

1
3 PUTTING NEW WINE IN OLD
5 BOTTLES: UTILIZING RHETORICAL
7 HISTORY TO OVERCOME
9 STIGMA ASSOCIATED WITH
11 A PREVIOUSLY DOMINANT LOGIC
13

15 Shilo Hills, Maxim Voronov and C. R. (Bob) Hinings

17
19 **ABSTRACT**

21 *In this paper, we seek to highlight how adherence to a dominant logic is an*
23 *effortful activity. Using rhetorical analysis, we show that the use of*
25 *rhetorical history provides a key mechanism by which organizations may*
27 *convince audiences of adherence to a dominant logic, while also subverting*
29 *or obscuring past adherence to a (currently) subordinate logic. We illus-*
31 *trate such use of rhetorical history by drawing on the case study of Ontario*
33 *wine industry, where wineries use rhetorical history to demonstrate adher-*
35 *ence to the logic of fine winemaking, while obscuring the industry's past*
37 *adherence to the now-subordinate and stigmatized logic of alcohol making.*
39 *Implications for future research on institutional logics are discussed.*

AU:2

31 **Keywords:** Institutional logics; institutional complexity; practice;
33 institution

35

Institutional Logics in Action, Part B

37 **Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 39B, 411–449**

39 **Copyright © 2013 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited**

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 0733-558X/doi:10.1108/S0733-558X(2013)0039A&B017

1 The institutional logics perspective has emerged as a leading body of
2 research in organization theory. The notion of institutional logics (Fried-
3 land & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Thornton, Ocasio, &
4 Lounsbury, 2012) refers to the “the socially constructed, historical patterns
5 of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which
6 individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time
7 and space, and provide meaning to their social reality” (Thornton & Ocasio,
8 1999, p. 804). A key contribution of this perspective has been to enable
9 scholars to more fully acknowledge the institutional contradictions and
10 contestations that permeate many organizational fields, impacting both
11 people and organizations (e.g., Creed, Dejordy, & Lok, 2010; Lounsbury,
12 2007), as actors attempt to either displace one logic with another, defend
13 their preferred logic or navigate multiple logics that coexist within a field on
14 an ongoing basis (Pache & Santos, 2010; Reay & Hinings, 2009).

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

27 We argue that a key aspect of the actor’s or the group’s adherence to a
28 currently dominant institutional logic involves strategic construction and
29 reconstruction of the past to simultaneously reconstruct actors’ identities
30 and project the associated images convincingly in accordance with the
31 dominant logic (Wry, Lounsbury, & Glynn, 2011), while erasing the
32 memories of past adherence with a previously dominant logic (Zerubavel,
33 2003). Such use of rhetorical history (Suddaby, Foster, & Trank, 2010)
34 extends beyond decoupling (e.g., Meyer & Rowan, 1977) because it utilizes
35 rhetorical constructions of history to demonstrate actors’ ongoing commit-
36 ment to the dominant institutional logic and obscure their *past* adherence to
37 the now-subordinated logic. In other words, the past is reinterpreted to suit
38 the needs of the present. This might be especially salient in fields where
39 remnants of the previously dominant logic are now not only subordinate but
also illegitimate and perhaps even a source of collective stigma for actors

1 (Hudson, 2008). Examples of manifestations of previously dominant but
 2 now stigmatized logics might range from bureaucratic control systems
 3 (Gouldner, 1954) in present day corporations (Hamel & Prahalad, 1996)
 4 and government agencies (Du Gay, 2008) to more extreme examples, like
 5 slavery in the American South (Clarke & Fine, 2010).

6 We illustrate the important use of rhetorical history as a mechanism for
 7 demonstrating adherence to a dominant logic by drawing on a case study of
 8 the Ontario wine industry where the hierarchy of the logic of *alcohol making*
 9 that dominated until 1988 has since been rebalanced with the logic of *fine*
 10 *winemaking*. Table 1 outlines the differences between these two sets of logics
 11

13 **Table 1.** Two Logics of Winemaking.

	Alcohol Logic of <i>Alcohol Making</i>	Aesthetic Logic of <i>Fine Winemaking</i>
17 Characteristics	Efficiency over quality	Viticulture and viniculture
18 Organizational identity	Commercial winemaking for ad hoc purposes	Unique combinations of techniques and terroir
19 Legitimacy	Whatever market will bear	Artisan acclaim and authenticity
20		Internationally accepted quality standards
21		Regulated geographic areas, natural sugar levels, grape growing techniques, and production methods
22		Old World winemaking techniques
23		Vintage variation
24 Authority structures	Government and Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO)	Vitners Quality Alliance (VQA)
25		Government and Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO)
26		Grape growers marketing board
27 Mission	Creating inexpensive wine for a local commercial market	Creating aesthetically pleasing, premium wines that can compete with the best wines produced globally
28		
29 Focus of attention	North American grapes (<i>labrusca</i> varieties)	European grapes (<i>vinifera</i> varieties)
30		Viticultural areas or appellation systems
31 Strategy	Creation of wines for purposes of wide alcohol consumption and intoxication	Effective grape stewardship to express local terroir
32		
33 Logics of investment	Capital committed to high quantity production of wines	Capital committed to high quality production of wines
34		
35 Consumers	Local market	Domestic and international markets
36 Rules of succession	Frequent changes in ownership	Family estate firms

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

AU 3

13 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

15 *Challenges of Adherence*

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

39 Institutional logics link material practices and the symbolic to explain
contradictions between rituals, mental schemas, and behavior (DiMaggio,

1 1997; Friedland & Alford, 1991). Contestations and contradictions in
2 institutional environments allow actors to strategically exploit inconsistent
3 and alternate logics to advocate for and influence institutional change
(Rao & Giorgi, 2006; Seo & Creed, 2002) and exercise agency (Battilana,
4 Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009; Lounsbury, Ventresca, & Hirsch, 2003).

5 Institutional logics researchers see organizations as involved with
6 multiple institutional spheres (Thornton et al., 2012), and the fact that
7 organizations encounter institutional complexity due to the multiplicity of
8 logics that exist within any field or industry is primary (Greenwood et al.,
9 2011), often with inconsistent and heterogeneous effects (Dunn & Jones,
10 2010). It has been acknowledged thoroughly that institutional complexity
11 requires a great deal of work by actors to navigate their institutional
12 environments effectively (Greenwood et al., 2011; Kraatz & Block, 2008;
13 Pache & Santos, 2010). Scholars have dedicated considerable attention to
14 the examination of actors' effort and challenges in navigating such
15 complexities. For example, some researchers have investigated the organi-
16 zational arrangements needed to address multiple logics that apply con-
17 flicting pressures to organizations (Reay & Hinings, 2009). Others have
18 attended to the theorization efforts undertaken by actors to navigate such
19 contradictions (Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007) and to champion a new logic
20 (Lounsbury, 2002; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005; Wry et al., 2011). Yet,
21 others attended to how even the most private aspects of people's selfhood –
22 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,
23 prevailing logic have not been paid adequate attention, implying that such
24 adherence is unproblematic.

25 Our main argument is that adherence with prevailing institutional logics is
26 effortful, potentially difficult, and deserving of research attention in its own
27 right, especially under conditions where actors have been historically
28 situated in an environment that has valorized a different, opposing
29 institutional logic. Even in environments where the hierarchy of logics is
30 clearly established, actors may face difficulties in adherence (e.g., Lok & de
31 Rond, 2012). Although we are not suggesting that dealing with conflicting
32 logics is unimportant, we think that focusing on how actors adhere to a
33 dominant logic is as important as understanding the efforts actors
34 make to navigate institutional contradictions. As Emirbayer and Mische
35 (1998) observe, even putatively routine and habitual behavior is skillful
36 and requires selective attention to the environment, and being able to
37 deploy from the appropriate repertoire of actions and maintaining
38 expectations. It is, at least in part, a creative and improvisational activity
39

1 (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998) that requires
intricate interplay between particular actors and audiences (Alexander, 2004).
3 Fields vary in terms of the salience of logic contradictions and the
intensity of contestation among proponents of different logics. Some
5 conflicts may appear to be settled (Helms, Oliver, & Webb, 2012) – at least
temporarily – and actors then must focus their attention and effort on
7 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
9 least ceremonial adherence from all actors operating in a particular field.
Taking seriously the effort involved in adherence to a dominant logic and
11 the processes through which such adherence is perceived by others to be
genuine is important to more fully explicate processes of mollifying
13 complexity. Quite simply, navigating multiple logics and adhering to a
clearly dominant logic are challenging, albeit in different ways, and both
15 deserving of research attention.

17
19 *Rhetorical History: Avoiding Stigma and the Work of Adherence*

21 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
23 logic while at the same time demonstrating discontinuity and distancing the
identities and images from the subordinate logic. In cases where organiza-
25 tions or industries have historically espoused subordinate logics, as in our
case study of the Ontario wine industry, it may be necessary to forget
27 (Anteby & Molnár, 2012) this history by downplaying or obscuring it, and
instead demonstrate continuity with legitimate logics. In this way,
29 organizations engage storytelling efforts (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001) that
strategically utilize historical constructions (Foster, Suddaby, Minkus, &
31 Wiebe, 2011; Suddaby et al., 2010), to both convince audiences of
adherence, as well as to distance organizations from the stigma (Hudson,
33 2008; Rivera, 2008) of past association with a now illegitimate logic.

35 Within the institutional entrepreneurship literature, the role of story-
telling in the symbolic importation of alternate institutional logics has been
highlighted (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001; Vaara & Tienari, 2011; Weber &
37 Dacin, 2011; Wry et al., 2011). According to Boje (1991, p. 106), storytelling
constitutes “the institutional memory of the organization” and operates as a
39 method by which actors can promote preferred logics. Collective activity
in telling and retelling stories bridge past, present and future activities,

1 allowing individuals to make sense of environments and events via
2 supplementing individual with institutional memories (Boje, 1991, 1995;
3 Gephart, 1991). Organizational legitimacy can be enhanced by expression of
4 a coherent defining collective identity story (Wry et al., 2011) by making
5 identity understandable to audiences and appropriately positioning identity
6 to determine membership boundaries. In response to isomorphic pressures
7 (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), stories often come to resemble those deemed
8 predominately appropriate and that conform to normative logics and
9 audience expectations (Golant & Sillince, 2007; Polletta, Chen, Gardner, &
10 Motes, 2011).

11 As a form of storytelling, history operates as an important resource from
12 which organizations can frame identity and images and enhance audience
13 perceptions of legitimacy (Anteby & Molnár, 2012; Foster et al., 2011;
14 Suddaby, Foster, & Quinn-Trank, 2010). Although often viewed as neither
15 malleable nor manageable due to its existence or lack of existence (Ostrom,
16 1991), the notion of history has been extended to include a rhetorical
17 dimension, whereby actors can construct particular versions of history that
18 tap into acceptable values and norms (Anteby & Molnár, 2012; Bates, 2011;
19 MacMillan, 2008). The notion of rhetorical history is defined by Suddaby et
20 al. (2010, p. 14) as a “means through which organizations can strategically
21 mediate between their material and symbolic environments,” that can be
22 used to manage organizational identity and image as a strategic resource.
23 Generally, rhetorical history, and other forms of storytelling denote the
24 strategic persuasion of audiences, using history, to shape perceptions of
25 legitimacy and appropriateness (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001). In this paper,
26 we argue that rhetorical history works to facilitate organizations’ efforts to
27 demonstrate adherence to a dominant institutional logic and obscure past
28 adherence to a now-subordinate and illegitimate institutional logic.

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

38 In contrasting historical narratives, eras are presented as eventful or
39 uneventful, continuous or discontinuous, and take on different shapes and
40 spaces occupying our memories (Zerubavel, 2003). Mnemonic bridging and

1 pasting, involved in linking present and past times, depicts historical
2 continuities that connect traditions and current activities. On the other
3 hand, historical discontinuity can be depicted through social and mental
4 partitioning of the past into separate and distinct periods. Zerubavel's
5 (2003) distinction between continuous and discontinuous historical narra-
6 tives provides a useful framework from which to understand the efforts of
7 actors as they employ rhetorical history to demonstrate adherence to a
8 dominant institutional logic, while suppressing historical alignment with
9 subordinate logics. We illustrate the use of such strategic portrayals of
10 history in demonstrating adherence to a dominant and simultaneous
11 rejection of subordinate institutional logics. We do so by drawing on the
12 case of Ontario wine industry to illustrate how organizations can utilize
13 rhetorical history effectively in order to demonstrate their adherence to a
14 dominant logic.

15

17

METHODS

19

Research Setting

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

28 Although winemaking in Ontario dates back to the middle of the 19th
29 century, many attribute the birth of "serious" winemaking in Ontario to the
30 founding of Inniskillin Winery in 1975 (Frank, 2008), because it was the first
31 to adhere to the logic of fine winemaking that was a dominant logic in many
32 established regions and would become an insurgent logic (Rao, Monin, &
33 Durand, 2003) in Ontario, whose wine industry adhered to the logic of
34 alcohol making (Bramble, 2009; Phillips, 2004). The distinction between the
35 two logics can be made as follows: whereas the logic of *fine winemaking*
36 constructs wine as an essentially artistic product that is appreciated,
37 consumed, critiqued and priced based on its aesthetic qualities (Beverland,
38 2005; Colman, 2008; McCoy, 2005; Roberts & Reagans, 2007; Zhao, 2005);
39 the logic of *alcohol making* constructs wine in a more banal way – as
essentially an alcoholic beverage. The former logic is codified through a

1 variety of norms (about grape growing, winemaking, labeling, marketing,
2 etc.) that elevate wine into the realm of art appreciation. In contrast, the
3 latter logic is less specific with respect to most aspects of wine production,
4 and the various laws and regulations are typically limited to safety and
5 retailing (Colman, 2008). In 1988, the Free Trade Agreement with the
6 United States threatened to destroy the Canadian wine industry because it
7 exposed Canadian wineries to increased international competition from
8 both industrial wine producers as well as fine wine producers. The jolt
9 boosted Ontario wineries adhering to the logic of fine winemaking, and
10 eventually the government supported the efforts to institutionalize the logic.
11 Thus, in the case of the Ontario wine industry, the Free Trade Agreement
12 acted as a shock that, while nearly decimating the industry, also motivated
13 the wineries to transform the way they operated and their identities, and the
14 images they projected. It incentivized the industry to uproot the cold hardy
15 labrusca grapes, such as Concord, that dominated Ontario vineyards due to
16 ease of cultivation. Such grapes were frequently used to produce sweet, foxy
17 wines that are illegitimate in accordance with the more aesthetic logic of fine
18 winemaking. Instead, Ontario wineries planted vinefera grapes, such as
19 Riesling, Chardonnay, and Pinot Noir, associated with high-quality wines
20 as defined by the logic of fine winemaking.

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

36 One of the challenges encountered by the Ontario wine industry has been
37 to erase the poor reputation that the pre-1988 wines had built among many
38 domestic consumers. This has made it necessary for wineries and other
39 actors interested in supporting the industry (e.g., government official, local
40 food activists, some wine critics, etc.) to continuously rationalize what has

1 been done and explain why Ontario wine should be seen as “world class.” In
2 other words, they must continuously remind audiences that they now adhere
3 to the dominant logic of fine winemaking, while at the same time distancing
themselves from their past association with the logic of alcohol making.

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

20 21 22 *Data Collection*

23
24
25 The data sources used in this paper are excerpted from a broader study of
26 the organization of Ontario wine industry wherein qualitative data was
27 collected in various forms (interviews, observations, and documents) over a
28 period of four years. This study consists of the analysis of 326 electronic
29 newsletters from 40 wineries and web sites of 15 wineries. Our sampling was
30 driven by the desire to incorporate wineries exhibiting a range of variables,
31 such as size, age, commercial success, quality reputation, ownership struc-
32 ture, location, product range and pricing, among other factors, and to
33 understand overall how the Ontario wine industry might be collectively
utilizing different forms of rhetorical history.

34
35 Newsletters and web sites offer a unique opportunity for researchers to
36 understand the ongoing use of rhetorical history by organizations and the
37 implicit rules at the field level that guide the selection and deployment of
such techniques. We were especially interested in understanding how
38 wineries tapped into various historical resources in order to demonstrate
39 their adherence to the dominant logic of fine winemaking, and to essentially

1 rebalance the hierarchy of dominance between the plural logics of alcohol
and fine winemaking.

3 While newsletters typically target loyal customers and other individuals
that have ongoing relationships with particular wineries, web sites represent
5 wineries' attempts to represent themselves in a desirable manner to a more
general audience. Thus, the two data sources offer useful complements to
7 each other.

9

Analysis

11

Rhetorical analysis offers a method for both the strategies employed
13 and the broader context of relevant societal discourses and their links
(Heracleous & Barrett, 2001; Sillince & Brown, 2009; Suddaby & Green-
15 wood, 2005). Because newsletters and web sites have a persuasive intent and
are designed purposefully to influence audience perceptions, attending to the
17 rhetorical devices used in these narratives enhanced our understanding of
the ways in which wineries are persuasively using history. Repeated readings
19 of the web sites and newsletters, in consultation with the literature on
rhetoric, allowed us to identify various rhetorical strategies identified in
21 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
23 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
25 through the plethora of texts generated by the wineries. This decision was
mainly pragmatic and intended to avoid "getting overwhelmed" by the
27 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
29 rhetorical analysis.

Analytical Strategy

The stages of analysis were similar for both the newsletters and the web
33 sites. Yet similarities *and* differences between the two genres of texts were
examined throughout the research process because they are directed at
35 somewhat different audiences and might use rhetorical devices in different
ways to theorize practices and activities. The first stage of the analysis
37 involved reading over the newsletters and web sites to understand their
general content and format. While reading, general impressions were noted,
39 possible themes for coding identified, and notes taken on how and why these
themes were emerging. For example, the fact that wineries often use

1 historical depictions of the land upon which their grapes are grown was
noted as a potential theme.

3 The coding stage of analysis entailed looking for words and phrases that
5 were frequently used within the newsletters and web sites, primed by our
research interest in rhetorical history. For example, phrases involving the
7 notion of *terroir*¹ were quite prevalent, and were easily coded under
“*terroir*.” Themes within the web sites and newsletters were identified, as
9 were broader ideas, concepts, activities, relations and terminology used.
Because rhetorical analysis requires grasping the significance of a particular
11 utterance in its context (Heracleous & Barrett, 2001), we designated the
units of analysis to range from a paragraph to a whole newsletter – whatever
13 smallest passage could be interpreted meaningfully. When a rhetorical
strategy could not be identified or no link to rhetorical history could be
15 made, no further analysis on a particular passage or even a document was
undertaken. At this stage we began to use the aforementioned rhetorical
17 devices to identify various discursive themes and interpretive repertoires that
emerged from the body of texts as a collection. For example, we intended to
19 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
21 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
23 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
25 were identified and served as subcategories. For example, the notion of
terroir was sometimes used in reference to soil composition as being similar
27 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
29 the existence of shared discourses by comparing and contrasting these
themes and categories, and by moving back and forth between broader,
31 more general societal discourses and the specific utterances. For example,
the use of *terroir* may be related to the broader societal construct of
33 geological history, which details the origins and history of the development
of earth, and essentially describes time as sequential in attempting to make
35 sense of the events that have taken place in a region.

As the analysis continued, and definitions of those categories were refined,
37 new categories were identified that did not fit with existing categories of
rhetorical strategies. Thus, it became necessary to analyze this manifestation
39 of rhetorical history as a new category of strategies. The similarities,
differences and patterns within and between subcategories were compared,

1 contrasted and noted. The process of category building continued, in order
2 to examine and interpret the newsletters and web sites, until no new themes
3 were found and a point of saturation was reached.

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

17 FINDINGS

18

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

26

27 *Continuity with the Logic of Fine Winemaking*

28
29 Because the logic of fine winemaking is rooted primarily in European –
30 especially French – winemaking conventions (Robinson, 2006), a very
31 salient theme found in our data features Ontario wineries *characterizing*
32 themselves as strict adherents of European traditions and techniques of
33 winemaking. Traditional European winemaking privileges techniques and
34 methods that aid the slow process of winemaking and embraces the
35 influences of land, soil and climate, or terroir, in wines. The main themes
36 were Following Old World Traditions, Terroir-Driven Winemaking,
37 Traditional Farming Methods, and Claiming Geographical Similarity (see
38 Table 2).
39

1 **Table 2.** Additional Quotes Illustrating Continuity with Logic of Fine
 2 Winemaking.

3 Theme	4 Illustrative Quotes and Rhetorical Devices Used
5 Following Old World 6 Traditions	<p>7 Through centuries of winemaking history in the Old World, the 8 art of the blend was always something that was given much 9 attention and appreciation. [...] Most people are familiar with 10 the blends of Bordeaux – probably some of the greatest in the 11 world – which consist of primarily Cabernet Sauvignon, 12 Merlot, and Cabernet Franc with smaller proportions of Petit 13 Verdot and Malbec. Outside of Bordeaux, these blends are 14 sometimes called “Meritage” blends, or in the case of Pillitteri, 15 we simply call it a “Cabernet Merlot” blend – an assemblage 16 consisting of the two Cabernet grapes, Franc and Sauvignon, 17 and Merlot. Like our winemaking forefathers, Pillitteri Estates 18 takes the art of blending very seriously as well. 19 [characterization, metaphor, denotation, expertise] (Pillitteri 20 newsletter)</p> <p>21 “All grapes are hand-picked and crafted into lively genuine wines 22 using only gentle traditional winemaking techniques.” 23 [characterization] (Frogpond website)</p> <p>24 “Jeff has a dedicated passion for producing fine wines in Prince 25 Edward County. He holds a great respect for traditional, old- 26 world styles of wines and a passion for excellence.” 27 [characterization] (Great Estates newsletter)</p> <p>28 “We are traditionalists and find the process of pulling a cork from 29 a bottle a bit more sensuous than twisting off a cap. Saying this 30 we purchase only high quality corks. Ken Douglas’s son David 31 who works as assistant winemaker for the Murphy Good 32 Winery in California sourced our most recent corks. David has, 33 over the last several years, developed considerable expertise in 34 selecting corks and conducts laboratory testing of each batch of 35 corks offered for sale to his winery to assess its TCA content. 36 He is now selecting our corks. Of our most recent batch, less 37 than 1 cork out of 100 corks had detectable TCA. The industry 38 norm is greater than 5 per 100 corks.” [characterization, 39 expertise] (13th Street newsletter)</p> <p>40 “This wine was produced in the traditional method with the 41 fermentation occurring in the bottle. It was disgorged after 42 resting on the lees for three years.” [characterization, imagery] 43 (13th Street newsletter)</p> <p>44 “Our Winemaker, Marc Bradshaw, was able to draw on some 45 Old World techniques from France and Italy to help create this 46 superb wine.” [characterization] (Pillitteri newsletter)</p> <p>47 “A Chianti-style red with bold, upfront fruit for lovers of 48 traditional Italian cuisine. Serve it ever so slightly chilled to</p>

Table 2. (Continued)

Theme	Illustrative Quotes and Rhetorical Devices Used
Terroir-based Wines	<p data-bbox="429 366 971 444">bring the evening to life. Enjoy with your grilled meat and veggie favourites.” [diatyposis, imagery] (Magonotta newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="410 447 1005 630">“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 comes wines whose trademark richness is interwoven with an exotic smokiness.” [imagery, denotation, personification] (Malivoire newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="410 633 1005 895">“Wine has been associated with its point of origin for hundreds of years and is often referred to as an ‘expression of place’. 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)</p> <p data-bbox="410 899 1005 1029">“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.” [characterization] (Cattail Creek newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="410 1032 1005 1133">“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!” [personification, imagery] (Stratus newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="410 1137 1005 1399">“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.” [characterization, denotation, imagery] (Kacaba website)</p> <p data-bbox="410 1402 1005 1536">“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</p>

1 *Table 2. (Continued)*

3 Theme	Illustrative Quotes and Rhetorical Devices Used
9 Traditional Farming 11 Methods Used	<p data-bbox="429 366 1007 499">working the land were handed down from father, to son Ted Lizak to grandson... From the first vintage in 2000, it became clear Legends Estates Winery had been graced with excellent terroir. The individuality of each varietal, the nuance of the land, the essence of every fruit is evident in each bottle.” [characterization, metaphor] (Legends Estates newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="408 526 1007 760">“When we first planted to vinifera grapes we knew that no mechanical harvesters could pick these sensitive grapes and harvest would have to be manual. Then, during our first harvest in 1985 new harvesting machines from Europe came to Niagara and mechanical harvesting of even vinifera varieties became the norm. Over the years we’ve done both, and find the quality from manual harvests is far superior to mechanical harvesting. Today all our grapes are harvested by hand.” [problem-solution, characterization] (13th Street newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="408 769 1007 1003">“By November our vineyards can be strange to behold, completely buried in soil to protect the buds, with only trellising wires and posts protruding. This means tying down 40,000 canes onto a low wire while on bended knee, ploughing soil over the canes with a tractor, and then reversing the process in the spring. The payoff, we hope, will continue to be dramatically higher bud survival rates that produce grapes with an enhanced minerality in the wines.” [characterization, imagery, denotation] (Chadsey’s Cairns website)</p> <p data-bbox="408 1012 1007 1185">“Other ‘tried and true’ measures we practice every year include carrying a small crop, which provides the vine with more carbohydrates and improves its winter-hardness, and hilling up the soil over the lower trunk of the vine. Hilling the soil provides protection of basal buds but provides no protection to the buds located higher on the vine.” [denotation, characterization] (13th Street newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="408 1194 1007 1242">“This lovely wine was hand picked and sorted to perfection.” [characterization] (Cornerstone newsletter)</p>

35 *Following Old World Traditions*

37 At times, continuity with the Old World winemaking tradition is expressed
 39 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

1 prior to making wine from them: “We are excited to report [...] the long
2 anticipated 2007 100% Amarone-style Cabernet Franc [...] We are
3 confident that this latest vintage is the ultimate expression of what our
4 wines are all about and for what we have continuously and patiently been
5 striving!”

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

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

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

33

34 ...Italy introduced us to a whole new world of fine food, wine, and the simple joys of
35 everyday life. We discovered the wonders of Amarone styled wines in the northern part
36 of the country. The more we learned about them, the more excited we became at the
37 prospect of bringing this incredible craftsmanship back with us to Ontario [...] And so
38 we did.... [...] In the time-held tradition of Amarone, we then proceeded to delicately
39 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

1 appassimento (drying process). It was in Veneto where it all started and reference to
2 amarone or recioto belong only to those winemaking visionaries. They were and still are
3 the legendary pioneers for whom we have huge respect and admiration. Our Canadian
4 stylistic interpretation with locally grown vinifera varietals are referred to as
5 appassimento (grape drying or Reductio Method) rather than the uniquely owned
6 names found in Veneto. A glass of our wine tells the rest of the story.

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

31 *Terroir-Driven Winemaking*

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

37 For example, Henry of Pelham seeks to define this notion using the
38 rhetorical device of *denotation* in one passage on its web site: “The origin of
39

1 the grapes used to make wine has long been important in traditional
2 winemaking regions to both winemakers and wine drinkers. The combina-
3 tion of location, soil, topography and climate – the terroir – is an important
4 factor in determining the character of a wine and, in many cases, its
5 quality.”

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

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

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

1 *Traditional Farming Methods*

3 Frequently, wineries elaborate their claims of terroir-based winemaking
5 by emphasizing the Traditional Farming Methods being used in their
7 winemaking, thereby highlighting the primacy of the land and vine-
yards 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:

9 The creation of excellent wine starts in the vineyard. The French have coined the term
11 'terroir' to define the factors that have an impact on the unique taste of each wine. These
13 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.

15 Through a form of *denotation*, the notion of terroir is seen as involving the
17 methods of growing grapes and proximity to water, as well as the climate
19 and soil. Thus, this message pertains explicitly to global traditions that value
21 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 commit-
ment 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.

23 Both in newsletters and on web sites, wineries tend to detail the laborious,
25 hands on methods of growing and harvesting grapes. Such references
27 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
29 that are bundled together under the logic of fine winemaking. While some
Ontario wineries, particularly in earlier newsletters, describe the work
31 associated with winemaking as grueling drudgery, most wineries describe the
work associated with traditional methods, including hand harvesting, as
33 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:

35 First of all, let me be blunt, there is no romance in growing grapes, just a lot of hard
37 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
39 of our garden and continue to feel challenged by the prospect of growing the best grapes
we can.

1 While describing the process of growing grapes as lacking in romance, this
3 passage still portrays Old World values, and the logic of fine winemaking,
5 implicitly as the owners are depicted as satisfied with their work. The explicit
7 message of this selection is that grape growing is hard work, while the more
9 implicit idea is that this hard work is pleasurable. Despite the depiction of this
11 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.

13 On many occasions, readers of newsletters are invited to get involved with
15 the work that goes into harvesting and are urged to take part in exciting
17 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...”

19 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
21 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,”
23 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
25 enjoyment of hard work to readers by offering the chance to partake in
various events around the winery. Flat Rock also invites their newsletter
27 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
29 immerse yourself in the joys of harvest. It’s what truly motivates all of us at
Flat Rock Cellars.”

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

35

37

Discontinuity with Logic of Alcohol Making

39 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.

Young industry	<p data-bbox="391 354 1007 456">“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)</p> <p data-bbox="391 461 1007 696">“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)</p> <p data-bbox="391 701 1007 881">“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)”</p> <p data-bbox="391 887 1007 1281">“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, <i>winegrowers</i>, 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 <i>terroir</i>, 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),</p>
Disparaging local winemaking history	<p data-bbox="391 1286 1007 1466">“As the native <i>labrusca</i> 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 <i>vinifera</i> acreage ensured that few of these plantings survived into the 1990s.” [problem-solution] (Malivoire newsletter)</p> <p data-bbox="391 1472 1007 1522">“At the time <i>vinifera</i> grapes were not yet as popular as they are today and so the decision to grow only <i>vinifera</i> grapes was a</p>

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

1 having these historical roots to build from (a paradoxical contrast to the oft
2 repeated claim that Ontario winemakers follow the tradition rigidly). In
3 essence, this passage privileges the widely accepted and legitimated historical
4 winemaking practices of European wine regions, and obscures the fact that
5 Ontario has a long history of winemaking, but that this history involved
6 unacceptable practices and techniques in their production of wine that used
7 to comply with a logic of alcohol making, rather than those practices
8 consistent with the dominant and normatively proper logic of fine
9 winemaking. The historical adherence of Ontario winemakers with this
10 subordinate logic is suppressed by describing the industry as only existing
11 within the last 40 years, rather than bringing to light the existence of an
12 industry in the region for two hundred years. This relatively young portrayal
13 of the history of wine production in Canada can be seen as a way of
14 eradicating collective memories of poor quality wine production in Canada
15 prior to the 1980s. Even the oldest wineries only make reference to the part
16 of their winemaking history in Canada that falls within this timeframe,
17 despite the fact that many draw on a family heritage of winemaking dating
18 sometimes centuries prior in more established, European wine regions.

19 Another depiction of Ontario as a newer wine growing region can be
20 found in a 13th Street newsletter: "*Ontario is a much younger wine growing* AU :4
21 *area and has so far identified three primary viticultural areas and 12 sub-*
22 *appellations.*" What needs to be implied from the phrase "much younger" is
23 the idea that Ontario is much younger than various established wine
24 growing regions, and this works to *characterize* the industry as such. This
25 comparison is implicit, but is more easily seen as the number of sub
26 appellations of Ontario is identified. Appellation systems have historically
27 been very important to quality wine production in Europe, particularly in
28 France, where the appellation system was initially introduced (Colman,
29 2008). Often, wineries in Europe only identify their wines in terms of these
30 appellations or Chateau locations. This reference to the twelve sub-
31 appellations of Ontario alludes to the adherence to the logic of fine
32 winemaking. At the same time, the reference to the young age of the
33 industry is downplaying, and even completely obscuring the historical
34 existence of an industry that was less than desirable within Ontario.

35 A web site selection from Featherstone demonstrates one way of
36 minimizing poor local history and distancing the region from historical
37 commitment to the subordinate logic of alcohol making by highlighting
38 instead the fact that their winery holds some of the oldest vines of a
39 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

1 1978 and is some of the oldest Riesling in Niagara. Today the entire grape
2 crop is bottled to produce Featherstone wines, with approximately 5,000
3 cases a year being vinified.”

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

22 *Disparaging Local Winemaking History*

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

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

35 While this passage itself includes a rare reference to a time where *labrusca*
36 grapes were ordinarily grown, and the planting of vinifera varieties was seen
37 as out of the ordinary, this passage does not explicitly detail the routine
38 practices of most as such. Instead, this passage refers to the fact that people
39 thought that attempts to plant vinifera grape varieties were “crazy,” thus

1 *characterizing* this winery as pioneering the development of fine winemaking
in the region because these unusual activities were undertaken, going against
3 the normative expectations that fell under adherence to the logic of alcohol
making. What is left unsaid is that most grape growers were largely
5 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
7 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
9 the logic of fine winemaking.

Similar *characterization* is found in the passage on the Inniskillin web site,
11 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:

13 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
15 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
17 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
19 *vinifera* vineyard which included Riesling, Chardonnay and Gamay and formed the
quality base for Kaiser to work with.

21 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,
23 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
25 winemaking history, and historical accommodation of the alcohol making
logic in Ontario and that existed because grape growers were not cultivating
27 acceptable wine varietals, and were instead growing the native *labrusca*
varietals. We see that the innovative thinking of this team, in realizing that
29 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
31 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
33 and Italy, which indicates a link to innovation in that this heritage helped
establish them as the “founding fathers of Canadian wine.”

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

37 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,
39 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

1 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
3 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
5 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
7 Vineyard in 1974, and in 1978 made their first vinifera plantings of Riesling and
Chardonnay.

9 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
11 is thus *characterized* as pioneers and as hard working and committed to
these traditional values of winemaking. When they mention the decision to
13 "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
15 appropriate viticulture. This notion of the poor suitability of vineyards is
again implicitly referred to when the efforts to plant vinifera varieties,
17 indicating that these had to be planted, and did not previously exist, as most
vineyards held plantings of the native labrusca varieties.

19 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
21 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
23 family was planting vinifera varieties at a time when most other wineries
were not doing so, or at the beginning of the era when native varieties were
25 beginning to be uprooted in favor of vinifera varieties across the region.
Interestingly, as is the case in many newsletters and web sites, the
27 widespread grape growing practices of planting and harvesting labrusca
varieties is not explicit, and the mention of this history is avoided or
29 refrained from.

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

The fact that this parcel of land is "ideal" for growing vinifera varieties is
37 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
39 fine winemaking is now dominant. This is noteworthy because as little as 30
years previously, it was commonly thought that vinifera varieties absolutely

1 could not be grown in the region, and certainly were unable to thrive due to
2 a number of reasons including temperature fluctuations, molds, and various
3 pests. These beliefs required much action and effort on the behalf of those
4 willing to counter them, but the way in which this passage describes the
5 region as not only suitable, but ideal, for growing noble varieties heavily
6 represses these efforts, as well as the historical adherence to an alternate
7 logic that prevailed in the region. In all, this passage works to *characterize*
8 the winery as legitimate producers of premium wines, and uses metaphor to
9 link the land to premium grapes, as only these varieties adhering to the
10 dominant logic of fine winemaking are cultivated.

11 12 **DISCUSSION**

13
14
15 Not all fields are characterized by ongoing and unresolvable tensions
16 between multiple logics. Some may have reached settlements (Helms et al.,
17 2012), at least temporarily, whereby the hierarchy between logics is clearly
18 established. Our intention in this paper is to highlight the effort involved in
19 complying with the dominant logic and to illustrate the use of rhetorical
20 history in demonstrating such adherence and to avoid stigma related to past
21 associations. In sum, our findings illustrate that adherence to a dominant
22 logic entails effortful work by actors to indicate continuity with this
23 legitimate, dominant logic and simultaneous rejection and obscuration of
24 historical adherence to a subordinate logic widely deemed unacceptable and
25 inappropriate. The attention is directed toward the current state of the
26 industry as being world class. Yet, these efforts to distance current practices
27 from this past also involve rhetorically obscuring or minimizing prior
28 adherence to the logic of alcohol making. We think that the acknowl-
29 edgment of the effortful nature of adherence to a dominant logic and of the
30 use of rhetorical history in doing so, illustrated in our study, offers a number
31 of important contributions to the study of institutional logics and prompts
32 some interesting research questions.

33 34 *Micro-Foundations of Institutional Logics*

35
36
37 Perhaps our most obvious contribution is to respond to Thornton et al.'s
38 (2012) call for greater attention to the micro-foundations of institutional
39 logics and a closer integration with the research on institutional work
(Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). Institutional work researchers have made

1 considerable effort to understand the processes and practices through
2 which people and organizations create, maintain and/or disrupt institu-
3 tions, and effort has been a defining feature of this research program
4 (Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2011). Both research areas share the interest
5 in embedded agency (Battilana & D'Aunno, 2009; Thornton & Ocasio,
6 2008); however, when effort is addressed, it tends to be done in the context
7 of attempts to transform or challenge institutional logics, and the efforts of
8 actors to cope with logics on a day-to-day basis, without necessarily trying
9 to bring about change in the field remain poorly understood (Greenwood
10 et al., 2011). Thus, we aim to demonstrate that adhering to a particular
11 logic is effortful, even when in circumstances where the distinction between
12 plural legitimate and illegitimate logics is unambiguous and seemingly
13 straightforward. Effort then is expanded not only in the service of either
14 promoting or stifling institutional change (Lawrence et al., 2011), but also
15 in the service of coping with day-to-day challenges of adherence – that can
16 be daunting at times.

17 Adhering to a particular institutional logic is by no means free of
18 challenges. It requires a great deal of situational awareness in order to
19 ensure that one's adherence to a particular institutional logic is credible to
20 varied audiences (Alexander, 2004). After all, intended adherence to a
21 particular logic that is not acknowledged or understood as such by
22 audiences would likely result in social sanctions, similar to those for willful
23 nonadherence. Thus, in our research on the Ontario wine industry it is
24 salient that wineries not only try to adhere to the dominant logic of fine
25 winemaking, but importantly, they try to communicate and demonstrate
26 this adherence to various audiences. To do so they draw on historical
27 constructions in a strategic manner, which indicates awareness that private
28 *adherence to* a particular logic is distinct from *demonstrating* such adherence
29 publically, and ensuring that the displays of adherence resonate with
30 audiences. Given that institutional change is not always intentional (Barley,
31 1986), future research may examine to what extent rhetorical history may,
32 over time, reconstitute relations between logics in the field.

33 Understanding the use of rhetoric in demonstrating adherence is
34 important. Prior research has attended to the role of rhetoric in motivating
35 or promoting institutional change (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002;
36 Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005), and we find that it is also important in the
37 context of more mundane demonstration of adherence to a dominant logic –
38 where the role of such a logic is commonly coherent and pervasively
39 recognized as acceptable and legitimate. An interesting finding in our data is
40 the duality of actors insisting that they adhere to the dominant logic *and* that

1 they do not adhere to the subordinate logic. In other words, they attempt to
2 strengthen the impression of adherence to the dominant logic by casting the
3 subordinate logic as the antagonist (Ruebottom, 2013). Historical construc-
4 tions become malleable resources in this endeavor, whereby actors attach
5 themselves to the putatively glorious pre-modern past of French wine-
6 making while distancing themselves from the stigma-inducing local wine-
7 making history. All of this implies an important emotive component,
8 whereby rhetorical constructions of history are meant to appeal not only to
9 reason, but perhaps more importantly to audiences' emotions (Alexander,
10 2004). Thus, we found wineries often attempting to "have it both ways" by
11 repudiating certain elements of local history in culture, while attempting to
12 leverage others in order to construct narratives that are less about logic and
13 more about emotional resonance (Green, 2004). Thus, another potential
14 contribution of greater attention to the use of rhetoric in adherence to a
15 dominant institutional logic might be shedding more light on affective
16 components of institutional logics that have received less attention, relative
17 to the cognitive ones (Voronov & Vince, 2012).

AU:5

18 Examining how organizations use rhetorical history to comply with
19 institutional logics is but one of many ways to examine the effortful nature
20 of adherence, and it requires researchers to pay attention to the nuances of
21 rhetoric use and the societal context within which such rhetoric is rendered
22 meaningful (Heracleous & Barrett, 2001). It forces researchers to retain the
23 logics *as well as* the people and organizations that need to navigate them and
24 to constantly confront the reality that neither is meaningful without the
25 other (Friedland & Alford, 1991). Naturally, we would argue that other
26 forms of effort are worthy of investigation. In particular, more material
27 aspects of adherence, ranging from practices, physical arrangements (of
28 rooms, buildings, etc.) and other artifacts to mundane nonverbal behavior
29 are worthy of investigation. Cultivating an understanding of adherence
30 effort requires closeness and fine-grained analyses (Barley, 1986, 2008), and
31 in our aim to do so, we find that the use of rhetorical history acts as an
32 important mechanism in such processes. However, there is a need for
33 scholars to study this along with other material practices to understand the
34 nature of decoupling and other processes associated with organizational
35 attempts of logic suppression and adherence. Another avenue for future
36 research, which due to the extent and type of data that was used in this
37 study, we were unable to address in detail, would be to examine more
38 thoroughly the variation that exists between the types of rhetorical history
39 used by different firms, and how this affects public perceptions as well as
firm reputation and performance.

Rootedness of Logics in Time and Place

1
3 Our study also illustrates the rootedness of logics in a time and a place (e.g.,
5 Lounsbury, 2007). The logic of fine winemaking, the dominant logic in our
7 study, is rooted heavily in the winemaking conventions of France and, more
9 recently, of other more established wine regions (Colman, 2008; Robinson,
11 2006). In the absence of recognized past adherence to this logic by Ontario
13 wineries, prior to 1970s (or 1980s on any kind of a significant scale), the
15 logic then is essentially foreign to Ontario, and rhetorical history is used to
17 link Ontario winemaking of the present to the logic of fine winemaking
19 rooted in the past and in a foreign country. Our study then speaks to the
21 nestedness of institutional logics within the broader societal forces (Green-
23 wood et al., 2011).

25 In addition, our study links to the institutional studies of globalization
27 (Drori, 2008). The logic of fine winemaking entered Ontario on large scale
29 through the institutional arrangements that constitute globalization (i.e.,
31 Free Trade and NAFTA). Importantly, however, whereas institutional
33 researchers of globalization tend to cast globalization as either benign or
35 neutral, it is apparent in our study that the importation of the logic of fine
37 winemaking to Ontario constitutes a force of domination, because it has
39 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.

Logics and Domination

35 Related to the above, it is interesting that although concern with domination
37 was quite salient in Friedland and Alford’s seminal chapter on institutional
39 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’ under-
standing” (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 244), the topic of domination has

1 been virtually absent from institutional logics research (see Thornton et al.,
2012 for an exception).² We think domination needs to be taken more
3 seriously in the research on institutional logics, because without accounting
for domination, scholars may overestimate the likelihood of successful
5 institutional transformation.

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

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

33

35

CONCLUSION

37 We welcome the increased interest in micro-foundations among institutional
logics researchers. In this paper, we argued that adherence to the dominant
39 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

1 study of effort, such as of the use of rhetoric, can facilitate a more
 2 epistemologically and methodologically open research program and allow
 3 institutional logics research to continue offering important insights into a
 4 variety of organizational and societal issues.

7 NOTES

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

12 2. Even these authors, though, in our view underemphasize the role of domination
 13 and utilize social psychological theories that do not incorporate concern with
 14 domination, when theorizing individual level behavior (see Cooper, Ezzamel, &
 15 Willmott, 2008 for more expanded discussion of neoinstitutional theory’s persistent
 16 inability to accommodate issues of domination).

17 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

18 This research was supported, in part, by a grant from the Social Sciences
 19 and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

23 REFERENCES

24 Alexander, J. C. (2004). Cultural pragmatics: Social performance between ritual and strategy.
 25 *Sociological Theory*, 22(4), 527–573.

26 Alford, R. R., & Friedland, R. (1985). *Powers of theory: Capitalism, the state, and democracy*. AU :6
 27 Cambridge University Press.

28 Anteby, M., & Molnár, V. (2012). Collective memory meets organizational identity:
 29 Remembering to forget in a firm’s rhetorical history. *Academy of Management Journal*. AU :7

30 Baldick, C. (2009). *The oxford dictionary of literary terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

31 Barley, S. R. (1986). Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of
 32 ct scanners and the social order of radiology departments. *Administrative Science*
 33 *Quarterly*, 31(1), 78–108.

34 Barley, S. R. (2008). Coalface institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby & AU :8
 35 K. Sahlin (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 491–518). LA:
 36 Sage.

37 Bates, T. G. (2011). *The reagan rhetoric: History and memory in 1980s america*. DeKalb:
 38 Northern Illinois University Press.

39 Battilana, J., & D’Aunno, T. (2009). Institutional work and the paradox of embedded agency.
 In T. B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in*

- 1 *institutional studies of organizations* (pp. 31–58). Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.
- 3 Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How actors change institutions: Towards a
theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3, 65–107.
doi: 10.1080/19416520903053598
- 5 Beverland, M. B. (2005). Crafting brand authenticity: The case of luxury wines. *Journal of
Management Studies*, 42(5), 1003–1029.
- 7 Boje, D. (1991). The storytelling organization: A study of storytelling performance in an office
supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 106–126.
- 9 Boje, D. (1995). Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as
‘Tamara-land’. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 997–1035.
- 11 Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL:
University of Chicago Press.
- 13 Bramble, L. (2009). *Niagara’s wine visionaries: Profiles of the pioneering winemakers*. Toronto:
Lorimer.
- 15 Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 17 Clarke, M. A. X., & Fine, G. A. (2010). “A” for apology: Slavery and the discourse of
remembrance in two american universities. [Article]. *History & Memory*, 22(1), 81–112.
- 19 Colman, T. (2008). *Wine politics: How governments, environmentalists, mobsters, and critics
influence the wines we drink*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 21 Cooper, D. J., Ezzamel, M., & Willmott, H. (2008). Examining “institutionalization”: A critical
theoretic perspective. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The
sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 673–701). LA: Sage.
- 23 Creed, W. E. D., Dejordy, R., & Lok, J. (2010). Being the change: Resolving institu-
tional contradiction through identity work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6),
1336–1364.
- 25 Cuddon, J. A., & Preston, C. (1998). *A dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*. Oxford:
Blackwell.
- 27 DiMaggio, P. J. (1997). Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 263–287.
- 29 Drori, G. S. (2008). Institutionalism and globalization studies. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver,
K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp.
449–472). LA: Sage.
- 31 Du Gay, P. (2008). ‘Without affection or enthusiasm’ problems of involvement and attachment
in ‘responsive’ public management. *Organization*, 15(3), 335–353. doi: 10.1177/
1350508408088533
- 33 Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The
contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967–2005. *Administrative
Science Quarterly*, 55, 114–149.
- 35 Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4),
962–1023.
- 37 Foster, W. M., Suddaby, R., Minkus, A., & Wiebe, E. (2011). History as social memory assets:
The example of tim hortons. *Management & Organizational History*, 6(1), 101–120.
- 39 Frank, M. (2008). Niagara rises. *Wine Spectator*, May 15, pp. 93–101.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and
institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new
institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–263). Chicago, IL: University of
Chicago Press.

- 1 Gephart, R. P. (1991). Succession, sensemaking, and organizational change: A story
of a deviant college president. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 4(3),
3 35–44.
- 4 Golant, B., & Sillince, J. (2007). The constitution of organizational legitimacy: A narrative
perspective. *Organization Studies*, 28(8), 1149–1167.
- 5 Golsorkhi, D., Leca, B., Lounsbury, M., & Ramirez, C. (2009). Analysing, accounting for and
unmasking domination: On our role as scholars of practice, practitioners of social
7 science and public intellectuals. *Organization*, 16(6), 779–797. doi: 10.1177/1350508
409343400
- 8 Gouldner, A. W. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- 9 Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011).
Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *The Academy of Management
11 Annals*, 5(1), 317–371.
- 12 Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of
13 professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *The Academy
of Management Journal*, 45(1), 58–80.
- 14 Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1996). *Competing for the future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business
15 School Press.
- 16 Helms, W. S., Oliver, C., & Webb, K. (2012). Antecedents of settlement on a new institutional
17 practice: Negotiation of the ISO 26000 standard on social responsibility. *Academy of
Management Journal*, 55(5), 1120–1145.
- 18 Heracleous, L., & Barrett, M. (2001). Organizational change as discourse: Communicative
19 actions and deep structures in the context of information technology implementation.
Academy of Management Journal, 44, 755–778.
- 20 Hoffman, A. J. (2001). *From Heresy to Dogma: An institutional history of corporate
21 environmentalism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- 22 Hudson, B. A. (2008). Against all odds: A consideration of core-stigmatized organizations.
23 *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 252–266.
- 24 Kraatz, M., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In
25 R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby & K. Sahlin (Eds.), *The sage handbook of
organizational institutionalism*. LA: Sage.
- 26 Kramer, M. (2004). *Making sense of wine*. Philadelphia, PA: Running Press.
- 27 Lawrence, T. B. (2008). Power, institutions and organizations. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver,
28 R. Suddaby & K. Sahlin (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp.
29 170–197). LA: Sage.
- 30 Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg,
31 C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organization
studies* (2 ed., pp. 213–254). London: Sage.
- 32 Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional
33 studies of organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1), 52–58.
- 34 Lok, J., & de Rond, M. (2012). On the plasticity of institutions: Containing and restoring
35 practice breakdowns at the cambridge university boat club. *Academy of Management
Journal*.
- 36 Lounsbury, M. (2002). Institutional transformation and status mobility: The professionaliza-
37 tion of the field of finance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 255–266.
- 38 Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the
39 professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 289–307.

- 1 Lounsbury, M., & Crumley, E. T. (2007). New practice creation: An institutional perspective on
innovation. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 993–1012. doi: 10.1177/0170840607078111
- 3 Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the
acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6/7), 545–564.
- 5 Lounsbury, M., Ventresca, M., & Hirsch, P. M. (2003). Social movements, field frames and
industry emergence: A cultural-political perspective on us recycling. *Socio-Economic
Review*, 1, 71–104.
- 7 MacMillan, M. (2008). *The uses and abuses of history*. Toronto: Viking Canada.
- 9 McCoy, E. (2005). *The emperor of wine: The rise of Robert M. Parker, jr. and the reign of
American taste*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- 11 Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth
and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.
- 13 Mills, M. S. (2010). *Concise handbook of literary and rhetorical terms*. Estep-Nichols Publishing. **AU :9**
- 15 Ostrom, E. (1991). Rational choice theory and institutional analysis. *Toward Complementarity*,
85(1), 237–243.
- 17 Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2010). When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of
organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. *The Academy of
Management Review*, 35(3), 455–476.
- 19 Phillips, R. (2004). *Ontario wine country*. North Vancouver: Witecap.
- 21 Polletta, F., Chen, P. C., Gardner, B., & Motes, A. (2011). The sociology of storytelling. *Annual
Review of Sociology*, 37, 109–130.
- 23 Pratt, M. G. (2009). For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative
research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 856–862.
- 25 Rao, H., & Giorgi, S. (2006). Code breaking: How entrepreneurs exploit cultural logics to
generate institutional change. In *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 27, pp. 269–
304). doi:10.1016/s0191-3085(06)27007-2.
- 27 Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in toque ville: Nouvelle cuisine
as an identity movement in french gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(4),
795–843, i. doi:10.1086/367917.
- 29 Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics.
Organization Studies, 30(6), 629.
- 31 Rivera, L. A. (2008). Managing “spoiled” national identity: War, tourism, and memory in
croatia. *American Sociological Review*, 73(4), 613–634.
- 33 Roberts, P. W., & Reagans, R. (2007). Critical exposure and price-quality relationships for new
world wines in the us market. *Journal of Wine Economics*, 2, 56–69.
- 35 Robinson, J. (2006). *The oxford companion to wine* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 37 Ruebottom, T. (2013). The microstructures of rhetorical strategy in social entrepreneurship:
Building legitimacy through heroes and villains. *Journal of Business Venturing*,
28(1), 98–116.
- 39 Seo, M. G., & Creed, W. E. D. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional
change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 222–247.
- Sillince, J. A. A., & Brown, A. D. (2009). Multiple organizational identities and legitimacy: The
rhetoric of police websites. *Human Relations*, 62(12), 1829–1856. doi: 10.1177/
0018726709336626
- Suddaby, R., Foster, W. M., & Trank, C. Q. (2010). Rhetorical history as a source of
competitive advantage. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 27, 147–173.

- 1 Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 35–67.
- 3 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(3), 801–843.
- 5 Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 99–129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 7 Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 9 Ulin, R. C. (1995). Invention and representation as cultural capital: Southwest French winegrowing history. *American Anthropologist*, 97(3), 519–527.
- 11 Van Leeuwen, C., & Seguin, G. (2006). The concept of terroir in viticulture. *Journal of Wine Research*, 17(1), 1–10.
- 13 Vaara, E., & Tienari, J. (2011). On the narrative construction of multinational corporations: An antenarrative analysis of legitimation and resistance in a cross-border merger. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 370–390.
- 15 Voronov, M., & Vince, R. (2012). Integrating emotions into the analysis of institutional work. *The Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 58–81.
- 17 Weber, K., & Dacin, T. (2011). The cultural construction of organizational life: Introduction to the special issue. *Articles in Advance*, 1–12. **AU:10**
- 19 Whately, R. (1962). *Elements of rhetoric: Comprising an analysis of the laws of moral evidence and of persuasion, with rules for argumentative composition and elocution*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- 21 Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimizing nascent collective identities: Coordinating cultural entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 449–463.
- 23 Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time maps: Collective memory and the social shape of the past*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 25 Zhao, W. (2005). Understanding classifications: Empirical evidence from the American and French wine industries. *Poetics*, 33(3-4), 179–200. doi: 10.1016/j.poetic.2005.09.010

27

29

31

33

35

37

39

1 APPENDIX: KEY TERMS IN RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

3

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

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


30 *Diatyposis* “a rhetorical figure in which advice is given” (Mills,
 31 2010, p. 115) is used as a way to provide instruction to
 32 audiences through rules and precepts and indicates
 33 that the wineries occupy a space of authority in their
 34 ability to provide such direction (Whately, 1962).
 35 This rhetorical device includes, for example,
 36 suggesting traditional pairings of particular food with
 37 a certain wine.

39

Appendix. (Continued)

- 1
- 3 *Denotation* provides “the most literal and limited meaning of a
5 word, regardless of what one may feel about it or the
7 suggestions and ideas it connotes.” (Cuddon &
9 Preston, 1998, p. 215). As Burke (1969, p. 24)
11 suggests, “to tell what a thing is, you place it in terms
13 of something else. This idea of locating, or placing, is
15 implicit in our very word for definition itself: to
17 define, or determine a thing, is to mark its
19 boundaries, hence to use terms that possess, implicitly
21 at least, contextual reference.” Thus, in providing
23 literal definitions for audiences, wineries can work to
25 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.
- 19 *Personification* refers to a rhetorical device that describes inanimate
21 objects, and other nonhuman concepts as having
23 human characteristics and qualities (Baldick, 2009;
Cuddon & Preston, 1998). For example, wineries
often endow wines with person-like traits, such as
“personality.”
- 27 *Imagery* involves the use of language to represent various
29 sensory experiences that extend beyond mental
31 pictures and may appeal to senses other than sight
33 (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
35 imagine herself in the vineyard, experiencing the
beauty, the sounds and other sensations that are
37 associated with it.
-

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

	Book: RSO-V039b-3610748 Chapter: 14	<p style="text-align: center;">Please e-mail or fax your responses and any corrections to:</p> E-mail: Fax:
---	--	---

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

Disk use

Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

- Scanning (parts of) your article Rekeying (parts of) your article
 Scanning the artwork

Bibliography

If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

- The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.**
 ***UNCITED REFERENCES:* This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section.**

Queries and/or remarks

Location in Article	Query / remark	Response
AU:1	As per style only 65 characters are allowed in the right running head. Please check for correctness.	
AU:2	Should the term "paper" be changed to "chapter" wherein being referred to the current chapter. Please suggest.	
AU:3	Please check all the heading levels as set for correctness.	

AU:4	Both quotation marks and italic font are given. As per style either of the two is preferred. Please suggest which one should be retained.	
AU:5	The references “Thornton & Occasio, 1999; Suddaby, Foster, & Quinn-Trank, 2010; Green, 2004” are cited in the text but not present in the reference list. Please provide the details or else the reference citation will be deleted from the text.	
AU:6	Please provide location in references Alford, R. R., & Friedland, R. (1985); Whately, R. (1962).	
AU:7	Please provide page range in ref. Anteby, M., & Molnár, V. (2012); Lok, J., & de Rond, M. (2012).	
AU:8	Please provide city name for location in ref. Barley, S. R. (2008); Cooper, D. J., Ezzamel, M., & Willmott, H. (2008); Drori, G. S. (2008); Kraatz, M., & Block, E. S. (2008); Lawrence, T. B. (2008).	
AU:9	Please provide complete details in ref. Mills (2010).	
AU:10	Please provide volume number in ref. Weber, K., & Dacin, T. (2011).	