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ABSTRACT

In this paper, we seek to highlight how adherence to a dominant logic is an effortful activity. Using rhetorical analysis, we show that the use of rhetorical history provides a key mechanism by which organizations may convince audiences of adherence to a dominant logic, while also subverting or obscuring past adherence to a (currently) subordinate logic. We illustrate such use of rhetorical history by drawing on the case study of Ontario wine industry, where wineries use rhetorical history to demonstrate adherence to the logic of fine winemaking, while obscuring the industry’s past adherence to the now-subordinate and stigmatized logic of alcohol making. Implications for future research on institutional logics are discussed.
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The institutional logics perspective has emerged as a leading body of research in organization theory. The notion of institutional logics (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012) refers to the “the socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, 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). A key contribution of this perspective has been to enable scholars to more fully acknowledge the institutional contradictions and contestations that permeate many organizational fields, impacting both people and organizations (e.g., Creed, Dejordy, & Lok, 2010; Lounsbury, 2007), as actors attempt to either displace one logic with another, defend their preferred logic or navigate multiple logics that coexist within a field on an ongoing basis (Pache & Santos, 2010; Reay & Hinings, 2009).

Whereas researchers have begun to focus attention on understanding actors’ efforts involved in dealing with conflicting institutional logics and the conflicting pressures resulting from such conflicts and contradictions (Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011), most research on situations where there is a dominant logic has neglected the study of processes by which actors try to adhere to dominant logics, and glossed over variation in actor adherence implying that adherence is automatic and effortless. However, adherence to a logic that is currently dominant might involve a great deal of effort that requires actors to not only utilize particular kinds of knowledge and skills (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998) but also engage in a social performance that is convincing to varied audiences (Alexander, 2004).

We argue that a key aspect of the actor’s or the group’s adherence to a currently dominant institutional logic involves strategic construction and reconstruction of the past to simultaneously reconstruct actors’ identities and project the associated images convincingly in accordance with the dominant logic (Wry, Lounsbury, & Glynn, 2011), while erasing the memories of past adherence with a previously dominant logic (Zerubavel, 2003). Such use of rhetorical history (Suddaby, Foster, & Trank, 2010) extends beyond decoupling (e.g., Meyer & Rowan, 1977) because it utilizes rhetorical constructions of history to demonstrate actors’ ongoing commitment to the dominant institutional logic and obscure their past adherence to the now-subordinated logic. In other words, the past is reinterpreted to suit the needs of the present. This might be especially salient in fields where remnants of the previously dominant logic are now not only subordinate but also illegitimate and perhaps even a source of collective stigma for actors.
(Hudson, 2008). Examples of manifestations of previously dominant but now stigmatized logics might range from bureaucratic control systems (Gouldner, 1954) in present day corporations (Hamel & Prahalad, 1996) and government agencies (Du Gay, 2008) to more extreme examples, like slavery in the American South (Clarke & Fine, 2010).

We illustrate the important use of rhetorical history as a mechanism for demonstrating adherence to a dominant logic by drawing on a case study of the Ontario wine industry where the hierarchy of the logic of alcohol making that dominated until 1988 has since been rebalanced with the logic of fine winemaking. Table 1 outlines the differences between these two sets of logics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Alcohol Logic of Alcohol Making</th>
<th>Aesthetic Logic of Fine Winemaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identity</td>
<td>Efficiency over quality</td>
<td>Viticulture and viniculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial winemaking for ad hoc purposes</td>
<td>Unique combinations of techniques and terroir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Whatever market will bear</td>
<td>Artisan acclaim and authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority structures</td>
<td>Government and Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO)</td>
<td>Internationally accepted quality standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Creating inexpensive wine for a local commercial market</td>
<td>Regulated geographic areas, natural sugar levels, grape growing techniques, and production methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of attention</td>
<td>North American grapes (labrusca varietals)</td>
<td>Old World winemaking techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Creation of wines for purposes of wide alcohol consumption and intoxication</td>
<td>Vintage variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logics of investment</td>
<td>Capital committed to high quantity production of wines</td>
<td>Viticultural areas or appellation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>Local market</td>
<td>Effective grape stewardship to express local terroir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of succession</td>
<td>Frequent changes in ownership</td>
<td>Capital committed to high quality production of wines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Two Logics of Winemaking.
by using the framework provided by Thornton and Ocasio (1999). A shift in dominance of logics occurred that resulted in such a clear demarcation between these plural logics, that the logic of alcohol making became marginalized, and the practices associated with it became normatively perceived as illegitimate. By examining the routine communication in which wineries engage with their clients through newsletters and web sites, we illustrate that a significant component of demonstrating adherence to the dominant logic of fine winemaking involves attempts to import and connect to European winemaking history while omitting and repressing the history of cultural beliefs and material practices associated with the previously dominant logic of alcohol making.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Challenges of Adherence

Institutional logics aid in understanding contradictions between beliefs and practices within and across institutions (Alford & Friedland, 1985) by recognizing interinstitutional connections occurring between society, organizations and individuals (Friedland & Alford, 1991) that both regulate, and provide opportunities for, agency (Friedland & Alford 1991; Thornton & Occasio, 1999). The notion of institutional logics was initially defined by Friedland and Alford (1991, p. 243) as “supraorganizational patterns of human activity by which individuals and organizations produce and reproduce their material subsistence and organize time and space.” These scholars conceptualized organizational actors as embedded within situational contexts of various social locations within broader interinstitutional systems. Thornton and Occasio (1999) further integrated structural, normative and symbolic dimensions of institutions that complement one another by arguing that the values, interests and assumptions of both individuals and organizations are embedded within the institutional logics dominating in particular contexts. Various plural institutional logics are at play within different social orders, and these logics influence how reasoning and rationality occur and are perceived (Thornton et al., 2012). An important contribution of these authors is to emphasize the importance of cultural and symbolic structures in diffusion processes, and to emphasize the societal contextuality of actorhood.

Institutional logics link material practices and the symbolic to explain contradictions between rituals, mental schemas, and behavior (DiMaggio,
Contestations and contradictions in institutional environments allow actors to strategically exploit inconsistent and alternate logics to advocate for and influence institutional change (Rao & Giorgi, 2006; Seo & Creed, 2002) and exercise agency (Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009; Lounsbury, Ventresca, & Hirsch, 2003).

Institutional logics researchers see organizations as involved with multiple institutional spheres (Thornton et al., 2012), and the fact that organizations encounter institutional complexity due to the multiplicity of logics that exist within any field or industry is primary (Greenwood et al., 2011), often with inconsistent and heterogeneous effects (Dunn & Jones, 2010). It has been acknowledged thoroughly that institutional complexity requires a great deal of work by actors to navigate their institutional environments effectively (Greenwood et al., 2011; Kraatz & Block, 2008; Pache & Santos, 2010). Scholars have dedicated considerable attention to the examination of actors’ effort and challenges in navigating such complexities. For example, some researchers have investigated the organizational arrangements needed to address multiple logics that apply conflicting pressures to organizations (Reay & Hinings, 2009). Others have attended to the theorization efforts undertaken by actors to navigate such contradictions (Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007) and to champion a new logic (Lounsbury, 2002; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005; Wry et al., 2011). Yet, others attended to how even the most private aspects of people’s selfhood – their identities – get mobilized in the process of inter-logic contestation (Creed et al., 2010). However, the efforts of actors to adhere with a new, prevailing logic have not been paid adequate attention, implying that such adherence is unproblematic.

Our main argument is that adherence with prevailing institutional logics is effortful, potentially difficult, and deserving of research attention in its own right, especially under conditions where actors have been historically situated in an environment that has valorized a different, opposing institutional logic. Even in environments where the hierarchy of logics is clearly established, actors may face difficulties in adherence (e.g., Lok & de Rond, 2012). Although we are not suggesting that dealing with conflicting logics is unimportant, we think that focusing on how actors adhere to a dominant logic is as important as understanding the efforts actors make to navigate institutional contradictions. As Emirbayer and Mische (1998) observe, even putatively routine and habitual behavior is skillful and requires selective attention to the environment, and being able to deploy from the appropriate repertoire of actions and maintaining expectations. It is, at least in part, a creative and improvisational activity
(Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998) that requires intricate interplay between particular actors and audiences (Alexander, 2004). Fields vary in terms of the salience of logic contradictions and the intensity of contestation among proponents of different logics. Some conflicts may appear to be settled (Helms, Oliver, & Webb, 2012) – at least temporarily – and actors then must focus their attention and effort on adhering to the logic that is currently the dominant one. Some logics might become so entrenched (e.g., Du Gay, 2008; Hoffman, 2001) as to require at least ceremonial adherence from all actors operating in a particular field. Taking seriously the effort involved in adherence to a dominant logic and the processes through which such adherence is perceived by others to be genuine is important to more fully explicate processes of mollifying complexity. Quite simply, navigating multiple logics and adhering to a clearly dominant logic are challenging, albeit in different ways, and both deserving of research attention.

Rhetorical History: Avoiding Stigma and the Work of Adherence

Even in environments where there is a clear hierarchy between dominant and subordinate logics, efforts to demonstrate adherence to a prevalent logic involve strategically aligning actors’ identities and images with the dominant logic while at the same time demonstrating discontinuity and distancing the identities and images from the subordinate logic. In cases where organizations or industries have historically espoused subordinate logics, as in our case study of the Ontario wine industry, it may be necessary to forget (Antebay & Molnár, 2012) this history by downplaying or obscuring it, and instead demonstrate continuity with legitimate logics. In this way, organizations engage storytelling efforts (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001) that strategically utilize historical constructions (Foster, Suddaby, Minkus, & Wiebe, 2011; Suddaby et al., 2010), to both convince audiences of adherence, as well as to distance organizations from the stigma (Hudson, 2008; Rivera, 2008) of past association with a now illegitimate logic.

Within the institutional entrepreneurship literature, the role of storytelling in the symbolic importation of alternate institutional logics has been highlighted (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001; Vaara & Tienari, 2011; Weber & Dacin, 2011; Wry et al., 2011). According to Boje (1991, p. 106), storytelling constitutes “the institutional memory of the organization” and operates as a method by which actors can promote preferred logics. Collective activity in telling and retelling stories bridge past, present and future activities,
allowing individuals to make sense of environments and events via supplementing individual with institutional memories (Boje, 1991, 1995; Gephart, 1991). Organizational legitimacy can be enhanced by expression of a coherent defining collective identity story (Wry et al., 2011) by making identity understandable to audiences and appropriately positioning identity to determine membership boundaries. In response to isomorphic pressures (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), stories often come to resemble those deemed predominately appropriate and that conform to normative logics and audience expectations (Golant & Sillince, 2007; Polletta, Chen, Gardner, & Motes, 2011).

As a form of storytelling, history operates as an important resource from which organizations can frame identity and images and enhance audience perceptions of legitimacy (Anteby & Molnár, 2012; Foster et al., 2011; Suddaby, Foster, & Quinn-Trank, 2010). Although often viewed as neither malleable nor manageable due to its existence or lack of existence (Ostrom, 1991), the notion of history has been extended to include a rhetorical dimension, whereby actors can construct particular versions of history that tap into acceptable values and norms (Anteby & Molnár, 2012; Bates, 2011; MacMillan, 2008). The notion of rhetorical history is defined by Suddaby et al. (2010, p. 14) as a “means through which organizations can strategically mediate between their material and symbolic environments,” that can be used to manage organizational identity and image as a strategic resource. Generally, rhetorical history, and other forms of storytelling denote the strategic persuasion of audiences, using history, to shape perceptions of legitimacy and appropriateness (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001). In this paper, we argue that rhetorical history works to facilitate organizations’ efforts to demonstrate adherence to a dominant institutional logic and obscure past adherence to a now-subordinate and illegitimate institutional logic.

Dialogic in nature, history is a form of collective memory and storytelling that informs actors’ interpretations of the past. Foster et al. (2011) describe such discursive narratives as taking on two forms: the specific narratives linking events along plotlines grounded in temporal order and geographical space, and the schematic narratives that utilize meta-narratives of cultural tradition to associate significance and meaning that extends beyond the activity itself. This, we argue, involves tapping into institutional logics because they provide the toolkits from which these narratives can be constructed (Thornton et al., 2012).

In contrasting historical narratives, eras are presented as eventful or uneventful, continuous or discontinuous, and take on different shapes and spaces occupying our memories (Zerubavel, 2003). Mnemonic bridging and
pasting, involved in linking present and past times, depicts historical continuities that connect traditions and current activities. On the other hand, historical discontinuity can be depicted through social and mental partitioning of the past into separate and distinct periods. Zerubavel’s (2003) distinction between continuous and discontinuous historical narratives provides a useful framework from which to understand the efforts of actors as they employ rhetorical history to demonstrate adherence to a dominant institutional logic, while suppressing historical alignment with subordinate logics. We illustrate the use of such strategic portrayals of history in demonstrating adherence to a dominant and simultaneous rejection of subordinate institutional logics. We do so by drawing on the case of Ontario wine industry to illustrate how organizations can utilize rhetorical history effectively in order to demonstrate their adherence to a dominant logic.

METHODS

Research Setting

We draw upon our case study of the Ontario wine industry, where the logic of alcohol making predominated until circa 1988. Since that time, great efforts on the behalf of actors within the industry have worked to replace this logic with the more aesthetic logic of fine winemaking. The subordinate logic is now widely perceived as unacceptable and illegitimate, and the historical association with it has been a source of stigma for the industry as a whole.

Although winemaking in Ontario dates back to the middle of the 19th century, many attribute the birth of “serious” winemaking in Ontario to the founding of Inniskillin Winery in 1975 (Frank, 2008), because it was the first to adhere to the logic of fine winemaking that was a dominant logic in many established regions and would become an insurgent logic (Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003) in Ontario, whose wine industry adhered to the logic of alcohol making (Bramble, 2009; Phillips, 2004). The distinction between the two logics can be made as follows: whereas the logic of fine winemaking constructs wine as an essentially artistic product that is appreciated, consumed, critiqued and priced based on its aesthetic qualities (Beverland, 2005; Colman, 2008; McCoy, 2005; Roberts & Reagans, 2007; Zhao, 2005); the logic of alcohol making constructs wine in a more banal way – as essentially an alcoholic beverage. The former logic is codified through a
variety of norms (about grape growing, winemaking, labeling, marketing, etc.) that elevate wine into the realm of art appreciation. In contrast, the latter logic is less specific with respect to most aspects of wine production, and the various laws and regulations are typically limited to safety and retailing (Colman, 2008). In 1988, the Free Trade Agreement with the United States threatened to destroy the Canadian wine industry because it exposed Canadian wineries to increased international competition from both industrial wine producers as well as fine wine producers. The jolt boosted Ontario wineries adhering to the logic of fine winemaking, and eventually the government supported the efforts to institutionalize the logic. Thus, in the case of the Ontario wine industry, the Free Trade Agreement acted as a shock that, while nearly decimating the industry, also motivated the wineries to transform the way they operated and their identities, and the images they projected. It incentivized the industry to uproot the cold hardy labrusca grapes, such as Concord, that dominated Ontario vineyards due to ease of cultivation. Such grapes were frequently used to produce sweet, foxy wines that are illegitimate in accordance with the more aesthetic logic of fine winemaking. Instead, Ontario wineries planted vinefera grapes, such as Riesling, Chardonnay, and Pinot Noir, associated with high-quality wines as defined by the logic of fine winemaking.

Since then, the industry has focused on producing high-quality wines in accordance with the logic of fine winemaking, and the logic of alcohol making has been marginalized, so much so, that even the wineries adhering to it seek to decouple their actions from their public images. Several Ontario wineries have since earned major international awards and garnered critical acclaim from such sources as the noted British critic Jancis Robinson, American critic Matt Kramer and the prestigious US-based Wine Spectator magazine, among others, and the region’s profile and prestige has been steadily increasing. All this indicates increasingly successful adherence to the logic of fine winemaking. In 2009, the industry produced 13 million liters of wine with a retail value of $210 million. The most famous and commonly exported Ontario wine product is Icewine, which in 2009 comprised 550,000 liters. The main export destinations for Ontario wine include United States, China, South Korea, United Kingdom, and Hong Kong, among others.

One of the challenges encountered by the Ontario wine industry has been to erase the poor reputation that the pre-1988 wines had built among many domestic consumers. This has made it necessary for wineries and other actors interested in supporting the industry (e.g., government official, local food activists, some wine critics, etc.) to continuously rationalize what has
been done and explain why Ontario wine should be seen as “world class.” In other words, they must continuously remind audiences that they now adhere to the dominant logic of fine winemaking, while at the same time distancing themselves from their past association with the logic of alcohol making.

Due to the valuing of tradition and nostalgia in the wine industry in general (e.g., Beverland, 2005; Colman, 2008; Ulin, 1995), the wine industry offers excellent opportunities to study rhetorical history, as wineries routinely attempt to associate themselves and their activities with images of a mythologized premodern past. Yet, as we argue below, our case offers instances of particularly interesting usages of rhetorical history for two reasons. First, it is very salient that rhetorical history is used not in idiosyncratic ways by particular wineries to differentiate or brand themselves. Rather, there is remarkable consistency across wineries with respect to the rhetorical devices being used as a means of demonstrating adherence to a dominant logic. This logic is somewhat foreign to the region because it lacks its own winemaking traditions that can be readily classified as adhering to a dominant logic of fine winemaking. Second, and related, unlike some regions that draw upon local historical and cultural events (e.g., Ulin, 1995), Ontario wineries’ rhetorical strategies are drawn primarily from foreign historical and cultural resources.

Data Collection

The data sources used in this paper are excerpted from a broader study of the organization of Ontario wine industry wherein qualitative data was collected in various forms (interviews, observations, and documents) over a period of four years. This study consists of the analysis of 326 electronic newsletters from 40 wineries and web sites of 15 wineries. Our sampling was driven by the desire to incorporate wineries exhibiting a range of variables, such as size, age, commercial success, quality reputation, ownership structure, location, product range and pricing, among other factors, and to understand overall how the Ontario wine industry might be collectively utilizing different forms of rhetorical history.

Newsletters and web sites offer a unique opportunity for researchers to understand the ongoing use of rhetorical history by organizations and the implicit rules at the field level that guide the selection and deployment of such techniques. We were especially interested in understanding how wineries tapped into various historical resources in order to demonstrate their adherence to the dominant logic of fine winemaking, and to essentially
rebalance the hierarchy of dominance between the plural logics of alcohol and fine winemaking. While newsletters typically target loyal customers and other individuals that have ongoing relationships with particular wineries, web sites represent wineries’ attempts to represent themselves in a desirable manner to a more general audience. Thus, the two data sources offer useful complements to each other.

Analysis

Rhetorical analysis offers a method for both the strategies employed and the broader context of relevant societal discourses and their links (Heracleous & Barrett, 2001; Sillince & Brown, 2009; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). Because newsletters and web sites have a persuasive intent and are designed purposefully to influence audience perceptions, attending to the rhetorical devices used in these narratives enhanced our understanding of the ways in which wineries are persuasively using history. Repeated readings of the web sites and newsletters, in consultation with the literature on rhetoric, allowed us to identify various rhetorical strategies identified in prior rhetoric research that could be used as sensitizing devices in our data analysis. Although a great many such devices are available, we focused on the ones that were used most commonly in the context of Ontario wineries’ deployment of rhetorical history, and we used them as a starting point to sift through the plethora of texts generated by the wineries. This decision was mainly pragmatic and intended to avoid “getting overwhelmed” by the extensive and varied usage of rhetorical history that was apparent in the data. Please see the appendix for descriptions of the key terms we used in the rhetorical analysis.

Analytical Strategy

The stages of analysis were similar for both the newsletters and the web sites. Yet similarities and differences between the two genres of texts were examined throughout the research process because they are directed at somewhat different audiences and might use rhetorical devices in different ways to theorize practices and activities. The first stage of the analysis involved reading over the newsletters and web sites to understand their general content and format. While reading, general impressions were noted, possible themes for coding identified, and notes taken on how and why these themes were emerging. For example, the fact that wineries often use
The coding stage of analysis entailed looking for words and phrases that were frequently used within the newsletters and web sites, primed by our research interest in rhetorical history. For example, phrases involving the notion of terroir were quite prevalent, and were easily coded under “terroir.” Themes within the web sites and newsletters were identified, as were broader ideas, concepts, activities, relations and terminology used. Because rhetorical analysis requires grasping the significance of a particular utterance in its context (Heracleous & Barrett, 2001), we designated the units of analysis to range from a paragraph to a whole newsletter – whatever smallest passage could be interpreted meaningfully. When a rhetorical strategy could not be identified or no link to rhetorical history could be made, no further analysis on a particular passage or even a document was undertaken. At this stage we began to use the aforementioned rhetorical devices to identify various discursive themes and interpretive repertoires that emerged from the body of texts as a collection. For example, we intended to understand what role actors’ use of terroir plays in the newsletters and web sites, and how and why they act rhetorically to persuade audiences. The notion of terroir here presented an interesting role, as it is used by wineries to both conform to broader, traditional Old World values while at the same time to confer a sense of distinctiveness and uniqueness to wineries by appealing to a more local history.

As the newsletters and web sites were further categorized, other themes were identified and served as subcategories. For example, the notion of terroir was sometimes used in reference to soil composition as being similar to that of more legitimized wine regions, while at other times it was used to highlight the uniqueness of local plots of land. We attempted to substantiate the existence of shared discourses by comparing and contrasting these themes and categories, and by moving back and forth between broader, more general societal discourses and the specific utterances. For example, the use of terroir may be related to the broader societal construct of geological history, which details the origins and history of the development of earth, and essentially describes time as sequential in attempting to make sense of the events that have taken place in a region.

As the analysis continued, and definitions of those categories were refined, new categories were identified that did not fit with existing categories of rhetorical strategies. Thus, it became necessary to analyze this manifestation of rhetorical history as a new category of strategies. The similarities, differences and patterns within and between subcategories were compared,
contrasted and noted. The process of category building continued, in order to examine and interpret the newsletters and web sites, until no new themes were found and a point of saturation was reached.

Most of the analysis was done by the first author, who had no access to the field and relied purely on the newsletters and web sites to do the coding. She periodically engaged the second author who had conducted the interviews and observations that were a part of the larger study of the organization of the Ontario wine industry to assess the similarities and differences of the interpretations resulting from the researchers’ differences and the access to different data. As the study progressed, the second author also independently analyzed a sample of the newsletters and web sites previously analyzed by the first author. Disagreements were discussed, and the coding was refined. This allowed the study to benefit from both detached analysis by the first author and in-depth industry insight acquired by the second author (Pratt, 2009).

FINDINGS

The findings of this study demonstrate the importance of rhetorical history as a mechanism by which adherence to a dominant logic is achieved. In the routine communication attempts of web sites and newsletters, a significant aspect of demonstrating adherence to a dominant logic involves attempts to import and connect to traditional European winemaking history while repressing and even omitting the history of association with the previously dominant, now subordinate logic.

Continuity with the Logic of Fine Winemaking

Because the logic of fine winemaking is rooted primarily in European – especially French – winemaking conventions (Robinson, 2006), a very salient theme found in our data features Ontario wineries characterizing themselves as strict adherents of European traditions and techniques of winemaking. Traditional European winemaking privileges techniques and methods that aid the slow process of winemaking and embraces the influences of land, soil and climate, or terroir, in wines. The main themes were Following Old World Traditions, Terroir-Driven Winemaking, Traditional Farming Methods, and Claiming Geographical Similarity (see Table 2).
Table 2. Additional Quotes Illustrating Continuity with Logic of Fine Winemaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Illustrative Quotes and Rhetorical Devices Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following Old World Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through centuries of winemaking history in the Old World, the art of the blend was always something that was given much attention and appreciation. […] Most people are familiar with the blends of Bordeaux – probably some of the greatest in the world – which consist of primarily Cabernet Sauvignon, Merlot, and Cabernet Franc with smaller proportions of Petit Verdot and Malbec. Outside of Bordeaux, these blends are sometimes called “Meritage” blends, or in the case of Pillitteri, we simply call it a “Cabernet Merlot” blend – an assemblage consisting of the two Cabernet grapes, Franc and Sauvignon, and Merlot. Like our winemaking forefathers, Pillitteri Estates takes the art of blending very seriously as well. [characterization, metaphor, denotation, expertise] (Pillitteri newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“All grapes are hand-picked and crafted into lively genuine wines using only gentle traditional winemaking techniques.” [characterization] (Frogpond website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Jeff has a dedicated passion for producing fine wines in Prince Edward County. He holds a great respect for traditional, old-world styles of wines and a passion for excellence.” [characterization] (Great Estates newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We are traditionalists and find the process of pulling a cork from a bottle a bit more sensuous than twisting off a cap. Saying this we purchase only high quality corks. Ken Douglas’s son David who works as assistant winemaker for the Murphy Good Winery in California sourced our most recent corks. David has, over the last several years, developed considerable expertise in selecting corks and conducts laboratory testing of each batch of corks offered for sale to his winery to assess its TCA content. He is now selecting our corks. Of our most recent batch, less than 1 cork out of 100 corks had detectable TCA. The industry norm is greater than 5 per 100 corks.” [characterization, expertise] (13th Street newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“This wine was produced in the traditional method with the fermentation occurring in the bottle. It was disgorged after resting on the lees for three years.” [characterization, imagery] (13th Street newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Our Winemaster, Marc Bradshaw, was able to draw on some Old World techniques from France and Italy to help create this superb wine.” [characterization] (Pillitteri newsletter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “A Chianti-style red with bold, upfront fruit for lovers of traditional Italian cuisine. Serve it ever so slightly chilled to SHILO HILLS ET AL.
Table 2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Illustrative Quotes and Rhetorical Devices Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terroir-based Wines</strong></td>
<td>“Slightly off dry, showing a beautiful balance of floral sweetness and citrus fruit along with the typical minerality of our terroir. Their birthplace, the Moira Vineyard, appears from above as an island nestled into an angle of the Niagara Escarpment. From its well-drained, mineral-infused soil come wines whose trademark richness is interwoven with an exotic smokiness.” [imagery, denotation, personification] (Malivoire newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wine has been associated with its point of origin for hundreds of years and is often referred to as an ‘expression of place’.</strong> Recognizing that the character of a wine is directly influenced by where the grapes are grown, European countries with a long history of winemaking slowly evolved appellation systems to identify different wines for consumers. The ‘terroir’ – the combination of location, soil, topography and climate – is an important indicator of the character of a wine and in many cases, its quality.” [metaphor, denotation] (13th Street newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With his knowledge and passion for winemaking, his style of traditional winemaking focuses on creating wines which showcase the purity of fruit and exhibit the unique terroir, or environment, in which the grapes are grown.”</strong> [characterization] (Cattail Creek newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The return is a wine that expresses the diversity and age of our vines, complexity in our soils and the vagaries of Mother Nature – all adding up to be a very fine wine!”</strong> [personification, imagery] (Stratus newsletter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Niagara Escarpment Bench provides drainage for air, frost and water. All of these can have a negative effect on growing grapes. They drain down the Escarpment to the flats below and particularly in the case of frost, are eventually warmed by the waters of Lake Ontario and return to moderate the cold frosty nights in Spring and Fall or freezing nights during the winter. Grapes do not like wet feet and the acreage is under-drained to follow the natural slope. The Syrah planted ravine acts as a heat sink for this particular heat loving variety.”</strong> [characterization, denotation, imagery] (Kacaba website)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The roots of a romance with the land run deep in the Lizak family. In 1946, matriarch Sophie Lizak and husband John planted the seeds of enterprise on a tender fruit farm of a dozen acres. The fertile soil and micro-climate of the Niagara peninsula fed his passion and as time passed, the customs of</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following Old World Traditions

At times, continuity with the Old World winemaking tradition is expressed in most general terms by asserting that a winery operates by strictly adhering to Old World norms and practices. One such effort to maintain these traditions is found in a newsletter, and again in a web site passage, of Foreign Affair Winery as they rely upon the Amarone-style of drying grapes.
prior to making wine from them: “We are excited to report [...] the long anticipated 2007 100% Amarone-style Cabernet Franc [...] We are confident that this latest vintage is the ultimate expression of what our wines are all about and for what we have continuously and patiently been striving!”

The straightforward message from this statement relates to the traditional methods and the logic of fine winemaking used to create this wine. The notion of terroir is less obviously insinuated from the pronouncement that this wine is the “ultimate expression” of what the winery stands and works hard for. What is left unsaid, but is still nonetheless bundled into the interpretation is the role that terroir, the earth, weather, and sun, play in the expression of character in wine. Thus, a commitment to terroir is, in effect, communicated by metaphorically linking the wine and the ultimate expression of the winery, the land upon which the grapes are grown, and thus, the local history that contributed to the characteristics of the land expressed in the wine. Furthermore, the fact that this wine is a vintage that expresses this metaphor links to global and traditional values of age and slowness in winemaking that are consistent with the fine winemaking logic. This passage involves expression of the logic of fine winemaking, in both the Amarone method of winemaking, as well as communicating a dedication to the expression of terroir.

As a whole, this passage indicates a commitment to traditional methods and values in winemaking, and links to the logic of fine winemaking, through its use of the Old World mythology of terroir to characterize this wine as a vintage expression of local history. In this newsletter passage, the Amarone-style is merely mentioned. This passage works to characterize this winery as traditional and as adhering to the logic of fine winemaking in their approach to creating this wine, and as committed and dedicated to producing quality wines that are an “expression of what our wines are all about.”

In a web site narrative, the story behind the commitment to Amarone-style winemaking is explicated in much more detail:

...Italy introduced us to a whole new world of fine food, wine, and the simple joys of everyday life. We discovered the wonders of Amarone styled wines in the northern part of the country. The more we learned about them, the more excited we became at the prospect of bringing this incredible craftsmanship back with us to Ontario [...] And so we did.... [...] In the time-held tradition of Amarone, we then proceeded to delicately dry our grape stock in a barn until each of the varietals were perfect for winemaking...We are very proud of the fact that our wines are Canadian and home grown. But [...] we were greatly influenced by the rich Italian (Veneto Region) history of
appassimento (drying process). It was in Veneto where it all started and reference to amarone or recioto belong only to those winemaking visionaries. They were and still are the legendary pioneers for whom we have huge respect and admiration. Our Canadian stylistic interpretation with locally grown vinifera varietals are referred to as appassimento (grape drying or Reductio Method) rather than the uniquely owned names found in Veneto. A glass of our wine tells the rest of the story.

The most explicit references to history in this selection involve connections to Old World Traditions and local history, which are both aspects involving a globally accepted logic of fine winemaking. The Amarone method, itself somewhat controversial with respect to the extent that it is truly “traditional” even in the context of European French-centric tradition (Robinson, 2006), is ascribed to the traditional wine craftsmen of Amarone and used rhetorically to indicate “tradition” that the winery seeks to carry on. Because the techniques are imitated locally, in local soils with their own characteristics, rather than in Amarone, they are referred to as appassimento, or Amarone-style. The reference to local terroir, and thus the local history and geology of the land that allow for this “locally grown vinifera,” is implicit, and it is integrated into the broader narrative of demonstrating continuity with mythologized Old World history. The family connection to northern Italian wines is explained in more detail on the web site, as is Amarone-style winemaking. We learn the history of the method, and how this family winery adapted these putatively traditional Italian methods to Canadian winemaking. Wine is personified at the end of this passage, as it takes on the ability to tell a story. Such a personification of wines represents a traditional construction of wine as having the characteristics of living entities (Kramer, 2004; McCoy, 2005); by personifying wine, the wine is given an individual identity which essentially brings the wine to life in the mind of a reader. By rhetorically tapping into this historical construction, terroir and widely accepted repertoire, this passage indicates alignment with the dominant logic of fine winemaking.

Terroir-Driven Winemaking

The concept of terroir is heavily relied upon to demonstrate the continuity with the Old World history of winemaking in a more specific way, and Ontario wineries overwhelming rely upon descriptions of terroir, which indicates their commitment to Old World winemaking traditions and the logic of fine winemaking.

For example, Henry of Pelham seeks to define this notion using the rhetorical device of denotation in one passage on its web site: “The origin of
the grapes used to make wine has long been important in traditional
winemaking regions to both winemakers and wine drinkers. The combina-
tion of location, soil, topography and climate – the terroir – is an important
factor in determining the character of a wine and, in many cases, its
quality.”

The traditional ideology of terroir is very clearly discussed in this passage,
and by tapping into this ideology, this passage works to demonstrate a
commitment to the traditional logic of fine winemaking. In this particular
excerpt, the notion of traditional winemaking, and thus the connection to
this dominant logic is made very explicit; however, the local aspect of this
notion is somewhat downplayed. Here, as in many other narratives that
describe wines and their terroir, wine is personified as having character, and
the land is deemed responsible for imbuing wine with particular chara-
ceteristics. Additionally, this passage, much like the narratives of other
wineries, provides a definition of terroir that strategically links the land of
the winery to the quality wines it produces. The explicit overtone is that of
traditional winemaking and continuity with the logic of fine winemaking,
while local terroir and the history of the land must be inferred from the
definition provided.

A passage on the Cave Springs web site offers a further explanation of the
concept of terroir: “Great wines come from great vineyards. As wine-
growers, our goal is to honor the rich, expressive character of our vineyards,
and to craft wines that capture the essential essence – the terroir – that
defines our land.” The key theme of this passage again relates to traditional
values of terroir and indicates that the role of the winegrower is to “capture
the essential essence” of the vineyard in the wines that are produced.
Further, we see the notion of the “craft” of winemaking. Such references to
winemaking as a craft, and especially to wines as handcrafted, are highly
prevalent throughout the newsletters and web sites of Ontario wineries, and
they highlight traditional conceptions of winemakers as artisans who,
through laborious methods, create quality wines by hand. However, the role
of terroir is not diminished by the efforts of the winemaker; indeed, the
winemaker is often seen, as here, merely as bringing out the qualities of the
land that are already inherent within the grapes.

In evoking terroir in this manner, wineries seek to demonstrate
adherence to the logic of fine winemaking by framing their activities and
practices in light of the age-old notion that harks back to the mythology-
rich and putatively glorious past of French winemaking (Kramer, 2004;
Robinson, 2006).
Traditional Farming Methods

Frequently, wineries elaborate their claims of terroir-based winemaking by emphasizing the Traditional Farming Methods being used in their winemaking, thereby highlighting the primacy of the land and vineyards over the winemaking that is a hallmark of the terroir philosophy (Robinson, 2006). A passage on the web site of Sprucewood Shores also defines terroir:

The creation of excellent wine starts in the vineyard. The French have coined the term ‘terroir’ to define the factors that have an impact on the unique taste of each wine. These factors are the specific compilation of soil conditions, the trellising method used, the amount of precipitation, the proximity to the moderating influence of bodies of water, the intensity of heat units and the length of time for growing and maturing the grapes. Through a form of denotation, the notion of terroir is seen as involving the methods of growing grapes and proximity to water, as well as the climate and soil. Thus, this message pertains explicitly to global traditions that value terroir based, and fine, winemaking. There is also an explicit reference to the “French” aspect of terroir, which further indicates continuity with the traditions of this Old World wine producing region, also indicating commitment to the logic of fine winemaking. However, less explicit is the reliance upon local geological history for providing the “bodies of water” and “length of time for growing” that influence grape growing.

Both in newsletters and on web sites, wineries tend to detail the laborious, hands on methods of growing and harvesting grapes. Such references implicitly rely upon Old World notions of terroir and commitment to the expression of the land in the creation of quality wines, which are all concepts that are bundled together under the logic of fine winemaking. While some Ontario wineries, particularly in earlier newsletters, describe the work associated with winemaking as grueling drudgery, most wineries describe the work associated with traditional methods, including hand harvesting, as motivated by passion and a dedication to quality and the production of fine wines. For example, an older newsletter of 13th Street described grape growing as follows:

First of all, let me be blunt, there is no romance in growing grapes, just a lot of hard work consisting of a series of repetitive tasks that typically have to be completed within a narrow window of opportunity. Why do we do it? I guess because it is very satisfying at the end of the day to look back on what you have achieved, whether it is pruning a row of grapes or cutting the grass in the vineyard. We view the vineyard as an extension of our garden and continue to feel challenged by the prospect of growing the best grapes we can.
While describing the process of growing grapes as lacking in romance, this passage still portrays Old World values, and the logic of fine winemaking, implicitly as the owners are depicted as satisfied with their work. The explicit message of this selection is that grape growing is hard work, while the more implicit idea is that this hard work is pleasurable. Despite the depiction of this work as laborious and less than romantic, this passage raises and answers a question that readers will perhaps ask, and at the same time characterizes the winemakers as dedicated to growing quality grapes. The motivation behind partaking in the “series of repetitive tasks” is the satisfaction achieved after labouring to grow the “best grapes we can.” Most other wineries tend to instead portray the more romantic side of grape growing and winemaking.

On many occasions, readers of newsletters are invited to get involved with the work that goes into harvesting and are urged to take part in exciting opportunities to experience the traditions involved in fine winemaking. In one newsletter from Flat Rock Cellars, readers are invited to partake in the exciting activities of the Grape Stomp: “Harvest is a busy and exciting time, and this is your chance to experience it! Roll up your pants and make wine the old fashioned way. Book now, spaces are filling up fast...”

In this passage, identification is used to offer readers a chance to take part in the creation of a wine by performing the traditional method of grape stomping. The winery is characterized as excited at the prospects of the harvest and to share this busy time with readers, “the old fashioned way,” clearly indicating to audience members that this winery is devoted to the principles of the logic of fine winemaking. Invitations like this one extend the enjoyment of hard work to readers by offering the chance to partake in various events around the winery. Flat Rock also invites their newsletter audience to join in similar activities: “As with every fall there are always many things to experience at Flat Rock Cellars. Please take the time to truly immerse yourself in the joys of harvest. It’s what truly motivates all of us at Flat Rock Cellars.”

Together, these passages characterize the wineries as enjoying the hard work associated with the harvest season and as faithful to the age-old principles of terroir winemaking, so much so that they want readers to join in the enjoyment and excitement.

Discontinuity with Logic of Alcohol Making

We noted concerted efforts to obscure or downplay the local winemaking history (see Table 3) prior to 1970s (or 1980s, in some cases), because early
**Table 3.** Additional Quotes Illustrating Discontinuity with Logic of Alcohol Making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young industry</td>
<td>“Made from our youngest vines (still 20+ years old, the same age as most ‘Old Vines’ in Ontario), it represents Chardonnay at its purest.” [characterization, denotation, metaphor] (Daniel Lenko newsletter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There is a widespread impression that Canadian viticulture and viniculture did not exist in a meaningful way before the late 1900s. True, early Canadian wine had little or no impact (or appeal) beyond its domestic market... Vineyards planted to native hybrids spread across southern Ontario through the mid-1800s but the cultivation of traditional wine grape varieties was not yet possible. North American pests and the Canadian climate’s legendary adversity thwarted early efforts.” [aphorism] (Malivoire website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“On July 31, 1975, Inniskillin Wines incorporated and its founders Karl J. Kaiser and Donald J.P. Ziraldo were granted the first winery license in Ontario, Canada since prohibition... Then in 1984, Kaiser made the most of the extreme Canadian winter to produce his first Icewine – a pivotal point for Inniskillin. The world began to take notice.” [characterization] (Inniskillin website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“So much happens when a wine region is born. The landscape is altered. Long-time crop fields are replaced with row upon row of unfamiliar cedar posts and wires, virtual factories of growth sprouting overnight. Laconic farmers with squint-lined eyes, well schooled in the ebbs and flows of agriculture, politely listen to lectures on grape growing delivered by the new kids in the fields, winegrowers, if you please. A buzz quickly fills the air: will the vineyards usher in a new era of economic prosperity and sophistication, or unexpected tax hikes for traditional farmers startled to discover they’re now living on prime grape terroir, for heaven’s sake. As for the pioneer grape growers, we are like characters in a black and white movie who have entered one of those goofy car races across treacherous terrain, careening from madcap adventures to tragic mishaps.” [denotation, metaphor, characterization] (Chadsey’s Cairns website),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging local winemaking history</td>
<td>“As the native labrusca varieties used for Canadian ports and sherries were not suited to table wines, hardy French hybrids seemed to be the answer. Marechal Foch vines were planted widely across the Niagara Peninsula during the third quarter of the 20th century, although the increasing demand for vinifera acreage ensured that few of these plantings survived into the 1990s.” [problem-solution] (Malivoire newsletter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | “At the time vinifera grapes were not yet as popular as they are today and so the decision to grow only vinifera grapes was a
Table 3. (Continued)

...difficult one for us to make, but we were encouraged by our mentor Paul Bosc at Chateau des Charmes.” [problem-solution] (13th Street newsletter)

“Both Karl Kaiser and Donald Ziraldo believed their future in the wine business was dependent on using the Vitis vinifera grapes, the preferred family of grapes used to produce the fine wines in the great wine regions of the world. When sourcing these limited grapes became a challenge in the early 70’s, Ziraldo took the lead and planted a vinifera vineyard which included Riesling, Chardonnay and Gamay and formed the quality base for Kaiser to work with.” [characterization, denotation] (Inniskillin website)

“The existing vineyard was very run down and after one year of picking the Fredonia, Concord and Niagara grapes; it was obvious that the whole farm needed to be replanted.” [problem-solution] (13th Street)

winemaking adhered to the now-marginalized logic of alcohol making. Narratives strive to emphasize the newer, more legitimate winemaking history in Ontario, while marginalizing or even disparaging the more distant past, characterized by adherence to the logic of alcohol making.

Young Industry

Although winemaking in Ontario dates back to the mid-1800s, the industry is often characterized as young. One example that obscures the history of winemaking, as it adhered to the subordinate logic of alcohol making can be found in a Pillitteri newsletter, as it describes the industry as new:

When compared to the likes of France, Italy, and Greece, all of which have hundreds or even thousands of years of wine making history under their belts, Canada has a mere 40 or so years of solid wine making roots to draw from. Where Niagara lacks in experience, we make up in creativity and flexibility in our wine making practices.

This passage works to characterize the industry as young, new and lacking in experience. Further, it describes Canada as not having a history that it can draw upon, but what must be inferred from this description is that Canada does not have a legitimate history or acceptable experiences in winemaking, as can be read from the lack of “solid winemaking roots.” This phrase also uses metaphor, as winemaking history acts as the roots from which present practices may or may not be drawn upon. Niagara is characterized, and personified, as creative and flexible, as a result of not
having these historical roots to build from (a paradoxical contrast to the oft repeated claim that Ontario winemakers follow the tradition rigidly). In essence, this passage privileges the widely accepted and legitimated historical winemaking practices of European wine regions, and obscures the fact that Ontario has a long history of winemaking, but that this history involved unacceptable practices and techniques in their production of wine that used to comply with a logic of alcohol making, rather than those practices consistent with the dominant and normatively proper logic of fine winemaking. The historical adherence of Ontario winemakers with this subordinate logic is suppressed by describing the industry as only existing within the last 40 years, rather than bringing to light the existence of an industry in the region for two hundred years. This relatively young portrayal of the history of wine production in Canada can be seen as a way of eradicating collective memories of poor quality wine production in Canada prior to the 1980s. Even the oldest wineries only make reference to the part of their winemaking history in Canada that falls within this timeframe, despite the fact that many draw on a family heritage of winemaking dating sometimes centuries prior in more established, European wine regions.

Another depiction of Ontario as a newer wine growing region can be found in a 13th Street newsletter: “Ontario is a much younger wine growing area and has so far identified three primary viticultural areas and 12 sub-appellations.” What needs to be implied from the phrase “much younger” is the idea that Ontario is much younger than various established wine growing regions, and this works to characterize the industry as such. This comparison is implicit, but is more easily seen as the number of sub-appellations of Ontario is identified. Appellation systems have historically been very important to quality wine production in Europe, particularly in France, where the appellation system was initially introduced (Colman, 2008). Often, wineries in Europe only identify their wines in terms of these appellations or Chateau locations. This reference to the twelve sub-appellations of Ontario alludes to the adherence to the logic of fine winemaking. At the same time, the reference to the young age of the industry is downplaying, and even completely obscuring the historical existence of an industry that was less than desirable within Ontario.

A web site selection from Featherstone demonstrates one way of minimizing poor local history and distancing the region from historical commitment to the subordinate logic of alcohol making by highlighting instead the fact that their winery holds some of the oldest vines of a particular variety in the region: “The Chardonnay and Cabernet Franc, planted in 1986, were left to thrive as was the Riesling, which was planted in
1978 and is some of the oldest Riesling in Niagara. Today the entire grape crop is bottled to produce Featherstone wines, with approximately 5,000 cases a year being vinified.”

This passage utilizes ideas of traditional values and local history as the noble European vinifera varietals that have been grown on the land of the winery since the late 1970s are highlighted. Of note is the phrase “were left to thrive,” as it may be assumed that other varietals historically were grown and removed from the property, and that those varietals were likely the undesirable native labrusca varietals. This omission is important, because it indicates a repression of local history, wherein it was uncommon prior to these dates for grape growers to cultivate the traditionally honored varietals of grapes involved in fine winemaking. The Riesling vines are described as some of the oldest in the region, but upon looking at the date of its planting, we can see that these vines are much younger than many vines in Europe, which are often hundreds of years old. In characterizing these Riesling vines as old, we understand that they are only old in relation to the noble grape vines currently existing in Ontario, but are actually significantly younger than those of Europe or other world class wine regions. Thus, in a roundabout way, and more implicitly, this passage too describes the Ontario wine region, and its vines, as young, when compared to Old World wine regions.

Disparaging Local Winemaking History

Another way in which the historical association of the region with the logic of alcohol making is concealed is by explicitly disparaging the local winemaking prior to the diffusion of the logic of fine winemaking in the region.

One of the most explicit illustrations of attempts to disparage local history can be found on the web site for Henry of Pelham, which ties its founding story to the uprooting of the then-popular labrusca grapes, associated with the logic of alcohol making: “In 1984 when our father, along with each of us (Matthew, Daniel and Paul), tore out the Concord and Niagara grapes at our own expense, people thought we were crazy. When we planted Riesling and Chardonnay under newly contoured hills and under drainage, many said they would never grow.”

While this passage itself includes a rare reference to a time where labrusca grapes were ordinarily grown, and the planting of vinifera varietals was seen as out of the ordinary, this passage does not explicitly detail the routine practices of most as such. Instead, this passage refers to the fact that people thought that attempts to plant vinifera grape varietals were “crazy,” thus
characterizing this winery as pioneering the development of fine winemaking in the region because these unusual activities were undertaken, going against the normative expectations that fell under adherence to the logic of alcohol making. What is left unsaid is that most grape growers were largely unwilling to undertake such activity, as their investment in and adherence to the logic of alcohol making took priority, at that time, over attempts to comply with the global standards and values of fine winemaking. In this manner, the winery also characterizes itself as a pioneer of the diffusion of the logic of fine winemaking.

Similar characterization is found in the passage on the Inniskillin web site, which also indicates, but does not explicitly mention, the poor state of the industry in its reference to a gap in the Ontario wine market:

While tasting Ontario Wines in the early 70s, they [the founders] realized a gap existed in the premium market segment. They seized the opportunity to fill that gap and set out to break new ground to produce premium varietal wines from premium grapes grown in the Niagara Peninsula. Both [...] believed their future in the wine business was dependent on using the Vitis vinifera grapes, the preferred family of grapes used to produce the fine wines in the great wine regions of the world. [...] Ziraldo took the lead and planted a vinifera vineyard which included Riesling, Chardonnay and Gamay and formed the quality base for Kaiser to work with.

The founders of this winery are characterized as playing a legendary role in Niagara history; they noticed “a gap existed” and, in looking to fill this gap, they decided to plant the European vinifera varietals that are consistent with the logic of fine winemaking. We can surmise that this gap refers to the poor winemaking history, and historical accommodation of the alcohol making logic in Ontario and that existed because grape growers were not cultivating acceptable wine varietals, and were instead growing the native labrusca varietals. We see that the innovative thinking of this team, in realizing that the future of winemaking was in vinifera varietals and pioneering their entry to the region, and acceptance of the fine winemaking logic has been integral to the success of the winery. We also see a connection between the family histories of the founders and the Old World winemaking regions of Austria and Italy, which indicates a link to innovation in that this heritage helped establish them as the “founding fathers of Canadian wine.”

Yet another such reference is made by Cave Spring on its web site, as it describes the movement toward the growth of vinifera varietals:

From his early days as one of the first farmers to plant the noble grape varietals of Europe in Ontario, to his forward-thinking integration of Niagara wine and tourism, Len has worked to define the future of the Niagara Peninsula. Growing up working on his family’s small vineyard, Len learned the meticulous art of viticulture, pruning and
tying the vines alongside his father and grandfather, both hobbyist winemakers. Seeing his son’s interest in viticulture, Len’s father John, Sr. decided that the Pennachetti family would invest in better vineyards. Together, he and Len scouted the benchlands of the Niagara Escarpment by plane and discovered the historic Cave Spring Farm, with its hillside location, clay-limestone soils and ideal proximity to Lake Ontario. Situated on one of the finest slopes of the Beamsville Bench, Len and his father founded Cave Spring Vineyard in 1974, and in 1978 made their first vinifera plantings of Riesling and Chardonnay.

Here, we see the references to global traditions, in the “meticulous art of viticulture,” and the laborious methods used to realize this art. This family is thus characterized as pioneers and as hard working and committed to these traditional values of winemaking. When they mention the decision to “invest in better vineyards” they are making an implicit reference to the fact that many vineyards at the time were subpar, and not up to the standards of appropriate viticulture. This notion of the poor suitability of vineyards is again implicitly referred to when the efforts to plant vinifera varietals, indicating that these had to be planted, and did not previously exist, as most vineyards held plantings of the native labrusca varietals.

The fact that this land is suited for prime grape growing due to its unique location indicates a reference to terroir, implying both traditional values and geological history of the land. In looking at the dates that are mentioned and the characterization of the family as pioneers, we also note that this family was planting vinifera varietals at a time when most other wineries were not doing so, or at the beginning of the era when native varietals were beginning to be uprooted in favor of vinifera varietals across the region. Interestingly, as is the case in many newsletters and web sites, the widespread grape growing practices of planting and harvesting labrusca varietals is not explicit, and the mention of this history is avoided or refrained from.

Frequently we found, such as in a newsletter from Angels Gate, that the acceptability of growing vinifera varietals is more taken for granted, and assumed: “Mountainview speaks to our location which is nestled against the escarpment while having a commanding view of Lake Ontario in the distance. These two geographical features create the ideal conditions for growing premium vinifera grapes.”

The fact that this parcel of land is “ideal” for growing vinifera varietals is not even of argument in this passage, which taps into the idea that this fact is socially and normatively accepted by audiences as true, and that the logic of fine winemaking is now dominant. This is noteworthy because as little as 30 years previously, it was commonly thought that vinifera varietals absolutely
could not be grown in the region, and certainly were unable to thrive due to a number of reasons including temperature fluctuations, molds, and various pests. These beliefs required much action and effort on the behalf of those willing to counter them, but the way in which this passage describes the region as not only suitable, but ideal, for growing noble varietals heavily represses these efforts, as well as the historical adherence to an alternate logic that prevailed in the region. In all, this passage works to characterize the winery as legitimate producers of premium wines, and uses metaphor to link the land to premium grapes, as only these varietals adhering to the dominant logic of fine winemaking are cultivated.

**DISCUSSION**

Not all fields are characterized by ongoing and unresolvable tensions between multiple logics. Some may have reached settlements (Helms et al., 2012), at least temporarily, whereby the hierarchy between logics is clearly established. Our intention in this paper is to highlight the effort involved in complying with the dominant logic and to illustrate the use of rhetorical history in demonstrating such adherence and to avoid stigma related to past associations. In sum, our findings illustrate that adherence to a dominant logic entails effortful work by actors to indicate continuity with this legitimate, dominant logic and simultaneous rejection and obscuration of historical adherence to a subordinate logic widely deemed unacceptable and inappropriate. The attention is directed toward the current state of the industry as being world class. Yet, these efforts to distance current practices from this past also involve rhetorically obscuring or minimizing prior adherence to the logic of alcohol making. We think that the acknowledgment of the effortful nature of adherence to a dominant logic and of the use of rhetorical history in doing so, illustrated in our study, offers a number of important contributions to the study of institutional logics and prompts some interesting research questions.

**Micro-Foundations of Institutional Logics**

Perhaps our most obvious contribution is to respond to Thornton et al.’s (2012) call for greater attention to the micro-foundations of institutional logics and a closer integration with the research on institutional work (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). Institutional work researchers have made
considerable effort to understand the processes and practices through which people and organizations create, maintain and/or disrupt institutions, and effort has been a defining feature of this research program (Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2011). Both research areas share the interest in embedded agency (Battilana & D’Aunno, 2009; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008); however, when effort is addressed, it tends to be done in the context of attempts to transform or challenge institutional logics, and the efforts of actors to cope with logics on a day-to-day basis, without necessarily trying to bring about change in the field remain poorly understood (Greenwood et al., 2011). Thus, we aim to demonstrate that adhering to a particular logic is effortful, even when in circumstances where the distinction between plural legitimate and illegitimate logics is unambiguous and seemingly straightforward. Effort then is expanded not only in the service of either promoting or stifling institutional change (Lawrence et al., 2011), but also in the service of coping with day-to-day challenges of adherence – that can be daunting at times.

Adhering to a particular institutional logic is by no means free of challenges. It requires a great deal of situational awareness in order to ensure that one’s adherence to a particular institutional logic is credible to varied audiences (Alexander, 2004). After all, intended adherence to a particular logic that is not acknowledged or understood as such by audiences would likely result in social sanctions, similar to those for willful nonadherence. Thus, in our research on the Ontario wine industry it is salient that wineries not only try to adhere to the dominant logic of fine winemaking, but importantly, they try to communicate and demonstrate this adherence to various audiences. To do so they draw on historical constructions in a strategic manner, which indicates awareness that private adherence to a particular logic is distinct from demonstrating such adherence publically, and ensuring that the displays of adherence resonate with audiences. Given that institutional change is not always intentional (Barley, 1986), future research may examine to what extent rhetorical history may, over time, reconstitute relations between logics in the field.

Understanding the use of rhetoric in demonstrating adherence is important. Prior research has attended to the role of rhetoric in motivating or promoting institutional change (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005), and we find that it is also important in the context of more mundane demonstration of adherence to a dominant logic – where the role of such a logic is commonly coherent and pervasively recognized as acceptable and legitimate. An interesting finding in our data is the duality of actors insisting that they adhere to the dominant logic and that
they do not adhere to the subordinate logic. In other words, they attempt to strengthen the impression of adherence to the dominant logic by casting the subordinate logic as the antagonist (Ruebottom, 2013). Historical constructions become malleable resources in this endeavor, whereby actors attach themselves to the putatively glorious pre-modern past of French winemaking while distancing themselves from the stigma-inducing local winemaking history. All of this implies an important emotive component, whereby rhetorical constructions of history are meant to appeal not only to reason, but perhaps more importantly to audiences’ emotions (Alexander, 2004). Thus, we found wineries often attempting to “have it both ways” by repudiating certain elements of local history in culture, while attempting to leverage others in order to construct narratives that are less about logic and more about emotional resonance (Green, 2004). Thus, another potential contribution of greater attention to the use of rhetoric in adherence to a dominant institutional logic might be shedding more light on affective components of institutional logics that have received less attention, relative to the cognitive ones (Voronov & Vince, 2012).

Examining how organizations use rhetorical history to comply with institutional logics is but one of many ways to examine the effortful nature of adherence, and it requires researchers to pay attention to the nuances of rhetoric use and the societal context within which such rhetoric is rendered meaningful (Heracleous & Barrett, 2001). It forces researchers to retain the logics as well as the people and organizations that need to navigate them and to constantly confront the reality that neither is meaningful without the other (Friedland & Alford, 1991). Naturally, we would argue that other forms of effort are worthy of investigation. In particular, more material aspects of adherence, ranging from practices, physical arrangements (of rooms, buildings, etc.) and other artifacts to mundane nonverbal behavior are worthy of investigation. Cultivating an understanding of adherence effort requires closeness and fine-grained analyses (Barley, 1986, 2008), and in our aim to do so, we find that the use of rhetorical history acts as an important mechanism in such processes. However, there is a need for scholars to study this along with other material practices to understand the nature of decoupling and other processes associated with organizational attempts of logic suppression and adherence. Another avenue for future research, which due to the extent and type of data that was used in this study, we were unable to address in detail, would be to examine more thoroughly the variation that exists between the types of rhetorical history used by different firms, and how this affects public perceptions as well as firm reputation and performance.
Our study also illustrates the rootedness of logics in a time and a place (e.g., Lounsbury, 2007). The logic of fine winemaking, the dominant logic in our study, is rooted heavily in the winemaking conventions of France and, more recently, of other more established wine regions (Colman, 2008; Robinson, 2006). In the absence of recognized past adherence to this logic by Ontario wineries, prior to 1970s (or 1980s on any kind of a significant scale), the logic then is essentially foreign to Ontario, and rhetorical history is used to link Ontario winemaking of the present to the logic of fine winemaking rooted in the past and in a foreign country. Our study then speaks to the nestedness of institutional logics within the broader societal forces (Greenwood et al., 2011).

In addition, our study links to the institutional studies of globalization (Drori, 2008). The logic of fine winemaking entered Ontario on large scale through the institutional arrangements that constitute globalization (i.e., Free Trade and NAFTA). Importantly, however, whereas institutional researchers of globalization tend to cast globalization as either benign or neutral, it is apparent in our study that the importation of the logic of fine winemaking to Ontario constitutes a force of domination, because it has redefined what winemaking is all about and altered “the range of options available” (Lawrence, 2008, p. 178) to the local wineries. In our case study, however, this domination served to provide the impetus for beneficial change in the identity of the Ontario wine industry, insofar as reputation and legitimacy are concerned. This was accomplished through the altering of actors’ mindsets, and their efforts toward redefining both ends and means of what is desirable in winemaking – so much so, that the winemaking of old is now cast as “bad,” but also provides a template of illegitimate wine production, from which more legitimated identities can be realized and constructed.

Related to the above, it is interesting that although concern with domination was quite salient in Friedland and Alford’s seminal chapter on institutional logics, and they took neo-institutionalists to task for offering up “an institution-free conception of interest and power” and assuming “objective interests that can be understood independently of the actors’ understanding” (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 244), the topic of domination has
been virtually absent from institutional logics research (see Thornton et al., 2012 for an exception). We think domination needs to be taken more seriously in the research on institutional logics, because without accounting for domination, scholars may overestimate the likelihood of successful institutional transformation.

In our study, it was apparent, for example, that Ontario wineries were more preoccupied with demonstrating faithful adherence to the dominant institutional logic than with finding ways to differentiate themselves from their foreign competitors. This suggests that once invested in a particular logic (Voronov & Vince, 2012), actors may have difficulty reflecting on the extent to which this logic is suitable to advancing their interests – quite simply because the logic also defines what those interests are (Friedland & Alford, 1991), a point that seems to have been underemphasized by institutional logics researchers.

We would suggest that one way to avoid “losing” the focus on domination might involve incorporating Bourdieu’s notion of habitus, which refers to the actors’ field prescribed dispositions (Golsorkhi, Leca, Lounsbury, & Ramirez, 2009; Voronov & Vince, 2012), into the research on institutional logics. The notion would be helpful not only in sensitizing scholars to the pervasive role of domination in various fields, but it would also offer a useful meso-link between macrolevel structures and individual-level actions. Attending to actors’ habitus would enable researchers to better assess the extent to which particular logics are internalized and become “second nature,” while others are adhered to more ceremonially. Such variance in the level of internalization of institutional logics into actors’ thoughts, feelings and actions is an important measure of the relative dominance of particular logics, with those that are incorporated into particular actors’ habitus being more dominant than those that provoke ceremonial adherence. Furthermore, because different actors’ habitus within a field is likely to vary, these differences might also help researchers grasp the extent to which different logics are more dominant in some segments of a field as compared to others.

CONCLUSION

We welcome the increased interest in micro-foundations among institutional logics researchers. In this paper, we argued that adherence to the dominant logic should not be taken-for-granted or treated as automatic. One way to capture this effort is by attending to rhetorical history. We hope that the
study of effort, such as of the use of rhetoric, can facilitate a more epistemologically and methodologically open research program and allow institutional logics research to continue offering important insights into a variety of organizational and societal issues.

NOTES

1. This notion refers to “the relationship between the characteristics of an agricultural product (quality, taste, style) and its geographic origin, which might influence these characteristics” (Van Leeuwen & Seguin, 2006, p. 1).

2. Even these authors, though, in our view underemphasize the role of domination and utilize social psychological theories that do not incorporate concern with domination, when theorizing individual level behavior (see Cooper, Ezzamel, & Willmott, 2008 for more expanded discussion of neoinstitutional theory’s persistant inability to accommodate issues of domination).
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APPENDIX: KEY TERMS IN RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

Characterization refers to particularly vivid and idiosyncratic representations of persons as portrayed within texts. We took this to “include direct methods like the attribution of qualities in description or commentary, and indirect (or ‘dramatic’) methods inviting readers to infer qualities from characters’ actions, speech, or appearance” (Baldick, 2009, p. 52). According to Burke (1969), it allows audiences to ascribe particular moral qualities to an actor. In our context, it involves attempts to portray wineries and their representatives as having certain values, morals and characteristics. These might include, for example, accounts of a winemaker’s heroic effort to produce a superb wine and the sacrifices that had to be made to accomplish that.

Identification we relied heavily upon Burke’s (1969, p. 580) observation that “you persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his,” thereby attempting to establish a shared sense of values with the audience. Thus, wineries might try to ingratiate themselves to the audience or invite the audience to participate in certain winery experiences that should be especially appealing to them.

Diatyposis “a rhetorical figure in which advice is given” (Mills, 2010, p. 115) is used as a way to provide instruction to audiences through rules and precepts and indicates that the wineries occupy a space of authority in their ability to provide such direction (Whately, 1962). This rhetorical device includes, for example, suggesting traditional pairings of particular food with a certain wine.
Appendix. (Continued)

Denotation provides “the most literal and limited meaning of a word, regardless of what one may feel about it or the suggestions and ideas it connotates.” (Cuddon & Preston, 1998, p. 215). As Burke (1969, p. 24) suggests, “to tell what a thing is, you place it in terms of something else. This idea of locating, or placing, is implicit in our very word for definition itself: to define, or determine a thing, is to mark its boundaries, hence to use terms that possess, implicitly at least, contextual reference.” Thus, in providing literal definitions for audiences, wineries can work to define the boundaries of meaning surrounding a word, and can ensure congruity of understanding among readers. For example, wineries might explain in detail the meaning of a particular grape growing or winemaking practice.

Personification refers to a rhetorical device that describes inanimate objects, and other nonhuman concepts as having human characteristics and qualities (Baldick, 2009; Cuddon & Preston, 1998). For example, wineries often endow wines with person-like traits, such as “personality.”

Imagery involves the use of language to represent various sensory experiences that extend beyond mental pictures and may appeal to senses other than sight (Baldick, 2009; Cuddon & Preston, 1998). As such, the use of imagery allows audiences to participate in the texts on a deeper, sensory level that provides a different experience as individuals can witness what the text describes. For example, wineries may attempt to use such a device in order to help the reader to imagine herself in the vineyard, experiencing the beauty, the sounds and other sensations that are associated with it.
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