

Artful Organizing

Essays on Places, Measurements, and
Money Flows in the Contemporary
Cultural World

Artful Organizing

Essays on Places, Measurements, and
Money Flows in the Contemporary
Cultural World

Erik Wikberg





Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D.,
in Business Administration
Stockholm School of Economics, 2017

*Artful Organizing: Essays on Places, Measurements, and Money Flows
in the Contemporary Cultural World*

© SSE and the author, 2017

ISBN 978-91-7731-044-0 (printed)

ISBN 978-91-7731-045-7 (pdf)

Front cover illustration:

© Skizer/Shutterstock.com, 2017

Back cover photo:

Max Green Ekelin, 2017

Printed by:

Ineko, Gothenburg, 2017

Keywords:

Cultural production, art worlds, plural institutional logics.

To my favorite teacher

Foreword

This volume is the result of a research project carried out at the Department of Management and Organization at the Stockholm School of Economics (SSE).

This volume is submitted as a doctoral thesis at SSE. In keeping with the policies of SSE, the author has been entirely free to conduct and present his research in the manner of his choosing as an expression of his own ideas.

SSE is grateful for the financial support provided by Jan Wallander and Tom Hedelius stiftelse, which has made it possible to carry out the project.

Göran Lindqvist

Director of Research
Stockholm School of Economics

Andreas Werr

Professor and Head of the
Department of
Management and Organization

Acknowledgements

Doing research has not been the lonely endeavor I imagined when I commenced the doctoral program. A doctoral student must take a great deal of individual responsibility and push the work forward through his or her own efforts. However, over the years, I have learned that research is ultimately a collective and communal process. There are lots of colleagues who have been indispensable to my dissertation process. I will always be grateful to you.

I would first like to express my deepest gratitude to my main supervisor Lars Strannegård. You have been a truly inspiring and always encouraging mentor throughout these years. You have shown me how to follow through projects and papers, and how incredibly fun and rewarding this can be.

Stockholm School of Economics could not have a better or more inclusive President, and I could not have a better supervisor. You are simply the best.

Emma Stenström is someone else without whom this dissertation would not exist. You have always been a professional role model to me, but as I have gotten to know you personally, you have also become a role model as a human being at large. You are always smart, kind and funny. If I someday end up having children, I truly wish that I can become somewhat of the fantastic and dedicated parent I have seen you being for your son.

My supervising committee – Lars Strannegård, Emma Stenström, Anna Tyllström and Karin Fernler – was formally chosen late in the process, but you have nevertheless given me great support in the finalization of my dissertation. Thank you Anna and thank you Karin! I am so thankful for all of your hard work and encouragement. Thank you so much!

My sincere appreciation is furthermore extended to my opponent Bengt Kristensson Ugglå, as well as Ingalill Holmberg, Dan Kärreman and Udo Zander, who formed my grading committee.

I would also like to send a warm, special thanks to Lin Lerpold at the Mistra Center for Sustainable Markets, with whom I worked parallel to my doctoral studies. I will always be deeply impressed by you. You are brave and tough, yet incredibly compassionate and kindhearted. You are just an amazing individual.

I am finally gratefully indebted to my collaborators on both past and planned projects.

Niklas Bomark, I had such a fun time writing with you! Seldom have I met such a hardworking and analytical person.

Pierre Guillet de Monthoux and Pamela Schultz Nybacka, I feel delighted and inspired after each one of our meetings. I so much look forward to co-writing with you in the near future. We sometimes jokingly say that our discussions must appear crazy to the outside world, but if you know the truth, I think these discussions are absolutely brilliant. I am so happy to be part of your team. Thank you!

Isak Nilson, thank you for establishing Art Initiative and finally making art an integral part of our school's DNA. Mark my words – you will have a remarkable career in the art world of tomorrow. It will be very exciting to see what the future holds for you.

Markus Göransson, I have known you for more than half my life, and I have admired you from the very beginning. You are not only one of the absolutely most talented individuals I have ever met in my life; you are certainly also the most humble. I am so glad that you are now (once again) a colleague of mine, and I am very much looking forward to collaborating with you!

Markus has moreover proofread most parts of this dissertation in his spare time, for which I am deeply grateful. Thank you so very much!

All remaining errors, omissions, and inaccuracies are – of course – solely my own.

Stockholm, May 1, 2017

Erik Wikberg

Contents

PART 1: An introductory chapter to the dissertation.....	1
PART 2: The articles	47
Article 1: Selling By Numbers: The Quantification and Marketization of the Swedish Art World for Contemporary Art.....	49
Article 2: Demarcations and Dirty Money: Financing New Private Contemporary Art Institutions in Sweden.....	75
Article 3: Architects at Work: Four Organizational Models as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics.....	109
Article 4: Managing Competing Logics Through Situational Irony	143
Article 5: Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics	177

Artful Organizing: Essays on Places, Measurements and Money Flows in the Contemporary Cultural World

Part 1: An introductory chapter to the dissertation

In an increasingly complex and contradictory world, the need to find systematic knowledge about the organizing principles of our times is more urgent than ever. This dissertation focuses on how individuals, organizations, and markets manage contradictory demands and expectations from their environment. As the contemporary cultural world is a remarkably complex environment for conducting business, it offers extraordinarily good possibilities to study these phenomena. This dissertation consists of five self-contained studies; that is, studies that are intended to be read as standalone texts. The studies in this dissertation that have already been published have naturally been shaped by the respective journals and their readerships, but this introductory chapter links the articles together. It makes a theoretical contribution by presenting and discussing an institutional logic of the art world and the different situations in which this logic is subjected to market practices and commercial activity.

There are a few basic, yet profound, questions that underlie the five studies in this dissertation; all-embracing questions that are certainly not suitable as specific and narrow research questions, but that can still be important because they circumscribe the essential motivations for writing this

dissertation. Such questions are: Can we obtain systematic knowledge about the organizing principles of the contemporary cultural world? Will we in such a pursuit find that cultural production is essentially different from other types of production in modern capitalism, or is it essentially the same? Is there a need to distinguish between the organizing principles in these social domains?

This introduction argues that the literature on institutional logics offers one way of systematically understanding the organizing principles of a social sphere, such as the contemporary cultural world. From previous literature, we know that cultural production contains certain characteristics that separate it from the organizing principles in other social domains (i.e. communities, corporations, families, markets, professions, religions, and states). Because the organizing principles of cultural production in various ways are essentially different from other types of production in modern capitalism, there are several reasons to focus studies on the organizing principles of this type of production.

One apparent reason for studying these sectors is their economic contributions. Cultural production at large (including all visual and performing artists, movies, theatre, sound recordings, and book publishing) does not only supply us with artistic expressions that create meaning in our lives; they also contribute to our economy as a whole as employers and taxpayers. In addition, there is a widespread belief that these sectors are becoming increasingly important to our economy on a symbolic level. If we conceptualize our contemporary economy as a “post-industrial,” “post-Fordist,” “post-Westphalian” economy, it is clear that ephemeral values of products and services are gaining momentum at the expense of the functional values of a product or service. This is not surprising, as our social and economic order can be said to move from “substance to image” (Alvesson, 1990). One could argue that social and psychological values of products and services are becoming more important in a well-developed, prosperous economy characterized by abundance rather than scarcity. Needs that can be satisfied are in such economies replaced by desires that are insatiable. Producers of everyday products such as houses, furniture, cars, telephones, or almost any other marketed product are heavily dependent on the ephemeral values of their products; the social status the product brings, the aesthetics

of its design, the psychological feelings it evokes for different individuals, and the image of the corporate brand. To produce these values is hence becoming more and more important in our contemporary economies, and commercial businesses of all sorts look to cultural production to learn how such ephemeral values are created. Therefore, studies on the contemporary cultural world are also relevant for organizations outside the cultural realm.

Scholars of different theoretical backgrounds have for a long time distinguished the specificities of the social sphere of cultural production that deal with art. The philosopher and art critic Arthur Danto (1964) coined the concept of the art world and gave rise to institutional theory within the academic discipline of art history. His main points are that in order for art to become art, a theory of art is needed. The social interactions in the art world are necessary for separating art from non-art. Hence, a Brillo box is just a package of steel wool soap pads when found in a supermarket, but becomes art when it is displayed and accepted as an artwork in an art venue such as a gallery or museum. The philosopher George Dickie (1971, p. 101) offered a more formalized definition of what is a work of art: “A work of art in the classificatory sense is 1) an artifact 2) on which some person or persons acting on behalf of a certain social institution (the artworld) has conferred the status of candidate for appreciation.” Later, the social institution of the art world has attracted a lot of attention from sociologists. Howard S. Becker (1982) advocated that the art world should be seen as a network of producers and intermediaries that collectively constitute the art world. The rich body of works by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu instead conceptualized the art world as a field of cultural production, wherein actors strive for economic vis-à-vis symbolic capital (social and cultural capital). Bourdieu’s (1993) field metaphor emphasizes the social positions of the different agents of the field. In this view, fields of cultural production are hierarchical and entangled in larger fields of power and class relations. The Swedish organizational fields in cultural production have in previous research been described as being commercialized at the same time as our economy has become more aesthetic (Stenström, 2000), hinting that this is a field with several institutional logics at play. There is thus a longstanding tradition of viewing the art world as a social sphere of a peculiar nature. Strangely, however, in the body of literature on institutional logics, which

this introductory chapter contributes to, there is to my knowledge no attempt to provide full-bodied systematic knowledge about the organizing principles of the art world in the same way as for other social domains.

This chapter argues that there are specificities of the art world that justify an institutional logic of art, just as there are good reasons for conceptualizing institutional logics for other social spheres in society. True, such an overarching analytical concept on the macro level must be understood as an ideal type. Previous research conceptualizes *one* institutional logic for the family and the state, even though there are obvious differences between different types of families, religions, and states. In the same fashion, I argue that the construct of one institutional logic of art can be a useful theoretical concept if understood as a Weberian ideal type that focuses on the similarities rather than the differences between the many different kinds of art worlds, art organizations, and art professions in different times and places. The purpose of this chapter is first to discuss what an institutional logic of art adds to the literature on institutional logics. Second, building on the studies of this dissertation, I describe and analyze different kinds of organizing in art organizations and art markets, where the institutional logic of art is subjected to market practices and an institutional logic of the market. In this process, I describe which ideal types of art organization arise in fields with multiple institutional logics and how such art organizations deal with contradictory expectations. The results of such an inquiry are discussed not only in relation to the literature on institutional logics, but also in regard to the theoretical fields of the sociology of quantification and the study of organizational stigma. Finally, I present some concluding remarks where, among other things, the social implications of this dissertation are discussed.

Organizing in fields with plural institutional logics

The literature on institutional logics has become increasingly popular over the last quarter of a century. It has expanded our understanding of the organizing principles of different social domains in society – communities, corporations, families, markets, professions, religions, and states (Friedland and Alford, 1991; Thornton, 2004; Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012) – and has become popular to the extent that it has become “some-

what of a buzz word” (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008, p. 99). On the one hand, the literature may be criticized for over-using the concept of institutional logics and treating the smallest of variations as results of multiple institutional logics. A well-cited study by Rao, Monin and Durand (2003) for instance conceptualizes the new and the old French cuisine as two different institutional logics. On the other hand, the literature may be criticized for lacking institutional logics for profound social domains. Higher education, philanthropy, and culture, for example, do not fit the standard frameworks of this body of literature (Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorf, 2015).

This introductory chapter addresses this gap by presenting an institutional logic of art as a synthesized result of the five self-contained studies in this dissertation. This institutional logic is based on the root metaphor of the organization as an art space. Just like art spaces in the literal sense, reflexivity is a key component and center of attention for these organizations. Not only do they need to handle money flows for their survival, they also need to invite their stakeholders into a discussion on what art is and should be. This separates art organizations from most organizations that sell products or services. Car dealers may sometimes debate or question the purpose of the car, or what a car is, but not to the same extent as people in the art world debate what art, and good art, is. There are of course many ways to classify different types of cars, and standards for how they should be classified, just as art is classified in different ways – but a car manufacturer would not be able to put a porcelain urinal in a motor show and argue that it is a car. Most other occupations do not engage in a continual self-referencing discussion about their professions to the same extent as art professions. We seldom hear salespeople question the purpose of sales or read about farmers who want to distinguish between farming and non-farming. Contemporary art organizations and art professions, however, do engage in such introspective and self-contemplative debates; we even expect them to discuss and decide what art is and what it is not, as well as, for example, the role of the artist, the critic, the curator, and the gallery owner. The social process of this reflexivity is fundamentally a process of self-reference. This is the reason why art first and foremost relates to other expressions of art, and why an artist who is recognized as an “artist’s artist” has received the

highest form of legitimacy. It is also something that is apparent already in opening words of Arthur Danto's article from 1964: "Hamlet and Socrates, though in praise and deprecation respectively, spoke of art as a mirror held up to nature. As with many disagreements in attitude, this one has a factual basis. Socrates saw mirrors as but reflecting what we already see; so art, insofar as mirrorlike, yields idle accurate duplications of the appearances of things, and is of no cognitive benefit whatever. Hamlet, more acutely, recognized a remarkable feature of reflecting surfaces, namely that they show us what we could not otherwise perceive – our own face and form – and so art, insofar as mirrorlike, reveals us to ourselves."

A commonly shared belief in art is linked to this self-referencing, reflexive process. Just as the institutional logic of the family departs from a feeling of unconditional love, and as the market departs from stock prices (Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012), the fundamental source of legitimacy in the art world hinges on a belief in art. Thornton (2008) compares the belief in art with a religious belief, stating that she is an atheist who goes to galleries just like her mother went to church. Curators and critics act as sources of authority in this social domain, and the source of identity is the artist's contribution to art history and art theory, which too is linked to the self-referencing, reflexive process significant for the art world. The status of the individual in the art world is thus a natural center of attention, and the basis of strategy is to consecrate the oeuvre of the artist in such a way that that the artworks become interesting from an art theoretical or art historical perspective, which in turn drives prices.

The economic system of the art world is composed of several economic systems – the publicly financed system for the production and acquisition of artworks differs from the commercial markets for art, and the primary and secondary market of art operate through different business models. For a gallery owner in the primary market of contemporary art, the goal is essentially to build the value of artists over time and to control this development through fixed prices. For an auction house, the goal is not to maximize the prices of the productions of particular artists, but rather to have a circulation of artworks as high as possible. They also use the auction as the price-setting mechanism instead of fixed prices. This may interfere with the gallery owner's strategy to build the value of the artist's oeuvre

over time. In some cases, gallery owners may therefore choose to sell artworks only to clients they trust not to resell the artwork in the secondary market for a lengthy period of time. They may also choose to buy their own artists at auctions to maintain the prices of their other works.

If we by the economic system of the art world refer to the dynamics between the primary and the secondary market for contemporary art, it can best be described as “insider capitalism.” As mentioned, the informal control mechanism to govern this economic system has to do with social control of the supply of art. In art galleries, the owner decides whom to sell to, and can simply dismiss clients who have put artworks on sale in the secondary market at a too early phase. The social relation between the buyer and the gallery owner also forms the basis of the negotiation of terms and prices, which shapes a completely different economic system than for instance the market capitalism on stock exchanges, where prices are constantly updated and transparent. Furthermore, a person who buys art for the first time can feel intimidated and insecure about how to buy art and what is a justified price for a particular artwork. In contrast, an experienced art buyer who has acquired an amount of cultural and social capital buys art with a greater deal of confidence. The practice of buying and collecting art, especially in the primary markets, is hence mainly an economic system with buyers who hold “insider knowledge” about how this economic system functions. In addition, the opaqueness of prices and money flows in the art world are apparent even in museums. Exhibition guides are not supposed to disclose the economic value or the purchasing price of the artworks exhibited, as museum art is not to be seen as a commodity. In an informal small talk at an auction house, one purchaser of a major state-owned museum in Stockholm said that she had noticed that many traditional art collectors intentionally did not bid on the artworks she bid on, because they knew that she was bidding in the role of an agent for the museum and not as a private collector. Thereby, they wanted to give way to her so that the artwork would end up in the public museum and not in a private collection. A few other collectors, on the contrary, were spurred to bid on the artworks she bid on because they saw it as a signal of quality and because they desired to own an artwork that would otherwise hang in a museum. This can be seen as an illustrative example of the importance of insider

knowledge – to know, for example, who is who in the art world – and how it in turn shapes the economic system.

Art organizations and art markets are culturally infused by a theory of art, as well as the market practices in the market places they are part of. In order to understand how the worlds of art and commerce interact, and in fact are seamlessly integrated, we not only need to distinguish the ideal types of organizing in these spheres, but also study the interplay between the world of art and the world of commerce.

A world of contradictory expectations

The literature on institutional logics not only increases our knowledge about the organizing principles of communities, corporations, families, markets, professions, religions, and states. Equally importantly, it helps us to understand the interplay between these logics. Organizations are exposed to an increasing number of different and sometimes contradictory expectations from various domains of social life. Commercial companies are expected to engage in activities outside of the traditional realm of commercialism, activities not directly connected to the profit-maximizing goal of the company. They are, for instance, expected to take action against environmental pollution, to promote equality in the workplace and to participate in a wide range of social issues that were previously reserved for the state or the civil society. Organizations in civil society are instead turning to activities that are primarily associated with commercial companies; they hire marketing specialists, use advertising firms to facilitate their fundraising activities, and work actively to establish an attractive brand. New types of organizing principles have, moreover, affected Western states in recent decades. In the 1990s, for instance, the movement of New Public Management applied new sets of organizing principles from the commercial realm to publicly owned organizations. In short, we live in a society where different types of organizations in different kinds of organizational fields put pressure on each other and inflict several sets of co-existing, and sometimes conflicting and competing, expectations on each other. Organizations of all sorts face a world of increasingly contradictory expectations, and this also includes organizations in the art world.

The literature on institutional logics (Friedland and Alford, 1991; Thornton, 2004; Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012) pays special attention to how organizations manage different expectations. Friedland and Alford (1991, p. 248) define an institutional logic as “a set of material practices and symbolic constructions constituting organizing principles.” They proposed that Western societies are both culturally and politically shaped by five institutional orders: the capitalist market, the bureaucratic state, the democracy, the nuclear family, and Christianity. In a slightly revised form, Thornton (2004) proposed the following six institutional logics: the market, the corporation, the professions, the state, the family, and religions. Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012) then added the institutional logic of the community to this list. Put in relation to the examples above, we can see how commercial companies are affected by the institutional logics of the bureaucratic state and democracy in addition to the institutional logic of market capitalism, and also how organizations in civil society and in the state are affected not only by the institutional logics of the bureaucratic state and democracy, but also by the institutionalist logic of market capitalism.

In the early years of this school of thought, Friedland and Alford (1991, p. 248–249) proposed that “institutional logics are symbolically grounded, organizationally structured, politically defended, and technically and materially constrained, and hence have specific historical limits.” In addition, they view cognitive schema, normative expectations and material practices as key elements of institutional logics. It is therefore justified to study both immaterial and material aspects of institutional logics. Nevertheless, Jones, Boxenbaum, and Anthony (2013) have concluded that in recent decades, the more abstract (cognitive, normative, and symbolic) aspects of institutional logics have received far more scholarly attention than the material aspects, which calls for studies that also take material aspects of institutional logics into account.

Institutional logics as a development of the new institutionalism in organization theory

To put the literature on institutional logics in context, it is key to understand that it has developed as a theory formation within the new institu-

tionalism in organization theory. Central to the new institutionalism is the rejection of rational-actor models as a sole explanation for organizational structures and economic behavior. One of the most formative texts in this school of thought is an article by Meyer and Rowan (1977), which argues that many formal organizational structures arise as reflections of rationalized institutional rules. The sociological period of modernity, rather than rationalization, is hence brought to the forefront. Economic behavior and organizational structure and principles are thereby seen as products of culture and social interaction, rather than individualistic rational choice. In this view, economic actors strive to make choices that are legitimate in the eyes of others before making the most rational choice in terms of maximizing utility.

In the new institutionalism, there are different types of structures that affect the choices of individuals, ranging from unconscious cognitive biases to formal coercive regulations. The most commonly referred structures in these essays are institutions. Hoffman (1999, p. 351) for instance states that institutions are commonly defined as “rules, norms, and beliefs that describe reality for the organization, explaining what is and is not, what can be acted upon and what cannot.” Institutions may consequently be formal or informal, coercive or voluntary, and the individual may be aware or unaware of the institutions. DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983) modern classic *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields* suggests that there are three isomorphic processes: coercive, mimetic, and normative, and that “once a set of organizations emerges as a field, a paradox arises: rational actors make their organizations increasingly similar as they try to change them” (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p. 147).

Friedland and Alford’s (1991) text *Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions* argues that Weberian bureaucracy is not the only prevailing template for organizing. Instead, there are several central institutions of the contemporary capitalist West that each dictates different organizing principles and supra-organizational patterns of actions. Although the initial idea behind institutional logics was to describe fundamental organizing principles in society, many contemporary studies on institutional logics refer to substantially less fundamental organizing principles as institutional logics.

As institutional logics entail “a *set* of material practices and symbolic practices” [italics added] (Friedland and Alford, 1991, p. 248), it is important to note the difference between an institutional logic and the institution it may support. Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorf (2015) exemplify this distinction by arguing that behind the institution of the market, there is a more abstract or second-order logic that prescribes commodification of human activity, which in turn implies that there is not *one* logic of capitalism, but rather several logics, comprised of underlying practices and symbols, which make capitalism possible. Voronov, Clerc, and Hinings (2013) similarly use the notion of scripts and argue that institutional logics have underlying scripts (meso-level constructs that link macro-level institutional logics to the micro-level day-to-day practices of individual actors), which to various extents are relevant in the interaction of each audience group. Drawing on Friedland and Alford (1991), Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorf (2015) also note that social situations and activities carry multiple meanings and motivations. There is thus not a one-to-one relationship between the meaning of an institution and the practices associated with it. Institutional logics, furthermore, “underpin the appropriateness of organizational practices in given settings and at particular historical moments” (Greenwood et al., 2010, p. 522).

Institutional logics are both material and immaterial (Friedland and Alford, 1991) and the immaterial aspects of institutional logics have received far more attention than the material aspects (Jones, Boxenbaum, and Anthony, 2013). A study by Thornton and Ocasio (1999) describing the transition of the higher education publishing system from an editorial to a market logic, for instance, does not discuss whether the actual textbooks changed during this period. Glenn and Lounsbury (2005) assert that the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra moved from an aesthetic to a commercial logic, but did not discuss whether musical instruments, technical supports, and so on changed during the transition. We can read about the competing logics of the Canadian healthcare system and the various mechanisms at play for managing rivalry in such a system, but not whether or not the physical layouts of the hospital changed, if different medical equipment was purchased in the transition, and so on (Reay and Hining, 2009). This, in turn, renders our understanding of shifts in institutional logics incomplete,

a consequence of which is that we for the most part may have a hard time to visualize and describe these shifts in other than abstract terms.

In one recent study, however, the socio-material aspects of institutional logics are put to the forefront (Hultin and Mähring, 2014). It shows how digital and physical visualization boards in an emergency ward at a Nordic university hospital function as artifacts that constitute an integral part of the operational staff's sense-making and enactment of a new institutional logic. It furthermore notes that theory on the material practices of institutional logics generally focus more on structures and practices and not on the specific objects and technologies through which an institutional logic is instantiated (Cloutier and Langley, 2013). Such studies bridge the macro- and micro-levels of institutional logics and can open up the "black box" of how to study material practices of institutional logics on the ground.

Hybrid organizations and their strategies

Organizations that incorporate several conflicting institutional logics have been referred to as "hybrid organizations" (Battilana and Dorando, 2010). Such organizations are becoming increasingly common in modern societies (Kraatz and Block, 2008). Previous studies have shown that hybrid organizations typically adopt strategies of decoupling and compromising to manage their inherent competing logics, and Pache and Santos' (2013) study on French work integration social enterprises shows how such organizations selectively coupled intact elements prescribed by different logics, so that new sites combined for-profit and nonprofit forms in terms of the legal status of the sites. Pache and Santos also identified a specific hybridization pattern they refer to as "Trojan horse," meaning that organizations with low legitimacy strategically adopted social welfare logic elements in an attempt to gain legitimacy and acceptance.

Thus, recent studies on institutional logics have advanced the literature with an institutionalist perspective beyond its early focus on isomorphism and decoupling (Meyer and Rowan, 1977) and different strategic responses of compliance, compromise, avoidance, defiance, and manipulation (Oliver, 1991). The body of literature on institutional logics encompasses a broad set of alternative developments of fields with competing institutional logics: there are studies of how institutional logics reconcile, co-exist or gain dom-

inance over the competing logic. Institutional logics may be geographically demarcated. Mutual funds may for instance be governed by one institutional logic in Boston and a different one in New York, and a way for one organization to follow both institutional logics at the same time is to set up offices in different cities (Lounsbury, 2007). Institutional logics may also be reconciled through the use of selective coupling (Pache and Santos, 2013) and in other situations may dominate and replace another institutional logic (e.g. Rao, Monin, and Durand, 2003).

A focus of this dissertation is situations where institutional logics are challenged by elements of the logic of market capitalism. Previous studies on fields that have been subjected to such a force include descriptions of how various fields, for example professional law firms (Cooper et al., 1996), the publishing field (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999), and the health care field (Scott et al., 2000) have moved toward the logic of market capitalism. In a study of institutional complexity in Spain, Greenwood et al. (2010) show that market logics may be affected by both regional state logics and family logics. Large, visible and regional firms were prone to be affected by regional state logics, whereas smaller firms were more prone to be affected by family logics, for instance in decisions to downsize. Scott et al. (2000) concluded that new regulatory systems disempowered the medical professional, especially for the more powerful and higher-priced medical doctors, while also giving rise to new organizational forms in the health care system. Thornton and Ocasio (1999) concluded that this change spurred a change in executive attention from the author-editor relationship and internal growth to resource competition and acquisition growth. The product market and the market for corporate control furthermore determined executive succession, whereas this had previously been determined by organization size and structure. Cooper et al. (1996), moreover, made use of the geological metaphor of sedimentation to describe cases where the dominance of the logic of market capitalism made one archetype of a law firm become layered on another archetype, rather than result in a distinct transformation where all elements are instantly changed.

Jay (2013), in addition, studied how a public-private hybrid organization managed the complex challenge of climate change under the institutional logics of government bureaucracies, business firms and nonprofit associa-

tions. He concluded that organizations that are subjected to conflicting institutional logics interestingly face paradoxical outcomes: What is seen as a success from the point of view of one institutional logic is considered a failure from the point of view of the conflicting institutional logic.

How to design an institutional logic of art

As mentioned, Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorf (2015) note that major social structures such as science, art, philanthropy or education do not have a place in the ideal type frameworks of institutional logics offered by Thornton and colleagues (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999; Thornton, 2004; Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012). They assert that this is a blind spot in the literature on institutional logics and that the theoretical field suffers from conservatism. Although there are studies that deal with institutional logics of aesthetics (Glynn and Lounsbury, 2005) in for example a symphony orchestra and in architecture (Thornton, Jones, and Kury, 2005), there is no study that proposes a full-bodied institutional logic of art in the way suggested for family, community, religion, state, market, profession and corporation (see Table 1 below, from Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012). Their full-bodied description of the respective institutional logics is based on nine characteristics: their root metaphor, their sources of legitimation, their sources of authority, their sources of identity, their basis of norms, their basis of attention, their basis of strategy, their informal control mechanism, and their economic system.

When it comes to an institutional logic for cultural production, Glynn and Lounsbury (2005) argue that mainstream or pop interpretations of classical music blur the dominant aesthetic logic with a commercial logic. They refer to DiMaggio (1987) and acknowledge that “critics are conventionally viewed as cultural authorities who evaluate music and artists on the basis of already established aesthetic systems” (Glynn and Lounsbury, 2012, p. 1035), but their article says little about the basis of the mission, attention and strategy for symphony orchestras. Thornton, Jones, and Kury (2005) *do* provide an extensive list for the aesthetic logic in the architectural field, describing the economic system as “personal capitalism,” the “architect as artist-entrepreneur” as a source of identity, “reputation of the architect” and “aesthetics of design” as sources of legitimacy, “design prowess” as a source of authority, “personal

reputation” and “prestige of firms” as bases of mission, “resolution of design problems and entrepreneurial challenges” as a basis of attention, and “increased prestige of patron or government sponsor” as a basis of strategy. However, it remains unclear if the same institutional logic would be suitable for the world of fine art. Later in this chapter, in the section “Theoretical contributions,” I therefore develop the description of an institutional logic of art into a full-bodied set of characteristics according to the framework of Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012) and discuss its relevance and limitations.

Categories	Family	Community	Religion	State	Market	Profession	Corporation
1. Root metaphor	Family as firm	Common boundary	Temple as bank	State as redistribution mechanism	Transaction	Profession as relational network	Corporation as hierarchy
2. Sources of legitimacy	Unconditional loyalty	Unity of will Belief in trust and reciprocity	Importance of faith and sacredness in economy and society	Democratic participation	Share price	Personal expertise	Market position of firm
3. Sources of authority	Patriarchal domination	Commitment to community values and ideology	Priesthood charisma	Bureaucratic domination	Shareholder activism	Professional association	Board of directors Top management
4. Sources of identity	Family reputation	Emotional connection Ego-satisfaction and reputation	Association with deities	Social and economic class	Faceless	Association with quality of craft Personal reputation	Bureaucratic roles
5. Basis of norms	Membership in households	Group membership	Membership in congregation	Citizenship in nation	Self-interest	Membership in guild and association	Employment in firms
6. Basis of attention	Status in household	Personal investment in group	Relation to supernatural	Status of interest group	Status in market	Status in profession	Status in hierarchy
7. Basis of strategy	Increase family honor	Increase status and honor of members and practices	Increase religious symbolism of natural events	Increase community good	Increase efficiency profit	Increase personal reputation	Increase size and diversification of firm

8. Informal control mechanism	Family politics	Visibility of actions	Worship of calling	Backroom politics	Industry analysts	Celebrity professionals	Organization culture
9. Economic system	Family capitalism	Cooperative capitalism	Occidental capitalism	Welfare capitalism	Market capitalism	Personal capitalism	Managerial capitalism

Table 1: Revised interinstitutional system ideal types from Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012, p. 73).

A reflective reading of the dissertation

An overview of the five studies

The dissertation consists of five essays on organizing money flows, market practices and places in the contemporary cultural world. As the different studies have aimed to make theoretical contributions to several and different theoretical bodies of literature, they have not always used the same theoretical framework (see Table 2 below for details). This chapter offers a short reflective reading of the five studies and explains how they relate to each other through a more uniform theoretical framing. This introductory chapter hence presents the five independent studies of this dissertation together in an overview, which in turn highlights the theme and contributions of the different studies.

As previously mentioned, the central aim of this introductory chapter is to develop an institutional logic of art and then to study the interplay between this logic and the institutional logic of the market. More specifically, two aspects are addressed. First, which organizational forms arise when art organizations are subjected to both an institutional logic of art and an institutional logic of the market? Second, how do art organizations manage these multiple institutional logics?

The primary theoretical body to which this introductory chapter strives to contribute is the literature on institutional logics. There are, however, two complementary bodies of literature that the studies relate to; namely the sociology of quantification and organizational stigma. The contributions to these theoretical bodies are presented below under separate headings.

Article	Theoretical framing in the article	Theoretical framing in the reflective reading in this chapter
1. Wikberg, E. and Strannegård, L. (2014). "Selling By Numbers: The Quantification and Marketization of the Swedish Art World for Contemporary Art," <i>Organizational Aesthetics</i> , 3(1): 19–41.	Art worlds, marketization, quantification, commensuration	Analyzes the historical development of the institutional logics in the Swedish art world
2. Wikberg, E. and Strannegård, L. (2012). "Demarcations and Dirty Money: Financing New Private Contemporary Art Institutions in Sweden," <i>Homo Oeconomicus</i> , 29(3): 95–118.	Institutional theory, demarcations, identity	Analyzes which organizational forms arise when an institutional logic of art is subjected to an institutional logic of the market.
3. Wikberg, E., Stenström, E., and Strannegård, L. (2017). "Architects at Work: Four Organizational Models as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics." Status: To be submitted.	Institutional logics, management of innovation, creative industries, symbolic boundaries, organizational fields	Analyzes which organizational forms arise when an institutional logic of art is subjected to an institutional logic of the market.
4. Wikberg, E. and Bomark, N. (2015). "Managing Competing Logics Through Situational Irony," <i>International Journal of Managing Projects in Business</i> , 8(4): 649–678.	Institutional logics, organizational irony, situational irony	Analyzes how art organizations handle co-existing institutional logics of art and the market.
5. Wikberg, E. (2017). "Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics." Status: To be submitted.	Institutional logics, organizational stigma, category studies	Analyzes how art organizations handle co-existing institutional logics of art and the market.

Table 2: Theoretical framing of the studies in the articles vis-à-vis this introductory chapter.

The first study: How the art world has become influenced by the logic of market capitalism during three decades

The first article *Selling By Numbers: The Quantification and Marketization of the Swedish Art World for Contemporary Art* (Wikberg and Strannegård, 2014) provides a background for the development of the Swedish art world for contemporary art. It analyzes the development of the Swedish art world for contemporary art between 1981 and 2011. It empirically shows how numbers have become increasingly important in this field of cultural production, and that the institutional logics of this field have always been in flux. The article describes and analyzes the role of market practices and their impact on the organization of the Swedish art world during the period under study. It proposes that the re-organization of the Swedish art world for contemporary art can be summarized in three new orders: 1) in a move towards the ideal type of a market, 2) in a turn towards quantification and commensuration, and 3) in the organization of new market places as a reaction to the institutional logic of market capitalism. The third point refers to how gallery owners have organized art fairs as a reaction to increased competition from auction houses. The move towards the ideal type of a market may be seen as a sign that the institutional logic of market capitalism has become more influential in the Swedish art world for contemporary art. That the Swedish art world has turned towards quantification and commensuration may be seen as an example of what happens when the institutional logic of art is mixed with the institutional logic of the market. The fact that galleries in the primary market have organized new market places in the form of art fairs and that auction houses in the secondary market have opened up new online outlets provides one example of the type of organizational forms that arise in organizational fields with multiple institutional logics. The study shows that as the institutional logic of market capitalism advances, these new types of market places arise. It also examines how organizations manage multiple institutional logics. When art galleries are increasingly exposed to the institutional logic of market capitalism, they may organize art fairs instead of changing their business model and operations. This observation is similar to one of Reay and Hinings' (2009) findings that organizations in fields with competing institutional logics may innovate jointly in experimental sites.

The second study: A clash between the traditional financing principles of the state and the institutional logic of the market capitalism

Demarcations and Dirty Money: Financing New Private Contemporary Art Institutions in Sweden (Wikberg and Strannegård, 2012) demonstrates that art institutions are financed in surprisingly different ways, and that these financing forms are subjected to institutional logics that are quite different. Whereas three out of four financing forms (the cases of Fotografiska, Spritmuseum, and Sven-Harrys) were seen as unproblematic, one evoked a great deal of controversy. This can be related to the literature on organizational stigma. The controversial and stigmatized case in the study dealt with a monetary contribution from the commercial auction house of Bukowskis to the primarily publicly financed art institution of Tensta konsthall. The collaboration had been preceded by some changes in the national cultural policies of Sweden, where private enterprises and civil society have been encouraged to take a more active part in the development of cultural sectors. For instance, in 2009 the Swedish government abandoned its earlier commitment to counteracting “the negative effects of *commercialism*” (Swedish Government, 2009), while affirming its support for opening up cultural sectors to private actors. Private-public partnerships were encouraged to a greater extent than before and some raised concerns that this could risk the artistic freedom of cultural producers. So how did Tensta konsthall deal with these emerging changes in the institutional logics of its field? The study argues that the collaboration from the point of view of Tensta konsthall could be seen as a protest by following the new “rules of the game” in absurdum. This way of managing competing institutional logics may be analyzed in relation to the emerging literature on organizational stigma. It could be seen as one (less successful) response to avoid organizational stigma by over-emphasizing the institutional changes that Tensta konsthall had been subjected to since the new changes in the cultural policies of Sweden.

The article shows that in this field of multiple institutional logics, private contemporary art institutions may take many forms in terms of their financing structures, and also that different art institutions are subjected to quite different expectations depending on their niche. It furthermore showed how one actor responded to multiple and conflicting institutional

logics by over-emphasizing the institutional logics they are subjected to and wish to protest against. As this reaction appeared to be a novel and interesting way of managing institutional logics, I chose to study it further in a later study named *Managing Competing Logics Through Situational Irony* (Wikberg and Bomark, 2015), which is described further below.

The third study: A contrasting case of architectural companies

The article *Architects at Work: Four Organizational Models as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics* (Wikberg, Stenström, and Strannegård, 2017) analyzes an organizational field different from that of the Swedish art world for contemporary art. It also expands the geographical scope and builds on empirical data gathered in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Sweden and China. It is based on Friedland and Alford's (1991) argument that Weberian rationalized institutions do not make up the only prevailing template for organizing in the modern world. One interviewee in the study jokingly said that there are "architects in scarves and architects in ties." These stereotypes may serve as illustrative examples of the aesthetic and efficiency logic in the architectural field proposed by Thornton, Jones, and Kury (2005). The institutional logic of the first type does not necessarily apply to the second. Instead, what may be highly legitimate and credible for one type of architect may not work for the second type, and vice versa. Which types of organizational forms arise in this field where artistic practices are subjected to the institutional logic of the market? These multiple comparative case studies of nine companies in four countries identify four ideal types of organizing, which we label: the Genius Model, the Style Model, the Method Model, and the School Model. The findings, in conformity with the findings of Wikberg and Strannegård (2012), show that such organizational fields give rise to a multitude of organizational forms. One contribution of this type of findings from interpretative, qualitative studies is that it puts flesh and blood on the theoretical skeletons that view organizations as socially constructed, reflecting the institutions in which they are embedded (e.g. Brunsson and Sahlin-Andersson, 2000), rather than being constructed according to the principles of microeconomics and transaction costs (e.g. Coase, 1937).

As a contrasting case with respect to the other articles, which focus on the fields for contemporary art, the field of architecture may also highlight some differences that are valuable to distinguish and also identify the particularities of an institutional logic of art. Clearly, the economic system of architecture is different from the dynamics between auction houses and galleries. To use social control of the supply of art as an informal control mechanism is another feature that does not apply to the field of architectural firms. This adds to the *raison d'être* for an institutional logic of art, which I elaborate on later in this chapter.

In the two last articles of the dissertation, the focus moves from which kind of organizations and market places arise in fields with multiple institutional logics to how organizations and actors manage contradictions in institutional logics.

The fourth study: Irony as a response to divergent institutional logics

The fourth study (Wikberg and Bomark, 2015) – *Managing Competing Logics through Situational Irony* – describes and analyzes Tensta konsthall's collaboration with the auction house Bukowskis as a single case study. The paper introduces the concept of organizational irony (Johansson and Woodilla, 2005) to the literature on institutional logics and argues that Tensta konsthall and the artists Goldin+Senneby made use of situational irony to manage competing institutional logics. Situational irony, in contrast to verbal irony, is produced and embedded in the logic of the situation and not in spoken utterances. Irony may be humorous, but does not have to be, and it is built on multiple meanings. Unlike a metaphor, which states that A is or resembles B, irony states that A seems to be like B, but on further investigation, you see that it is not. In the case, Tensta konsthall and Goldin+Senneby produced several accounts of situational irony in the layers and meta-layers of a so-called primary sale exhibition at the auction house of Bukowskis. Depending on how media and other audiences interpreted these different, multiple meanings in the situational irony, and which meaning they sided with, organizational stigma was produced or avoided. When the exhibition was not interpreted as irony but taken at face value, spectators criticized Tensta konsthall for not acting in accordance with how they

should act; that is, according to a cultural institutional logic implying that they should not be involved in the commercial circulation of artworks or collaborate with a company owned by a family whose fortune was made in the oil industry. If interpreted as irony, however, the very same act was seen in diametrically different terms – as a critique of the institutional logic of market capitalism, which could be seen as a threat to the independence of art institutions in Sweden.

The fifth study: Strange loop categorization as a way to manage institutional logics

The fifth and final study (Wikberg, 2017) – *Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics* – examines the Absolut Art Collection in relation to the theory on institutional logics, category studies and organizational stigma. Between 1986 (or 1985; the dates differ in the Absolut archives) and 2004, Absolut Vodka commissioned more than 850 artworks from 550 artists for this corporate art collection. All artworks included the Absolut Vodka bottle, and the images were used both as artworks and as print advertising. Absolut Vodka was owned by the Swedish state when the corporate art collection was initiated, and because Sweden prohibits advertising for alcohol, the images were virtually unheard of in Sweden. Later, when Absolut Vodka was sold by the Swedish state to Pernod Ricard in 2007, the Swedish parliament took a unanimous decision to separate the Absolut Art Collection from the acquisition. It was then described as a unique art treasure and placed in a special museum. Throughout the case, the objects have at different times and in different settings been categorized as art and/or advertising, which implies that the same objects have been subjected to different institutional logics in different contexts. Furthermore, the objects have at different occasions been subjected to stigmatization from different audiences. The collection as a whole may be seen as a prime example of a desecration of artworks. The artworks, which were produced by some of the world's most famous artists and once exhibited at Biennale Venice and the Louvre, were later said to not be art at all by some influential voices in the local Swedish art world when exhibited in a newly established special museum. One art critic wrote that the objects were advertising, not art, although they could be seen as

very creative and good advertising – and thus positioning them in relation to an institutional logic of advertising. Others, who wanted to emphasize the category membership of art, while at the same time not entirely dismiss the viewpoints of those who saw it as advertising, argued that it could be seen as “advertising as art.” One informant furthermore talked about the objects as “art as advertising as art.” One contribution of this study is that I identify the mechanism I denote as strange loop reframing – alluding to the concept of strange loops coined by Hofstadter (1979) – to describe how actors re-categorize an object from a first-order category (e.g. “art”) to a second-order category (e.g. “art as advertising”), and from a second-order category to a third-order category (e.g. “art as advertising as art”). This recursive reframing mechanism shifts which institutional logic should be the most salient and may thereby be a strategy for avoiding stigmatization. The study thereby contributes to several bodies of literature related to institutional logics, category studies, organizational stigma as well as the desecration processes in the art world.

Summary of methods

All studies in the dissertation are of a qualitative research type. The primary data collection has been semi-structured in-depth interviews, complemented by a wide array of other data: secondary literature, journalistic articles in mainstream and specialized media, observations, informal conversations, and more. In total, the dissertation builds on a dataset of 89 formal interviews, excluding informal interviews and shorter conversations and discussions. Two out of five studies include interviews conducted outside of Sweden. *Architects at Work: Four Hybrid Organizational Forms as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics* (Wikberg, Stenström, and Strannegård, 2017) comprises interviews conducted in Beijing, London, Lund, Manchester, Stockholm, and Rotterdam. The article *Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics* (Wikberg, 2017) builds on a qualitative dataset of interviews conducted in New York, Paris, and Stockholm. For details of why these methods were employed, I refer to the methods section in the respective article.

Article	Research design and primary data collection
1. Wikberg, E. and Strannegård, L. (2014). "Selling By Numbers: The Quantification and Marketization of the Swedish Art World for Contemporary Art," <i>Organizational Aesthetics</i> , 3(1): 19–41.	A qualitative research article on the organizational field of the Swedish art world for contemporary art. Data collection of 28 semi-structured in-depth interviews.
2. Wikberg, E. and Strannegård, L. (2012). "Demarcations and Dirty Money: Financing New Private Contemporary Art Institutions in Sweden," <i>Homo Oeconomicus</i> , 29(3): 95–118.	Comparative case study of four private art institutions in the Swedish art world for contemporary art. Data collection of 8 semi-structured in-depth interviews.
3. Wikberg, E., Stenström, E., and Strannegård, L. (2017) "Architects at Work: Four Organizational Models as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics."	Comparative case study of nine architectural companies in four countries. Data collection of 29 semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted in four countries.
4. Wikberg, E. and Bomark, N. (2015). "Managing Competing Logics Through Situational Irony," <i>International Journal of Managing Projects in Business</i> , 8(4): 649–678.	Single case study of a collaborative project between Tensta konsthall and Bukowskis. Data collection of 9 semi-structured in-depth interviews, complemented by a number of informal interviews and shorter discussions.
5. Wikberg, E. (2017). "Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics." Status: To be submitted.	Single case study of the Absolut Art Collection. Data collection of 15 semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted in three countries.

Table 3: A summary of the methods employed in the studies

Discussion

When undertaking a reflective reading of these articles, one may identify several co-existing and sometimes competing institutional logics at play. *Architects at Work: Four Organizational Models as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics* (Wikberg, Stenström, and Strannegård, 2017) deals with an organizational field with a cultural vis-à-vis a capitalist market logic. The many different organizational forms present in the case study, summarized in four ideal types of architectural models, are to be seen as reflections of these logics. *Selling By Numbers: The Quantification and Marketization of the Swedish Art World for Contemporary Art* (Wikberg and

Strannegård, 2014) assumes the same conflicting institutional logics with different views of what is commensurable and incommensurable respectively. It describes how the institutional logic of market capitalism has become increasingly influential during the three decades under study. Because it has become more common, and more legitimate, to quantify what was previously seen as incommensurable, actors in the art world may now relate artists and artworks to different sorts of numbers (for example prices and artist rankings). *Demarcations and Dirty Money: Financing New Private Contemporary Art Institutions in Sweden* (Wikberg and Strannegård, 2012) may certainly be seen as another type of illustration of how different institutional logics give rise to a plethora of art organizations in an organizational field, even in regard to a small art world like the one in Stockholm and confined to private art institutions specialized in contemporary art. In addition, *Architects at Work: Four Organizational Models as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics* (Wikberg, Stenström, and Strannegård, 2017) extends the study of an organizational field to an international level and shows that architectural practices vary and develop in different streams in the same organizational field. The last study also provides a contrasting case that helps distinguish between an institutional logic of art, applicable to organizations dealing with contemporary art, and the institutional logics of cultural production that are applicable to architectural firms.

The contribution of these articles is hence to empirically show that organizational fields of art are characterized by multiple institutional logics are not as uniform as one may assume if only taking the processes of isomorphism into account. This is not in any way a new observation in the literature on institutional logics, it is rather one of the fundamental building blocks. The contribution of my articles is in short to empirically analyze *how* such organizations differ from each other.

The contributions to how art organizations manage competing institutional logics are more theoretical in nature. The dissertation identifies two ways of handling competing logics that have not been identified in the previous literature on institutional logics. The first response described in Wikberg and Bomark (2015) is to produce organizational irony, and the second response described in Wikberg (2017) is to reframe objects in recursive strange loops.

Managing Competing Logics Through Situational Irony (Wikberg and Bomark, 2015) presents organizational irony as a possible response for managing competing institutional logics. The analysis merges the body of literature on institutional logics with theory on organizational irony (Johansson and Woodilla, 2005). The main contribution of the article is to show how the production of situational irony can be used as a response to competing institutional logics. As irony entails multiple meanings, Tensta konsthall could use it to convey two diametrically different messages at the same time. Each of these meanings may be seen as corresponding to two different institutional logics. Tensta konsthall could seemingly follow the institutional logic of market capitalism by collaborating with a commercial auction house with controversial owners. At the same time, it could manifest a critique against this turn in Swedish cultural politics and essentially follow a cultural logic that is incompatible with the logic of the capitalist market. An artist-driven blog, tsnok, argued that the director of Tensta konsthall had taken advantage of her reputation as a capitalist critic to send the message that if *she* collaborates with the capitalists, then something must be seriously wrong with the system itself. This meaning attempts to twist or turn the meaning of the first message. In this way, the response to the competing logics is that of the trope of irony: You think that A is or resembles B, but on further investigation, you see that it is not. Clearly, this way of reasoning is highly contingent on a social constructionist epistemology, which acknowledges that social reality is multifaceted (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). There are several social realities co-existing at the same time and place, and the social process of making sense of these realities is what leads us to eventually perceive it as an objective facticity.

Another possibility that follows from the view that social reality is constructed and multifaceted, is to “go meta” in regards to how we manage institutional logics. *Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics* (Wikberg, 2017) presents “strange loop reframings” as a categorization process for handling contradictory expectations stemming from multiple institutional logics. Absolut Vodka’s corporate art collection used the commissioned artworks both as print advertising and as conventional artworks. The institutional logics at play in this article are the institutional logic of advertising and the institutional logic of art. Depend-

ing on whether the objects were categorized as art or advertising, they were not only subjected to different normative expectations, but also other legislative requirements. Because of the Swedish prohibition on alcohol advertising, the objects were not allowed to be reprinted or shown in Sweden at all. Later, when the company was sold to Pernod Ricard, the parliament unanimously approved a motion that instead categorized the objects as a “unique art treasure.” As such, the motion argued that it should not be commoditized or sold. These are two examples of situations in the case study where the objects were rather univocally categorized as “advertising” or “art.” Depending on which category the objects were ascribed to, they were subjected to different institutional logics. A former curator of the collection therefore said that he always talked about the objects as advertising when talking to the business executives at the company, and as art when talking to the artists. However, most interviewees did not simply categorize the objects as a division between only two options. Instead, they conceptualized them in multiple ways, for instance, as “advertising as art” or “art as advertising.” Depending on the target audience, these categorizations proved crucial in order to be legitimate and avoid stigmatization. The main contribution of the article is that actors may attempt to re-categorize objects to shift one institutional logic to another. Alluding to Hofstadter’s (1979) concept of strange loops, I call this mechanism a strange loop re-framing. The article describes how actors re-categorize an object from a first-order category (e.g. “art”) to a second-order category (e.g. “art as advertising”), or from a second-order category to a third-order category (e.g. “art as advertising as art”). This mechanism shifts which institutional logic should be the most salient and may thereby be a strategy for avoiding stigmatization, which I will return to shortly.

The contributions to the sociology of quantification

Before I return to organizational stigma, I would like to place the article *Selling By Numbers: The Quantification and Marketization of the Swedish Art World for Contemporary Art* (Wikberg and Strannegård, 2014) in relation to the sociology of quantification. The article concludes that numbers in the form of, for example, prices, price databases, and artist rankings have become increasingly common from 1981 to 2011. Closely linked to the process of

quantification is the social process of commensuration (Espeland and Stevens, 1998); that is, the transformation of qualities into a common metric. Although works of art are sometimes perceived as symbols of the unique and priceless, developments in recent decades in the Swedish art world show that its organizing principles have developed in the opposite direction. This is important since the process of commensuration is not merely a technical or neutral procedure; it also constructs relations of authority and in this way is social, biased, and political (Espeland and Stevens, 1998). This aspect is implicit in an article published in *Dagens Nyheter*, where Swedish authorities are asked to rank Swedish artists. The article was published alongside a ranking of the ten most successful contemporary Swedish artists from Artfacts.net. The director of Moderna Museet, Daniel Birnbaum, said: “Klara Lidén is number one, even if it is a bit silly to rank it that way. Everyone wants her, in Sweden and perhaps even more out in the world. Nathalie Djurberg is also big and it will be interesting to see what she will do next.” The director of Tensta Konsthall, Maria Lind, said that Klara Lidén belongs to the mainstream side of the art world; an art world that in her view has become increasingly divided between mainstream and explorative artists. She said: “Personally, I think she’s like IKEA, a tenuous and marketable variant of what others do better. Talking about ‘big artists’ may not be relevant; but rather in which contexts different types work.” (Leffler and Thorén Björling, 2011). Just as hinted by Maria Lind, there are difficulties associated with comparing different types of artists on a common metric. The processes of commensuration are in this case not only likely to lump mainstream and explorative artists together, but also promote the first group at the expense of the other.

The findings of our study show that the Swedish art world for contemporary art has had an increased focus on quantification. This does not, however, imply that qualitative aspects in all situations and places have been downplayed. A parallel finding is that auction catalogues today give more room to exhaustive provenience. This might be a consequence of the broad development of contemporary art becoming text-based, conceptual, and relational. The value and quality of art is hence more to be found in the contextual and conceptual, and not in the clearly visible.

Despite the turn to quantification in the Swedish art world for contemporary art, there hence seems to be an opportunity for further research on the contexts and places in which the processes of quantification are the most and the least present. Mainstream media seem to provide a clear example of a context that to a high degree has turned to quantification and commensuration. At the beginning of the 1980s, art prices were seldom highlighted in mainstream media articles. Today, articles about “price records” in the secondary market are almost a journalistic genre in itself, and the public relations officers at the auction houses consequently use price records as a marketing tool. In broadcast television, the immensely popular *The Antiques Road Show* may be seen as another prime example of an in-built dramaturgy that peaks when the price of a specific antique or an artwork is to be announced.

The shared conceptual and theoretical framework of the art world in this dissertation builds on philosophers’ concepts of the art worlds (Danto, 1964; Dickie, 1971), which have later been investigated and applied by sociologists (Becker, 1982; Bourdieu, 1993; Velthuis, 2003) and other scholars inspired by sociological thought (i.e. Thornton, 2008; Horowitz, 2011; Thompson, 2008). In its most simplistic form, this theoretical body argues that art is what the art world decides it should be. As a broader reflection of my dissertation work, however, I would like to acknowledge that this should not be understood as there being a culture of consensus in the art world. There are many art worlds, also in a small city like Stockholm, and there is a range of professions and professional interests with contrasting views about what art, and good art, should be. Different contexts and places are to varying degrees subjected to processes of quantification and commensuration (as shown by Wikberg and Strannegård, 2014). A single exhibition can have multiple and diametrically different interpretations among art critics (as shown by Wikberg and Strannegård, 2012; Wikberg and Bomark, 2015). Different actors in the art world expect very different financing structures of private art institutions (as shown by Wikberg and Strannegård, 2012). Commissioners who buy art for a corporate art collection may have a fundamentally different view of what the objects are (and categorize them accordingly) than artists and art professionals; and artworks that were once perceived as worthy to be exhibited at Le Louvre may

in another context not be considered art at all (as in the case of Wikberg, 2017). In short, the art world may be described as a social structure with many nuances, and I encourage further research to pay equal attention to differences and similarities within the organizational field of the art world.

The contributions to the literature on organizational stigma

In addition to the contributions to other types of literature, this dissertation also contributes to the emerging body of literature on organizational stigma. Three out of five articles relate to this theme: *Demarcations and Dirty Money: Financing New Private Contemporary Art Institutions in Sweden* (Wikberg and Strannegård, 2012), *Managing Competing Logics through Situational Irony* (Wikberg and Bomark, 2015), and *Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics* (Wikberg, 2017). In short, the first study (Wikberg and Strannegård, 2012) describes how Tensta konsthall evoked a lot of controversy and stigma among certain audiences in the art world by collaborating with a commercial actor, as a result of the anti-capitalist positioning of the art institution. The second study (Wikberg and Bomark, 2015) investigates this phenomenon in more depth and concludes that one way of dealing with organizational stigma is by producing organizational irony. The third study (Wikberg, 2017) is the one that most explicitly deals with this particular sub-theme, and may be read as an extreme case of artworks by *the* most prestigious artists in the world of contemporary art, once exhibited at *the* most prestigious art institutions in the world, later not being considered artworks at all in the local Swedish art world for contemporary art. This, once again, can serve as an illustrative point that there is not one united and unanimous art world. Even within the organization that commissioned this corporate art collection, there were several audiences. A former curator of the collection described how he always talked about the commissions as advertising when talking to the business executives and as art when talking to artists. Likewise, the professionals that currently work with the collection, who are highly aware of the stigmatization of this collection, have worked to re-categorize the objects as artworks and not as advertising. This does not imply that they argue that the objects are just art or just advertising. Instead, they conceptualized the objects as “art as advertising” or “advertising as art” or even “art as advertising as art.”

There is a small but growing body of literature on organizational stigma (Hudson and Okhuysen, 2014), and previous studies have for example studied the genre of comedy pornography (Jensen, 2006), gay male bathhouses (Hudson and Okhuysen, 2009), and light cigarettes (Hsu and Grodal, 2015). Such studies on organizational stigma are about the “distasteful or undesirable” Hudson and Okhuysen (2014, p. 242) and some would argue that the three studies above only qualify as mild forms of organizational stigmatization. Certainly, the markets for contemporary art are less stigmatized than the organizational fields for pornography, gay male bathhouses, and cigarettes. However, for the organizational field for contemporary art, the studies do entail certain *events* that could be seen as highly stigmatized. Art critic Birgitta Rubin for instance commented on the controversies around Tensta konsthall’s primary sale exhibition described in Wikberg and Strannegård (2012) and Wikberg and Bomark (2015) in the following way: “I was very surprised by the tremendously malignant tone of the debate and the remarkably strong reactions. I have never experienced that [in the Swedish art world for contemporary art] before.” The most remarkable form of stigmatization, however, is found in the last study (Wikberg, 2017). To my knowledge, there is no other case where a collection of artworks by Louise Bourgeois, Keith Haring, Andy Warhol, Rosemarie Trockel, and countless others of the most influential contemporary artists of the last century has been stigmatized to the point that it is not even seen as art at all. Once again, this is not to say that all actors and individuals shared this view – others did indeed see it as art. Organizational stigma occurs precisely because of the presence of multiple audiences embedded in multiple institutional configurations. Hudson and Okhuysen (2014, p. 244) for instance conclude that “the contradictory and conflicting approval and disapproval, from different audiences” results in organizational stigma. In the same article, they argue that there are structural barriers in the academic publishing system that discourage articles dealing with taboo topics. Journal editors may for instance rule that certain studies are inappropriate for their journals regardless of their scientific quality because the topic is seen as inappropriate. It may even be the case that there is a selection bias already in the ideation processes of researchers, where successful and prestigious cases are over-represented when cases are selected. By studying a collaborative

project between Tensta konsthall and Bukowskis that many viewed as unsuccessful, or the desecration of a corporate art collection, I hope to contribute to a more nuanced and comprehensive view of the art worlds under study.

The institutional logic of art subjected to market practices

Finally, I would like to go back to the main contribution of this introductory chapter, which is to offer a new institutional logic of art based on the five studies of this dissertation and then describe what happens when this institutional logic is subjected to the institutional logic of the market. This answers the call of Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorf (2015) that more attention should be given to large societal domains like art, philanthropy and education which are overlooked in the literature on institutional logics. I have made use of a framework from Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012) to propose an ideal-type institutional logic for art worlds for fine art.

These fields are made of up both places and market places, as well as a wide range of occupations. The art world (Danto, 1964; Dickie, 1974; Becker, 1982; Thornton, 2008) encompasses actors directly involved in the production and sales of artworks, as well as critics, curators, promoters, and commissioners of art. Thornton (2008) lists seven places of the contemporary art world: an auction, an art school, an art fair, an art prize, an art magazine, an artist's studio and an art biennale. The art world is held together by a "belief in art", and there is a common interest to distinguish "high-brow art" from "lowbrow art," "professionals" from "amateurs" and "art" from "non-art." The fact that this "belief in art" is shared among all professions and in all places, to various extents, might indicate that it is reasonable to view these organizational fields as held together by *one* common institutional logic.

Based on the five studies of this dissertation and their aggregated empirical work, I conclude that the root metaphor for the institutional logic of art is to see the organization as an art gallery. "In the future all department stores will become museums and all museums will become department stores" is a quote often attributed to Andy Warhol. What then are the differences between an art gallery and a department store? Regardless of whether the art gallery is a commercial one, which puts the artwork up for

sale, or is a gallery with the sole purpose of exhibiting the art, reflexivity is the key component. The art on display should resonate with us as social beings and more importantly resonate with other works of art. Artists' works resonate with other artists' works. To be referred to as an "artist's artist" is therefore the highest form of legitimacy. This is natural, because it is commonly understood that art is more than meets the eye. Arthur Danto (1964, p. 580) for instance stated: "To see something as art requires something the eye cannot descry – an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge about art history: an art world." Danto (1964) describes the history of art in three phases: first, art uniformly imitated reality until the late 19th century, next art was fractured into manifestos of what art should be, and finally, art culminating in awareness of itself (also see Danto, 1984). Artworks call for interpretation and reflection to a higher extent than we are expected to interpret or reflect upon everyday products we buy or even highly aesthetic products such as designer clothing or designer furniture. As stated in the beginning of this introductory chapter, the reflective, self-referenced element of the art organization is also evident in that we expect art organizations to engage in an on-going debate about what art is and is not, and to discuss and develop the role of the artist, the curator, the critic, and other professions in the art world.

A second feature of the root metaphor is that art spaces display expensive objects at the same time as they go to great lengths to conceal the price or economic value of the very same objects, which is related to the economic system of "insider capitalism" that is characteristic for the institutional logic of art. This feature contrasts with the ads we often see in department stores. We do not expect price abatements on art at the end of an exhibition; art galleries never have special assortments of art "on sale," and we do not expect to buy "two artworks for the price of one," etc. Prices are generally very opaque. In one informal interview in this dissertation, a museum guide said that museum staff would never speculate or brag about the economic value of any of the displayed artworks, even though it is part of the attraction of viewing art. The same phenomenon is present at commercial art galleries, where prices are discreetly marked in price lists and often negotiated and settled in the back room of the gallery. Even auction houses, which are today symbols of being totally transparent in regards

to their asking and end prices and which use these numbers strategically in their marketing, once had a similar opaqueness in so far as asking prices were not publicly available so that an uninitiated art buyer had to ask the auctioneer in advance what a reasonable price might be (Hellström and Petersén, 1992).

The source of legitimacy is the commonly held “belief in art,” a belief Thornton (2008) describes as almost “religious.” It is a belief that holds artworks as sacred objects in a Durkheimian sense, which unlike the logic of market capitalism forbids that all elements of an object may be commodified. Therefore, an art collector cannot solely care for the economic value of the art collection without losing face, and an artist cannot solely care for economic success without being seen as a “sell-out.”

Curators and critics are important sources of authority in the proposed institutional logic of art. To be an esteemed artist you first of all need to be displayed at influential art museums and art biennales, and must therefore seek the approval of the responsible curators. To sell at high prices is not the cause of an artist’s high esteem – it is rather the result of one. In a small art world with a high degree of public financing, like the Swedish art world for contemporary art, artists can gain high esteem through the representation at important museums and biennales, at the same time as he or she is not represented by a commercial art gallery or sold at auction houses.

The sources of identity are strong in the proposed institutional logic of art, as an artist’s oeuvre is inevitably linked to the artworks of other artists, art movements and art galleries. The contribution to art theory and art history is thus ultimately the sources of identity for artists. Just as most forms of cultural productions, the art world is an organizational field “where the winner takes it all” and where artists can be divided into an A-list and a B-list (Caves, 2000). In a similar fashion that “membership in a household” constitutes the basis of norms in a family, or “citizenship in a nation” constitutes the basis of norms in the institutional logic of the state, the basis of norms in the proposed institutional logic of art is based on membership in this artistic A-list. Such membership separates “professional artists” from “amateurs” and good or true art from bad art or non-art.

Professionalism can, but does not need to, build on artistic higher education. Rather, it is the status in the art world that forms the basis of atten-

tion, and this ultimately determines which artists will be deemed successful and worthy of resources, esteem, and attention.

In order to reach status and gain membership in the artistic A-list, artists and their representatives need to consecrate the artworks and the artist's oeuvre in a manner that goes beyond marketing these objects as valuable, high-priced collectables. It is a process in which they become symbolically "priceless."

There are a number of informal control mechanisms to promote or disapprove such consecration. An obvious way to obstruct an artist's consecration is of course for curators or gallery owners to exclude an artist from being exhibited. A slightly more subtle obstacle for an artist's consecration is unfavorable reviews of their exhibitions, or the absence of any reviews altogether. In the economic circulation of artworks, there are well-known rules of the game that relate to the supply of art. An art gallery that does not want its artists' work to be circulated in the secondary market until the artworks have gained a certain level of consecration as well as economic value may consider "punishing" the collector that puts the artwork on auction by not allowing him or her to buy more artworks at the gallery. In some cases, when it comes to the most precious and desired artworks in a commercial art gallery, a collector may even first have to prove him- or herself "worthy" by having a "track record" of not letting artworks bought at a gallery be sold at an auction. The social control of supply is also present in several anecdotal statements that galleries manipulate the prices of their artists when they are put on auction. This can be done if the gallery owner sends somebody to the auction to bid on the artworks originating from the gallery, in order to drive up the prices of the artist's oeuvre. Galleries may in addition give influential collectors exclusive rights to some artworks, as well as offer big discounts to prestigious museums or other important art spaces that can give provenance to an artwork and an artist's oeuvre. The discount system can sometimes even be implicit in the auction houses. As mentioned, in an informal interview at an auction house, the purchaser of a state museum said that she knew that some art collectors, as a gesture of courtesy, intentionally did not bid on the same artworks that she bid on. There is also another aspect of the opaqueness of art markets that concerns the relations between gallery owners and their artists. Artists may offer art-

works as gifts to their gallery owners, and these gifts may be of a monetary value that should not be trivialized.

In sum then, the economic system of the art world can metaphorically be described as “insider capitalism,” in which the economic values of artworks are often opaque and in which the transparent prices at auction houses are sometimes manipulated by buyers with an interest in keeping the price level of a particular artist as high as possible. This theme is central in the articles in this dissertation (Wikberg and Strannegård, 2012; Wikberg and Bomark, 2015) that describe the artistic duo of Goldin+Senneby and their participation in an auction house’s primary sale. In the interviews that form the basis of this dissertation, it has several times been said that “what would be illegal in the financial markets is often practice in the contemporary art world,” referring to attempts to manipulate prices or use information undisclosed to the public at the expense of others. It is therefore not surprising that the particularities of the economic system of the art world have attracted a lot of research in recent years (e.g. Horowitz, 2011; Thompson, 2008; Velthuis, 2005; Velthuis, 2008) and are likely to do so in the future, as the opaqueness of these economic circulations become increasingly uncovered.

Categories	Institutional logic of art
1. Root metaphor	Organization as art gallery
2. Sources of legitimacy	A belief in art
3. Sources of authority	Curators and critics
4. Sources of identity	Contribution to art theory and art history
5. Basis of norms	Membership in the artistic A-list
6. Basis of attention	Status in the art world
7. Basis of strategy	Consecration of an artist's oeuvre and artworks
8. Informal control mechanism	Social control of the supply of art
9. Economic system	Insider capitalism

Table 4: This chapter's theoretical contribution to the list of other institutional logics described by Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012, p. 73).

Table 4 above summarizes the proposed institutional logic of art building on the aggregated data and the five self-contained studies of this dissertation.

How useful is the proposed institutional logic of art, and what are the limitations of this logic? The main argument why this institutional logic is interesting and useful is that all of the nine proposed categories are distinctively different from the other categories compiled for the other institutional logics proposed by Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012) in Table 1. This is to say that the institutional logic of art is a comprehensive set of features and not merely a slightly different version of another institutional logic. As a consequence, it opens up for studies of the art world on its own terms and fills a gap in the literature on institutional logics. As our economies become more and more aestheticized, studies of the art world are becoming increasingly relevant, and the need for such an institutional logic is only likely to grow. However, the proposed set of features does have limitations. The art world in Stockholm differs from the art worlds in metropolitan cities like New York, London, Paris, and Berlin; and it likewise differs from small, local art worlds in the countryside of Sweden. There are obvious differences between art worlds in states with completely different economic systems and national wealth, and it obviously changes during different times and varies with different sub-cultures within the art world. These limitations, however, are not unique for the institutional logic of art. The institutions around families, communities, religions, states, markets, professions, and corporations vary with times and locations; some of these social domains are likely to be a lot more variable than the social domain of the art world. What may complicate the concept of the institutional logic of the art world are the varied understandings of the concept of the art world itself (i.e. Danto, 1964; Dickie, 1971; Becker, 1982; Thornton, 2008). There are several differences between the different outlooks on the “art world” among these scholars. Danto (1964) focused on art displayed in the traditional “white cube” gallery setting, which neglects a lot of objects conventionally seen as art; everything from cave paintings to street art. Becker (1982) instead focused on networks and their cooperative activity that produces art. Likewise, Dickie (1971) shifted and broadened the focus from “a theory of art” to the “coordinated activities” between a large number of

roles involved in the production of art and cultural production: composers, artists, playwrights, musicians, actors, musical instrument makers, players, critics, and so on. Finally, Thornton (2008) focused on contemporary art and conceptualized the art world as “a loose network of overlapping subcultures” unified by a belief in art. The obvious limitation to my proposed institutional logic of art is that it is based primarily on Swedish empirics and that studies of other art worlds might have resulted in different conclusions. Nevertheless, the theoretical foundations of the proposed institutional logic are based on studies carried out in shifting geographical settings and different times. Also, art worlds are connected. The Swedish art world follows developments in big art worlds in cities like New York, Paris and Berlin. This relation, however, is not shared; there are art worlds that are influencers and art worlds that are followers. To build an institutional logic solely on empirical studies of the big influential art metropolises would risk overlooking local variations, and to build an institutional logic of art based on empirical studies of a smaller art world such as the art world in Stockholm risks being deemed irrelevant for the world’s most elitist art worlds. In the proposed institutional logic of art, I have tried to strike a balance between empirical observations and previous research. Thereby I have tried to avoid both of these risks. I have also focused on common denominators and not local specificities. I have furthermore focused on contemporary art and not tried to propose an institutional logic that would hold true for all types of cultural production.

Against this background, I argue that the proposed institutional logic of art offers a valuable theoretical framework for organizational theorists wanting to study art worlds for contemporary art. The separate studies also answer Jones, Boxenbaum, and Anthony’s (2013) call to take material aspects of institutional logics into account. In the two articles about Tensta konsthall, for example, the reader can learn about what the material artworks in the exhibition looked like. In the study about architectural companies, the reader learns more about the different architectural styles of the different case firms. In the article about Absolut Vodka, the reader learns which artists and artworks were part of the corporate collection and how the collection developed over time. Likewise, the first article about the development of the Swedish art world describes several artworks that in dif-

ferent ways relate to the material aspects of the institutional logic of art vis-à-vis the institutional logic of the market.

One must be aware that the institutional logic of art is a macro-level ideal type. To say that there is a need for one institutional logic of art does not mean that there is not a need to conceptualize less macro-level institutional logics for street art or Indian contemporary art. I therefore encourage future studies to improve, contest or challenge the proposed assumptions in this introductory chapter, to seek and develop local variations that make it possible to compare art worlds in different geographical sites and in different times, as well as institutional logics of different subcultures within an art world. As social norms are central to institutional theory, it would be interesting to compare, for example, differences between integrated professional artists who make canonical works within established conventions, avant-garde artists who relate to these conventions by deliberately breaking them and naïve artists who are unaware of or indifferent to the conventions and norms of their art world.

In summary, the main contribution of this introductory chapter is twofold. First, I have constructed an institutional logic of art that can be a useful construct for further research. Second, and perhaps more importantly, I have demonstrated a number of examples of how this institutional logic of art is challenged by the institutional logic of the market. In particular, I have shown which types of organizational forms arise in art organizational fields and how art organizations deal with the conflicting expectations that result from an institutional logic of art meeting an institutional logic of the market.

Concluding remarks

This introductory chapter has presented a reflective reading of the five self-contained articles of this dissertation, and sketched how they could be related to each other through a more uniform theoretical framing than if they are read as five independent studies with different theoretical framings. Writing a compilation of articles, however, is not the streamlined, fully planned and uniform process that such a reflective reading suggests. If you read this dissertation to the end, you will realize that the articles written at

the beginning of the research process differ from the ones that were written late in the process. Hopefully, the type of analysis that emerges in the later articles may illustrate the progress and development of my dissertation process. The reflective reading of this introductory chapter has taken the theoretical framing of these later articles as a point of departure. In practice, articles can also change considerably during a peer-review process. The reflective reading is hence to be seen as an alternative or rather complementary reading to the self-contained articles themselves, which have had the readerships of their respective journals as primary target groups and not the readers of this compiled dissertation. The broad question of how art organizations organize in fields with high institutional complexity, however, has been a central point of departure for the entire doctoral process. The separate studies have studied different angles of this broader question and this introductory chapter has offered a format to show how they relate to each other.

One question that, on the contrary, was never really raised during my years as a doctoral student is: For whom do we write? In my view, this reflective reading may metaphorically speaking be seen as a handrail for the reader who wants to read all articles at once and reflect upon what they altogether arrive at. But for whom did I write when I wrote the articles along the way, and in what way did I want to contribute to the larger academic field of organization theory? Looking back, I have primarily written for the audience of other scholars, and more specifically, for particular readerships in certain academic journals. Even though this might sound instrumental and pragmatic, it has been a very inspiring target group to write for, which is open to arguments and reasoning that would not always be appreciated in, for example, the world of commercial businesses.

However, there are good reasons for organizations of all types to understand how value, legitimacy, and stigma are produced in an organizational field, especially in post-industrial economies. In these times it is well known that most companies do not simply sell products and services. Instead, they aim to sell feelings, fantasies and identity. These ephemeral and symbolic values are as important as the functional value (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Dobers and Strannegård, 2005). Companies producing cars, handbags, chairs, water bottles, coffee percolators or other everyday

products hence need to understand how such values are produced, and may view the art world as an inspiring case where an artist with just the material cost of some paint and a canvas can create an artwork that is potentially worth a fortune. The aesthetic dimension is not something the products could just as well do without, but is to be seen as an inalienable part of the products (Löfgren and Willim, 2005; Entwistle, 2002). Workers and not only products are seen as having a competitive advantage based on their aesthetic qualities, and may be conceptualized as aesthetic labor (Nickson et al., 2001; Johansson and Näslund, 2009). It is hence not hard to find commercial practical implications studies about art and aesthetic values. These instrumental values and practical implications were important in the application for the research program *The Economy of the Senses* at the Stockholm School of Economics, which my dissertation work was part of, and they are likely to become more important for businesses as more and more consumers live in a world of abundance and desire products and services that contain aesthetic and ephemeral qualities beyond their brute functional value.

But what then are the social implications of these studies? Given that the markets for top-quality contemporary art are confined to a tiny, wealthy elite, I first felt less hopeful that my work could have valuable social implications for others than perhaps the fortunate few who are already part of the art world. One journalistic article that first spurred this feeling of futility was an article written by art critic Ben Lewis. Alluding to Joseph Stieglitz's article *Of the 1%, by the 1%, for the 1%* published in *Vanity Fair* (2011), which shows that we are living in an ever more unequal society, Ben Lewis contended that contemporary art also excludes "the 99%" (Ben Lewis, 2012). He even proposed a Lewis's Law that clarifies the problem of artworks becoming more and more expensive, and thereby more and more excluding: "the more unequal the society, the higher the prices paid for art." If that holds true, studies about the art world for contemporary art can therefore be seen as mirroring the state of Western capitalism at large. Entering the art world is like crossing the threshold of a new terrain with unfamiliar rules and values, populated with people you are not always likely to meet in (other) commercial businesses. Many of these values are of a kind that I would like all other social domains to possess as well. It is, in most situations, for

example, one of few places where people with various sexual orientations can love whomever they want without being ashamed. It is also fairly open to various radical political orientations and worldviews. To be able to experience that feeling of inclusion, however, you must of course first be let in. As one of my interviewees said: “Contemporary art is so incredibly including and incredibly excluding at the same time.” When let into this world, we are allowed to fantasize about other social realities, which ultimately helps us develop our feeling of empathy and do what we can to better the social conditions of our fellow human beings and ourselves. I hope that the social implication of the studies of this dissertation is that someone, somewhere can feel that he or she is a bit more curious and confident to enter this special world. I hope that the studies can help lower the thresholds to the art world, because at the end of the day, it is a great place to experience.

References

- Alvesson, M. (1990). "Organization: From Substance to Image?" *Organization Studies*, 11(3): 373–394.
- Battilana, J. and Dorando, S. (2010) "Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of microfinance organizations," *Academy of Management Journal*, 6: 1419–1440.
- Becker, H.S. (1982). *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ben Lewis [online], available at: <http://www.benlewis.tv/artcrit/contemporary-art-excludes-99/> (originally published July 23, 2012).
- Berg Johansen, C. and Boch Waldorf, S. (2015). "What are Institutional Logics – and Where is the Perspective Taking Us?" Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, 2015, 7–11 August 2015, Vancouver, Canada.
- Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality*. London: Penguin.
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). "The field of cultural production, or: The economic world reversed," *Poetics*, 12: 311–356.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*, Ed. Johnson, R. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brunsson, N. and Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2000) "Constructing Organizations: The Example of Public Sector Reform," *Organization Studies*, 21(4): 721–746.
- Caves, R. E. (2000). *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cloutier, C. and Langley, A. (2013) "The logic of institutional logics: Insights from French pragmatist philosophy," *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 22: 235–247.
- Cooper, D. J., Hinings, B., Greenwood, R., and Brown, J. L. (1996). "Sedimentation and transformation in organizational change: The case of Canadian law firms," *Organization Studies*, 17: 623–647.
- Danto, A. (1964). "The artworld," *The Journal of Philosophy*, 61(19): 571–584.
- Danto, A. (1984). "The End of Art." In *The Death of Art*. Lang, B. (Ed.). New York: Haven Publications.
- Dickie, G (1971). *Aesthetics: An Introduction*. New York: Pegasus.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1987). "Classification in art," *American Sociological Review*, 52: 440–455.
- DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. (1983), "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields," *American Sociological Review*, 48(2): 147–160.

- Dobers, P. and Strannegård, L. (2005) "Design, Lifestyles and Sustainability. Aesthetic Consumption in a World of Abundance," *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 14(5): 324–336.
- Entwistle, J. (2002) "The aesthetic economy: The production of value in the field of fashion," *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 2(3): 317–339.
- Espeland, W. N. and Stevens, M. L. (1998). "Commensuration as a social process," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1): 313–343.
- Friedland, R. and Alford R. R. (1991) "Bringing society back in: symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions." In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. W.W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2320–63.
- Glynn, M. A. and Lounsbury, M. (2005). "From the critics' corner: Logic blending, discursive change and authenticity in a cultural production system," *Journal of Management Studies*, 42: 1031–1055.
- Greenwood, R., Magañán Díaz, A., Xiao Li, S., and Cepeda Lorente, J. (2010). "The Multiplicity of Institutional Logics and the Heterogeneity of Organizational Responses," *Organization Science*, 21(2): 521–539
- Hellström, G. and Petersén, G-G. (1992). *Det stora konstspelet: Hur 80-talets gyllene konstmarknad förvandlades till trauma på 90-talet*. Stockholm: Gedins.
- Hoffman, A. J. (1999) "Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the US chemical industry," *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 351–371.
- Hofstadter, D. (1979). *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*. New York: Random House.
- Holbrook, M.B. and Hirschman, E. C. (1982). "The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun," *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(2): 132–140.
- Horowitz, N. (2011). *Art of the Deal: Contemporary Art in a Global Financial Market*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hudson, B. A. and Okhuysen, G. A. (2009). "Not with a Ten-Foot Pole: Core Stigma, Stigma Transfer and Improbable Persistence of Men's Bathhouses," *Organization Science*, 20(1): 134–153.
- Hudson, B. A. and Okhuysen, G. A. (2014). "Taboo Topics: Structural Barriers to the Study of Organizational Stigma," *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(3): 242–253.
- Hultin, L. and Mähring, M. (2014). "Visualizing institutional logics in sociomaterial practices," *Information and Organization*, 24: 129–155.
- Hsu, G. and Grodal, S. (2015). "Category Taken-for-grantedness as a Strategic Opportunity: The Case of Light Cigarettes, 1964-1993," *American Sociological Review*, 80(1): 28–62.
- Jay, J. (2013). "Navigating Paradox as a Mechanism of Change and Innovation in Hybrid Organizations," *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1): 137–159.

- Jensen, M. (2006). "Legitimizing illegitimacy: Identity spaces and markets for illegitimate products." Manuscript, University of Michigan, <http://www.chicagobooth.edu/research/workshops/orgs-markets/docs/jensen-legitimacy.pdf> (accessed April 24, 2017).
- Johansson, M. and Näslund, L. (2009). "Welcome to Paradise. Customer experience design and emotional labour on a cruise ship," *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 3(1): 40–55.
- Johansson, U. and Woodilla, J. (2005). *Irony and Organizations: Epistemological Claims and Support Field Stories*, Stockholm: Liber.
- Jones, C., Boxenbaum, E., and Anthony, C. (2013). "The immateriality of the material in institutional logics," *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 39: 51–75.
- Kraatz, M. S. and Block, E. S. (2008). "Organizational implications of institutional pluralism." In *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R., and Sahlin-Andersson, K. (Eds.). London: Sage.
- Leffler, T and Thorén Björling, S. (2011). "... och det går bra för svenska konstnärer," *Dagens Nyheter*, May 19, 2011. Retrieved from: <http://www.dn.se/kultur-noje/-och-det-gar-bra-for-svenska-konstnarer#>
- Lounsbury, M. (2007). "A Tale of Two Cities: Competing Logics and Practice Variation in The Professionalization of Mutual Funds," *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 289–307.
- Löfgren, O. and Willim, R. (Eds.) (2005). *Magic, Culture and the New Economy*. Oxford: Berg.
- Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. (1977). "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony," *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2): 340–63.
- Nickson, D., Warhurst, C., Witz, A., and Cullen, A-M. (2001). "The Importance of being Aesthetic: Work, Employment and Service Organisation." In *Customer Service. Empowerment and Entrapment*. Sturdy, A., Grugulis, I., and Willmott, H. (Eds.). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Pache, A-C. and Santos, F. (2013), "Inside Hybrid Organizations: Selective Coupling as a Response to Competing Institutional Logics," *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4): 972–1001.
- Rao, H., Monin, P., and Durand, R. (2003). "Institutional change in toque ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy," *American Journal of Sociology*, 108: 795–843.
- Reay, T. and Hinings, C. R. (2009). "Managing the Rivalry of Competing Institutional Logics," *Organization Studies*, 30(6): 629–652.
- Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., and Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional Change and Healthcare Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stenström, E. (2000). *Konstiga företag*. EFI: Stockholm.

- Swedish Government [online], available from: <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/12/03/32/e6ab6539.pdf> (originally published September 10, 2009).
- Thompson, D. (2008). *The \$12 Million Stuffed Shark: The Curious Economics of Contemporary Art*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*, Redwood City: Stanford University Press.
- Thornton, P. H., Jones, C., and Kury, K. (2005), "Institutional Logics and Institutional Change: Transformation in Accounting, Architecture, and Publishing." In *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. Jones, C. and Thornton, P. H. (Eds.). London: JAI: 125–170.
- Thornton, P. H. and Ocasio, W. (1999). "Institutional Logics and the Historical Contingency of Power in Organizations: Executive Succession in the Higher Education Publishing System, 1958-1990," *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3): 801–843.
- Thornton, P. H. and Ocasio, W. (2008). "Institutional Logics." In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., and Suddaby, R. (Eds.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Thornton, P.H., Ocasio, W., and Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: Foundations, research, and theoretical elaboration*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thornton, S. (2008). *Seven Days in the Art World*. New York: WW Norton.
- Vanity Fair [online], available at: <http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2011/05/top-one-percent-201105> (originally published in May 2011).
- Velthuis, O. (2003). "Symbolic meanings of prices: Constructing the value of contemporary art in Amsterdam and New York galleries," *Theory and Society*, 32: 181–215.
- Velthuis, O. (2008). *Talking prices, symbolic meanings of prices on the market for contemporary art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wikberg, E. and Bomark, N. (2015). "Managing Competing Logics Through Situational Irony," *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 8(4): 649–678.
- Wikberg, E., Stenström, E., and Strannegård, L. (2017). "Architects at Work: Four Organizational Models as Reflections and Responses to an Organizational Field with Plural Institutional Logics." Submitted for possible publication in *Organization*.
- Wikberg, E. and Strannegård, L. (2012). "Demarcations and Dirty Money: Financing New Private Contemporary Art Institutions in Sweden," *Homo Oeconomicus*, 29(3): 95–118.
- Wikberg, E. and Strannegård, L. (2014). "Selling By Numbers: The Quantification and Marketization of the Swedish Art World for Contemporary Art," *Organizational Aesthetics*, 3(1): 19–41.
- Wikberg, E. (2017) "Reframing Art and Advertising: Materiality, Stigma and Strange Loops in Institutional Logics." Submitted for possible publication in *Scandinavian Journal of Management*.

Part 2: The articles