



Citation for published version:

Clemente, M & Roulet, TJ 2015, 'Public opinion as a source of deinstitutionalization: a 'spiral of silence' approach', *Academy of Management Review (AMR)*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 96-114.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0279>

DOI:

[10.5465/amr.2013.0279](https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0279)

Publication date:

2015

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

University of Bath

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Public Opinion as a Source of Deinstitutionalization: A ‘Spiral of Silence’ Approach

Marco Clemente*
Aalto University
marco.clemente@aalto.fi

Thomas J. Roulet*
University of Bath
troulet@gmail.com

* Authors are listed alphabetically to reflect equal contribution to authorship.

Forthcoming at the *Academy of Management Review*.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank associate editor John Lammers, the editorial team of the special topic forum Communication, Cognition and Institutions, and the three anonymous reviewers, who provided crucial feedback, and contributed to the shaping of this work. We are also grateful to Michael Gill, Joan Dunbar, Gino Cattani, Roger Dunbar, Santi Furnari, Camilla Stack, Lionel Paoella, Kristina Dahlin, Lianne Lefsrud, Rick Delbridge, Shira Mor, Robin Gustafsson, Jens Schmidt, Marina Biniari, Markku Maula, Henri Schildt, the participants of the 2014 European Theory Development Workshop in Amsterdam and the participants of HOTREG in Helsinki. This research was partially supported by the HEC Foundation, and the Novak Druce Centre at the University of Oxford.

ABSTRACT

This article develops a theoretical model to explain how public opinion can lead to the deinstitutionalization of a practice. Our model draws upon the ‘spiral of silence’ theory, that originated in the mass communication literature, and which suggests that social actors tend to support majority views. At the micro level, this behavior triggers a spiral of silence that leads to homogenous public opinion. We use analogical reasoning to posit the existence of a spiral of silence at the institutional field level. When public opinion becomes hostile to a particular practice, institutional fields tend to resist this external opposition. Insiders face the dilemma of whether to align with the majority view expressed by public opinion, or to comply with the one expressed at the field level. After discussing the mechanisms by which insider voices mediate and diffuse the hostility of public opinion at the field level, we discuss the boundary conditions applicable to our analogy. Our paper advances the understanding of nested and connected climates of opinion and bridges the gap between insider- and outsider-driven deinstitutionalization.

Keywords: Public opinion, deinstitutionalization, spiral of silence, institutional field.

Deinstitutionalization is the process by which practices are abandoned because they have lost their social approval (Oliver, 1992; Scott, 2001). Given that “all institutions are discursive products” (Phillips, Lawrence & Hardy, 2004: 638), a deinstitutionalization process relies on discursive struggles between actors who push to abandon a practice and those who try to maintain it (Greenwood, Suddaby & Hinings, 2002; Green, 2004; Vaara & Tienari, 2008). Studies of deinstitutionalization usually focus on opposing insider-driven and outsider-driven processes (Maguire & Hardy, 2009), depending on whether the disruptive discourse occurs inside or outside the field. While previous literature has acknowledged functional, political, and social maintenance or challenge of institutional arrangements (Oliver, 1992; Dacin, Goodstein & Scott, 2002), little has been said about the role of outsiders in this process (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). One premise of this literature is that institutional fields defend their existing practices by reacting en masse to outsider hostility (Maguire & Hardy, 2009; Guérard, Bode & Gustafsson, 2013), especially when key insiders have a strong interest in maintaining institutionalized practices (Fiss, Kennedy & Davis, 2012). However, discursive struggles around institutions usually happen simultaneously both within a field (Oliver, 1992) and outside, at the society level (Hauser, 1998), with one discourse influencing the other.

Consider different cases on how fields react when the public disapproves their practices. Some fields consistently respond to external attacks by producing coordinated “defensive institutional texts” (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). Sometimes, these discourses succeed in sustaining controversial practices, such as bonuses in the investment bank industry (Shlomo et al., 2013), and sometimes they fail, such as when agribusiness abandoned DDT (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). More generally, a closer look reveals that fields may respond heterogeneously to external pressures as

insiders split between those that take the side of the new hostile public climate and those who oppose it.

Outsider-driven deinstitutionalization can indeed ignite a discursive battle among field insiders (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). However, given that previous research has taken an either/or approach – insider-driven vs. outsider-driven processes – little is known about how the two processes are linked, specifically how external discourse causes confrontation among insiders. This paper looks at how public opinion can act as a form of outsider-driven deinstitutionalization by influencing discursive dynamics within a field. Insiders are key actors in deinstitutionalizing a practice, as they can ultimately decide on whether to engage in a practice or not. We bridge the gaps between multiple levels of discourse inherent in the deinstitutionalization process, and build a better understanding of existing links between outsider- and insider-driven deinstitutionalization. Our paper analyzes the link between public opinion and field opinion, the expression of the dominant view at the institutional field level, and how this relationship contributes to the deinstitutionalization process.

To study the role of public opinion in deinstitutionalizing a practice, we draw on an established mass communication theory known as the ‘spiral of silence’, that establishes how actors become less and less likely to express their voice when they perceive they are in the minority. German political scientist, Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, introduced this theory (Noelle-Neumann, 1974; 1977; 1993) as an effort to understand how individual actions and voices aggregate and eventually produce homogenous public opinion (Noelle-Neumann, 1993; Scheufele & Moy, 2000). Because they fear being in the minority (Glynn, Hayes & Shanahan, 1997), people tend not to speak up when they normally would. This triggers a spiral, which boosts

the voice of those in the majority and inhibits the voice of the minority, resulting in a macro phenomenon we call public opinion. While the spiral of silence theory originates in the mass communication literature, its mechanisms can work at different levels, such as small groups or organizations (Price & Allen, 1990; Blackmon & Bowen, 2003). We propose that a spiral of silence can also develop at the institutional field level, where field opinion enhances or inhibits insider voices. The spiral of silence theory helps to reduce these two macro phenomena (public and field opinion), to micro processes (such as social actors' voices), which lends itself to analytical study.

This analogy between public sphere and institutional field as two parallel discursive spaces forms the basis of our theoretical framework (Noelle-Neumann, 1993). Our conceptual blending relies on a constitutive analogy. A constitutive analogy is a form of reasoning that “produces an entirely integrated conceptual representation” between the source domain and the target domain (Cornelissen and Durand, 2014: 9)¹. From the public opinion literature, we import causal dynamics and key concepts to understand the dynamics of institutional fields, but we also create an integrated framework that incorporates concepts taken from both communication and organization theory. When applying the spiral of silence theory both at the public and field level, our theoretical model suggests that insider voices are the liaison between public and field opinions. When public opinion starts to oppose an existing

¹ According to Cornelissen and Durand (2014), a constitutive analogy is a ‘full’ analogy. Thus, it differs from a heuristic analogy, which is only conceptual and episodic, and from a causal analogy, which relies on an asymmetric comparison between the source and the target domain.

² Insiders will decide whether to align their voice with hostile public opinion or with favorable field opinion depending on the relative strength of the fear of isolation in the public sphere and in the field. On the public side, it is obvious that the greater the strength of public disapproval, the more likely it is for insiders to support public opinion versus the contrasting field opinion. However, our focus is to

institutionalized practice, insiders feel torn between following the majority opinion in their field and going with the new hostile climate at the public level. To understand insiders' decisions to align with field opinion or public opinion, we examine the spiral of silence operating in the two respective spheres. In the last section of this article, we specify the limitations of our analogy and the boundary conditions for the deployment of the spiral of silence in the field.

Our theoretical development builds on the emerging body of work bridging the gap between communication and institutional theory literature (Lammers & Barbour, 2006; Green, Babb & Alpaslan, 2008; Schultz & Wehmeier, 2010; Ganesh & Stohl, 2013). We build on Suddaby's (2011) radical stance that "patterns of communication determine social institutions" (Suddaby, 2011: 187), which extends Lammers' (2011) concept of "institutional messages". We make several contributions to the existing literature. First, research on institutional fields has alternated between macro- and micro-approaches. The spiral of silence has addressed a similar issue in the mass communication literature by linking public opinion to individual voices. Building on the analogy between the public sphere and institutional fields as discursive spaces, we propose that the spiral of silence theory can apply to institutional fields, where insider voices aggregate to form a field opinion.

Second, we advance research on institutional fields, by hypothesizing the existence of overlapping and nested fields, which mutually influence each other. Insider voices bridge outsider-driven and insider-driven deinstitutionalization, and explain how external pressure can propagate among field members, despite the resistance of some of the insiders. Finally, by transposing the spiral of silence theory to the institutional level of analysis, we contribute to the mass communication literature by proposing the co-existence of different spirals of silence. We use this

insight to enrich the spiral of silence theory by showing that fear of being in the minority potentially can affect social actors across a broad range of discursive spaces.

THE INFLUENCE OF PUBLIC OPINION ON DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION

Institutions are accumulations of beliefs and understandings, which progressively become established facts, and ultimately condition and shape future actions (Scott, 2001; Lammers & Barbour, 2006). Institutions govern behaviors through the institutionalization of practices, with penalties as the consequence of deviation from these (Jepperson, 1991). Once institutionalized, practices evolve to be the most natural way to act (Oliver, 1992). Although recent research has improved our understanding of practice diffusion and variation (Ansari, Fiss & Zajac, 2010; Fiss, Kennedy & Davis, 2012; Gondo & Amis, 2013), less has been said about “the process by which the legitimacy of an established or institutionalized organizational practice erodes or discontinues” (Oliver, 1992: 564).

Not only are studies on deinstitutionalization rare (Maguire & Hardy, 2009), but they tend to focus on insider-driven deinstitutionalization, when efforts to disrupt certain practices come from insiders (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). Given the increasing pressure of external actors to change accepted and profitable business practices on the grounds of safety, fairness or sustainability, scholars have recently been studying outsider-driven deinstitutionalization processes (Maguire & Hardy, 2009; Guérard et al., 2013). Previous studies have suggested that fields comprise a set of homogenous actors engaging in defensive institutional work (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). This process usually terminates when the practice becomes illegal (Bonardi & Keim, 2005; Maguire & Hardy, 2009) resulting in coercive abandonment of a practice.

This perspective has two main limitations. First, not all practices can be outlawed, since they are outside the realm of the laws or because companies can use non-market strategies to lobby the government and keep existing practices in place. Triggering voluntary abandonment of a practice by field members can therefore be more effective than coercive pressure. Second, and more importantly, not all insiders decide to resist; some might align with public hostility, instigating a struggle with other field members. Taking these factors into consideration, this paper describes situations in which outsider-driven deinstitutionalization triggers a confrontation among insiders, resulting in a voluntary abandonment of a practice.

“Institutions are discursive products” (Phillips, Lawrence & Hardy, 2004: 638) and rely on interactions between existing justifications and challenges from emergent discourses (Green, 2004; Green, Babb & Alpaslan, 2008). Therefore, any change in practice adoption needs to be accompanied by a change in its underlying and supporting discourses. One of the difficulties of studying processes of deinstitutionalization is that many actors intervene at different levels. We propose that besides the mediating effect of regulation, discursive dynamics outside the field exert a direct influence on the discourse among insiders (Bonardi & Keim, 2005). This is because discursive struggles usually occur at the same time in the institutional field and in the public sphere (Hauser, 1998). The discursive nature of institutions and the fact that the discourse happens at multiple levels of analysis allow us to study the impact of public opinion on institutions. This study enhances the understanding of the relationship between insider-driven and outsider-driven deinstitutionalization (Oliver, 1992), by bridging the gap between the discursive spheres at societal and field levels.

Institutional Fields, Field Opinion, and Deinstitutionalization of Practices

Institutional fields are social arenas where actors coalesce around a common purpose (Hoffman, 1999). They consist of the set of actors (either individual or organizations) who directly engage in a practice. Discourses within a field are crucial to the creation, continuation and abandonment of a practice (Green et al., 2008; Greenwood et al., 2002). These discourses rely on opinions or the “outward expression of a mental attitude” (Grunig, 1979: 741) which, over time, culminate in the existence of a dominant view (Converse, 1987). This dominant opinion exerts a form of social control and pressures individual actors to conform (Oshagan, 1996). The institutional field is a reference group for its members, namely a “group whose perspective constitutes the frame of reference of the actor” (Oshagan, 1996: 337); and reference groups exert a strong pressure on decision making (Oshagan, 1996; Glynn & Park, 1997; Neuwirth & Frederick, 2004; Kim, 2012).

At the institutional field level, engaging in a disapproved behavior produces social sanctions for members who are caught red-handed (Glynn & Huge, 2007). Because others can observe and judge such behaviors, the field’s view about what constitutes the most appropriate way to act prevails. Conforming to the dominant view leads to social approval, and non-conformists incur social penalties, such as ‘losing face’ (Ho et al., 2013). The opinion of other insiders conditions social actors’ engagement in a practice (Rimal & Real, 2005). Rimal and Real (2003: 185) established that peers perceptions of behavioral norms strongly affect engagement in practices, based on “how widespread a behavior is among referent others” and the threats and benefits of compliance, or non-compliance.

As the first building block of our analogy between the public and institutional fields as two discursive arenas, we call the overall climate of opinion at the field level *field opinion*, to mirror the concept of public opinion. Field opinion represents the

dominant view of insiders in a field about a given topic or practice. A practice has to be socially approved in order to be institutionalized (Maguire & Hardy, 2009), meaning it requires the support of field opinion. By contrast, any efforts to deinstitutionalize a practice, even if originated outside of a field, eventually entail a change of discourse among members of the field. Then, when field opinion opposes a practice, that practice is likely to be abandoned. Therefore, we conceive the deinstitutionalization of a practice as a two-stage process whereby field opinion becomes hostile to a practice and consequently exerts pressure on its actors to abandon it.

Field Opinion as Nested in the Public Opinion

Insiders engage in discursive struggles not only in their own fields, but also in other broad social arenas. The broadest level is public opinion, which arises from population-wide dialogues (Hauser, 1998). The concept of public opinion comes originally from Plato's notion of *doxa*, the common belief or the popular way of thinking (Crombie, 2012). Since then, philosophers have described how people seek approval from others by behaving in ways they know others will approve. During the Renaissance, Michel de Montaigne, among others, was concerned with the influence that public opinion exerts on social life. He elaborates on the human tendency to behave in conformity with commonly held views, a behavior which is triggered by the pursuit of others' approval (Montaigne, 1958). In the same vein, John Locke, in his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding," published in 1690 (Locke, 1998), establishes the law of opinion as the most powerful dictum in modern societies, a source of social pressure that compels individuals to adopt the perspective of the

majority. Public opinion is therefore a form of social control (Noelle-Neumann, 1993).

Public opinion pressures individuals to conform to prevailing views (McLeod & Hertog, 1992; Scheufele, 2008) in order to obtain social approval in the eyes of the general public. Because the public observes and judges behaviors (and punishes deviant individuals), it dictates what constitute the most natural ways to act (Glynn et al., 2005). As stressed by Noelle-Neumann, the coercive role of public opinion arises from the moral dimension of contentious matters (Noelle-Neumann, 1993; Scheufele & Moy, 2000), thus it relies mostly on normative processes, well identified by institutional theorists (Scott, 2001). To explain the normative pressure of public opinion, Scheufele (2008) cites the debate about stem cell research (the practice of using human embryos for research). Because it is difficult to obtain objective answers to such questions, public opinion provides a critical indication of what position to take: in other words, the opinion of the majority appears to be the right way to think and eventually shapes individuals' perceptions when they seek to make sense of their environments (McLeod & Hertog, 1992).

Because they are part of both a field and the society, insiders feel pressure from both field and public opinion. However, public opinion works at a broader level, which is why we posit that field opinion is nested in, and therefore influenced by, public opinion. Previous literature has mainly looked at the role of public opinion in policy-making (Burstein, 2003; Habermas, 2001). Public opinion can exert pressure on politicians seeking re-election, to make some practices illegal (Bonardi & Keim, 2005). However, the effect of public opinion on the engagement of practices is not necessarily mediated by the government. Our paper focuses on ways, besides making it illegal, that public opinion influences the deinstitutionalization of a practice.

To understand the role of public opinion in deinstitutionalization processes more fully, we need to understand the micro-processes that link the two macro phenomena (public opinion and field opinion). This leads us to our first research question: How does public opinion influence field opinion?

Once we understand the detailed process through which public opinion influences field opinion, it ought to be possible to understand why some fields are more likely to respond to public opinion than others. In some fields, members are very sensitive to public opinion, and in others, they are relatively insensitive. The example of the investment banking industry is telling. Since the economic crisis in 2008, public opinion regarding maximization of shareholder value has become increasingly varied. In the US, public opinion has shifted from full support of shareholder value maximization practices in the 1980s – the bonus system, extreme risk taking, focus on dividends (Ho, 2009; Madrick, 2011) – to a more mixed perspective, as a consequence of the discursive attacks that followed the 2008 failures (Roulet, Forthcoming). However, these controversial practices have persisted (Shlomo et al., 2013). Thus, our second research question aims to understand the causes of the variation in the way public hostility leads to the abandonment of a practice. The answer to this question depends on the deployment of the spiral of silence within a field. Figure 1 lays out our theoretical framework.

Insert Figure 1 about here

THE SPIRAL OF SILENCE

The spiral of silence theory is one of the most prominent approaches to explain the formation of a climate of opinion. Noelle-Neumann (1974; 1977; 1993;

1995) built the spiral of silence model inductively to understand the German election of 1965, in which the results came out quite differently than expected, with a clear victory for the Christian Democrats although they were thought to be neck and neck with the Social Democrats. To help understand the puzzle, she used Tocqueville's example of the Church's decline in France before the revolution (Tocqueville, 1955). Tocqueville focused on the relative likelihood that individuals would voice their opinion rather than remain silent. Both scenarios suggest that individuals feared being socially isolated and thus joined the majority, even if they disagreed with it. In Tocqueville's mind, public opinion is, paradoxically, the drawback to equality and freedom: being part of a multitude gives people confidence in the public's judgment, which, in turn, subtly coerces individuals to avoid public disapproval by behaving in ways consistent with dominant opinion.

The Spiral of Silence at the Public Level

The spiral of silence approach posits the existence of a vicious circle: the longer members of a minority fail to express their views, the more unstoppable the spiral of silence becomes (see Figure 2). The spiral of silence theory relies on a micro-level psychological phenomenon (Matthes et al., 2012; Neuwirth et al., 2007): social actors avoid expressing views, which they think are marginalized, and voice social judgments based on their perceptions of the majority opinion (Prentice & Miller, 1996; Ho et al., 2013).

Insert Figure 2 about here

Ultimately, the spiral of silence implies movement towards silencing minority opinions (Scheufele, 2008), although a hard core of supporters in the field may remain

(McDonald, Glynn, Kim & Ostman, 2001; Matthes, Morrison & Schemer, 2010). Empirical research supports the notion of fear of isolation (Noelle-Neumann & Petersen, 2004; Noelle-Neumann, 1993), as well as the relationship between perceptions of support for one's opinion and one's willingness to voice it (Glynn, Hayes & Shanahan, 1997). This mechanism sets the spiral of silence in motion in a self-reinforcing circle. Members of a minority are less likely to express their opinion, while members of a majority are more likely to voice theirs (Scheufele & Moy, 2000; Yanovitzky & Stryker, 2001; Scheufele, 2008). These dynamics lead to the emergence of a dominant opinion. Noelle-Neumann's (1993) theory bridges micro-level behaviors - the decision to speak up or stay silent, and macro-level consequences - the emergence of dominant opinions and social norms. The metaphor of a downward spiral suggests unidirectionality (Salmon & Glynn, 1996), the conclusion of which is that willingness to speak out tends to decrease to a point where the prevailing opinion becomes the only one.

This "quasi-statistical" ability to understand public opinion and its evolution depends on three main elements: the voice of other people, the media, and interpersonal opinions (Noelle-Neumann, 1993; Bowen & Blackmon, 2003).

The role of the voice of other people. Voice is the key variable in Noelle-Neumann's (1993) model of public opinion, and it is at the heart of the spiral of silence theory. The more strongly people believe they are in the majority, the more willing they are to express their opinions, while people who hold an opposing view become increasingly fearful of voicing their opinions and, thus, increasingly silent. According to Noelle-Neumann (1974; 1993), this is how public opinion is generated. Thus, voice and perceived public opinion create a mutually reinforcing circle. Voice is any public expression of opinion and in addition to verbal expression (Glynn &

Huge, 2007; Hayes, 2007), it may consist of wearing a campaign button supporting a political candidate (Noelle-Neumann, 1993), putting a bumper sticker on one's car or, more recently, putting a "like" on Facebook.

The role of the media. The media are a second key variable in generating public opinion. People "mix their own direct perceptions and those filtered through the eyes of the media into an indivisible whole that seems to derive from their own thoughts and experiences" (Noelle-Neumann, 1993: 169). The media work through two mechanisms. First, they create common knowledge (Scheufele, 2008; Adut, 2008), by increasing the connectivity between the members of a fragmented audience, many of whom do not interact (Moy, Domke & Stamm, 2001; Cattani et al., 2008). As Adut (2008: 79) suggests, we "all read the same thing in the newspaper, knowing that others are reading the same thing, creating common knowledge about events". Second, the media provide authority and saliency. There is a belief that what is presented in the media is worthy of being told and, in being told, acquires relevance (Roulet, Forthcoming). The media are a crucial vehicle for assessing the climate of opinion at the public level.

The role of interpersonal relationships. Interpersonal relationships are another important source people use to gauge public opinion. While Noelle-Neumann assumed that the "public eye" had more influence on voice, additional research in the communication literature has challenged this speculation (Kennamer, 1990; Price & Allen, 1990; Moy, Domke & Stamm, 2001). For example, Moy, Domke and Stamm (2001) show that fear of isolation stems not only from mainstream opinion, but also from the views of friends and family. By interacting only with those who share their opinions and by avoiding those who think differently, "people lose their quasi-statistical ability to correctly assess views of the environment" (Noelle-Neumann

1993: 124). In this case, society splits into two groups, each of which thinks it is in the majority: “a dual climate of opinion” emerges (Noelle-Neumann, 1993).

One of strengths of the spiral of silence theory lies in its construction from observations of a wide range of public opinion phenomena, connecting different fields of research, from political shifts to the decline of well-established institutions such as the church in France (Noelle-Neumann, 1993). The spiral of silence theory has successfully linked individual micro-processes - individual voices, to macro-outcome - the formation of a climate of opinion. This approach is particular relevant for institutional theory, and specifically literature on institutional fields, which tries to associate individual actions to collective outcomes (Kennamer, 1990). Next, we show how mechanisms of the spiral of silence can explain the emergence of a climate of opinion at the institutional field level.

The Spiral of Silence at the Field Level

Our model develops an analogy (Cornelissen & Durand, 2014) between the domain of communication (source) and the one of institutional theory (target) and it integrates the spiral of silence in the public sphere, and the one deployed in the field, as a way to explain the deinstitutionalization of a practice. Both public opinion and field opinion are collective expression of dominant views, arising from the aggregation of voices of many individual actors'. Previous research has suggested that the mechanisms of the spiral of silence can also occur at the sub-group level (Price & Allen, 1990), meaning that social actors may face being in the minority at both the public and field levels, and become sensitive to the majority opinion in both. In their study of car manufacturers, Guérard et al. (2013) provide an exemplary case

study on how pressure to conform to the field opinion can be exerted by members of a field. In an effort to abandon and replace an existing practice (the production of diesel cars that do not filter particular matters), a coalition of social movements introduced traffic light accreditation (green, yellow and red cards) for German car manufacturers. The coalition gave a red card to all German car manufacturers except Ford Germany, which had been the only company open to negotiating with social movements. At that point, a top manager of Ford Germany called a member of the coalition and requested that they get a red card as well, because all the CEOs of the other German car manufacturers were angry with him (Guérard et al., 2013: 801):

Within two hours, I got a phone call from the office of the director of Ford Germany. The assistant of the CEO told me: ‘Mr. Y, you can’t imagine what is happening. Every five minutes we get phone calls from the other CEOs of German car manufacturers. They are telling us that the alliance at the German Association of the Automotive Industry...is broken [by Ford Germany]. We have to ask you to give us a red card like the others [car manufacturers]. [...] Otherwise the alliance with all the others [car manufacturers] is endangered.’ (Involved Environmental Activist, interview, 2010)

Members of a field can clearly fear being in the minority position vis-à-vis other insiders, thus must also monitor their field in order to assess the dominant opinion.

Taking the three areas of influence that contribute to the spiral of silence at the public level, we use the same elements - insider voices, field media, and interpersonal relationships - to examine insiders’ perceptions of the field opinion on a practice.

The role of insider voices. The perception of other field members’ positions plays a crucial role on an insider’s decision to voice (Oshagan, 1996). Insiders spontaneously evaluate the possible reaction of their peers before making a decision

to voice: this is what Neuwirth & Frederick (2007) call “peer influence”. Insiders have a strong interest in the engagement of a practice, and are thus likely to express opinions in favor or against its enactment. In a similar way as in the public sphere, individual actors that believe they are in the majority in the field would be more likely to express their opinions. By contrast, minority views will become less and less likely to be expressed. Moreover, insiders are ultimately responsible for practice engagement or abandonment. Thus, the voices of insiders carry a greater weight than the ones of outsiders, especially when they side with public opinion. When some insiders align with public hostility, they make public view more legitimate within a field and create a breach through which hostility can spread.

The role of field media. Like the influence of the media in forming public opinion, fields have specialized media outlets that play a crucial role in the creation of meaning (Lounsbury & Rao, 2005). These media can take the form of trade journals and industry magazines, as well as media networks, such as Bloomberg or Reuters in the finance industry (Craig, 2001). Specialized media create meaning which strongly influences the ideas and behaviors of their restricted audience (Fombrun, 1996). Recent research on the spiral of silence shows that social actors tend to expose themselves to selected media, and these media consequently have a greater influence on their likelihood to express their voice (Tsfati, Stroud & Chotiner, 2014). Because field media are targeted at, and tailored to, field members, they appear very relevant and exert a strong pressure for conformity. The opinion they express appears as the dominant view at the field level, especially when they are perceived as close to the core actors of the field (Lounsbury & Rao, 2005). In the finance industry, the idea of extreme bonuses was entertained by press outlets such *Trader Monthly*, a lifestyle

magazine aimed at pitching luxury products to top-earnings actor of the field with the motto “See it, make it, spend it”.

The role of interpersonal relationships within the field. At the field level, people interact with both outsiders, who will be sensitive to public opinion, and other insiders, who will be sensitive to field opinion. Within peer groups, insiders will have closer connections and more interactions with specific field members. Research on the spiral of silence shows that, in broad contexts, social actors are more commonly influenced by friends and family (Moy, Domke & Stamm, 2001). Similarly, insiders are greatly influenced by other field members with whom they interact frequently, such as direct colleagues or friends within the field.

Insider Voices: From Public Opinion to Field Opinion

Fear of being in the minority and perceptions of the dominant opinion influence an agents’ decision to speak up or stay silent about a practice. When they evaluate the climate of opinion to decide whether they should voice or not, insiders represent a special case. Both the climate of opinion in the broad society (public opinion) and in their more direct social environment (field opinion) affects their choice. Indeed, actors within an institutional field are embedded in two discursive spaces and two potential spirals of silence, one at the public and one at the field level. Tension occurs when public opinion is hostile to a practice supported by field opinion. Insiders face the dilemma of whether to follow the majority view expressed by the public opinion and oppose the practice, or to comply with the majority of their field. Insiders opposing a practice will be in the majority at the public level, but in the minority in their field. Conversely, insiders defending a practice align with the dominant view of their field, but they will belong to the minority at the public level.

Figure 3 represents the overall model that links public opinion to field opinion, and shows the micro-processes through which hostile public opinion can pervade the debate in a field. Figure 3 conceptualizes the link between the spiral of silence at the public and field levels. It describes the initial situation when public opinion opposes a practice, the field defends it, and insiders have to decide whether or not to defend the practice. If they do, they will face a spiral of silence at the public level and if they oppose it, they will face a spiral of silence at the field level where they are in the minority. Spirals of silence at the public and field levels are in opposition, pulling insiders in different directions. This tension remains until the field opinion changes and becomes aligned with public hostility or vice versa.

Insert Figure 3 about here

What results from this tension depends on whether the fear of being in a minority is stronger in the field or at the public level.² If insiders decide to comply with the field opinion and oppose the public's vilification of a practice, the influence of public opinion on field opinion slows, in what Aardal (1998) calls an "upward" spiral of silence. If insiders comply with public opinion, they will tend to silence other field members; and if they become the majority at the field level, the spiral of silence in the field will become aligned with the one in the public sphere. This

² Insiders will decide whether to align their voice with hostile public opinion or with favorable field opinion depending on the relative strength of the fear of isolation in the public sphere and in the field. On the public side, it is obvious that the greater the strength of public disapproval, the more likely it is for insiders to support public opinion versus the contrasting field opinion. However, our focus is to understand why fields react in a different way at a given level of public disapproval. Therefore, we consider the level of public disapproval a constant in the following discussion.

baseline theoretical mechanism explains how hostile public opinion spreads within an institutional field: insider voices are a backdoor through which field opinion can get “contaminated” by public disapproval, provided that their fear of isolation is greater in the public sphere than in the field setting.

This does not imply that public hostility will propagate all institutional fields at the same pace; in some cases insiders will not echo the voices of their peers. Any broad deterministic claims that link individual actions to a collective outcome are thought to be tentative (Creed et al., 2014). Institutional fields differ in how insider voices influence the field opinion and eventually win over other insiders. In the next section, we analyze how the spiral of silence literature explains this heterogeneity.

From Field Opinion to the Abandonment of a Practice

Once field opinion becomes hostile to a practice, the practice is likely to be abandoned (see Figure 1). However, this does not mean that all insiders will simultaneously abandon the practice. In some fields, insiders will converge quickly to the new climate of opinion at the field level, whereas in others this process will take longer. According to the spiral of silence theory, this depends on the strength of the silencing pressure caused by the dominant opinion, in this case, in the field. There are two possible scenarios. The first one is when there is a strong silencing pressure on the minority in the field (field opinion exerts a significant pressure on insiders to conform). At a given level of public disapproval, public opinion will have limited impact on insiders, as they will tend to align with their field. Eventually, when field opinion becomes hostile to a practice, it will in turn exert a strong pressure to silent the insiders who still support the practice, thus hastening the abandonment of the practice.

The opposite process happens when the silencing mechanism caused by the dominant opinion in the field has limited power. In this scenario, initially insiders are more likely to side with hostile public opinion, because their fear of being in the minority in the public sphere is greater. However, this time, the move towards abandoning a practice tends to happen more slowly. It may be easier to reach a tipping point when field opinion swings towards opposing a practice, but once this happens, the spiral of silence exerts less pressure on other insiders to abandon the practice. In such fields, the overall field climate has a reduced influence on individual behaviors, whether in engaging or abandoning a practice. Table 1 shows these two scenarios.

Insert Table 1 about here

Our model advances a second important insight for literature on deinstitutionalization; fields where the silencing pressure is strong are less permeable, i.e. “closed or not exposed to ideas from other institutional arenas” (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996: 1030). However, upon reaching a tipping point, i.e. when the field opinion switches to opposition to a practice, insiders will quickly abandon a practice, and the change becomes robust. This is because a strong fear of being in the minority at the field level makes the field less penetrable in the first place, but creates stronger conforming pressures when the field opinion reverses. Instead, fields where the silencing pressure is weak are more permeable to public opinion, and are more receptive to influences from other institutional arenas. In these fields, it is easier to win insiders to one’s own side in the first place, although subsequently it is difficult to make all actors converge.

Because the fear of being in the minority is the baseline mechanism of both the spiral of silence and our integrative theory of deinstitutionalization, we discuss hereafter the boundary conditions in which the fear of being in the minority in the field can exist and generate a spiral of silence at the field level. Our model builds on a number of assumptions. Identifying boundary conditions is a key element when blending theories from different domains, as some assumptions erode during the process of mapping concepts and causal mechanisms (Okhuysen & Bonardi, 2011). Finally, we discuss certain factors that our analogy might underestimate, and how those factors limit our theoretical reasoning.

BOUNDARY CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE ANALOGY

As we build the concept of field opinion and suggest the emergence of a spiral of silence at the field level, we rely on the plausibility of assumptions from the source domain vis-à-vis the target domain (Cornelissen & Durand, 2014; Okhuysen & Bonardi, 2011). Because of the constitutive nature of the analogy, our theory may seem to “overwrite existing theory” (Cornelissen & Durand, 2014: 9) by underplaying motives identified in the institutional theory literature and narrowing our focus on patterns of communication as the basis of institutions (Suddaby, 2011). We address those challenges by exploring the boundary conditions and limitations of the spiral of silence theory in light of institutional theory literature.

Boundary Conditions for the Spiral of Silence at the Field Level

Although a meta-analysis of the literature reveals a significant relationship between climate opinion and willingness to voice (Glynn et al., 1997), the spiral of silence theory faces challenges on empirical grounds. The current debate is not

around whether the theory is supported or not, but mainly on the magnitude of the effects (Scheufele & Moy, 2000; Kim, 2012). We explore the literature that challenges the spiral of silence theory and its relationship to institutional theory as a way to set up boundary conditions for our theoretical framework.

Boundary conditions associated with the targeted practice. Previous work on the spiral of silence has suggested that an element of controversy is crucial for creating the conditions for the existence of the fear of being in the minority. Studies have shown that the spiral of silence tends to emerge for value-laden issues, or those with a moral component (Scheufele, 2008; Kim, 2012), where judgments result by comparing subjective standards and norms of behavior. As Noelle-Neuman (1995) notes, public opinion does not determine what is right or wrong, but rather what is good or bad. For some practices, such as stem cell creation and usage, no objective definitive view exists, and as a consequence the climate of opinion takes its position based on a morality judgment (Scheufele, 2008). Conforming to the dominant view is more likely in this case as there is no authoritative argument and deviant moral judgment is more harshly considered (Noelle-Neumann, 1995; Neuwirth et al., 2007). Therefore, value-laden practices are more likely to trigger a spiral of silence through strong conforming pressures.

In spite of moral condemnation from the field majority, some practices can be maintained when they are indispensable for some agents, for example when agents face economic constraints and continue a practice because their survival is at stake (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). In such cases, insiders would then hide their engagement in the practice to avoid being isolated. However, a number of examples suggest that institutional fields can create mechanisms, such as economic incentives, to convince the most recalcitrant actors (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). This happened in the case of

“connect-time pricing” in the online database industry (Farjoun, 2002), and in the governance structure in the Dutch accounting sector (Lee & Pennings, 2002). This suggests that visibility singularly affects the deployment of the spiral of silence. If a practice is visible to other insiders, but not to the public, conformity to field opinion is a relatively easy choice for insiders. Similarly, if a practice is invisible to the field, engaging in this practice won’t be perceived as deviant behavior. Therefore, a practice needs to be visible to other field members for the spiral of silence to deploy at the field level.

Boundary conditions associated with field configuration. Given that an institutional field is a network of social actors, the configuration of the field will influence the way social actors are linked and how they influence each other. Coming back to the example of the German automotive industry (Guérard et al., 2013), the fear of Ford Germany’s top executives materialized only when their peers from other firms started to threaten to seclude them. This was possible because the German automotive field is well connected, partly because of the presence of a professional association such as the German Association of the Automotive Industry. Professional associations play a key role in shaping organizational fields, and one way they do this is by increasing connectivity among members of a field (Greenwood et al., 2002).

Connectivity is a macro-level property that relates to the robustness of a network and information flow. In highly connected networks, each member is mutually connected to a large number of other members (Wasserman, 1994). Empirical findings have confirmed that connectivity enhances the effect of interpersonal relationship on the spiral of silence phenomenon (Noelle-Neumann, 1977; 1993). Connectivity influences insider voices in two ways. First, it helps field members gauge field opinion. Second, it increases the fear of being in the minority:

insiders who diverge from field opinion will be penalized by strategic or normative sanctions by a broader set of other field members. If field members are isolated and do not interact, fear of being in the minority would not emerge (like in the case of geographically dispersed fields). Therefore, we propose that connectivity contributes to the deployment of the spiral of silence at the field level, and thus silencing pressures will be stronger in connected fields.

Limitations of the Analogy

Fear of being in the minority and the role of agency. The spiral of silence theory relies on peoples' fear of being in the minority as a baseline mechanism. Although not disputing the mechanism, a traditional criticism of the theory has been that it has misinterpreted or overemphasized the cause of this as being fear of social isolation (Scheufele & Moy, 2000) – a normative process - and ignored other conforming processes (Neuwirth et al., 2007). This might also be the reason why the effects of the spiral of silence are generally found to be low in magnitude (Glynn et al., 1997). Lang & Lang (2012), among others, point out the importance of looking at two other non-normative motives: strategic and cognitive orientations. While it is arguable that these motives are important in a political context (Lang & Lang, 2012; Scheufele, 2008), they are undoubtedly crucial in many institutional fields where actors have economic and social ties. Thus, when applying the spiral of silence to institutional fields, it is important to consider all three motives to conform: normative motives are triggered by avoidance of disapproval; strategic motives are prompted by members' reliance on outsiders to create value; and cognitive motives appear when field members deal with ambiguity and uncertainty. Those three sorts of rationales are well known by institutional theorists (Oliver, 1991; Dacin et al., 2002). Strategic

motivation plays a significant role in institutional fields where actors often mutually depend on others to acquire key resources (Casciaro & Piskorski, 2005; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Institutional theory has pointed out the role of self-interest in refusing or embracing conformity (Oliver, 1991). Cognitive reasons may be equally important, especially in uncertain situations where actors rely on the judgments of others to help them make better decisions (Price & Allen, 1990; Oliver, 1991). A significant amount of literature in the last three decades has shown how practice engagement is influenced by “taken-for-grantedness” (Aldrich & Fiol, 1994), routines, and competitors’ representations in spite of normative or strategic reasons to comply with them (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

This variety of motives can drive the existence of what Noelle-Neumann (1993: 171) call the hard core, “those who remain at the end of a spiral of silence process, in defiance of threats of isolation”. Thus, there is a subset of individual actors who are not subject to the spiral of silence (Matthes et al., 2010), and whose presence might remain the last frontier defending a practice facing public opposition. Hard-core people are not only motivated by ideology, socio-cultural and psychological reasons (Scheufele & Moy, 2000), but also simply by instrumentalism (Oliver, 1991). Some insiders are strongly vested in upholding a particular practice, such as top executives with golden parachutes (Fiss et al. 2012), and this can form the basis for a hard-core group. We acknowledge the variety of motives at the agent level, they do not obstruct the basic mechanism of the spiral of silence (Lang & Lang, 2012; Kim, 2012; Matthes, et al. 2012). The presence of a hard-core contingent can slow down the mechanisms identified in this paper. Our theoretical framework does not include this level of granularity, neither does it emphasize agency, although multiple motives might play a crucial role in evaluating the strength of the silencing at the field

versus at the public level. Future research could examine the mix of motives in avoiding being in the minority, and those situations where hard-core contingents help maintain publicly disapproved practices.

Endogeneity between institutions and public opinion: the role of media.

The existence of democratic and representative media is a crucial element for understanding the close relationship between public opinion and institutions. Although a spiral of silence can exist without the media (Noelle-Neumann, 1993), and in both democratic and authoritarian contexts (Matthes et al., 2012), it relies on access to the media and the opportunity to express oneself through the media (Woong Yun & Park, 2011). Recent theorization of the spiral of silence identified the media and its use as sources of reflexivity (Slater, 2007; Tsfati et al, 2014). The content of media influences how it is used, and in turn how it affects individual behaviors. For example, individuals are likely to avoid media that condemn their behavior and to select sources of information that are friendly and confirm their pre-existing beliefs (Tsfati et al., 2014).

When affected by public opinion, institutions can also shape the media, which in turn impact public opinion. For example, hardcore practices in the porn industry illustrate how media create reflexivity in the interaction between public opinion and institutions. Despite public disapproval, actors in the early porn industry successfully sustained several sexual practices in filming porn in the 1970s, particularly homosexual sex (Escoffier, 2009). However, the public's acceptance of those practices has significantly relied on films made by mainstream cinema, where "the pornographic potential of film was an important factor driving its development" (McNair, 2012: 11). In other words, the cinema helped bring porn into the mainstream, while porn contributed to the development of cinema, suggesting a

circular relationship between public opinion and institutions, through the intermediary role of the media.

Our model regards media as a fixed, rather than a moving, part. We assume the climate of opinion and its impact on behaviors does not affect media to the extent it influences the causal mechanisms we unveil. The emergent role of social media, through which users themselves partially create content (Burns, 2008), represents an interesting case. On one hand, social media ensure broad participation and rely on decentralization and large-scale diffusion. Organizations find it difficult to exert control on such media (Pallas, Strannegård & Jonsson, 2014), and those media become a less biased source of information and more adequately reflects public opinion. For example, Twitter is now used to mirror the political landscape and has some predictive power regarding the results of elections (Tumasjan et al., 2010). On the other hand, whenever possible individuals tend to seek media sources that reflect their own beliefs (Schulz & Roessler, 2012) although they are still subject to the fear of being in the minority, even in their online expression (Kim, Kim & Oh, 2014). Thus, social media create two contradictory effects on the spiral of silence mechanism: individual actors select information that is consistent with their prior views, but at the same time, social media increase their likelihood to be exposed to the majority view. Therefore, it is not clear how social media will impact our theoretical model: it would depend on the motivation of the actors. Social media will allow unbiased actors to assess public opinion more accurately, while partisan actors will self-select sources that support their beliefs and reproduce and diffuse this information.

DISCUSSION

Building on our constitutive analogy between the public and institutional fields, we integrate concepts and key vocabularies to contribute to both the source (communication science) and the target domain (institutional theory). For institutional theorists, our approach offers a multi-level theory to bridge the gap between outsider- and insider-driven deinstitutionalization, building on the link between the baseline mechanism of fear of being in the minority and the emergence of a shared interpretation regarding a practice. At the institutional level, this link between micro-processes and macro outcomes explains how contradictory institutional prescriptions can converge through the homogenization of distinct climates of opinion. In addition, we contribute to the mass-communication literature by offering a robust account of the institutional-level of analysis and including institutional field as a source of an alternative climate of opinion.

Contribution to Institutional Theory

This paper brings a number of contributions to institutional theory, in particular to the literature on deinstitutionalization, the debate on linking micro behaviors to macro-level outcomes, and in understanding interactions between different social arenas and institutional fields. To conclude, we discuss how our theoretical framework relates to existing approaches on the acceptance of institutional ideas, and how voice and fear of being in the minority may further develop institutional theory.

Deinstitutionalization literature. While institutionalization is a well-explored mechanism, deinstitutionalization and especially outsider-driven deinstitutionalization has received limited attention (Maguire & Hardy, 2009).

Insider- and outsider-driven deinstitutionalization have been usually treated separately. Our framework bridges this gap by explaining how public opinion can mobilize support of insiders and, eventually, deinstitutionalize a practice. Because of the fear of being in the minority, insiders can support deinstitutionalization in order to align themselves with public opinion. Also, the present study contributes to the literature on institutional work, when individuals and organization actively configure their institutional environments (Lawrence, Suddaby & Leca, 2011). We suggest that institutional maintenance and disruption are two sides of the same coin; disruption can trigger maintenance, and vice versa.

Micro-macro link. Our study advances the study of multi-level approaches to institutions. Recent articles have called for a shift in focus towards a more interaction-centered view of institutions, with emphasis on negotiation of practices (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Creed et al., 2014). While this perspective on “inhabited institutions” strives to link micro-processes of interaction with macro-level outcomes, we offer the spiral of silence as a theoretical bridge to link those two levels of analysis. The spiral of silence theory helps understand how individual reactions create changes at the level of the overall field: through their voices and the influence on field opinion. Fear of being in the minority is a process of self-regulation and enables us to capture tensions between overlapping memberships of individual actors. Our approach relies on the nested nature of climates of opinion and tensions existing between different sources of conforming pressures. We explain how the conflicting prescriptions of the public and the field can be resolved.

Fields’ ‘nestedness’. While we focus on deinstitutionalization, our model has more general implications for understanding fields’ ‘nestedness’. While recent research has focused on the interstitial space between fields (Furnari, 2014), we focus

on their *overlap*. This resonates with research on institutional complexity, where actors are dependent upon multiple and incompatible institutional arrangements (Greenwood et al., 2011). Although we focus on ‘nestedness’ within the broad public, fields can be nested in each other: for example, the investment banking industry is part of the broader field of the finance industry (Roulet, Forthcoming). In addition, the finance industry reacted in some way to practices enacted in the subfield of investment banking. Robert Wilmers, CEO of the American commercial bank M&T, attacked the risky practices of investment bankers, and praised the virtues of the “good” commercial banks (M&T Bank, 2010). ‘Nestedness’ of fields creates multiple climates of opinion, and thus potentially contradictory pressures to conform. Still, while all actors are sensitive to isolation in the public sphere, they might not fear being in the minority at some field levels. In the case of Robert Wilmers, his position was motivated by conforming pressures at the public level: he opposes investment banking practices, because they are targeted by public opinion. Thus, we see how public opinion actually influences relationships and pressures between institutional fields.

Finally, our spiral of silence approach suggests that the processes of institutionalization and deinstitutionalization rely on the voice of actors within fields, which are then triggered by an individual feeling - fear of being in the minority. Potentially, these two concepts can enrich current institutional theory research. Our first key concept is fear of being in the minority, a self-regulation process that explains conformity to institutional prescriptions but also helps account for multiple levels of embeddedness (institutional field members are also part of broader contexts), a key suggestion of the inhabited institutions approach (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006).

Our approach complements Zilber's (2006) perspective on translating myths from broad to local institutional levels: the spiral of silence explains how institutional prescriptions at the public level "translate" at a local level, and how the dynamics of local spheres can either lead to rejection or enactment of public prescriptions. Our second key theoretical element is voice, the simple outward expression of individual actors. Voice helps explain the spread of support or hostility towards institutional prescriptions. This "voice model of institutionalization" also echoes existing institutional theorization.

The idea that voice and silence affect institutions aligns with the concept of institutional work, which recognizes the power of individuals and organizations to change their institutional environments (Lawrence, Suddaby & Leca, 2011). Voice is a key unit of analysis in understanding both maintaining and disrupting institutional work. Voice is the medium through which activists and social movements disrupt institutionalized practices (Hiatt, Sine & Tolbert, 2009), but it can also expose supporting rationale for defensive institutional work (Maguire & Hardy, 2009). However, maintenance and disruption have not been conceptualized through the lens of voice yet (i.e. the simple expression of an opinion), but rather through the concept of discourse, which focuses on the framing and the content of this expression (Phillips, et al. 2004).

The conformity mechanism generated by fear of being in the minority also echoes the literature on emotions and institutional work (Creed et al. 2014; Voronov & Vince, 2012) by emphasizing social and emotional bonds to understand individual actors' motivations for participating in institutionalization or deinstitutionalization processes. But fear of being in the minority is also related to a well-identified driver of institutional change: identity (Creed, et al. 2010). The choice of aligning with the

field or the public is comparable to the tension between a field's aspired and ascribed identity. Identification with the field can drive adherence to a logic and thus practice engagement (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). Similarly, actors' identification with a field would positively moderate their fear of being in the minority. The spiral of silence theory differs from broader approaches to institutional change by focusing on how individual self-regulation processes aggregate at the field level, and ultimately determine institutional resistance or change. Identity, discourses, or emotions can trigger institutional change but they tend to remain at a unique level of analysis, while self-regulation processes can bridge the gap between multiple levels of analysis.

Contribution to the Spiral of Silence and Mass Communication Literature

The mass communication literature has established the crucial role of referent groups in influencing voice (Price & Allen, 1990; Oshagan, 1996; Neuwirth & Frederick, 2004; Kim, 2012), but has focused relatively little attention on understanding their dynamics. We explore theoretically the dynamics of opinion in referent groups by defining field opinion as an alternative climate of opinion compared with public opinion, thus following Noelle-Neumann's (1993) call for research on dual climates of opinion. By focusing on institutional fields, our model advances a situation of multiple competing horizontal spirals of silence, rather than vertical and cascading spirals of silence (Bowen & Blackmon, 2003). As Lammers & Barbour (2006) did for organizational communication, we offer a more robust account of the institutional level of analysis for mass communication research. In this sense, we discuss the importance of "institutional messages" for mass communication research (Lammers, 2011; Lammers & Barbour, 2006), as our theory explains the formation of messages from individual actions to institutional fields. Our multi-level

approach extends the concept of institutional messages by building on a number of Suddaby's (2011) points: our theory places individual actors at the center of the transmissions of those institutional messages, and explains how patterns of communication can shape institutional change.

Our study also explains why empirical studies found a low magnitude for the effects of the spiral of silence effects (Glynn et al., 1997): public opinion exerts little influence on some actors, either because they are in a relatively impermeable field, or because they and their referent group have limited exposure to outsiders' voices. In addition, the spiral of silence originated and has been tested mostly on normative motives, and not strategic or cognitive motives. The latter are key aspects of institutional fields, therefore we expect the spiral of silence to strongly affect contexts where multiple ties between actors and their various dimensions generate strong motivations in order to avoid being in the minority.

CONCLUSION

We explain how public opinion can affect institutional fields. We theorize specifically on the development of discursive conflicts regarding practices at the societal and field levels, the relationship between public opinion and field opinion, and the deinstitutionalization of these practices. We argue that institutional fields act as reference groups for their members, and the dominant opinion in a field can exert strong pressure on insiders to conform, and thus abandon a practice when the majority of their field oppose it. Fear of being in the minority brings about a spiral of silence, which ultimately silences minority supporters of a practice. Field opinions are, however, nested in the broader arena of public opinion. When public opinion opposes a practice, it exerts a constraining influence on institutional fields and this influence is

mediated by insider voices. When field opinion supports a practice against public opinion, insiders must either comply with the public opinion, or stick with the majority of their field. The outcome of this tension depends on the deployment of the spiral of silence within the field. In fields that exert a strong silencing pressure on their members, insiders are less likely to align with public opinion's hostility initially, but once a majority of field members agree with public opinion, field opinion exerts a greater pressure on other members to comply and abandon a practice. On the contrary, for fields that exert weak silencing pressure, insider voices more easily align with public opinion in the first part of the process, but once field and public opinion are aligned, field opinion exerts less pressure to conform on the remaining insiders who still engage in the practice.

REFERENCES

- Adut, A. (2008). On scandal: Moral disturbances in society. *Politics, and Art*, 78.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Fiol, C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 645-670.
- Ansari, S. M., Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, E. J. (2010). Made to fit: How practices vary as they diffuse. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(1), 67-92.
- Aardal, B. (1994). The 1994 Storting election: volatile voters opposing the European Union. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 17(2), 171-180.
- Bonardi, J. P., & Keim, G. D. (2005). Corporate political strategies for widely salient issues. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(3), 555-576.
- Bowen, F., & Blackmon, K. (2003). Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1393-1417.
- Bruns, A. (2008). *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to produsage* (Vol. 45). Peter Lang.
- Burstein, P. (2003). The impact of public opinion on public policy: A review and an agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 29-40.
- Cattani, G., Ferriani, S., Negro, G., & Perretti, F. (2008). The structure of consensus: Network ties, legitimation, and exit rates of US feature film producer organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(1): 145-182.
- Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. J. (2005). Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(2), 167-199.

- Converse, P. E. (1987). Changing conceptions of public opinion in the political process. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51, S12-S24.
- Cornelissen, J. P., & Durand, R. (2014). Moving forward: Developing theoretical contributions in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*.
- Craig, G. (2001). The global financial news, information & technology corporations. *Southern Review: Communication, Politics & Culture*, 34(2), 4.
- Creed, D., Hudson, B., Okhuysen, G., & Smith-Crowe, K. (2014). Swimming in a sea of shame: Incorporating emotion into explanations of institutional reproduction and change. *Academy of Management Review*.
- Bruns, A. (2008). *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, And Beyond*. Peter Lang Academic Publishers.
- Dacin, M. T., Goodstein, J., & Scott, W. R. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 45-56.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* 48: 147-160.
- Escoffier, J. (2009). *Bigger than life: The history of gay porn cinema from beefcake to hardcore*. Running Press.
- Farjoun, M. (2002). The dialectics of institutional development in emerging and turbulent fields: The history of pricing conventions in the on-line database industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(5), 848-874.

- Fiss, P. C., Kennedy, M. T., & Davis, G. F. (2012). How golden parachutes unfolded: Diffusion and variation of a controversial practice. *Organization Science*, 23(4), 1077-1099.
- Fombrun, C. J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing Value from the Corporate Image*. Harvard Business School Press
- Furnari, S. (2014). Interstitial spaces: Micro-interaction settings and the genesis of new practices between institutional fields. *Academy of Management Review*.
- Ganesh, S., & Stohl, C. (2013). From Wall Street to Wellington: Protests in an era of digital ubiquity. *Communication Monographs*, 80(4), 425-451.
- Glynn, C. J., Hayes, A. F., & Shanahan, J. (1997). Perceived support for one's opinions and willingness to speak out: A meta-analysis of survey studies on the spiral of silence. *Public opinion quarterly*, Vol 61(3), 1997, 452-463
- Glynn, C.J., Herbst, S., O'Keefe, G., Shapiro, R., Lindeman, M. (2005). *Public Opinion*, 2nd edition, Westview Press.
- Glynn, C. J., & Huges, M. E. (2007). Opinions as norms applying a return potential model to the study of communication behaviors. *Communication Research*, 34(5), 548-568.
- Glynn, C. J., & Park, E. (1997). Reference groups, opinion intensity, and public opinion expression. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 9(3), 213-232.
- Gondo, M. B., & Amis, J. M. (2013). Variations in Practice Adoption: The Roles of Conscious Reflection and Discourse. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2), 229-247.

- Green, S. E. (2004). A rhetorical theory of diffusion. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 653-669.
- Green, S. E., Babb, M., & Alpaslan, C. M. (2008). Institutional Field Dynamics and the Competition Between Institutional Logics The Role of Rhetoric in the Evolving Control of the Modern Corporation. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22(1), 40-73.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1022-1054.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 58-80.
- Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 317-371.
- Grunig, J. E. (1979). A New Measure of Public Opinion on Corporate Social Responsibility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22(4), 738-764.
- Guérard, S., Bode, C., & Gustafsson, R. (2013). Turning point mechanisms in a dualistic process model of institutional emergence: The case of the diesel particulate filter in Germany. *Organization Studies*, 34(5-6), 781-822.
- Habermas, J. (2001). The public sphere: An encyclopedia article. *Media and Cultural Studies*, 73.

- Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. J. (2006). Inhabited institutions: Social interactions and organizational forms in Gouldner's Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. *Theory and Society*, 35(2), 213-236.
- Hauser, G. A. (1998). Vernacular dialogue and the rhetoricality of public opinion. *Communications Monographs*, 65(2), 83-107.
- Hayes, A. F. (2007). Exploring the Forms of Self-Censorship: On the Spiral of Silence and the Use of Opinion Expression Avoidance Strategies. *Journal of Communication*, 57(4), 785-802.
- Hiatt, S. R., Sine, W. D., & Tolbert, P. S. (2009). From Pabst to Pepsi: The deinstitutionalization of social practices and the creation of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(4), 635-667.
- Ho, K. (2009). *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street*. Duke University Press.
- Ho, S. S., Chen, V. H. H., & Sim, C. C. (2013). The spiral of silence: examining how cultural predispositions, news attention, and opinion congruency relate to opinion expression. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 23(2), 113-134.
- Hoffman, A. (1999). Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the U.S. chemical industry. *Academy of Management Journal*. 42(4): 351-371.
- Jepperson, R. L. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. in DiMaggio P. and Powell W. (eds) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, 6, 143-163, University of Chicago Press.
- Kenamer, J. D. (1990). Self-serving biases in perceiving the opinions of others. *Communication Research*, 17, 393-404.

- Kim, S. H. (2012). Testing fear of isolation as a causal mechanism: Spiral of silence and genetically modified (gm) foods in south korea. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 24(3), 306-324.
- Kim, S., Kim, H., & Oh, S. H. (2014). Talking about Genetically Modified (GM) Foods in South Korea: The Role of the Internet in the Spiral of Silence Process. *Mass Communication and Society*.
- Lammers, J. C., & Barbour, J. B. (2006). An institutional theory of organizational communication. *Communication Theory*, 16(3), 356-377.
- Lammers, J. C. (2011). How institutions communicate: Institutional messages, institutional logics, and organizational communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(1), 154-182.
- Lang, K., & Lang, G. E. (2012). What is this Thing we Call Public Opinion? Reflections on the Spiral of Silence. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 24(3), 368-386.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). *Institutions and Institutional Work*. *The Sage handbook of organization studies*, 215.
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1), 52-58.
- Lee, K., & Pennings, J. M. (2002). Mimicry and the market: Adoption of a new organizational form. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 144-162.
- Locke, J. (1998). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Penguin Classics.

Lounsbury, M., & Rao, H. (2004). Sources of durability and change in market classifications: A study of the reconstitution of product categories in the American mutual fund industry, 1944–1985. *Social Forces*, 82(3), 969-999.

M&T Bank (2010). **Annual Report**.

Madrick, J. (2011). *Age of Greed: The Triumph of Finance and the Decline of America, 1970 to the Present*. Alfred a Knopf Incorporated.

Maguire, S., & Hardy, C. (2009.) Discourse and deinstitutionalization: The decline of DDT. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(1), 148-178.

Matthes, J., Morrison, K. R., & Schemer, C. (2010). A spiral of silence for some: Attitude certainty and the expression of political minority opinions. *Communication Research*, 37(6), 774-800.

Matthes, J., Hayes, A. F., Rojas, H., Shen, F., Min, S. J., & Dylko, I. B. (2012). Exemplifying a dispositional approach to cross-cultural spiral of silence research: fear of social isolation and the inclination to self-censor. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 24(3), 287-305.

McDonald, D. G., Glynn, C. J., Kim, S. H., & Ostman, R. E. (2001). The spiral of silence in the 1948 presidential election. *Communication Research*, 28(2), 139-155.

McLeod, D. M., & Hertog, J. K. (1992). The Manufacture of Public Opinion by Reporters: Informal Cues for Public Perceptions of Protest Groups. *Discourse & Society*, 3(3), 259-275.

McNair, B. (2012). *Pornography in the Multiplex*. in Hines, C., & Kerr, D. (Eds.). (2012). *Hard to Swallow: Hard-core Pornography on Screen*. Columbia University Press.

- Montaigne, M. E. (1958). *The complete essays of Montaigne* (Vol. 1). Stanford University Press.
- Moy, P., Domke, D., & Stamm, K. (2001). The spiral of silence and public opinion on affirmative action. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(1), 7-25.
- Neuwirth, K., & Frederick, E. (2004). Peer and social influence on opinion expression combining the theories of planned behavior and the spiral of silence. *Communication Research*, 31(6), 669-703.
- Neuwirth, K., Frederick, E., & Mayo, C. (2007). The spiral of silence and fear of isolation. *Journal of Communication*, 57(3), 450-468.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence a theory of public opinion. *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 43-51.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1977). Turbulences in the climate of opinion: Methodological applications of the spiral of silence theory. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 41(2), 143-158.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The spiral of silence: Public opinion--Our social skin*. (2nd edition). University of Chicago Press.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1995). Public Opinion and Rationality. in T. Glasser, CT. Salmon & E. Katz, *Public opinion and the communication of consent*, Cambridge University Press.
- Noelle-Neumann, E., & Petersen, T. (2004). The spiral of silence and the social nature of man. *Handbook of political communication research*: 339-356.
- Okhuysen, G., & Bonardi, J. P. (2011). The challenges of building theory by combining lenses. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 6-11.

- Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145-179.
- Oliver, C. (1992). The antecedents of deinstitutionalization. *Organization Studies*, 13(4), 563-588.
- Oshagan, H. (1996). Reference group influence on opinion expression. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 8, 335-354.
- Pallas, J. L. Strannegard, & S. Jonsson (Eds.) (2014). **Organizations and the Media: Organizing in a Mediatized World**. Taylor & Francis
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford University Press.
- Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of management review*, 29(4), 635-652.
- Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1996). Pluralistic ignorance and the perpetuation of social norms by unwitting actors. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 28, 161-209.
- Price, V., & Allen, S. (1990). Opinion spirals, silent and otherwise: Applying small-group research to public opinion phenomena. *Communication Research*.
- 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.
- Rimal, R. N., & Real, K. (2003). Understanding the influence of perceived norms on behaviors. *Communication Theory*, 13(2), 184-203.

- Rimal, R. N., & Real, K. (2005). How behaviors are influenced by perceived norms a test of the theory of normative social behavior. *Communication Research*, 32(3), 389-414.
- Roulet, T. (Forthcoming). "What Good is Wall Street?" Institutional Contradiction and the Diffusion of the Stigma over the Finance Industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Salmon, C. T., & Glynn, C. J. (1996). Spiral of silence: Communication and public opinion as social control. In Salwen and Stack (Eds), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research*, Routledge, 165-180.
- Scheufele, D. A., & Moy, P. (2000). Twenty-five years of the spiral of silence: A conceptual review and empirical outlook. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 12(1), 3-28.
- Scheufele, D. A. (2008). Spiral of silence theory. In Donsbach W. and Traugott M. W. *The SAGE handbook of public opinion research*, 173-183.
- Schultz, F., & Wehmeier, S. (2010). Institutionalization of corporate social responsibility within corporate communications: Combining institutional, sensemaking and communication perspectives. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 15(1), 9-29.
- Schulz, A., & Roessler, P. (2012). The spiral of silence and the internet: Selection of online content and the perception of the public opinion climate in computer-mediated communication environments. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 24(3), 346-367.

- Shlomo, J. B., Eggert, W., & Nguyen, T. (2013). Regulation of remuneration policy in the financial sector: Evaluation of recent reforms in Europe. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, 5(3), 256-269.
- Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations, 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Slater, M. D. (2007). Reinforcing spirals: The mutual influence of media selectivity and media effects and their impact on individual behavior and social identity. *Communication Theory*, 17(3), 281-303.
- Suddaby, R. (2011). How communication institutionalizes: A response to Lammers. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 0893318910389265.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford University Press.
- Tocqueville, A. (1955). *The old regime and the French revolution*, trans. Stuart Gilbert (Garden City, NY, 1955), 3.
- Tsfati, Y., Stroud, N. J., & Chotiner, A. (2014). Exposure to ideological news and perceived opinion climate testing the media effects component of spiral-of-silence in a fragmented media landscape. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 19(1), 3-23.
- Tumasjan, A., Sprenger, T. O., Sandner, P. G., & Welpe, I. M. (2010). Election forecasts with Twitter: How 140 characters reflect the political landscape. *Social Science Computer Review*, DOI: 10.1177/0894439310386557.
- Vaara, E., & Tienari, J. (2008). A discursive perspective on legitimation strategies in multinational corporations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 985-993.

- Yanovitzky, I., & Stryker, J. (2001). Mass media, social norms, and health promotion efforts a longitudinal study of media effects on youth binge drinking. *Communication Research*, 28(2), 208-239.
- Voronov, M., & Vince, R. (2012). Integrating emotions into the analysis of institutional work. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 58-81.
- Wasserman, S. (1994) *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. Vol. 8. Cambridge university press.
- Woong Yun, G., & Park, S. Y. (2011). Selective posting: Willingness to post a message online. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 16(2), 201-227.
- Zilber, T. B. (2006). The work of the symbolic in institutional processes: Translations of rational myths in Israeli high tech. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 281-303.

TABLES

TABLE 1

Field opinion and the abandonment of a practice

Strength of the silencing pressure at the field level

		Strong silencing pressure of the field	Weak silencing pressure of the field
Field opinion's alignment with public hostility	Field opinion supports the practice against public opinion	Public opinion's hostility spreads less easily among insiders	Public opinion's hostility spreads more easily among insiders
	Field opinion opposes the practice in alignment with public opinion	Abandonment of the practice is faster	Abandonment of the practice is slower

FIGURES

FIGURE 1

Public opinion, field opinion and deinstitutionalization




FIGURE 2

A schematic representation of the spiral of silence theory





FIGURE 3

Schematic summary of the impact of public opinion on deinstitutionalization



BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Marco Clemente (marco.clemente@aalto.fi): Marco Clemente is Postdoctoral Researcher at the Institute of Strategy at Aalto University and he is affiliated with the Society and Organizations Research Center at HEC Paris. He studies the socio-institutional determinants of competitive advantage. His current research focuses on the social and economic consequences of organizational misconduct and scandals.

Thomas J. Roulet (troulet@gmail.com): Thomas Roulet is Assistant Professor at the University of Bath, Novak Druce Fellow at the University of Oxford and is also affiliated with the Society and Organizations Research Center at HEC Paris. His research focuses on negative social evaluations (stigma, disapproval, illegitimacy) at the organizational, individual and practice levels.