoption of inductively verified institutional logics informs the implementation of open practices such as participatory journalism. With an approach that employs empirical testing characteristic of a neo-institutionalist view of institutional logics theory, we address the organization’s environment and the way that a corporate logic of control is dealt with as key explanatory factors (cf. Lowrey, 2011, p. 65) in the way that institutional tensions are managed.

### *A managerial perspective on digital open practices*

The overall research design for this study can be characterized as a revelatory case study, which is particularly apt when the ‘investigator has access to a situation previously inaccessible to scientific observation’ and where the descriptive aspect alone is considered ‘revelatory’, i.e. revealing novel results (Yin, 2009, p. 49). Although there are recent exceptions (Krumsvik, 2014; Picard, 2015), the majority of studies of mass media and the Internet (as well as of traditional media) tend to focus on

audiences and content rather than organizational issues due to researchers' difficulties in obtaining access to mass media producers and production sites (Keith, 2011, p. 2). These hurdles have been made even more difficult with online news over the past 15 years, as news organizations have 'struggled with the organization, stifling and even location of their Internet units' (Keith, 2011, p. 2). In contrast, unparalleled access to and long-term engagement with a newspaper organization enabled the current study.

Sweden is of interest when studying newspaper organizations and digitalization since the country rates high on levels of Internet penetration and use (Facht & Hellingwerf, 2011; Findahl, 2013) and also exhibits high levels of newspaper readership (Carlsson & Facht, 2010). The study we present is an in-depth case study of one prominent media corporation in Sweden, *Nya Wermlands-Tidningen* (*The New Wermland Newspaper*<sup>1</sup> – henceforth NWT). Results from the qualitative analyses were used in tandem with seed categories (Miles & Huberman, 1994) adopted from the institutional logics approach (Thornton, 2002; Thornton et al., 2012) to drive the subsequent qualitative analysis of data. The purpose of the analysis itself was to explore one or more hypothesized dominant institutional logics, and then to nuance those with empirical findings from qualitative interviews conducted with upper-, mid- and low-level managers, thus linking concrete findings to theory. The linking is then used to construct a matrix of managerial categories along one dimension, and dominant logics on the second dimension, yielding 'archetypical' intersections, or patterns of practice, that show in detail how each category is negotiated and put into practice in each institutional logic.

### Case background

The Swedish press has historically speaking been dominated by a strong regional press rather than a strong national press. An early characteristic that still persists today, inherited from the turn of the last century, is that the vast majority of the papers were run as small family enterprises with the owner being editor-in-chief or managing director. The relations between these papers and the political sphere were generally ideological and intellectual rather than economic or organizational (Ohlsson, 2012), although there are examples of papers financed, at least in part, by political factions (Gustafsson & Hadenius, 1976). Thus, most papers were run on an entrepreneurial basis, but with dual motives: to influence opinion *and* to make financial profit (Ohlsson, 2012, p. 21). In some cases the commercial objective was clearly the dominant one, but in most cases the political and commercial objectives weighed equally heavy (Hadenius, 1983, p. 290).

NWT's long history harks back to being one of the first newspapers that grew out of the increasingly modern and regulated newspaper industry of the 19th century. During the latter half of that century, the paper changed editor-in-chief every third year on average, and in 1913 the first member of the Ander family, named Ernst, was made partner in the business. This marked the beginning of a family ownership that remains to this day. In 1913 Ernst became editor-in-chief, and shortly prior to the Great War, was the sole owner of the business (Ohlsson, 2009, p. 63). He acquired the then debt-ridden NWT for the symbolic sum of SEK 1. He eventually set the company on a path of successful rejuvenation, turning it into one of the most successful newspapers in the country. His son, Gustaf Ander, assumed managerial responsibilities in the 1960s, and was succeeded by his two sons Lars and Staffan Ander in 1986. A fourth-generation Ander is currently employed in the organization. NWT is part of a tradition of family-owned newspapers that is still strong in Sweden, with several of the major regional newspapers currently managed by fourth- and fifth-generation offspring (Olsson, 2012, p. 24).

In 2010, NWT had grown to become the most successful general newspaper corporation in the country with a net profit margin of 30%. Aside from its eponymous region-covering print and



**Table 1.** Empirical overview of the interview respondents.

Subject	Number of interviews	Subject	Number of interviews
<b>UM #1</b>	2	<b>MM #1</b>	3
<b>UM #2</b>	1	<b>MM #2</b>	1
<b>UM #3</b>	2	<b>MM #3</b>	2
<b>UM #4</b>	1	<b>LM #1</b>	2
<b>UM #5</b>	1	<b>LM #2</b>	5

digital (online) publication, it owns and publishes 13 subsidiary, local print newspapers and 3 free newspapers in Sweden. The NWT corporation furthermore owns minority interest in Norwegian media groups Schibsted (a Norwegian multinational media group) and Polaris Media (based in Trondheim with 30 newspapers in Norway).

### *Data collection*

The empirical data consists of a total of 20 in-depth, qualitative interviews with the complete population of managers at NWT (N=10) carried out between February 2009 and April 2013 (see Table 1). In mid-December 2008 a pilot interview was conducted with the web director of NWT that resulted in a workflow chart depicting actors, processes and workflow in the creation of news, providing a conceptual framing for succeeding interviews.

Interviews varied in length between 32 and 91 minutes. Managers were interviewed sometimes multiple times and until there were several overlaps in the interview material in order to reach sufficient triangulation between interviewees. In order to preserve some level of anonymity, and rather than using the real names of staff or positions, managers were divided into three conceptual levels of management (see Table 1): upper-level manager (UM), mid-level manager (MM) and low-level manager (LM). The NWT authority structure suggests that an upper manager opinion is more influential than that of middle or lower managers. Therefore, in the analysis, empirical data is weighted according to the place each respondent holds in this hierarchy.

Holders of the following positions were interviewed:

- President – representing the family members and owners group of the corporation with controlling interest.
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO) – exclusively responsible for the day-to-day running of the organization. The CEO further appoints the management staff, who are also responsible for articulating, executing and maintaining long-term corporate strategies.
- Managing editor – has the power of executive decision over the news director, whether something should be printed or not, and how much attention is given to a story.
- Legally responsible publisher – a purely judicial appointment as opposed to a set organizational position. This person is legally responsible for everything that is printed in the newspaper.
- Editor-in-chief – a member of the owners group, and a family member with executive editorial decision-making.
- Assistant editor-in-chief – responsible for day-to-day executive editorial decisions, subordinate to the editor-in-chief.
- News director – responsible for determining the news value of incoming tips and information. The individual acts as a first filter and gatekeeper, and decides what should be printed

and what should be discarded based on assumptions of regional interest and newsworthiness. They also decide on the length and placement of articles in the newspaper, and assign incoming stories to reporters.

- Web director – manages the ‘web desk’, or the online equivalent of the newsdesk, and its reporters, and decides where on the website a story ends up, and how much space it is given. This person is also responsible for developing the business side of the newspaper’s online edition, including advertising strategies, social media strategies and the website’s general developing process.
- Production manager – responsible for interdepartmental development, collaboration and quality control.
- Regional director and editor-in-chief – responsible for one of the subsidiary newspapers with executive editorial mandate.

The respondents with a higher number of interviews were key managers in relation to web production and overall daily newsroom management. In addition to these interviews, two board meetings were attended that resulted in extensive field notes. On two occasions, preliminary results of the study were member-checked at a general newsroom meeting and an editorial meeting.

## Analysis

Analysis was supported using the qualitative software package HyperResearch (Hesse-Biber, Dupuis, & Kinder, 1991) and performed in two sequential rounds of coding, identifying different logics and their relationships. In the first round we used theoretically grounded codes based on the institutional logics perspective in order to identify components constituting different institutional logics (see Table 2, column headed Linking of Theory to Category). These codes refer to (1) preferences or the value of each logic (e.g. legitimacy, authority, identity) or (2) repertoires of behaviours through which these preferences could be achieved (e.g. norms, attention, strategy) in a correct, efficient or sincere way (Thornton et al., 2012). Examples of codes in the first round were ‘gate-keeping and control’, ‘professional higher cause’, ‘for-profit’ and ‘undermined markets’, in the end indicative of three logics at work: a corporate logic, a professional logic and a market logic.

In the second round of coding we applied codes describing the relations between the dominant logics that emerged in the first round of coding (Charmaz, 2006). In this phase it was possible to detect how different logics were intermingled. These configurations enabled us to analyse their respective characterizations with respect to inner coherence, strain or contradiction, thereby attributing these relations with qualities, which subsequently were aggregated into themes. We applied inductive coding of the interviews, focusing on areas of tension, or areas representing managerial foci – recurring patterns of themes that emerged in the open interviews. In this second round the following foci were detected:

- A managerial perspective on technology
- A managerial perspective on content
- A managerial perspective on consumers
- A managerial perspective on production

These four foci, or perspectives, represent areas of particular interest, contested or stimulating clusters of discussion during the interviews. We then proceeded to view each focus area through inductively verified logics, producing a matrix of managerial foci/institutional logics (Table 2). This allows for analysis along two dimensions, detecting what each logic articulates for each

**Table 2.** The analytical process from interview quote to theoretical grounding and categories. The analytical process converges in the 'category' column. For illustrative purposes, a 'typical' sample quote is provided for the first logic.

Quote	Empirical Rationale	Category	Linking of Theory to Category	Logic
Technology/Market sample quote, e.g. 'I don't know if people realize this [about Facebook]. In the grand scheme of things it means that people are online with their names and that's a huge advantage.'	Managers' views on how online technologies affects the target market, i.e. readers, consumers, market share.	Technology	The market logic represents those that read newspapers either in print or digital form, i.e. the constituent citizens that want whatever journalism offers.	Market logic
Content/Market sample quote, e.g. 'We have always encouraged people to send in their opinions.'	Managers' views on how content is adapted to what customers actually want.	Content	Market represents demands for content (both mode of delivery and the informational content itself).	
Consumer/Market sample quote, e.g. 'Readers are more involved now than ever before.'	Managers' views on the extent to which the reader can or should influence content	Consumer	Market represents the extent to which readers actually are allowed near the newsmaking process (i.e. user-generated content).	
Production/Market sample quote e.g. 'It's like turning on a tap – these xenophobic comments come flowing in.'	Managers' views on readers that actively respond to content, and take active part in content generation.	Production	Market represents instances of participation, for instance as comments on an article.	
Technology/Profession (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on technology and how online technologies affect the idea of the profession and professional practices.	Technology	The professional logic represents the way a technology can either disrupt or galvanize the profession.	Professional logic
Content/Profession (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on how content is journalistically produced.	Content	The professional logic represents the gatekeeping process.	
Consumer/Profession (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on what the consumer wants relates to a journalistic way of working.	Consumer	The professional logic represents ideas of what readers (should) want.	
Production/Profession (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on how mode of production influences a journalistic way of working.	Production	The professional logic represents the notion that how content is produced influences the quality of that content.	
Technology/Corporate (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on how technology is or should be used in order to maintain business as usual.	Technology	The corporate logic represents control over technology	Corporate logic
Content/Corporate (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on control over content, and content as a commodity.	Content	The corporate logic represents control over content.	
Consumer/Corporate (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on the reader as consumer and recipient of news.	Consumer	The corporate logic represents the reader as customer.	
Production/Corporate (corresponding empirical data as exemplified above)	Managers' views on mode of production as a viable means to control and sustain the organization.	Production	The corporate logic represents the hierarchy and organizational structure under which content is produced	

managerial perspective, as well as how managerial perspectives are parsed through (enacted) under each logic (see Table 2 for details regarding the analytical process). We propose that, by studying the results along these two dimensions, tensions are not only made visible, but the matrix reveals the kind of tension.

As the empirical research design of the present study focuses on subjective, verbal utterances of managers through interviewing, results may seem contradictory, inconsistent or even erroneous. However, rather than validating the empirical evidence against some objective notion of ‘truth’, we chose to embrace the in-situ subjectiveness of the data, and argue that the claims do indeed represent and reveal the managerial perspective such as it is. Data was collected with the explicit purpose to elucidate the (sometimes contradictory) problem-solving strategies of managers in media organizations and how they choose to leverage logics (as they see them) in an effort to withstand and mobilize resources, rather than the resolution of tensions per se.

## Results and Discussion – Enacting Logics of Control at NWT

The empirical data shows that the managers of NWT make sense of this new mode of professional work by combining the professional logic with, in this case, the corporate and market logic (cf. Thornton et al., 2012). We see this way of combining several institutional logics as an attempt to assume corporate control (i.e. maintaining a viable business) over one logic by extending reasoning to a second logic, in essence employing a ventriloquizing strategy (Cooren, 2012). As we show further on, the ultimate goal of such a more or less subconscious strategy is to handle the corporate tensions that come as a result of reconciling perceived, institutional demands of professionalism (i.e. preserving the jurisdiction of journalism) with external market demands for increased openness. The traditional model of journalism is that of the undisturbed gatekeeping organization (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996) where news is created and packaged, only to be passed along to the outside when it is deemed good enough. The managerial courses of action that come as a result of attempts to protect the traditional model of journalism against these tensions are characterized by a general, conservative attitude towards change. This conservatism serves a stabilizing function, where emphasis is placed on continuing as if nothing has changed: maintaining business as usual.

### *Maintaining business as usual*

For managers that follow and uphold a corporate logic, changes affecting the balance of power between readers and content providers represent a recurring and oftentimes problematic concern. At NWT, conforming to external demands for change is seen as less desirable than maintaining ‘business as usual’. This unease stems from how these types of changes relate to fundamental viewpoints around editorial control that require the reconciliation of some very difficult professional and corporate thought patterns: who is in control of, and responsible for, the texts that are published? There is furthermore a sense of pride in being conservative as perseverance and riding out the storm has served the organization well in the past. However, although the general attitude is one of conservativeness and insularity, there is also the realization that adopting a more customer-oriented approach rather than maintaining the long-lived product-oriented approach is necessary in order to stay relevant:

I think it’s gradually dawned on the industry as a whole that we have to make newspapers that readers want to pay for. It used to be the case that the best accolade you could get was that a colleague read your piece, or winning an industry award. But... You can’t just write for your own newsroom. We partly work differently today. (UM #2)

Generally speaking – and I would imagine this goes for most workplaces – we don't want change. (MM #2)

The conservative agenda is supported by a professional and corporate logic that favours old routines before new ones in order to maintain business as usual. Thus, as when confronted with digital open practices, the knee-jerk reaction is one of defending established ways of working and the current institutional order, as expressed by another upper-level manager:

There's all this talk about online news, but I mean, nothing will replace the printed paper. (UM #4)

Several respondents gave the impression that any kind of digital, open practice must be able to harmonize with the established framework of the print edition, in other words, without disrupting the business model that still brings home 80–90% of the revenue. In spite of the strong goodwill aspect of implementing aspects of digital open practices and that some form of user-generated content is an inevitable future to some extent, albeit of an as yet unsatisfactory business value, the commitment to the print edition remains steadfast:

Our circulation might be cut in half in the next 20 years, but we can still produce [the print edition] and make business, I guarantee you it can be done. (UM #1)

This statement is indicative of a strong product-oriented approach rather than a customer-oriented approach, echoing the classic 'marketing myopia' phenomenon discussed by Levitt (1960). The formal organization is designed to resist any changes that challenge the current profit model, in this case represented by the print edition. The tendency towards maintaining business as usual shows there is also a slight but discernible tension with the existing market logic. Digital distribution is taken into consideration only if it is able to provide revenue at the same level as the print edition, 'otherwise we can't have 65 journalists hired that produce the news content' (MM #2). Potential digital open practices are seen as needing pre-approval that is contingent on the market's acceptance, and the corporate desire to keep 65 employees is not met by a (digital) market logic. However, it is met (albeit less and less) by the traditional print newspaper market. The digital market challenges the traditional corporate logic, forcing a reluctant change after all, or at least the realization that change has to take place, emphasizing the uncertainty as to exactly how that should happen:

I think we're ok, but we still have to adapt quite a lot, we've come closer, become more involved, tried to speak the same language as the readers. (MM #1)

The basic, inherent paradox in this development stems from the fact that the consumption of online news is drastically increasing, combined with a declining circulation for the print edition and the inability to transform the increased demand for digital news into a viable profit stream:

We've never had as many readers as we do today, and we've also never lost as much money as we do today. (UM #3)

While maintaining a conservative stance, the respondents nevertheless realize that this paradox is a direct result of a recent, digital market logic that exerts tensions on the traditional corporate logic. Managers, for instance, argue that being on Facebook is important for journalists, but maintaining a detached distance is equally, if not more, important:

Facebook has become a work tool for our journalists. But you can't just say 'ok'. For us it's about catching up with what's going on and parry from that. (MM #2)

The 'parrying' is an exercise in restraint meant to protect the integrity of the organization. This is in keeping with an industry that rewards conservative behaviour. According to several respondents, NWT maintains the attitude that an investment is not allowed to produce a deficit, and only rarely is something accepted that would break even. This sense of thrift was made apparent down to the most minute things, such as when buying newspaper rolls in bulk when there were rumours that prices would go up, and storing them in the staff parking garage. Being careful with spending appears related to personal engagement in the success of the business:

The most important thing for a successful newspaper is one person in charge and healthy capital. Say what you want about private enterprise but there's an incredible dynamic in it! And of course it's your own money. (UM #1)

Even if this quote suggests that the private enterprise generally is incredibly dynamic, and that it promotes a conservative frame for the corporate logic, based on centralized authority and carefulness as an approach that prevent firms from investments that may produce a deficit. In this context, it is then often also the journalists that are the ones who are expected to parry any awkward situations in the daily practice of news production that can be blamed on such risky investments in digital technology.

### *Gatekeeping and careful openness*

The professional logic becomes even more evident when the managers describe how NWT needs to promote relationships with a range of sources in order to stay legitimate. Without legitimacy, the end result is 'more of an entertainment site' (UM #1), something NWT does not want to be. The taken-for-grantedness of the institutionalized practice of professional gatekeeping is in this case made evident in the matter-of-fact way in which it is frequently addressed, and seen as existing independently of the potential for digital open practices. Openness is not seen as contingent on opening up the gates, but rather keeping the gates under control in relation to a broader spectrum of inbound flows. Control is seen as the basic foundation of any kind of practice that is non-disruptive. NWT encourages people to contribute news stories but they 'wash it' and only publish 'what's interesting':

We scrutinize it carefully. Without [scrutiny] there are one or two lunatics out there, as you may call them, that would... It would be heaven for these crazies to be published. All the dogmatists, and whatnot, I mean if they were allowed free rein... (UM #1)

The term 'participatory journalism' is seen as somewhat of an oxymoron because the practice of journalism implies an autonomy from external forces that seek to impose or dissolve the professional or centralized control stemming from a corporate/professional amalgamated logic. There is also the aspect of gaining control over technology in order to avoid what can be described as its 'dark side', characterized by the difficulties of managing the quantity of publications and the questionable content therein:

The Web is a technology, and we should use it in a way that suits us, not to accommodate what we feel is the somewhat lesser side of it all. We decide that. The Web as such we have absolutely nothing against, it is a perfectly splendid way to communicate news, but it's the flipside we need to worry about, not the technology. (UM #6)

The 'flipside' in this case refers to insults and violations of individuals or groups' integrity by an anonymous crowd that is now instantly able to publish such volumes of comments or texts that managers are concerned that they and their professionals will lose control over digital journalism.

This is also the reason why it is made clear that becoming more isolated from readers is a necessary consequence in the face of increased participation, both content-wise and ethically. The challenge, it seems, is rather about braving the storm of the participatory trends and remaining steadfast, responsible content providers:

The tendency is clear. We're becoming more closed, insular maybe not just content-wise but what's allowed in terms of opinion. Maybe we've seen the adolescent Internet, maybe now we move towards a more settled, responsible approach. (UM #3)

This seemingly contradictory attitude reflects how the settled demand for a responsible approach is, in part, fuelled by social media sites like Facebook. It not only provides ground for comments and content, this new technology also elicits demands to come to terms with anonymity, and to hold the individual accountable for their own content. In fact, Facebook is seen as a digital innovation that fundamentally changed the online picture, by enabling more or less unperceivable numbers of people to reach any comment or text that is published:

I don't know if people realize this. In the grand [national] scheme of things it means that 4 million people are online with their names and that's of course a huge advantage – being able to link login to Facebook. (MM #2)

Other respondents point out that social media should not just be framed as a problem; it offers new and interesting possibilities. However, these opportunities have to be carefully exploited:

I don't see it primarily as a problem but mainly something good, healthy and useful. It's just a matter of how we deal with it in a responsible way where we safeguard the ethics of the press and freedom of speech. That's central to us. (UM #2)

Once again, the respondents stress that it is important to remain responsible and professional when dealing with readers. Most of the managers at NWT adhere to a professional logic to emphasize a corporate approach of control by encouraging their journalists to be careful and responsible. Innovative online technologies allow newspapers to enter into a dialogue with readers in new ways. One of the respondents (UM #2) describes how dialogue increases contact with the reader: 'for example, we have a reporter on call, we tell people to call in, people can text, chat...' The manager continues by emphasizing the importance of encouraging people to contribute with opinions and that this has always been core of the newspaper industry. Still, it is also explicitly expressed that social media demands increased professional attention to gatekeeping procedures. Online reader participation is a potential that has to be explored and exploited, but within the current paradigm and with discretion. This new technology is seen as 'something positive. But it has to be filtered' (UM #1).

### *Voices of the puppet*

Logics condition choice and provide a rationale for organizations and their actions (Lounsbury, 2007; Thornton, 2002, 2004). The organization examined in this study exemplifies how organizations can be influenced by multiple and sometimes conflicting arrangements of such rationales or logics (Kraatz & Block, 2008). Furthermore, the results enable us to go one step further by describing how more complex combinations of three logics can shape the managerial strategy that guides managers in the context of digital journalism. First, the above account of enacted logics of control at NWT describes how such a strategy is moulded, in particular by the playing out of three

**Table 3.** Voicing the Puppet – Managerial voices under each logic exemplified using quotes from respondents.

Category/Logic	Corporate	Profession	Market
<b>Technology</b>	<b>The gatekeeper voice:</b> The Web is a technology, and we should use it in a way that suits us, not to accommodate what we feel is the somewhat lesser side of it all.	<b>The gatekeeper voice:</b> This new technology has enabled immediate reactions, and/.../ It's just a matter of how we deal with it in a responsible way where we safeguard the ethics of the press and freedom of speech.	<b>The advocate voice:</b> I don't know if people realize this [about Facebook]. In the grand scheme of things it means that people are online with their names and that's a huge advantage.
<b>Content</b>	<b>The gatekeeper voice:</b> We encourage people [to come in with news stories]. But we 'wash' it after. And we publish what's interesting. We scrutinize it carefully.	<b>The reclusive voice:</b> The tendency is clear. We're becoming more closed, insular maybe not just content-wise but what's allowed in terms of opinion.	<b>The defensive voice:</b> We have always encouraged people to send in their opinions.
<b>Consumer</b>	<b>The realist voice:</b> We've never had as many readers as we do today, and we've also never lost as much money as we do today.	<b>The sceptic voice:</b> Take commentaries – a very sensitive thing. Anything can come in. Which is why it has to be scrutinized before it is published.	<b>The inclusive voice:</b> Readers are more involved now than ever before.
<b>Production</b>	<b>The conservative voice:</b> If you don't have legitimacy in what you publish then it would be really strange. Then it's more of an entertainment site.	<b>The exclusive voice:</b> We see reader participation as something positive when filtered.	<b>The conservative voice:</b> It's like turning on a tap – these xenophobic comments just come flowing in.

institutional logics (corporate, professional and market) against four categories that represent core areas affected by consumer co-creation and user-generated content, namely technology, content, consumer and production. Table 3 summarizes the empirical findings by mapping the three logics onto the four inductively generated categories. To capture the essence of each of these mappings, Table 3 also introduces nine analytical manager stereotypes (e.g. 'the gatekeeper', 'the advocate') used to frame the discussion below.

Using selected and shortened quotes from the empirical data, the statements in each cell of Table 3 describe the managerial voice such as it exists under each logic, pertaining to each central theme. In other words, each cell represents the voice of a manager stereotype as it is parsed through a particular logic and a particular theme. Technology is seen as affecting (a) the relationship between producer (production) and consumer and as a result (b) who has control over content. Reading the table vertically shows the inherent contradictions, particularly under the 'market' heading. The combination of voices of defensiveness, advocacy, inclusiveness and conservatism makes clear just how disparate the managerial strategies are in relation to the market logic. Broadly speaking, the table reveals the way in which managers act as puppet masters, ventriloquizing (Cooren, 2012) voices of several other logics depending on context. The collaborating combination



of a corporate and professional logic in the study constitutes a generally conservative approach, or working strategy, enabling managers to handle the involvement of increasingly larger crowds of consumers that want to participate in media production. In other words, the market logic, as depicted in Table 3, exerts pressure on the need for a *common agreement* between the professional and market logic. In this way, corporate and professional logics appear to speak on behalf of each other, building a rhetorical buffer zone between the opposed corporate and market logics. Keeping up appearances is precisely the effect of mutual ventriloquizing.

Most notably the logic of the market emerges as exhibiting the most contradictory voices, particularly when it comes to production vs. consumer, or content vs. consumer. Thus, the consumer emerges as being placed squarely at the centre of controversy, which is in keeping with the amount of critical voices raised at what is seen as the oxymoronic notion of ‘participatory journalism’.

The ventriloquizing strategy that emerged in the study is shaped by two different ways of combining the corporate and professional logic. A continuously more participatory and ambiguous market supported by new digital solutions is subordinated to a combination of defensive corporate control and professional assurances of ethical and high standards of digital media (cf. Rolandsson, Bergquist, & Ljungberg, 2011). By being a realistic, reclusive or defensive gatekeeper, managers leverage corporate control by preventing openness and participatory journalism from threatening or even undermining professional quality. This strategy is a direct result of managers identifying a responsibility to enable journalists to produce high quality content. The trespassing of amateurs on professional ground is to be kept to a minimum so that low quality text or feature entertainment does not undermine the legitimacy of the profession. However, the corporate responsibility for professional ethics also constitutes an alternative way of combining corporate and professional logics. In this case, conservative, exclusive and sceptic managers capitalize on ethically aware journalists, said to protect the customer from personal insults, claims or information that are not scrutinized and that may mislead them.

Having explored how each logic cuts through the categories of managerial foci, our analysis reveals how aligned professional and corporate logics are in comparison to the market. The market distinguishes itself by being comparatively neutral or even liberal to user-generated content. These internal contradictions span horizontally over the managerial focus on the ‘consumer’ as it is parsed through the three logics. These contradictions reveal the difficulty in reconciling the validation of the consumer as an agent of inclusion in the logics of the profession and the logic of the corporation as well as how the logic of profession and the corporate logic collaborate.

## Conclusion

We conclude this paper by first revisiting the concept of legitimacy, seen by Friedland and Alford (1991), Thornton et al. (2012) and many more, as a result of resolved institutional tensions. This study nuances this claim by showing that organizational legitimacy can be achieved and maintained with (or in spite of) existing unresolved institutional tensions.

This article has identified two streams of research that to some extent give competing accounts of how managers negotiate existing organizational conditions to manage digital open practices, in particular digital journalism. One stream of research describes how managers use new digital technologies to further gain and retain control, ostensibly at the expense of professionals and their occupational interests (Aitamurto & Lewis, 2012; Rothmann & Koch, 2014). The other stream claims that managers may lose corporate control with the new digital practices (Lowrey, 2011; Siles & Boczkowski, 2012). This dichotomy suggests that digital journalism is a catalyst for tensions with seemingly diametrically opposed consequences for management. On the one hand managers may be prevented from following the guidelines of the corporate logic and forced to *surrender*

control over professional practices. On the other hand, tensions may encourage managers to reach what may be referred to as organizational *resolutions*, where a complementary relationship between the corporation and the market strengthens corporate control at the expense of the professional logic (Cloutier & Langley, 2013; McPherson & Sauder, 2013). The fact that these streams give partly contradictory descriptions of the managerial approach to the professional logic indicates that we do not know enough about how managers in media organizations tackle new modes of digital journalism, and more research is needed to fully understand the disruptive nature of digital open practices.

With these two streams of research in mind, we investigated how managers use the professional logic of control to respond to the perceived threat of digital news production. Contrary to previous research, we conclude that the way digital journalism exerts pressure on managers to find a defensive compromise between the corporate and professional logic is a *ventriloquizing* strategy (Cooren, 2012) in which corporate and professional logics are seen as speaking on behalf of each other. Practically speaking, this means using corporate logic rhetoric to control content, or using journalistic values and ethics to further the business side. The dominant side in such a proxy-based discourse is determined based on what best serves the situation.

The present study contributes to institutional logics theory by showing that logics that would conventionally have been seen as conflicting and causing tension may actually collaborate in order to circumvent a third. The result is a set of logics that, for all intents and purposes, achieve relative homogeneity although unresolved tensions prevail. The implication is that instead of assuming tension, institutional analysis needs to acknowledge that seemingly opposing logics may conditionally align (McPherson & Sauder, 2013; Pache & Santos, 2013). In the case of digital open practices, what is new is not so much the relationship with an increasingly participating outside, but rather the way in which the internal logics interact and relate to each other in order to avoid innovating around outside involvement. In the attempt to protect the integrity of the profession, managers may innovate the way an organization internally rationalizes and communicates in order to reach specific goals and legitimize certain actions. Furthermore, since tensions caused by digital open practices originate from outside the organization, reconciliation can only be achieved through accepting the tensions and finding ways to internally reconstruct legitimacy through coping rather than resolution.

Ventriloquism is in and of itself a way to improvise and deal with a very specific problem: reframing the apparent loss of control stemming from a broad societal changing force, into practices of maintaining corporate control over user-generated content. Emphasis is thus placed on controlling the one thing that is possible to control: gatekeeping the inward flow of 'outside' information. This tightening of control creates a sense of accomplishment, and provides a target on which to focus organizational efforts. This phenomenon shares some characteristics with 'organizational hypocrisy' (Brunsson, 2002) where institutional decoupling differs from ventriloquism in that the latter does not necessarily presume conscious decoupling, i.e. the calculated disconnect and organizational inadequacy that characterizes organizational hypocrisy. When the strategy for managing conflict is a rhetorical one, and when institutions are, at a technological and practical level, assumed to be fully capable of dealing with these kinds of outside institutional pressures, there is no bureaucratic hindrance per se, but rather a matter of public and professional legitimacy and finding acceptable patterns of action that do not violate the professional and/or corporate logic.

The fact that this strategy is shaped by both a tight relationship between corporate and professional logic, and a strained approach to the market, indicates that future research also should look more closely at connections between aforementioned streams of research. By understanding the managerial turn to a professional logic, as stimulated by corporate difficulties in managing the digital market, our results show that conventional wisdom has to be reconsidered. If participating

consumers in the digital market emerge as the reason for tensions that could undermine a more conventional fit between corporate and market logics (cf. Rolandsson et al., 2011; Pache & Santos, 2013), managers' defensive alignment with the professional logic could also be understood as an attempt to control what is perceived as a fickle digital market, i.e. those that prefer digitized content over the print edition. The ventriloquizing strategy found in this study not only indicates that the managerial search for corporate control over digital journalism can include less antithetical approaches to the professional logic (Thornton, 2002); but also that the increasingly participatory market for digital news puts strain on the firm's relation to the market. Instead of imposing demands on professionals to adapt to the market, market-related concerns may push the managers towards a compromise with the professional logic, through which they justify attempts to enhance their power over the market and increasingly participating consumers.

The ventriloquizing strategy found in this study thereby raises further, more general questions concerning the combination of corporate and market logic, described in organizational research as a dominant managerial guideline (Coase, 1937), and how it applies to digital news productions exposed to participatory consumers. In a digital context such as online journalism, where news organizations are exposed to a wider span of external actors, there seems to be reasons to explore the emergent managerial approach by widening the scope of investigation and not taking the relation between corporate logics and market logics for granted.

In this paper we have shown how managers reconfigure and use combinations of logics to handle the increased pressure to implement digital open practices and open up to user-generated content. This strategy is less about reconciling conflicts and tensions in the usual manner, and more about the ability of managers to manipulate logics, and in so doing dampen the effects of unresolved tensions. We refer to this phenomenon as 'voicing the puppet'.

## Funding

This research has received funding from the Swedish Research School of Management and IT and the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare, through project nr FAS 2010-1358.

## Note

1. Authors' translation.

## References

- Abbot, A. (1988). The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor. *Business History Review*, 80.
- Achtenhagen, L., & Raviola, E. (2009). Balancing tensions during convergence: Duality management in a newspaper company. *International Journal on Media Management*, 11, 32–41.
- Aitamurto, T., & Lewis, S. C. (2012). Open innovation in digital journalism: Examining the impact of open APIs at four news organizations. *New Media and Society*, 15, 314–331.
- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial micro-finance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 1419–1440.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Berente, N., & Yoo, Y. (2011). Institutional contradictions and loose coupling: Post-implementation of NASA's enterprise information system. *Information Systems Research*, 23, 376–396.
- Brunsson, N. (2002). *The organization of hypocrisy: Talk, decisions and actions in organizations*. Herndon: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Carlsson, U., & Facht, U. (2010). *MedieSverige 2010: Statistik och Analys*. Gothenburg: Nordicom Sweden.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (Eds.). (2014). *New frontiers in open innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cloutier, C. H., & Langley, A. (2013). The logic of institutional logics: Insights from French pragmatist sociology. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 22, 360–380.
- Coase, R. H. (1937). Nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4, 386–405.
- Cooren, F. (2012). Communication theory at the center: Ventriloquism and the communicative constitution of reality. *Journal of Communication*, 62, 1–20.
- Cooren, F., Matte, F., Benoit-Barné, C., & Brummans, B. H. M. (2013). Communication as ventriloquism: A grounded-in-action approach to the study of organizational tensions. *Communication Monographs*, 80, 255–277.
- Deephouse, D., & Suchman, M. (2008). Legitimacy in organizational institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin-Andersson, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 49–77). London: SAGE Publications.
- Doty, D. H., & Glick, W. H. (1994). Typologies as a unique form of theory building: Toward improved understanding and modeling. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 230–251.
- Dyck, B. (1997). Understanding configuration and transformation through a multiple rationalities approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34, 793–823.
- Evetts, J. (2011). A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities. *Current Sociology*, 59, 406–422.
- Facht, U., & Hellingwerf, K. (2011). *Nordicom–Sveriges Internetbarometer 2010*. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University.
- Fichman, R. G., Dos Santos, B. L., & Zheng, Z. (2014). Digital innovation as a fundamental and powerful concept in the information systems curriculum. *MIS Quarterly*, 38, 329–353.
- Findahl, O. (2013). *Swedes and the Internet*. SE (the Internet Infrastructure Foundation).
- Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to ‘professionalism’ as a disciplinary mechanism. *Sociological Review*, 47, 280–307.
- Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism, the third logic, on the practice of knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2013). *The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation?* Oxford: Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–266). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gawer, A., & Phillips, N. (2013). Institutional work as logics shift: The case of Intel’s transformation to platform leader. *Organization Studies*, 34, 1035–1071.
- Glynn, M. A., & Lounsbury, M. (2005). From the critics’ corner: Logic blending, discursive change and authenticity in a cultural production system. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42, 1031–1055.
- Glynn, M. (2013) Thornton, P., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M.: The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58, 493–495.
- Goodrick, E., & Reay, T. (2011). Constellations of institutional logics: Changes in the professional work of pharmacists. *Work and Occupations*, 38, 372–416.
- Greenstein, S., Lerner, J., & Stern, S. (2013). Digitization, innovation, and copyright: What is the agenda? *Strategic Organization*, 11, 110–121.
- Greenwood, R., Magán Diaz, A., Xiao Li, S., & Céspedes Lorente, J. (2010). The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization Science*, 21, 521–539.
- Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 317–371.
- Gustafsson, K. E., & Hadenius, S. (1976). *Swedish press policy*. Stockholm: The Swedish Institute.
- Hadenius, S. (1983). The rise and fall of the Swedish party press. *Communication Research*, 10, 287–310.
- Hesse-Biber, S., Dupuis, P., & Kinder, T.S. (1991). HyperRESEARCH: A computer program for the analysis of qualitative data with an emphasis on hypothesis testing and multimedia analysis. *Qualitative Sociology*, 14, 289–306.
- Johnson, T. J. (1972). *Professions and power*. London: Macmillan.

- Keith, S. (2011). Shifting circles: Re-conceptualizing Shoemaker and Reese's theory of a hierarchy of influences on media content for a new media era. *Web Journal of Mass Communication Research* (29).
- Kemppainen, P. (2012). The role of public service in digitization of radio. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 9, 71–83.
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web. *Public Relations Review*, 24, 321–334.
- Kodeih, F., & Greenwood, R. (2014). Responding to institutional complexity: The role of identity. *Organization Studies*, 35, 7–39.
- Kraatz, M., & Block, E. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin-Andersson, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 243–275). London: SAGE Publications.
- Krumsvik, A. H. (2014). Newspaper ownership and the prioritization of digital competences. *Digital Journalism*, 3, 777–790.
- Larson, M. S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Larson, M.S. (2003). Professionalism: The third logic (review). *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 46, 458–462.
- Lee, M. D. P., & Lounsbury, M. (2015). Filtering institutional logics: Community logic variation and differential responses to the institutional complexity of toxic waste. *Organization Science*, 26, 847–866.
- Levitt, T. (1960). Marketing myopia. *Harvard Business Review*, 38(4), 45–56.
- Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 289–307.
- Lowrey, W. (2011). Institutionalism, news organizations and innovation. *Journalism Studies*, 12, 64–79.
- Lowrey, W. (2012). Journalism innovation and the ecology of news production: Institutional tendencies. *Journalism and Communication Monographs*, 14, 214–287.
- Marquis, C., & Lounsbury, M. (2007). Vive la résistance: Competing logics and the consolidation of U.S. community banking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 799–820.
- McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in action: Managing institutional complexity in a drug court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58, 165–196.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Ohlsson, J. (2009). De första tidningsledarna. In M. Djerf-Pierre & L. Weibull (Eds.), *Ledarskap i framgångsrika tidningsföretag* (pp. 43–112). Gothenburg: JMG.
- Olsson, J. (2012). *The practice of newspaper ownership: Fifty years of control and influence in the Swedish local press*. Gothenburg: JMG.
- O'Reilly, T. (2005). What Is Web 2.0? O'Reilly Media. Retrieved from <http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>, Accessed 25 January 2017.
- Pache, A., & Santos, F. (2010). When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 455–476.
- Pache, A., & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 972–1001.
- Picard, R. G. (2015). The economics of print media. In R. G. Picard & S. S. Wildman (Eds.), *Handbook on the economics of the media* (pp.151–165). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Powell, W. (1990) Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organisation. In B. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 12, 295–336. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Purdy, J. M., & Gray, B. (2009). Conflicting logics, mechanisms of diffusion, and multilevel dynamics in emerging institutional fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 355–380.
- Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization Studies*, 30, 629–652.
- Rogers, J. (2013). *The death and life of the music industry in the digital age*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rolandsson, B. (2015). Partnership with the police: Logics and strategies of justification. *Qualitative Research in Organization and Management*, 10, 2–20.

- Rolandsson, B., Bergquist, M., & Ljungberg, J. (2011). Open source in the firm: Opening up professional practices of software development. *Research Policy*, 40, 576–587.
- Rothmann, W., & Koch, J. (2014). Creativity in strategic lock-ins: The newspaper industry and the digital revolution. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 83, 66–83.
- Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Shoemaker, P., & Reese, S. (1996). *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content*. New York: Longman.
- Siggelkow, N., & Levinthal, D. A. (2005). Escaping real (non-benign) competency traps: Linking the dynamics of organizational structure to the dynamics of search. *Strategic Organization*, 3, 85–115.
- Siggelkow, N., & Rivkin, J. (2006). When exploration backfires: Unintended consequences of multilevel organizational search. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 779–795.
- Siles, I., & Boczkowski, P. J. (2012). Making sense of the newspaper crisis: a critical assessment of existing research and an agenda for future work. *New Media and Society*, 14, 1375–1394.
- Singer, J. B. (2003). Who are these guys?: The online challenge to the notion of journalistic professionalism. *Journalism*, 4, 139–163.
- Singer, J. B., & Ashman, I. (2009). ‘Comment is free, but facts are sacred’: User-generated content and ethical constructs at the Guardian. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 24, 3–21.
- Singer, J. B., Domingo, D., Heinonen, A., Hermida, A., Paulussen, S., et al. (2011). *Participatory journalism: Guarding open gates at online newspapers*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Soloski, J. (1989). News reporting and professionalism: Some constraints on the reporting of the news. *Media, Culture and Society*, 11, 207–228.
- Thorén, C., Ågerfalk, P. J., & Edenius, M. (2014). Through the printing press: An account of open practices in the Swedish newspaper industry. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 15, 779–804.
- Thornton, P. H. (2002). The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: Conflict and conformity in institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 81–101.
- Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Thornton, P., Jones, C., & Kury, K. (2005). Institutional logics and institutional change: Transformation in accounting, architecture, and publishing. In M. Lounsbury (Ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 23, 125–170. London: Emerald Publishing.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 801–843.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin-Andersson, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 99–129). London: SAGE Publications.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Townley, B. (2002). The role of competing rationalities in institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 163–179.
- van Gestel, N., & Hillebrand, B. (2011). Explaining stability and change: The rise and fall of logics in pluralistic fields. *Organization Studies*, 32, 231–252.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*, 4th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Yoo, Y., Henfridsson, O., & Lyytinen, K. (2010). Research Commentary. The new organizing logic of digital innovation: An agenda for information systems research. *Information Systems Research*, 21, 724–735.

## Author biographies

Claes Thorén has a PhD in Information Systems and is currently senior lecturer at the Department of Informatics and Media at Uppsala University, Sweden. His primary research interests are organizations and social ontology, materiality, and the impacts of digitalization on organizations, work and innovation. His research on newspaper organizations and change has appeared in, among others, *Journal of the AIS*.

**Pär J. Ågerfalk** is a chaired full professor in Information Systems at Uppsala University, Sweden. His work on open source software, globally distributed and flexible software development, information systems development methodology and sustainable information systems has appeared in journals such as *MIS Quarterly*, *Journal of Information Technology* and *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*.

**Bertil Rolandsson** is associate professor at the Department of Sociology and Work Sciences, Gothenburg University, Sweden. He has conducted extensive research on digitalization and the organization of work, and has published several articles investigating how institutional tensions shape both digital work practices and co-production.