SECTION 4

LOCALIZING THE MACROFOUNDATIONAL

CHAPTER 5

FIGHTING 'FACTORY FICTION': THE EVOLUTION OF A MARGINALISED INSTITUTIONAL LOGIC IN UK TRADE BOOK PUBLISHING

Isabel Brüggemann, Jochem Kroezen and Paul Tracey

ABSTRACT

This study gives insights into how marginalised logics evolve after having been replaced by a new dominant logic. In light of the case of UK trade book publishing where an editorial logic persisted and morphed after the increasing commercialisation of the field – epitomised by the proliferation of so-called 'factory fiction' – the authors identify three generative paths of marginalised logic evolution: preservation, purification and radicalisation. The authors show how these paths hinge on the activities of three groups of actors who resist conforming to a dominant logic. The findings of this study advance their understanding of the historical evolution of institutional logics, but also remind them that the acts of resistance are typically embedded in macro-level dynamics related to broader institutional processes. In particular, this study sheds light on the different ways in which acts of resistance may be structured by actors' experience of friction between competing institutional logics.

Keywords: Institutional logics; institutional change; marginalisation; resistance; radicalisation; purification

INTRODUCTION

While previous research has paid extensive attention to how organisational fields evolve when there is a shift in dominant logics, relatively little research has considered what may happen to logics after they become marginalised. The findings of various studies suggest that marginalised logics are often preserved in the periphery (Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007; Schneiberg, 2007) or may even be revived after decomposition (Kroezen & Heugens, 2018). In these instances, there appears to be a long-term symbiotic dynamic among field-level logics that can inspire entrepreneurship and innovation through recombination (cf. Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). Yet, we lack theory to explain what may happen to the logics that are seemingly left behind in the wake of a shift towards a new dominant logic.

In this chapter, we address one aspect of this question by exploring how a marginalised logic evolves when field actors actively resist conformity to a dominant logic. Drawing on a case of the UK trade book publishing industry, which offers an ideal setting in which to observe our phenomenon of interest, we find three generative paths of marginalised logic evolution that hinge on the acts of resistance of actors with distinct identities. Specifically, we show how the editorial logic was *preserved*, *purified* or *radicalised*, depending on actors' experience of the friction between the market and the editorial logic in response to increasing commercialisation. While preservation was predominantly enacted by established players concerned about protecting their reputation and prestige, purification and radicalisation mainly emerged from the experimental activities of new actors who either followed their individual creative instincts and passions, or who became activists striving for an intra-logic shift in norms and practices by advocating for the incorporation of altruistic non-profit and social responsibility elements into publishing. Our findings, thus, shed light on the evolution of marginalised logics through acts of resistance, and show how such acts of resistance are structured by macro-level dynamics.

Our study advances our understanding of the historical contingency of institutional logics by conceptualising their possible evolutionary trajectories in the context of an important type of institutional change (cf. Ocasio, Mauskapf, & Steele, 2016). Specifically, we identify and describe the mechanisms of logic preservation, purification and radicalisation that explain how dramatic shifts towards new dominant logics may trigger different generative forms of activity from peripheral actors. Moreover, we use the institutional logics perspective to contribute to multi-level theory of institutional resistance that shows how acts of resistance are embedded in macro structures.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Institutional change in an organisational field is often understood as a change in institutional logics – the taken for granted principles, norms and practices that govern the field and shape organisational behaviour (Ocasio, Thornton, & Lounsbury, 2017; Thornton et al., 2012). Indeed, previous studies across a variety of contexts have shown how a change in dominant institutional logics underlies fundamental

changes in organisational populations (Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Haveman & Rao, 1997; Lounsbury & Pollack, 2001; Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003; Thornton, 2001, 2002). Field-level logics can be observed when actors collectively use similar sets of normative and cognitive schemas to make sense of and give sense to their context. For example, under an institutionalised market logic, actors in the publishing industry give normative and cognitive primacy to competition and financial market value over collaboration and the construction of a long-term legacy, which has important implications for field structure (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999).

Increasingly, scholars are also attending to the heterogeneity and complexity in field-level institutional logics that endures even after fields have seemingly settled around a dominant logic (Lounsbury, 2007; Reay & Hinings, 2005; Townley, 1997). Rather than assuming a binary shift in operating principles, this work shows that organisational fields tend to be messier and that institutional changes are often more subtle, incomplete and/or complex than is typically portrayed in existing accounts. While there are multiple reasons to expect that organisational fields are inherently pluralistic, one important reason may be the resistance put up by field actors that are unwilling to conform to one dominant logic. Research across a variety of organisational fields has shown how, once a new dominant logic emerges or is imposed, field actors who experience marginalisation may engage in various forms of such resistance rather than switching logics. These actors may follow passive forms of resistance, such as symbolic and partial adoption (Townley, 1997), or dormancy and abeyance (Kozhikode, 2016; Taylor, 1989). They may also engage in more active resistance, such as through new organisational founding (Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007), or even by inspiring larger-scale counter-movements (Simons, Vermeulen, & Knoben, 2016). Yet, while this research has advanced our understanding of the forms of action at the fringes of fields that can have important field-level outcomes, little research has considered how the dynamics of domination and resistance may impact the relevant institutional logics themselves.

This is an important issue as the ways in which marginalised logics are maintained or edited are likely to influence their subsequent evolution as well as that of the field in general. For instance, we may expect that marginalised logics that are strictly preserved will eventually decompose and dwindle while marginalised logics that are edited or updated may eventually resurge. However, empirical research that explicitly examines this issue is lacking. While previous work has identified different types of changes in field-level institutional logics, such as logic blending or logic segregation (Thornton et al., 2012), we lack theory that systematically looks at intra-logic evolution (cf. Ocasio, Mauskapf, & Steele, 2016) and more specifically at how marginalised institutional logics may evolve.

Such theory also provides an opportunity to examine how micro-acts of resistance are embedded in social structures at the macro-level. Previous research has shown how resistance is often structured by the presence of competing logics (Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007) as well as the nature of social relationships within and between communities (Simons et al., 2016). Less well understood, however, is how such macro-level structures may shape different resistance trajectories and ultimately different paths of logic evolution.

Thus, we address the following research question: How does a marginalised logic evolve when actors resist conformity to a new dominant logic?

THE UK TRADE BOOK PUBLISHING INDUSTRY[1]

The UK book publishing industry provides an ideal case to study the evolution of a marginalised logic through the resistance of actors in various field positions. The industry has recently experienced a dramatic increase in market concentration, which led to a situation in which 50% of the market share came under the control of only four publishing groups[2] (Booksellers Association, 2015), and an historical shift in regard to the factors that influence publication decision-making. For a long time, the role of book publishers had been as 'gatekeepers against the complete commercialization of ideas' (Packer, 2014): they ensured the literary quality of books and provided new talent with a platform to develop. Yet, bestseller lists from several countries over the past four decades reveal a transformation in publishing: listed titles increasingly come from popular genres and from the same bestselling authors, and increasingly lack recognition from literary critics (Verboord, 2011). In this section, we provide an overview of the historical trends which led to an increased dominance of the market logic and marginalisation of the editorial logic in Anglo-American book publishing.

Historical Developments

In the 1950s, the UK book publishing industry was dominated by approximately 50 privately owned medium-sized publishers (Clark & Phillips, 2014). By the 1970s, market concentration in both the UK and US publishing industries had begun to increase. At the same time, a stronger emphasis on market-orientated norms, reflected in a dominant focus on increasing profits and gaining competitive advantage, had started to spread (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). Andrew Schiffrin, editor at *Random House* when the company was acquired by the *Radio Corporation of America* in 1965, stated that 'in time, the rules were changed […] and each book was expected to make a sufficient contribution both to overhead and to profit' (Schiffrin, 2001, p. 73). Importantly, with the growing influence of a market logic (see Table 1 for a detailed depiction), new practices started to occupy a dominant status within the industry.

First, a clearer distinction started to be made between the creation of content by the author and its revision by the editor, as a number of publishing houses began to outsource their editorial services (Thompson, 2012). Relatedly, editors at corporate publishers started to experience pressures to spend less time focussing on building personal relationships with their authors (Epstein, 2001). Importantly, this led to a marginalisation of practices associated with an editorial logic in publishing: nurturing personal networks between authors and editors was no longer a priority or encouraged at publishing houses (see Table 1). Second, the opinions of marketing and sales staff about the commercial potential of manuscripts were given increasing weight in decisions on the titles to be taken on. As a result, many publishing houses effectively eliminated editorial independence (Greco, Milliot, & Wharton, 2014).

Table 1. The Market Logic and Three Instantiations of the Editorial Logic in UK Trade Book Publishing (Market Logic and Preserved Editorial Logic Based on Thornton, 2002).

	Market Logic	*Preserved* Editorial Logic (Traditionalists)	*Purified* Editorial Logic (Idealists)	*Radicalised* Editorial Logic (Activists)
Organisational identity	Publishing as business	Publishing as profession	Publishing as vocation	Publishing as social activism
Legitimacy	Market position	Personal reputation	Creative expression	Social responsibility
	Rank in performance	Rank in hierarchy	Individual passion	Morality
Authority structures	CEO	Founder–editor	Founder–editor	Founder-editor
	Corporate parent firm	Personal networks	Personal networks	Personal networks
	Public ownership	Private ownership	Private ownership	Private ownership
Mission	Build competitive position	Build prestige of house	Spread creative ideas	Spread morally important, underrepresented ideas
	Increase profits	Increase sales	Ensure diversity of literary field	Spark societal debates
Focus of attention	Resource competition	Author–editor networks	Author–editor networks	Networks between publishers
Strategy	Acquisition growth	Organic growth	Follow instincts and passions	Find likeminded allies
	Build market channels	Build personal imprints	Enable creativity	Establish social movement
				Disregard profits
Prototypical cases		P3, P7, P11	P16, P20, P24	P23, P31, P33

By contrast, under the editorial logic, editors enjoyed important decision-making authority and publication decisions were often driven by developing the prestige rather than competitive position of the publishing house (see Table 1).

The increased dominance of the market logic and growing marginalisation of the editorial logic in the practices of publishing houses was evident in a dramatic change of literary content appearing in the market. In particular, independent publishers bought by larger corporate publishers began to publish substantially different books from those published prior to their acquisition. Connors, Henry, and Reader's (1985) case study of *Harry N. Abrams* – a small fine arts publisher that started to publish non-arts books reflective of a 'popular culture' after its acquisition by *Times Mirror Company* – vividly portrays larger publishers' increased attention to the bottom line. Indeed, in the 1980s and 1990s, the argument emerged that corporate publishing houses often directed their efforts solely towards books expected to sell particularly well (Coser, 1984; Moran, 1997). An important effect was that new, unknown authors started to face substantial difficulties in entering the market (Bekken, 1997).

Further illustrating this development, bestselling titles have become increasingly similar (Feather & Woodbridge, 2007; Sorensen, 2007): one can observe a gradual

increase in genre fiction and the use of the serial format over the past four decades (Verboord, 2011), which, being more 'formula driven' than other formats (Davis, 2006), more straightforwardly allows for judgements on profitability. This approach is also increasingly followed in the non-fiction domain, where series such as *The Economist Guide* – a collection of books on several management related topics – have emerged. In poetry, more and more commissioned anthologies are coming out of predominantly larger publishing houses. They often include poems that are written or selected to be relatable to a currently popular theme, predetermined by the compiler. In sum, historical developments in Anglo-American book publishing point to an increased emphasis on commercial factors. Overall, this may be described as a field-level shift towards a dominant market logic (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999).

Institutional Pressures for Market Logic Compliance

By 2018, the year we conducted our study, the dominance of a market logic in UK trade book publishing was evident in two important institutional pressures for publishing houses to conform to market-related expectations. First, publishers experienced pressures from retailers, who had gained increasing power due to concentration and showed themselves increasingly unwilling to stock titles that could not be expected to become bestsellers. Their central buying departments predominantly followed clear market-orientated selection criteria. For example, at the London Book Fair 2016, the CEO of the UK's largest book retailer admitted that their poetry section was 'not brilliant, [but] based on what people want to buy' (excerpt from field notes). In cases where retailers did take on titles that did not have bestseller potential publishers were well aware that these titles would most likely be displayed in the back of a store where they were less visible to customers and, therefore, less likely to be sold.

Furthermore, publishers experienced pressure to conform to a market logic from the Arts Council England, where fiction and poetry publishers who lacked sufficient funds could apply for funding. A recent addition to requirements for funding applications involved the need to include a clear description of the market potential of the titles publishers intended to publish with the funds, as well as related marketing plans.[3] As such, publishers had a substantially higher chance of securing funding in cases where their titles indicated a high market potential. Publishers interviewed for this study reported that they felt obliged to pitch their titles by, for instance, highlighting the potential of an author based on her or his previous successes.

Independent Book Publishers in the UK

Interestingly, however, the increasing pressures to conform to a market logic in the UK book publishing industry had not led to a decline in 'independent publishers' (smaller publishing houses without ties to a corporate publisher). On the contrary, the number of independent publishers rose from 430 in 2009 to over 600 in 2018.[4] Many of the more recently founded independent publishing houses we interviewed (mostly those founded in the last decade of the twentieth century and later, the majority of our sample[5]) were highly dependent on Arts Council funding and the appearance of their titles in retail stores due to comparatively fewer resources and market power.

For instance, the co-founder of a new publishing house we interviewed for this study described these pressures as follows: 'we have to think harder why we believe these are important books that people would be interested in'. The publishing director of another house spoke of experiencing 'a balancing act between how much we want to expand and how much we want to maintain our unique identity'.

Both funding bodies and corporate retailers were, thus, important sources of pressure for conformity to the market logic for these publishers. Yet, in a large-scale study of Anglo-American trade publishing, Thompson (2012) found that independent publishers, unlike corporate publishers, do not have a primary focus on mainstream fiction and non-fiction. This suggests that small independent publishers follow a different approach to publishing from that pursued by the majority of corporate publishing houses.

It is important to point out that this approach is not simply part of a differentiation strategy, but rather appears to be an active constituent in the identity construction of independent publishers in an environment dominated by market-orientated norms. For example, a literary agent working with both independent and corporate publishers told us that independent houses resist publishing 'factory fiction' and largely pride themselves on their resistance. Our study focussed on the responses of these independent publishers in the UK to the increased commercialisation of trade book publishing and how this affected the evolution of the marginalised editorial logic.

DATA AND METHODS

The study follows a qualitative approach to generate in-depth insights into how the editorial logic was maintained and/or changed by the various actors who resisted conformity to the dominant market logic. Our main data sources include 36 semi-structured in-depth interviews (P1–P36) with editors and managing directors of 35 UK-based independent publishing houses (for details of our sample, see Table 2), which were between 20 and 60 minutes long and conducted between February and July 2015, as well as observations of two major industry events in 2016: the London Book Fair and an international publishers' forum in Berlin. When attending these events, the first author listened to formal discussions, participated in informal networking and took extensive field notes. While we used the interviews to gain detailed insights into independent publishers' perspectives on industry developments and their positioning in context of the latter, observations of industry events and informal conversations engaged in at the latter helped us to support our emerging interpretations. Moreover, we collected rich historical accounts, including memoirs of prominent editors and historical industry publications, as well as material from the websites of the 35 publishers (using the 'way-back machine'), comprising about 1,100 pages of archival material in total. These accounts were particularly helpful in advancing our understanding of the historical foundations of the editorial logic in book publishing.

We analysed our data inductively in a series of steps (following Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013), as outlined below. We used the qualitative data analysis software *NVivo 11* to support this process.

Table 2.   List of Independent Publishing Houses and Interviewees Included in
Sample (Sorted by Foundation Year).

Pseudonym	Type of Publishing Company	Organisational Identity	Foundation Year	Position of Interviewee
P1	Fiction & Non-Fiction (Christian)	Traditionalist	1698	CEO
P2	Fiction & Non-Fiction (Christian)	Traditionalist	Late eighteenth century	Managing Director
P3	Fiction & Non-Fiction	Traditionalist	1951	Sales & Marketing Director
P4	Non-Fiction	Traditionalist	1968	Publishing Director
P5	Non-Fiction (Area Studies and Global Affairs)	Traditionalist	1969	Senior Editor
P6	Fiction & Poetry	Traditionalist	1973	Founder & Editor
P7	Fiction & Non-Fiction	Traditionalist	1974	Managing Director
P8	Fiction	Traditionalist	1975	Managing Director
P9	Fiction & Poetry	Traditionalist	1977	Managing Director & Editor
P10	Poetry	Traditionalist	1979	Founder & Editor
P11	Fiction & Non-Fiction	Traditionalist	1986	Senior Commissioning Editor
P12	Poetry	Traditionalist	1986	Business Manager
P13	Poetry	Idealist	1993	Managing Director & Editor
P14	Non-Fiction	Idealist	1996	Publishing Director
P15	Fiction & Non-Fiction (Jewish Culture and Poetry)	Idealist	1996	Managing Director & Editor
P16	Fiction & Poetry	Idealist	1999	Founder & Director
P17	Non-Fiction (Environmental)	Idealist	2003	Publicity & Marketing Director
P18	Fiction	Idealist	2005	Managing Director
P19	Poetry	Idealist	2005	Founder & Editor
P20	Fiction	Idealist	2006	Founder & Editor
P21	Fiction	Idealist	2006	Founder & Editor
P22	Fiction & Poetry	Activist	2008	Editor
P23	Poetry	Activist	2009	Co-Founder & Editor I
P24	Poetry	Idealist	2009	Co-Founder & Editor II
P25	Fiction	Idealist	2010	Founder & Editor
P26	Fiction & Non-Fiction	Idealist	2010	Founder & Editor
P27	Poetry	Activist	2010	Founder & Editor
P28	Non-Fiction (Children & Nature)	Idealist	2011	Founder & Editor
P29	Fiction	Traditionalist	2011	Founder & Editor
P30	Fiction	Idealist	2011	Director & Editor
P31	Fiction	Activist	2012	Founder & Editor
P32	Fiction	Activist	2012	Founder & Editor
P33	Poetry	Activist	2012	Founder & Editor
P34	Fiction & Poetry	Activist	2012	Founder & Editor
P35	Fiction (Children)	Activist	2014	Founder & Editor
P36	Fiction	Activist	2015	Founder & Director

Identification of first-order categories: In a first step, we developed first-order categories through open coding. This involved looking across interview transcripts and field notes, as well as the archival material we collected, to generate categories that were close to the data. We coded for perceptions and behaviours of publishers that broadly seemed to indicate opposition to dominant industry norms as propagated through the market logic in publishing.

Identification of second-order themes: In a next step, we clustered similar first-order categories together and reduced them into second-order themes. These themes related to unstructured organisational practices that we interpreted as reflecting resistance to the market logic. During this step, two broad domains of resistance were identified: the maintenance of marginalised norms and practices, and the invention of alternative norms and practices.

Identification of aggregate dimensions: Finally, we related the different forms of resistance to alternative paths of marginalised logic evolution. During this step, we became aware of three distinct underlying patterns with particular forms of resistance having distinct effects on the editorial logic. This led ultimately to the development of three more abstract theoretical dimensions, each of which represented a discrete path, that we labelled logic preservation, logic purification and logic radicalisation.

The data structure that emerged from our analysis is shown in Table 3. Overall, our analysis enabled the development of theory on the ways in which different

Table 3. Data Structure.

First-order Categories	Second-order Themes	Aggregate Dimensions
A. Developing close author-editor relations B. Giving editors more say than marketing and sales staff	1. Maintaining professional practices	PRESERVATION OF MARGINALISED LOGIC
C. Publishing as a prestigious profession D. Publishers as literary gatekeepers	2. Conserving old sources of legitimacy	
E. Literary field lacks diversity F. Literary diversity is essential for the development of culture	3. Necessitating literary diversity	PURIFICATION OF MARGINALISED LOGIC
G. There is no formula for making publication decisions H. Successes come unexpectedly	4. Decision-making based on instincts	
I. Editors are given freedom to introduce new ideas J. Editors give priority to their own passions	5. Making room for creative expression	
K. Some important ideas are underrepresented in literature L. Publishers carry social responsibility to spread underrepresented ideas	6. Introducing social responsibility to the field of publishing	RADICALISATION OF MARGINALISED LOGIC
M. Acknowledging the work of other independents N. Setting up collaborations with other independents	7. Excluding notion of competition between publishers	
O. Formulating a common objective P. Choosing morals over profit	8. Eliminating profit-making	

groups resist conforming to a dominant logic, and the effects of these activities on the evolution of a marginalised logic at the field level.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE MARGINALISED EDITORIAL LOGIC IN UK TRADE BOOK PUBLISHING

Our analysis connects institutional resistance activities across a varied set of field actors with different paths of marginalised logic evolution. In this section, we illustrate three paths of marginalised logic evolution – preservation, purification and radicalisation – emerging from the resistance enacted by three groups of publishers (traditionalists, idealists and activists). Table 1 summarises the differences between the market logic and the three instantiations of the editorial logic that we describe in more detail below.

Path 1: Preservation of the Editorial Logic

The first path of marginalised logic evolution that we identified is its preservation. In the field of UK trade book publishing, preservation of the editorial logic (in the form of *publishing as profession*) is predominantly (but not solely) enacted by traditionalists, old and established independent publishing houses (see Table 1 for prototypical cases from our sample). These publishers are mostly interested in protecting their reputation (in front of authors, readers and critics) and conserving long-established values in the field of publishing. In this section, we first describe traditionalists' activities of resistance and then discuss how they relate to logic preservation.

Traditionalists: maintaining professional practices: First, traditionalists continue to deal with authors in person. They frequently have meetings with them, seeking their opinions to incorporate them in their amendments to the text and establish authors' 'trust' in the operations of the publishing house (P14). As a result of these close interactions, authors and editors tend to know each other personally by the time of publishing a book:

> When we're dealing with authors, everyone in the company will get to know them, so there is a lot more of a family, collaborative atmosphere. (P7)

Closely catering to the needs of authors has in the past given publishing the reputation of a 'gentlemanly trade' (Coser, Kadushin, & Powell, 1982). It is this tradition that traditionalists seek to uphold. Second, contrary to common industry practice, the most influential people in the publication decision-making process remain the editors. This is often done in direct opposition to the practices of corporate publishers, as described by the senior editor at a non-fiction publishing house:

> At some of the corporate publishers you [the editor] have to expect to sell 10,000 copies of a book, otherwise they [management] won't be interested [in it]. Whereas we might do a quirky book, where we have a bit more leeway to take it on and which, at a corporate publisher, would be seen as too small. (P11)

Traditionalists: conserving old sources of legitimacy: The above-outlined practices are connected to an understanding of publishing as a prestigious profession. Benett Cerf, founder of Random House, described his rationale for the

publication of an at-first poorly selling poetry collection by Robinson Jeffers in the 1930s in the following terms: 'Jeffers always sold well enough to make a little money. There was no real money in it, but great prestige'.[6] A similar motive survives in the decision-making of traditionalists, who seek to produce good art, for which they hope to be recognised throughout the industry. Some publishers described the uniqueness of their occupation as being rooted in the creative work of editors and directors, who discover 'diamonds from the roughs' (P29).

A key implication of this understanding is that the publisher, engaging in an 'artistic venture' (P27), does not make decisions primarily based on market considerations, but on whether a manuscript can be turned into a piece of artistic value. Traditionalists are, thus, often well aware that they are unable to grow their businesses to a large scale (due to not conforming to the expectations of corporate retailers and the wider industry).

As the concept of artistic value is largely subjective, it is often the case that at the time of discovery, a book is not deemed to be particularly valuable by a majority. One example comes from an independent publisher (P3), who, in the 1950s, published an author whom no one truly believed in and even shied away from at the time, due to the mostly controversial content of his work:

> We looked at it, we knew it had something […] we were going to publish him, and I was advised that we'd be sued if I went ahead.[7]

In 2015, the newly hired marketing director of the same firm (P3) still described the company's approach to selecting titles in the following way: it feels like being 'in a tiny little ship that's fighting its way through some very unfavourable waters'. Overall, traditionalists' attitudes date back to a time when publishing was considered to be a professional and intellectual activity (Escaprit, 1966) and the role of publishers was to ensure literary quality (Coser, 1975). This is reflected in publications that the managing director of one house described as 'adventurous' (P8) and an editor at another house as 'brave' and 'unexpected' (P6). Overall, traditionalists' activities can be linked to the maintenance of the previously dominant, but now marginalised, editorial logic.

Marginalised Logic Evolution through Preservation

At the field level, these practices indicate a persistence of the current status quo where the survival of the marginalised editorial logic is dependent on the success of independent publishers that are clinging onto the original norms and practices. Interestingly, this can also be observed in the larger corporate houses. As many of them have roots in the 'editorial logic era', the editorial norms and practices have been imprinted onto their organisations and not always completely abandoned with shifts towards the market logic. For instance, some of the older corporate houses still continue to build their prestige through small literary imprints,[8] whose titles reflect a more artistic mission than the majority of their other titles. Editors working at these imprints are given more freedom in choosing content that would not fit into a more commercial list (Jones, 2016). Very often the imprints are

established from the work of acquired smaller independent publishing houses (Roback, 2014), whom larger corporates turn to when looking for new literary fiction that would not come out of more mainstreamed decision-making processes (Duffy, 2015). Small independent publishers' resistance in the form of a preservation of the editorial logic, thus, over time, appears to have contributed to its maintained presence in the industry.

Path 2: Purification of the Editorial Logic

The second path of evolution of the marginalised editorial logic that we observe is its purification (in the form of a shift towards *publishing as vocation*). We find that small independent publishers interested in spreading literary diversity and developing new, unrecognised talent refine and, more specifically, purify editorial norms in publishing to adapt them to their more idealistic mission. In our sample, these include more recently founded publishing houses or established publishing houses, which changed their path to work in opposition to dominant industry practices (see Table 1 for prototypical cases). The founders or directors of these houses are predominantly motivated by pursuing their individual passions and aspire creatively to express themselves through publishing as an art form, rather than building prestige. For example, one founder, who was passionate about finding and publishing fiction set in Northern England where he grew up, described how more established publishers sometimes turn up their noses at his publications: 'who would be interested in a working class [fictional] character from the North?' For the founder, setting up his own publishing house was an opportunity to follow his individual passion. In this section, we describe idealists' activities of resistance and how they relate to logic purification.

Idealists: necessitating literary diversity: Besides clashes between market-based and artistic considerations, Anglo-American book publishing has historically experienced other sources of tension. In the 1920s, many new independent houses were formed to spread the idea of literary modernism, associated with experimental writing and a break with traditional formats and styles, which established 'old-line houses' did not welcome at the time (Epstein, 2001). These new independents pioneered modernist literature and 'championed avant-garde writers' in whom they passionately believed (Epstein, 2001, p. 9), such as Virginia Woolf and James Joyce. Their revolution resembles that of many small independent houses today that are convinced that dominant industry practices challenge literary diversity and individual creative expression.

A dominant critique made by idealists is that corporate publishers are adopting a formula that will produce a bestseller – reflective of a 'slight arrogance of what the reader will like' (P20) – thereby making it cumbersome for more experimental writers to enter the market, resulting in a lack of variety of titles that can 'inspire' readers (P34). The founder of a recently established publishing house (P20) stated that he knows 'so many wonderful writers that are having great difficulties in getting published'. Idealists are convinced that spreading literary diversity is the purpose of publishing as an art form. This was formulated by the co-founder of a poetry publishing house (P23) in the following way:

> I think society and culture can only benefit from lots of people doing lots of different things, not from having a really small bunch of people who are the leaders and everyone reads them. […] I mean the point of it all should be to have lots of literature, lots of good quality literature available for people to read and digest, because reading shapes who you are, shapes you as an individual. And it would be rubbish, if it was all just very limited.

The argument of a lack of diversity in literature, characteristic of a culture that lacks a richness of ideas, serves the purpose of necessitating alternative, non-formulaic practices in book publishing that enable publishers to follow their passions. Neither the market nor preserved editorial logic (focussed more on building prestige) explicitly takes into account publishers' individual creative expressions, whose heterogeneity can enable literary diversity.

Idealists: decision-making based on instincts: As described above, small independent publishers often depend financially on grants, such as those offered by the Arts Council England. When applying they are pressured to pitch the commercial potential of their titles. As a consequence, independent publishers could be expected to at least partly to rely on market-based considerations. Yet, being guided by their individual creative expressions, idealists amend existing industry approaches to incorporate them. Their approach of refining publishing practices starts with neglecting routines and formula, following their subjective instincts, which they find 'difficult to put into words' (P36). The founder of a small poetry press described it as 'you've got to have a good feeling about it' (P33), another fiction publisher as 'you kind of just know it the minute you read something' (P36). An instinctive approach to publication decision-making implies that no title is overlooked on the basis of poor sales estimates because it cannot be categorised in a popular genre, or due to an apparent lack of prestige.

As a result, successes come fairly unexpectedly to idealists. In fact, an appeal of certain titles to a wider audience is often not assumed. One poetry and fiction publishing house (P16), established in 1999, won the Man Booker Prize for a book chosen by one of their editors who, in the words of the founder, 'always finds amazing books', that are, however, very often not commercial. In this particular case, they did not expect a wide readership and were immensely surprised that the title went on to sell in high volumes and was also recognised by literary critics. Yet, idealists publish certain titles despite poor sales' estimates not because they expect prestige for the publishing house (as noticeable in the approach of traditionalists). The logic followed by idealists is rather a *purified* one in comparison with the preserved editorial logic (see Table 1): the legitimacy of their publication decisions is derived from their personal instincts and passions. Their motives in publishing are 'purer' in the sense that publishers act like artists focussed on individual creative expression, rather than their own prestige (although the latter might develop as a result of their activities).

Idealists: making room for creative expression: Finally, linked to instinctive decision-making is an explicit emphasis on creativity in the daily operations of idealists. Commissioning editors and publishing directors are actively encouraged to bring in their own ideas for new titles. One publishing director, who had recently joined an independent non-fiction house (P14) from a corporate publisher, said that he now had to attend fewer meetings with the editorial and marketing team,

giving him 'more time to come up with original ideas for books [and] to build new relationships with new authors'. His new employer is a typical example of an idealist, putting creativity at the forefront of its operations. Editors are enabled to set their own criteria for the selection of titles, rather than first having to justify their approach to sales and marketing teams. In turn, these editors give priority to their own passions when selecting titles for publication. The fascination a work holds for them often makes them strong advocates of something that might not otherwise have been published:

> Our primary questions are not who someone is, or whether something is going to make it into the supermarkets. Rather, it's whether this is an author we want, a novel we love. If the answer is yes on both counts – then, no matter how challenging a read the book is or how obscure the author, we will set about bringing it to the widest possible public. (P31, website)

When describing their missions, for example, on their websites, idealists point out their drastic opposition to corporate houses and the latter's approach to publishing that they regard as of inferior quality. As one can read on the website of a small fiction publisher: 'if you are looking for orange-headed celebrity books, you've probably come to the wrong place' (P20). All in all, the instinctive and creative practices of idealists support the publication of titles for an inherently artistic purpose. For idealists, publishing is not merely a profession, but rather a vocation or craft, whereby publishers pursue their personal interests and passions that lead them to follow more idealistic objectives than primarily increasing profit or building the prestige of the house.

Marginalised Logic Evolution through Purification

Observed at the field level, the purified editorial logic, nurtured by idealists, is not new. It rather describes a shift in how the editorial logic is embodied: it is rooted in norms and values that entered the field of publishing at a time when the editorial logic was still dominant. For instance, like traditionalists, idealists focus a substantial amount of their efforts on building close networks with, often unrecognised, authors. Yet, their idealistic and highly passionate motives behind their instinctive and creative approach show that idealists see themselves and act as if following a vocation rather than a profession. They have enriched the preserved editorial logic with more idealistic, 'purified' conceptions of publishing as an art form through increasing tensions between the literary and commercial realm in publishing. For example, following instincts and passions is at odds with and cannot be pursued through building a competitive position in the market, which often requires a substantial focus on mainstream fiction and non-fiction (see Table 1). Instead, a focus on creative expression in publishing means that diversity becomes a key feature of the literary field, as publishers follow their subjective instincts and individual passions.

The purification of the editorial logic has enabled idealists to occupy a noticeable niche in the industry. Today, publishers receive awards for taking an approach that is 'very different from mainstream publishing', as reflected in those for 'offering a platform for new and emerging writers'.[9] The British Book Industry Awards of recent years praised publishers for being 'passionate' and sticking to authors

they 'believe in'.[10] These practices are in stark contrast to those of corporate houses publishing new literary fiction through the acquired work of independent houses (thereby adhering more to the preserved editorial logic) rather than sourcing new, unrecognised talent themselves by following their gut instincts and passions. Overall, as idealists are recognised as important agents in the development of the field, norms associated with a purified editorial logic in publishing have started to spread throughout the industry. As such, in comparison to preservation, purification is a process that can contribute to field-level changes.

Path 3: Radicalisation of Editorial Logic

Finally, as a third path of marginalised logic evolution, we identify the radicalisation of the editorial logic (in the form of a shift towards *publishing as social activism*). We find that some of the more recently established independent publishing houses (referred to in this study as 'activists', see Table 1 for prototypical cases) form a movement, in which a commercial motive in publishing is *entirely* removed and replaced by a social responsibility to focus on particularly important topics underrepresented in fiction, poetry or non-fiction. The founders of these publishing houses are neither motivated by prestige nor creative expression, but by spreading moral values which they believe to be diminished or under attack in society. As a result, they make explicitly moral choices when choosing an author or deciding on the content of a publication, as we show below. In this section, we first describe activists' forms of resistance and then illustrate how they relate to logic radicalisation.

Activists: introducing social responsibility to the field of publishing: Underlying the activities of activists is the conviction that some morally important ideas are underrepresented in literature. An increasing number of small independent publishers are convinced that publishers need to exercise not just a cultural, but also a social responsibility for spreading underrepresented ideas. An example is a small fiction publishing house (P31), founded in 2012. The director of this house described the recent publication of a novel that he brought out despite strong concerns regarding its appeal to a wider audience. It was a dark, unusual story of a deeply disturbed and paranoid man that he thought could be perceived by readers as too intense and difficult to process:

> The next book we've got coming out in October, we almost didn't dare to publish it. We thought it was too difficult to explain and to market. But actually, we thought: No – this is exactly why we are here: to publish it.

The publishing house is a typical example of an activist: its perceived social responsibility is constituted in enhancing societal awareness of underrepresented themes in literature, in this case fiction on psychological illness. At another publisher (P23), focussed on small poetry collections, a sense of social responsibility was behind the commission of a collection of works by poets from different ethnic backgrounds:

> We wanted to say that poetry publishing could be different, it could be lots of poets working on something together. […] It's about mixing it up, making people realize that there is an alternative way of doing things.

The social responsibility of spreading morally important, underrepresented ideas in literature constitutes a new value in the field of publishing. It is different from pursuing individual passions, as following a social responsibility means selecting work primarily based on its potential to spark important societal debates, rather than creative merit.

Activists: excluding notion of competition between publishers: Guided by the mission to build a platform for revolutionary ideas, activists have realised that collaboration with others is required to establish such a platform. They have, thus, started to acknowledge the work of other, likeminded independent publishers by drawing parallels in their mission statements. The founder of a recently established fiction publishing house (P31) said:

> There are a lot more independent publishers like us […] We don't really set ourselves up in opposition to [these] publishers and what they're doing. I value what they're doing.

Some independent publishing houses have even started to collaborate with likeminded publishers. At one poetry publisher (P33), collaboration with another independent house took the form of weekly phone calls, during which they exchanged views on general developments in the industry, as well as their publication plans: 'we just talk about what we are doing, answer each other questions. We share it all' (P33). In a blogpost announcing their collaboration, the two publishers explained that they are 'resistant to the idea of compromising their core values'. In joining forces, activists can exert greater influence on the types of publication entering the market, thereby contributing to a reformation in publishing. They, therefore, do not consider themselves as standing in competition to each other. On the contrary, activists all benefit from the publication of work containing underrepresented, morally important ideas – regardless of who publishes such work: it diffuses the ideal of book publishing that they have subscribed to.

Activists: eliminating profit-making: Gradually emerging from informal collaboration between activists is an alternative, non-profit movement in publishing. Activists' perceived measurement of success is whether through their publications they can have impact upon the ideas that are given attention in the public sphere, such as when their publications have the potential to spark important debates. One founder stated that he does 'not worry whether it sells' if a particular book 'needs to be out there' (P23):

> There is a sense of: what do we want to bring into the world? What do we think should be there? What do we think people should buy because it's a good thing?

Another founder and editor reported that she does not 'expect any of (her) books to sell well', but seeks to publish 'well-written, purposeful books that make the reader think' (P34). In line with a removal of competition between publishers who share ideas is a non-profit approach. The founder of a poetry publishing house (P27) claimed: 'I'm happy if anyone publishes the poetry that should be published'. The type of poetry that 'should' be published, he explained, is that which is currently not popular enough to enter large collections, but contains inspiring ideas. A similar view was held by the owner of a fiction publishing house (P36), who claimed that the publishing of neglected stories is an achievement in itself:

> There are some great stories out there. I'm a reader, I love stories. So it doesn't matter who publishes them, whether I publish them or somebody else. Thank you for the stories.

Overall, activists have paved the way for a social movement within publishing, defined by the collaboration of small independent publishers who do not consider themselves competitors but collaborate to promote work that can expand and/or challenge public discourse.

Marginalised Logic Evolution through Radicalisation

Underlying the collaboration of activists is a *radicalised* interpretation of the editorial logic (see Table 1): while under the preserved editorial logic, competition over resources with other houses has a relatively low level of importance (compared with network-building with authors), activists have entirely removed the notion of competition from their activities. Publishers' mission under the preserved editorial logic of building the prestige of the house has evolved as a far more radical objective of reforming the entire industry into one that serves society. Finally, while commercial elements were still important under the preserved editorial logic in regard to increasing the sales of the house in the long term, they are entirely removed under the radicalised editorial logic. Non-profit publishing houses largely finance themselves through donor support and/or by using any profits made on titles for the production of new work. Combined, the publishing activities followed by activists, using books as generators of ideas, might be compared with those of political or social activist groups raising awareness for a particular cause.

Recently, the movement of activists has started to include other industry players, who sympathise with an independent, non-profit ethos. Among them are freelancers, such as cover-designers and copy editors, who offer their services free to small independent publishers, providing them with an 'economy of favors' (Thompson, 2012, p. 158). The year 2015 saw the inauguration of the Indie Book Day in the UK, a marketing event inaugurated by an alliance of independent bookstores to support independent publishers, many of them being non-profit orientated, and promote their less well-known publications (Campell, 2015). Finally, in 2016, the 'Building Inclusivity in Publishing Conference' was introduced as part of the London Book Fair. A key theme was finding ways to foster the discovery of new and unrepresented writing talent which an increasing number of established publishers appear to regard as their moral responsibility. For instance, participants talked about their 'responsibility to look for different voices' (excerpt from field notes). As more and more industry players start to join the movement, the radicalised editorial logic continues to spread in the field of UK trade book publishing.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to shed light on how an institutional logic can evolve at the field level after it has become marginalised by a new dominant logic. While previous research has acknowledged the often-enduring institutional heterogeneity

of organisational fields (Lounsbury, 2007; Reay & Hinings, 2005; Townley, 1997) and documented dynamics of resistance (e.g. Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007; Simons et al., 2016), we lack research that has integrated both by examining how resistance dynamics may contribute to intra-logic shifts. Our findings advance our understanding of this area by describing how institutional logics may experience preservation, purification or radicalisation after they have been marginalised by a new dominant logic. Relatedly, our study shows how acts of resistance are shaped by and embedded in social structures in the form of competing logics, and leads to important implications for research on the macrofoundation and microfoundation of institutional resistance. We outline each contribution below.

Institutional Resistance through the Preservation, Purification and Radicalisation of Marginalised Logics

The literature on institutional change has shown how field-level changes may result from shifts in institutional logics. The focus of this research has typically been on shifts in societal-level logics where one logic replaces another as the dominant influence in a particular field. More recent research has examined the historical contingency of institutional logics by describing how particular logics evolve (Ocasio, Mauskapf, & Steele, 2016). We extend this work by studying the evolution of a field-level logic after it has been marginalised. Specifically, we identify three possible paths of marginalised logic evolution, with each path distinguished by how the marginalised logic is blended with and segregated from elements of the dominant logic.

First, logic preservation involves the maintenance of marginalised logic elements in their current or preserved form. In this instance, field actors that resist (full) conformity to the dominant logic may continue to cling onto the current elements that they value by either refusing to change, by only engaging in partial or symbolic conformation to the dominant logic (Townley, 1999), or by maintaining precious elements in dormant or abeyant form (Kozhikode, 2016; Taylor, 1989). In the case of UK book publishing, we found that actors with significant industry pedigree, which had managed to remain independent from corporate publishers, engaged in this kind of resistance, while there were also pockets of institutional preservation in certain longstanding corporate houses. These types of actor appear to engage in institutional resistance as a form of custodianship (Dacin, Dacin, & Kent, 2019) designed to preserve the marginalised logic.

A second form of logic evolution that we identified is logic purification. This involves an editing of marginalised logic elements such that the logic is morphed into a purer form. In this instance, field actors that resist conformity to the dominant logic not only cling onto elements of the marginalised logic but may actually further segregate it from the dominant logic by refining pre-existing or preserved elements. This could, for instance, be accomplished by restoring abandoned traditions, principles and practices. In the case of UK book publishing, we found that field actors who experienced marginalisation by the dominant market logic engaged in entrepreneurship that led to the creation of new publishing houses or changes to existing publishing houses. This enriched the idea of editorship beyond a

self-interested focus on building the prestige of the publisher and moved it towards a purified focus on publishing as a creative art form. For example, some founders of newly established publishing houses had previously worked as editors or publishing directors at corporate houses and felt that they did not have the opportunity to follow their individual passions and creatively express themselves. Through adherence to 'purer' instantiations of editorial practice, such as instinctive decision-making, they turned publishing into more of a creative vocation. Some, although surely not all, of the refinements harkened back to earlier instantiations of the editorial logic such as during the time of literary modernism in the 1920s.

A third and final path of logic evolution that we observed is logic radicalisation. Logic radicalisation differs from logic purification in that it involves not just an editing of the marginalised logic by refining pre-existing elements, but also more substantial intra-logic change through the addition of new norms and practices. This form of resistance suggests an even stronger opposition to the dominant logic. Actors may radicalise a marginalised logic by infusing elements from exogenous logics or inventing new elements bottom-up. In the case of UK book publishing, we observed how new actors entered the field with different motives from those of the traditionalists and idealists, and engaged in entrepreneurship. Advancing the norm of social responsibility in publishing borrowed from societal-level logics of progressivism and equality, they sought to redefine the professional responsibilities of the publisher. Indeed, under this amended logic, the purpose and meaning of a publisher became fundamentally different from the preserved as well as the purified editorial logics. Publishing with the aim of advocating the improvement of society, the status of particular social groups, as well as equality of opportunities for authors from different backgrounds imbued this logic with a clear moral mission – it was no longer simply a cultural pursuit. This mission took immediate priority over publishers' individual passions and desire for artistic expression.

Importantly, the three paths of logic evolution we identified are 'ideal' paths. Different elements of these paths may be used by various resistant actors simultaneously. This raises questions about the extent to which the paths may overlap. However, this is a somewhat different empirical question and we are not able to answer it in this study. Further research is needed to investigate this issue.

Implications for Research on the Macrofoundations of Institutional Resistance

Through our study, we contribute to multi-level theory of institutional resistance: resistance often takes places in the context of competing logics at the macro-level, as in our case, when a new dominant logic usurps an existing one. The friction between these logics is experienced viscerally at the micro-level by actors who identify with the marginalised logic, which leads them to engage in different types of generative activity that reflect a more or less pronounced opposition to dominant norms. As resistant actors use the marginalised logic as a resource to fuel their resistance, the marginalised logic comes to evolve in different ways. Our study has three important implications for the study of the macrofoundations of institutional resistance.

First, our research sheds light on the nature and roles of peripheral field actors as they resist the emergence of a new logic. Specifically, we show that actors located at the periphery of institutional fields may either be established field actors who were marginalised by a new dominant logic to which they chose not to conform, or new (entrepreneurial) actors who see an opportunity to enter a field from the periphery by introducing alternative norms and practices. Our findings indicate that new peripheral actors appear to engage in more pronounced or radical forms of resistance to a dominant logic than established peripheral actors. The resistance of established actors appears to be primarily concerned with the maintenance of the practices they enacted prior to the institutional change rather than the radicalisation of marginalised practices. As such, our study suggests the need to distinguish between different forms of peripheral actors that may emerge in the context of macro-level change. In particular, future research could look into how identities of peripheral actors shape their forms of resistance, asking, for example, which identities are associated with logic purification and which are associated with logic radicalisation?

Second, we shed light on how fields can evolve based on the different paths that marginalised logics may take. Institutional resistance through marginalised logic preservation, on its own, is unlikely to result in subsequent field-level change but instead will preserve the status quo – a kind of enduring market partitioning (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007). In the case of UK book publishing, the preserved editorial logic was distinct but not completely segregated from the newly dominant market logic and actors did not collaborate on or coordinate their preservation activities: under both logics actors were guided by self-interested aims (pursuing short-term profit vs. building prestige) that did not appear to be completely incommensurable, as evidenced by the corporate publishing houses that managed to blend elements from both in their organisations. In contrast to resistance through preservation, resistance through purification is more likely to result in ongoing field-level changes because it involves editing the marginalised logic in a way that may inspire entrepreneurship and innovation. By purifying marginalised logics, they can be segregated more firmly from dominant logics, leading to a harder partition in the industry and a firmer challenge to the field actors that adhere to the dominant logic. In UK book publishing, this is evident in a noticeable niche that small independent publishers following a purified editorial logic are occupying. They are increasingly recognised, such as through various literary prizes, for producing non-mainstream fiction and being passionate about emergent writers.

However, of the three forms of resistance identified, marginal logic radicalisation appears to have the greatest potential to lead to subsequent logic shifts. That is because it involves the addition of new norms and practices that profoundly challenge and reshape the purpose and meaning of existing institutionalised practices. Importantly, radicalisation may be organised as a kind of social movement with resistant actors mobilising with a view to reforming a field. We saw an example of this in UK book publishing where some newly established independent publishing houses introduced a novel social responsibility to the field of publishing. At the core of their vision was the idea that publishing should operate on a

non-profit basis, with the publishing of titles that could make the reader 'think' prioritised over revenue and profit-making. Interestingly, other field actors, such as copy editors and booksellers, enthusiastically joined the movement. Thus, it appears that radicalised marginal logics can have an important influence on a field in spreading an alternative ethos that different groups of actors may identify with, thereby creating a movement that can contribute to field-level change. We encourage future research further to investigate the effects of radicalisation at the periphery of a field and, more broadly, the field-level outcomes concerning the evolution of a marginalised institutional logic.

Third, we show that important insights into institutional resistance may be derived from following a methodological approach that uses and combines insights from the analysis of macro- and micro-level data. Currently, the literature can be broadly characterised as comprising macro-focussed studies that consider change in a given field and micro-focussed studies that consider the role of specific actors in altering aspects of an institutional field. We bridge these perspectives by studying how macro-level shifts in institutional logics precipitate different forms of resistance by actors at the micro-level, and how these forms of resistance, in turn, shape the trajectory of the logics themselves. Specifically, we first drew on in-depth interviews with individual field actors to explore micro-level perceptions of and reactions to institutional change. Second, we made use of archival data, for example, autobiographical material from key field actors, through which we learned about historical developments in the field. In particular, we gained a detailed understanding of the evolution of the two competing institutional logics that served as the macro-level context of resistance. By combining data at these two levels, we were able to generate insights into the macrofoundation and microfoundation of institutional resistance. We believe that combining bottom-up and top-down approaches to the study of important dynamics in institutional fields, such as resistance, can be of great value to institutional researchers because it presents an opportunity to advance understanding of the interplay of macro-level structures and micro-level action. Previous studies (Kroezen & Heugens, 2018) have demonstrated the merits of multi-level data and we believe that future research on institutional fields could usefully adopt this approach.

CONCLUSION

Macro-level institutional change in the form of dramatic shifts towards new dominant logics can trigger a variety of generative forms of resistance from peripheral actors. When there is resistance in a field, marginalised logics may either be preserved or undergo internal shifts in the form of purification or radicalisation. Institutional logics that have been marginalised by a new dominant logic can, therefore, evolve along different paths.

However, determining which path of marginalised logic evolution is likely to have the most substantial impact on a field is an empirical question that we have not been able to address in the present study. Thus, we encourage more research into the different forms of resistance that occur in fields in opposition

to a dominant logic, and the conditions and mechanisms that may give primacy to one form of resistance over another with associated field-level outcomes in the constellation of institutional logics.

NOTES

1. Trade books are, unlike academic books, intended for a general, non-specialist audience and sold through retailers. They include non-fiction and fiction titles, including poetry and prose.

2. The 'Big Four' – the four largest English-language publishing groups – Bertelsmann, Hachette, News Corporation and Holtzbrinck.

3. For a full list of conditions, see information sheet: https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Information_sheets_Literature_projects_Project_grants_Mar18.pdf.

4. Counting official numbers of members of the UK Independent Publishers Guild.

5. See Table 2 for a detailed overview of our sample.

6. Interview with Benett Cerf available at: http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/digital/collections/nny/cerfb/transcripts/cerfb_1_5_210.html.

7. Interview with the founder and former director available at: http://www.3ammagazine.com/3am/blazing-the-trail-an-interview-with-peter-owen/.

8. Imprints refer to trade names under which works can be published. A publishing company can have multiple imprints, used to market works to different consumer segments.

9. Saltire Society Awards 2015 and 2014: http://www.saltiresociety.org.uk/awards/literature/previous-years/publishing-awards.

10. British Book Industry Awards 2016: http://content.yudu.com/web/1vcls/0A1xp12/BBIA2016/html/index.html?refUrl=http%253A%252F%252Fwww.thebookseller.com%252Fdigital-archives&page=1.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Bekken, J. (1997). Feeding the dinosaurs: Economic concentration in the retail book industry. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, *13*(4), 3–26.

Booksellers Association Reports Library. (2015). UK publishing groups – Consumer sales 2005–2014. Retrieved from https://www.booksellers.org.uk/industryinfo/industryinfo/industryreports. Accessed on 16 July 2020.

Campell, L. (2015). Indie book day backed by bookstores and publishers. *The Bookseller*. Retrieved from http://www.thebookseller.com/news/indie-book-day-backed-bookshops-and-publishers. Accessed on January 12, 2018.

Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the U.S. brewing industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, *106*(3), 715–762.

Clark, G., & Phillips, A. (2008). *Inside book publishing*. Oxon: Routledge.

Connors, L. E., Henry, S. L., & Reader, J. W. (1985). From art to corporation: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., and the cultural effects of merger. *Book Research Quarterly*, *1*(4), 28–59.

Coser, L. A. (1975). Publishers as gatekeepers of ideas. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *421*, 14–22.

Coser, L. A. (1984). The publishing industry as a hybrid. *The Library Quarterly*, *54*(1), 5–12.

Coser, L. A., Kadushin, C., & Powell, W. W. (1982). *Books: The culture and commerce of publishing*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Kent, D. (2019). Tradition in organizations: A custodianship framework. *Academy of Management Annals*, *13*(1), 342373.

Davis, M. (2006). The decline of the literary paradigm in Australian publishing. *Ten Years, Heat 12* (new series), *12*, 91–108. Retrieved from https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/handle/11343/34733. Accessed on January 20, 2018.

Duffy, K. (2015). Are small independent publishers doing the work for big publishers? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/dec/22/are-small-independent-publishers-doing-the-work-for-big-publishers. Accessed on January 25, 2018.

Epstein, J. (2001). *Book business: Publishing past, present and future*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Escaprit, R. (1966). *The book revolution*. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd.

Feather, J., & Woodbridge, H. (2007). Bestsellers in the British book industry 1998–2005. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 23(3), 210–223.

Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2012). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, *16*(1), 15–31.

Glynn, M. A., & Lounsbury, M. (2005). From the critics' corner: Logic blending, discursive change and authenticity in a cultural production system. *Journal of Management Studies*, *42*(5), 1031–1055.

Greco, A. N., Milliot, J., & Wharton, R. M. (2014). *The book publishing industry* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Haveman, H. A., & Rao, H. (1997). Structuring a theory of moral sentiments: Institutional and organizational coevolution in the early thrift industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, *102*(6), 1606–1651.

Jones, P. (2016). The little foxes. In *The bookseller*. Northridge, CA: Curtis Paul Books, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.thebookseller.com/blogs/little-foxes-328493. Accessed on February 5, 2018.

Kozhikode, R. K. (2016). Dormancy as a strategic response to detrimental public policy. *Organization Science*, *27*(1), 189–206.

Kroezen, J. J., & Heugens, P. P. M. A. R. (2018). What is dead may never die: Institutional regeneration through logic reemergence in Dutch beer brewing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *64*(4), 976–1019.

Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(2), 289–307.

Lounsbury, M., & Pollack, S. (2001). Institutionalizing civic engagement: Shifting logics and the cultural repackaging of service-learning in US higher education. *Organization*, *8*(2), 319–339.

Marquis, C., & Lounsbury, M. (2007). Vive la résistance: Competing logics and the consolidation of U.S. community banking. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(4), 799–820.

Moran, J. (1997). The role of multimedia conglomerates in American trade book publishing. *Media, Culture & Society*, *19*(3), 441–455.

Ocasio, W., Mauskapf, M., & Steele, C. W. J. (2016). History, society, and institutions: The role of collective memory in the emergence and evolution of societal logics. *Academy of Management Review*, *41*(4), 676–699.

Ocasio, W., Thornton, P. H., & Lounsbury, M. (2017). The institutional logics perspective. In R. Greenwood, T. B. Lawrence, C. Oliver, & R. Meyer (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (2nd ed., pp. 509–531). London: SAGE Publications.

Packer, G. (2014). Cheap words: Amazon is good for customers. But is it good for books? *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/02/17/cheap-words. Accessed on December 18, 2017.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, *108*(4), 795–843.

Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2005). The recomposition of an organizational field: Health care in Alberta. *Organization Studies*, *26*(3), 351–384.

Roback, D. (2014). Bologna book fair 2014 preview: Emerging imprints and promising publishers. *Publishers Weekly*. Retrieved from http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/childrens/childrens-industry-news/article/61350-emerging-imprints-and-promising-publishers.html. Accessed on February 8, 2018.

Schiffrin, A. (2001). *The business of books: How the international conglomerates took over publishing and changed the way we read*. New York, NY: Verso.

Schneiberg, M. (2007). What's on the path? Path dependence, organizational diversity and the problem of institutional change in the US economy, 1900–1950. *Socio-Economic Review*, *5*, 47–80.

Simons, T., Vermeulen, P. A. M., & Knoben, J. (2016). There is no beer without a smoke: Community cohesion and neighboring communities' effects on organizational resistance to anti smoking regulations in the Dutch hospitality industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(2), 545–578.

Sorensen, A. T. (2007). Bestseller lists and product variety. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, *55*(4), 715–738.

Taylor, V. (1989). Social movement continuity: The women's movement in abeyance. *American Sociological Review*, *54*(5), 761–775.

Thompson, J. B. (2012). *Merchants of culture: The publishing business in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Thornton, P. H. (2001). Personal versus market logics of control: A historically contingent theory of the risk of acquisition. *Organization Science*, *12*(3), 294–311.

Thornton, P. H. (2002). The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: Conflict and conformity in institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(1), 81–101.

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(3), 801–843.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Townley, B. (1997). The institutional logic of performance appraisal. *Organization Studies*, *18*(2), 261–285.

Verboord, M. (2011). Market logic and cultural consecration in French, German and American bestseller lists, 1970–2007. *Poetics*, *39*(4), 290–315.