

Portland State University

PDXScholar

---

Business Faculty Publications and  
Presentations

The School of Business

---

4-2016

# Converging Winds: Logic Hybridization in the Colorado Wind Energy Field

Jeffrey G. York

*University of Colorado Boulder*

Timothy J. Hargrave

*Simon Fraser University*

Desirée F. Pacheco

*Portland State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/busadmin\\_fac](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/busadmin_fac)



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

## Citation Details

York, Jeffrey G.; Hargrave, Timothy J.; and Pacheco, Desirée F., "Converging Winds: Logic Hybridization in the Colorado Wind Energy Field" (2016). *Business Faculty Publications and Presentations*. 49.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/busadmin\\_fac/49](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/busadmin_fac/49)

This Post-Print is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Business Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## Converging Winds: Logic Hybridization in the Colorado Wind Energy Field

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

**JEFFREY G. YORK**

University of Colorado at Boulder  
UCB 419  
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0419  
(303) 807-6027  
jeffrey.york@colorado.edu

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

**TIMOTHY J. HARGRAVE\***

Simon Fraser University  
8888 University Drive,  
Burnaby, B.C.  
Canada. V5A 1S6  
Seattle University  
(206) 816-5768  
timothy.j.hargrave@gmail.com

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

**DESIREE F. PACHECO\***

Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207-0751  
(303) 775-9974  
pacheco@pdx.edu

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

\*Second and third authors contributed equally and are listed alphabetically.

**Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to Tima Bansal and three anonymous reviewers for the outstanding guidance and helpful feedback they provided. We would like to thank Kathy Eisenhardt, Shon Hiatt, Suresh Kotha, Isobel O'Neil, Sarah Soderstrom, David Hekman, Tyler Wry, Stasi York, participants in the 2014 West Coast Symposium on Technology Entrepreneurship, participants in the 2013 Alliance for Research on Corporate Sustainability (ARCS) conference, and participants in a research seminar at Nottingham University Business School for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. In addition, we thank all of our interview participants for their time and insights. Desiree Pacheco is grateful for the support of the Center for Global Leadership in Sustainability's Faculty Development and Research Grant at the School of Business Administration, Portland State University. Jeffrey York acknowledges the financial support of the Vogt Sustainability Research fund and the Shane Faculty Scholar Gift through the Center for Education on Social Responsibility at the Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado Boulder for this research.

## Converging Winds: Logic Hybridization in the Colorado Wind Energy Field

### ABSTRACT

This study explores the hybridization of field-level logics, a process that integrates previously incompatible logics within an organizational field. Through an inductive study of the wind energy field in Colorado, we find that logic hybridization resulted when social movement organizations, incumbent firms, and policy makers variously responded to incompatibility between economizing and ecologizing logics. Compromise and framing efforts catalyzed social movements to alter the balance of power in the field, which transformed the relationship between field logics. Hybrid organizations then emerged to establish, legitimize, and embed a new set of inter-linked frames, practices, and arrangements that integrated previously incompatible logics. Incumbent firms and policy makers further formalized and embedded the new hybridized logic in the field. Our findings suggest that the hybridization of field-level logics is a complex process in which organizational actions and field-level conditions recursively influence each other over time.

## Converging Winds: Logic Hybridization in the Colorado Wind Energy Field

*True, there are a few "granola technologies" such as solar power or windmills that are touted as environmentally friendly. But they are high cost and relatively unreliable.*

*- Denver Post editorial introducing a debate on the future of energy in Colorado (Ewegen, 1999)*

*What if there was an investment opportunity guaranteed to jumpstart the local economy, enhance national security, expand Colorado's energy portfolio and promote the health of the planet for future generations? It also would earn your household a 286 percent return. Would you take it?*

*- Denver Post editorial discussing the promise of Colorado's "New Energy Economy" (McKinnon & Hart, 2008)*

New technologies are often steeped in controversy. For example, wind energy, the production of electricity through wind turbines, has been the subject of widespread disagreement (Vasi, 2011). Environmentalists and scientists insist that wind energy can mitigate the impacts of human induced climate change through the reduction of carbon emissions ([Ansari, Wijen, & Gray, 2013](#); IPCC, 2013; 2014). However, many incumbent utilities, power generators, and policy makers have argued that wind energy is inefficient and expensive. These arguments encapsulate two broadly held logics that place preservation of the natural environment in conflict with economic prosperity. For example, as the quotes above illustrate, there was widespread doubt regarding the potential of wind energy in Colorado. Yet, by 2008, the state had the first voter mandated state renewable energy standard, a Governor elected on a platform of building a "clean energy economy", and over 1000 megawatts (MW) of wind energy capacity. How and why did this change occur? We explore this question through the lens of institutional logics and their role in the evolution of organizational fields.

1  
2  
3 It is widely recognized that organizational fields are constituted by multiple, often  
4 incompatible, institutional logics ([Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011](#);  
5 [Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007](#); [Reay & Hinings, 2009](#); [Zietsma & Lawrence, 2010](#)). With this  
6 recognition has come growing attention to how organizations manage tensions that arise from  
7 incompatible logics within a field ([Greenwood et al., 2011](#)). Recently, hybrid organizing has  
8 been proposed as a method to manage logic incompatibility within organizations ([Battilana &](#)  
9 [Dorado, 2010](#); [Battilana & Lee, 2014](#)). Hybrid organizations are seen by many as important  
10 conduits of positive social and environmental change ([Battilana & Lee, 2014](#); [Frederick, 1995](#);  
11 [Hoffman, Badiane, & Haigh, 2012](#)).

12  
13 While scholars have examined hybrid organizations ([Battilana & Dorado, 2010](#); [Pache &](#)  
14 [Santos, 2013](#); [Tracey, Phillips, & Jarvis, 2011](#)) and practices ([Goodrick & Reay, 2011](#);  
15 [Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007](#); [Smets, Morris, & Greenwood, 2012](#)) that integrate logics at the  
16 organizational level, less is known about the hybridization of logics at the field level.  
17 Understanding the hybridization of field-level logics is critical, as this process may guide the  
18 establishment of new practices, organizations, and governance arrangements that help to resolve  
19 logic incompatibility. For example, field-level logic hybridization may help to reconcile social  
20 welfare, environmental, and economic goals ([Battilana, Lee, Walker, & Dorsey, 2012](#)).

21  
22 The purpose of this paper is to examine how logics become hybridized within an  
23 organizational field under conditions of logic incompatibility. We respond to Greenwood and  
24 colleagues' observation that although extant research has considered how organizations respond  
25 to such conditions, "...research must also address how organizational responses have feedback  
26 effects on field structure and institutional pluralism" ([Greenwood et al., 2011: 357](#)). To do so, we  
27 engaged in a historic case study of the emergence of wind energy in Colorado. As in many fields  
28 with significant environmental impacts, actors in the Colorado wind energy field faced

1  
2  
3 incompatibility between the logics of economizing—which is associated with efficiency, profit,  
4  
5 and private welfare—and ecologizing, which is associated with systems preservation and social  
6  
7 welfare ([Frederick, 1995](#); [Gladwin, Kennelly, & Krause, 1995](#)).

10 Our case study and resultant model detail the complex process of field-level logic  
11 hybridization. We show that compromise and reframing by proponents of incompatible logics  
12  
13 can unintentionally contribute to logic hybridization. By reinforcing the incompatibility of  
14  
15 logics, compromise may motivate actors espousing subordinate logics to contest the field's  
16  
17 powerful actors. Once field centralization is reduced, conditions are ripe for commercial  
18  
19 entrepreneurs (in our case, wind energy firms) to develop practices and technologies that  
20  
21 integrate elements of incompatible logics, and for new, specialized social movement  
22  
23 organizations (SMOs) to legitimize and help embed these new practices. The end result was a  
24  
25 hybridized field-level logic, which, building from [Thornton and Ocasio \(1999\)](#), we define as  
26  
27 *rules of action, interaction, and interpretation that integrate the goals of previously incompatible*  
28  
29 *logics through material forms, practices, and governance arrangements.* We conclude that the  
30  
31 hybridization of logics is a process involving multiple steps that alter the structure of the field  
32  
33 over time.

41 We make several contributions to the growing literature on institutional logics (e.g.  
42  
43 [Battilana & Dorado, 2010](#); [Battilana & Lee, 2014](#); [Hoffman et al., 2012](#); [Lee & Lounsbury,](#)  
44  
45 [2015](#); [Mars & Lounsbury, 2009](#); [Pache & Santos, 2013](#); [Thornton & Ocasio, 2008](#); [Thornton,](#)  
46  
47 [Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012](#); [Wry, Lounsbury, & Jennings, 2013](#)). First, our study unpacks the  
48  
49 nature of logic hybridization to show how this process goes beyond “blending of diverse  
50  
51 elements” ([Thornton et al., 2012](#)). We find that a hybridized logic does not simply aggregate  
52  
53 elements of multiple logics, but instead integrates the goals associated with previously  
54  
55 incompatible logics through specific material forms, practices, and arrangements that instantiate  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 these goals. Second, we elucidate a process of logic hybridization at the field level. Our process  
4 model clarifies that organizational attempts to symbolically adhere to conflicting prescriptions,  
5 such as compromise ([Oliver, 1991](#); [Pache & Santos, 2010](#)) and framing ([Lounsbury, Ventresca,](#)  
6 [& Hirsch, 2003](#); [Snow & Benford, 1988](#)) may not resolve logic conflict, but rather trigger further  
7 field-level change. Within this process we find that logic hybridization is dependent upon prior  
8 developmental changes in the relationship between incompatible logics. In our case, the  
9 assimilation of the means of one logic into the goals of another was an important step towards  
10 hybridization. Third, we illuminate the critical role of new hybrid organizations in embodying  
11 and legitimizing the hybridization of conflicting logics at the field level.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

27  
28 Institutional logics are socially constructed “rules of action, interaction, and interpretation  
29 that guide and constrain” individuals and organizations within an organizational field ([Thornton](#)  
30 [& Ocasio, 1999: 804](#)). Logics are comprised of both symbolic elements such as shared beliefs,  
31 interests, preferences, and goals, and material means such as practices, governance arrangements,  
32 and organizational forms ([Thornton & Ocasio 2008](#); [Thornton et al, 2012](#)). For example,  
33 [Thornton \(2004\)](#) shows that the once-dominant editorial logic in higher education publishing  
34 specified symbolic elements including goals (e.g., to build the publishing house’s prestige) and  
35 the material means of accomplishing these goals, such as authority structures (e.g., ownership by  
36 a powerful founder-editor).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Logics influence actors’ behaviors within organizational fields, which are “*relational*  
51 *spaces* ... where disparate organizations involve themselves with one another” to collaborate on,  
52 or contest, issues of common concern ([Wooten & Hoffman, 2008: 138](#); italics in original). In a  
53 *centralized* organizational field, power, defined as the ability to influence other actors in the field  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Reay & Hinings, 2009; [Reay & Hinings, 2005](#)), is concentrated in a relatively small number of  
4 organizations and individuals ([Meyer, Scott, & Strang, 1987](#)). Conversely, *decentralized* fields  
5 are characterized by the absence of extremely powerful actors ([Lounsbury, Ventresca, & Hirsch,](#)  
6 [2003](#)) and the distribution of power across a wide array of stakeholders.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 Because the organizations that comprise a field bring with them differing goals and  
13 means, multiple logics are often present within organizational fields ([Greenwood et al., 2011;](#)  
14 [Kraatz & Block, 2008;](#) [Thornton et al., 2012](#)). In relatively centralized fields, the multiple logics  
15 that constitute the field may be characterized as dominant and subordinate. A dominant logic is  
16 granted priority in the practices, technologies, governance arrangements, and organizational  
17 forms of the most powerful actors in the field ([Greenwood et al., 2010;](#) [Thornton & Ocasio,](#)  
18 [2008;](#) [Wry, Cobb, & Aldrich, 2013](#)). For example, public school systems that receive high levels  
19 of state funding are controlled by state governments, and thus are dominated by a state logic  
20 ([Meyer et al., 1987](#)). Although powerful actors may be aware of, and even have sympathy for,  
21 oppositional logics ([Delbridge & Edwards, 2013](#)), they consistently pursue the means and goals  
22 prescribed by the dominant logic in order to maintain their position of authority. In contrast, a  
23 subordinate logic is prioritized by few, less powerful actors, and in a small number of relatively  
24 inconsequential governance arrangements ([Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007](#)). For example, prior to  
25 the formation of the EPA in 1970, the logic of ecologizing enjoyed very low subscription in the  
26 U.S. chemical industry ([Hoffman, 1999](#)).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **Institutional Logic Incompatibility**

49

50 The multiple logics that constitute a field may be not only different, but also incompatible  
51 ([Friedland & Alford, 1991;](#) [Greenwood et al., 2011;](#) [Lounsbury, 2007](#)). As Scott describes,  
52 “there is no question but that many competing and inconsistent logics exist in modern society”  
53 (1995: 130). Institutional logics designate “which means are meaningful” and which “means-  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 ends couplets are thought appropriate” (Friedland, 2002: 383). They influence both the goals that  
4 actors find salient and the means selected to achieve those goals (Thornton, 2002). Logic  
5 incompatibility can arise as a result of differences between both the *goals* and the *means*  
6 associated with distinct logics (Pache & Santos, 2010). Pache and Santos (2013), for example,  
7 describe how incompatibilities between market and social welfare logics create tensions within  
8 social enterprises. These organizations confront logic incompatibility because certain practices  
9 such as the use of paid professionals are more aligned with a market logic’s means, yet may be  
10 incompatible with a social welfare goal.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22       Logic incompatibility can persist when actors perceive that the realization of the goals of  
23 one logic undermines the realization of the goals of another (Pache & Santos, 2010). This is  
24 because “goals reflect core values and beliefs and are evaluated based on a logic of  
25 appropriateness, making them hard to challenge or modify” (Besharov & Smith, 2014: 367).  
26  
27 Logic incompatibility may also persist because the means specified by a logic are linked to  
28 resource commitments and path dependencies that prevent change (Pache & Santos, 2010; Seo  
29 and Creed, 2002). Despite recognizing the existence and persistence of incompatible logics  
30 within fields, research has yet to explain how logic incompatibility evolves throughout time  
31 (Greenwood et al., 2011). Examining this process requires understanding of how actors respond  
32 to logic incompatibility and the effect of such actions on the relationship between logics within  
33 an organizational field.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **Organizational Responses to Logic Incompatibility**

49  
50       Institutional scholars have described specific strategies used by organizations to manage  
51 tensions between logics (Oliver, 1991). These include *compromise* (Greenwood et al., 2011),  
52 *contestation* (Hargrave & van de Ven, 2006), and *hybrid organizing* (Battilana & Lee, 2014).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 When organizations *compromise*, they bargain with external constituents and make  
4 concessions to partially conform to the demands of proponents of incompatible logics. For  
5 example, health care firms may adhere to minimal standards of economic and caregiver logics  
6 (Scott, 1983), and micro-finance organizations compromise between development and economic  
7 logics ([Pache and Santos, 2013](#)). Compromise strategies can take a variety of forms, including  
8 the decoupling of practices from an organization's goals (Bromley and Powell, 2014). Prior  
9 work has examined the determinants of organizational compromise and decoupling (e.g., [Oliver,](#)  
10 [1991](#); [Westphal & Zajac, 1994](#); [Zajac & Westphal, 2004](#)) but has paid less attention to the  
11 outcomes of these strategies. Because compromise implies partial conformity and does not fully  
12 resolve tension between logics, it may trigger subsequent changes in organizations and fields,  
13 rather than representing an end point.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Incompatible institutional logics may also incite actors to mobilize and engage in  
30 *contestation* through collective action ([Hargrave & van de Ven, 2006](#); [Seo & Creed, 2002](#);  
31 [Waldron, Navis, & Fisher, 2013](#)). For example, research on social movements has largely  
32 focused on how a dominant institutional logic may be challenged and replaced, through  
33 advocacy efforts (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996). Framing plays an important role in this  
34 process ([Lounsbury et al, 2003](#)). Frames are "schemata of interpretation" (Goffman, 1974: 21)  
35 which "render events or occurrences meaningful and thereby function to organize experience and  
36 guide action" (Snow & Benford, 2000: 614; see also Benford & Snow, 2000; Gamson, 1995;  
37 Snow & Benford, 1988). Like the symbolic elements of institutional logics, frames connect goals  
38 and motivations to strategies and means ([Benford & Snow, 2000](#)). Following [Fligstein \(1996\)](#),  
39 Lounsbury and colleagues argue that "frame challengers engage in political struggles to either  
40 establish dominance within a frame or de-institutionalize a frame that impedes their interests"  
41 (2003: 76). Research by Rao, Monin, and Durand (2003) attests to this, showing that within the  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 field of French cuisine, chefs began to abandon classical for nouvelle cuisine after activist chefs  
4 framed their roles in ways that were consistent with new and distinct identities. While the frames  
5 utilized by social movements have been shown to be instrumental to replacing logics (e.g.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 [Waldron, Fisher, & Navis, 2015](#)), this literature tells us little of how logics may be integrated.

11  
12  
13 Recently, scholars have recognized that organizations may combine multiple, often  
14 incompatible, logics through *hybrid organizing* ([Battilana & Lee, 2014](#)). Research on hybrid  
15 organizations recognizes that incompatible logics may be re-framed as compatible within  
16 organizations. For example, Tracey et al. (2011) describe how entrepreneurs combined “the logic  
17 of for-profit retail and the logic of nonprofit homeless support” (69) to create the hybrid form of  
18 a for-profit homeless support organization. Mars and Lounsbury (2009) highlight how students  
19 embedded in the logic of environmentalism, and then exposed to entrepreneurship education,  
20 fostered organizations with “...a market-centered approach to both building successful  
21 businesses and advancing environmental causes” (7). However, while the literature on hybrid  
22 organizing offers new insight into how organizations deal with logic incompatibility internally  
23 through their culture, identity, and governance ([Battilana & Lee, 2014](#); [Grimes, McMullen,](#)  
24 [Vogus, & Miller, 2013](#); [Miller, Grimes, McMullen, & Vogus, 2012](#)), it tells us little about how  
25 such organizations may influence field-level change or the hybridization of logics at the field  
26 level (but see [Tracey et al., 2011](#)).

### 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 **The Evolution and Hybridization of Field-level Logics**

47  
48 To develop our process model of field-level logic hybridization, we build on prior  
49 literature that has shown how change in the relationship between field-level logics can follow  
50 two broad patterns: 1) *developmental* change, in which the majority of prevailing practices and  
51 symbolic relationships remain, and 2) *transformational* change in which radical shifts in  
52 practices and means-goal relationships are observed (Thornton et al., 2012: 164).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In *developmental* change, a prevailing logic is reinforced, or minimally altered. One form  
4 of developmental change, *elaboration*, refers to the endogenous reinforcement of an institutional  
5 logic. In this process, “internal developments in institutional logics lead to new narratives and  
6 practices that further reinforce the prevailing logic” (Thornton et al., 2002: 167). For example,  
7 Shipilov, Greve, and Rowley (2010) show how organizations adopted new practices in board and  
8 CEO governance, to further reinforce a prevailing logic of shareholder value creation. In  
9 *assimilation*, dimensions of external logics are incorporated into a prevailing logic, yet “the core  
10 elements of the original logic prevail, with new practices and symbols made part of the prevalent  
11 logic” (Thornton et al., 2012:165 ). Murray (2010) finds that elements of a market logic, in this  
12 case patenting practices, were assimilated into the professional logic of academia as opposed to  
13 replacing or transforming it. Similarly, Arjaliés (2010) shows how the practice of socially  
14 responsible investing in France was assimilated within the market logic of the investment field.

15  
16  
17 Of most interest for this study are more radical, *transformational* changes in field-level  
18 logics. In *replacement* an institutional logic is supplanted by an alternative logic (Thornton et al.,  
19 164). Much of the work on the replacement of one competing logic by another has focused on  
20 the motivations and social position of early and late adopters of new practices (Greenwood &  
21 Suddaby, 2006; Leblebici, Salanci, Copay, & King, 1991; Sherer & Lee, 2002; Westphal, Gulati,  
22 & Shortell, 1997). Other researchers have taken a more social constructionist perspective on  
23 logic replacement. For example, building on Suddaby and Greenwood’s (2005) work on the role  
24 of rhetoric in institutional change processes, [Lepoutre & Valente \(2012\)](#) show that the  
25 willingness to deviate from a dominant logic and enact a new logic is a function of one’s implicit  
26 theory of change. Social movement scholars have portrayed logic replacement as a collective  
27 action process focusing on the role of framing in contestation, as discussed above.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Another form of transformational change is *blending*. Blending has been described as “combining dimensions of diverse logics” (Thornton et al., 2012:164). For example, Glynn and Lounsbury (2005) describe how aesthetic and market logics were simultaneously used in the discourse of Atlanta Symphony reviewers in the wake of a musician’s strike. Similarly, Smets et al. (2011) studied how a law firm began to incorporate elements of German and English law into their practices to better satisfy their client’s interests. Blending broadly describes the co-existence of dimensions of multiple logics, but does not refer to the integration of incompatible logics (Battilana & Lee, 2014).

*Hybridization* differs from blending in that *the goals of incompatible logics are integrated as complementary; they do not merely co-exist*. For example, Battilana and Dorado (2010) show how micro-finance organizations integrate development and banking logics as equally valid, complementary approaches to poverty alleviation. Contrary to assimilation, hybridization requires that the goals of distinct logics be constructed as simultaneously achievable, without granting dominance to one logic over another.

Hybridization processes change the relationship between incompatible logics, eventually leading to a new hybridized logic that integrates the incompatible logics. As with other institutional logics, we posit that a distinct hybridized logic emerges when it becomes embedded in organizational forms, material practices, and governance arrangements within a field. Surprisingly, while the concept of a hybridized field-level logic has been alluded to (e.g. Mars & Lounsbury, 2009; [Tracey et al., 2011](#)), the process logic hybridization has neither been theoretically clarified nor given empirical attention. Thus, the question of how and when logic hybridization occurs at the field level, and even the definition of a hybridized logic, is a critical gap in our understanding of field-level change.

1  
2  
3 This study seeks to build upon the literature on logic incompatibility and hybrid  
4 organizations reviewed above to develop a process model of field-level logic hybridization.  
5  
6 Based upon the critical theoretical gaps identified in our literature review, we entered our field  
7  
8 study with three research questions: (1) How can organizational responses to logic  
9  
10 incompatibility and evolving field conditions lead to logic hybridization?; (2) What is the role of  
11  
12 hybrid organizations in the process of field-level logic hybridization?; and (3) What distinguishes  
13  
14 logic hybridization from related concepts?  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 METHODS

22  
23 To conduct our research, we followed the process of theoretical sampling ([Eisenhardt &](#)  
24 [Graebner, 2007](#); [Glaser & Strauss, 1967](#)) in which a case is selected because it is suitable for  
25  
26 elaborating on the relationships between constructs of interest. As our goal was to outline the  
27  
28 sequence of events that produces logic hybridization, we engaged in a process study (e.g.  
29  
30 [Elsbach & Sutton, 1992](#); [Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013](#); [van de Ven &](#)  
31  
32 [Poole, 1995](#)) chronicling key events over time. We sought an empirical setting characterized by  
33  
34 multiple organizational responses to logic incompatibility over time.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 We engaged in an inductive study of the organizational field surrounding wind energy in  
41  
42 Colorado for the period from 1999 to 2008. Wind energy gave us a clear issue of common  
43  
44 concern and conflict at the field level ([Wooten & Hoffman, 2008](#)). As we discuss in depth below,  
45  
46 the wind energy field in Colorado was constituted by groups espousing incompatible logics, has  
47  
48 undergone significant institutional changes, and was characterized by logic hybridization that  
49  
50 integrated two previously incompatible logics over time. Our intent was to richly describe the  
51  
52 existence of a pattern ([Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007](#); [Yin, 2002](#)) to enable new theory building in  
53  
54 the underexamined process of logic hybridization.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Data Collection

We collected data using: (1) semi-structured interviews, (2) naturalistic observation, (3) keyword searches of newspaper articles, and (4) a wide variety of archival documents. We relied on our interviews as the primary source of data when exploring the incompatible logics espoused by actors within the field, as well as to delineate the motivations and strategies employed as organizations responded to logic incompatibility. The newspaper articles served as an important source of triangulating our interviews, and were our primary source of data when seeking to understand changes in field-level logics. We utilized the archival documents to understand field-level changes, triangulating with the newspaper articles and interviews. The sources and uses of our data are summarized in Table 1.

-----  
*Insert Table 1 about here*  
-----

***Semi-structured interviews.*** We conducted 34 interviews with 30 participants in the Colorado wind energy field, ranging from 60 minutes to three hours. To maintain consistency the lead author conducted all of the interviews. Initial interviews were garnered from contacting the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado. From these initial interviews we utilized a snowball technique asking each informant who they believed could best help us understand wind energy in Colorado. The initial interview protocol was wide ranging, as we sought to gain understanding of the historical evolution of the field. Subsequent interviews included more focused questions as themes began to emerge from the data. To ensure that our informants were not led by our emergent insights, we only introduced our themes for validation after conducting the initial protocol. The last protocol used is provided in Appendix A.

We sought informants who were familiar with how organizations responded to the incompatible demands of field-level logics. Many of our interviewees occupied multiple roles

1  
2  
3 over the period of our case study. For example, several individuals moved from environmental  
4  
5 activism to government or industry positions. Our sample included founders of clean energy  
6  
7 SMOs, which we describe below (3), founders of environmental SMOs (2), participants in clean  
8  
9 energy SMOs (4), founders of wind energy firms (4), individuals who had experience as  
10  
11 environmental activists and as government officials (2), an individual with experience as an  
12  
13 environmental activist and entrepreneur (1), attorneys (2), NREL researchers (2), wind energy  
14  
15 company employees (2), utility executives ranging from CEO to wind energy program manager  
16  
17 (5), Colorado Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Staff (2), and one ski resort Vice President of  
18  
19 Sustainability (1). We interviewed three of our participants twice, on separate occasions, and  
20  
21 conducted one round-table interview to follow up with a group of four utility executives.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Interviews were conducted in person whenever possible on dates ranging from June, 2010 to  
28  
29 April, 2014. Interviews were recorded and transcribed in 379 pages of single-spaced text.  
30  
31

32 *Naturalistic Observation.* We conducted multiple site visits to organizations involved  
33  
34 with wind energy in Colorado. We visited NREL on three occasions (2009, 2010, 2013) and the  
35  
36 National Wind Technology test site in Colorado (2009). We also attended three annual meetings  
37  
38 (2007, 2008, 2009) of the “Sustainable Opportunities Summit”, sponsored by Connected  
39  
40 Organizations for a Responsible Economy (CORE), a Colorado-based clean energy SMO. In  
41  
42 addition, we engaged in site visits with two wind energy firms (2010, 2011) and two visits to  
43  
44 Xcel Energy Headquarters in Denver (2013, 2014). These activities grounded us in the field and  
45  
46 helped us to identify informants and verify our observations. For example, our snowball sample  
47  
48 of social movement activists began with interviewing analysts at NREL. As we spent time at the  
49  
50 CORE meetings, we became sensitized to the historic issues of contention in the field. By  
51  
52 engaging in visits to Xcel, and sharing our emerging findings with them, we gained comfort that  
53  
54 our depiction of the organization’s historic actions and mindset was accurate.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
*Newspaper articles.* We engaged in in-vivo coding of 546 newspaper articles published in *The Denver Post* (Colorado's largest newspaper) between 1994 and 2010. These articles were identified through a search on the key terms "wind energy" and "renewable energy." Using these articles we constructed a timeline of the key events, revised with feedback from our informants.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
*Archival data.* In addition to the *Denver Post* articles, we utilized archival sources of data acquired through proactive searching and provided by informants. First, we searched the CPUC website for archived news releases for the terms "wind", "wind energy", or "renewable." Second, using the Internet Archive (archive.org) we searched for mentions of "wind energy" or "renewable" on all archived webpages for two large Colorado electric utility companies (Xcel Energy and Tri-state Generation and Transmission). Third, we searched the CPUC web archive for all decisions pertaining to "wind" that impacted all major utilities in the state (Xcel Energy, Tri-State, Holy Cross, Intermountain Rural and Colorado Mining). Fourth, we obtained all available resource plans for each Colorado utility. Fifth, we collected archival documents from a variety of sources including environmental SMOs, utilities, and NREL. Finally, we viewed and selectively transcribed television news coverage of the Windsource program. These archival documents totaled 1,781 pages, single-spaced.

#### 41 42 43 **Data Analysis**

44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
All of our data were carefully managed utilizing computer-based qualitative analysis software (Nvivo 10). In addition, we maintained careful records of all documents and interview notes. As we engaged in the collection of these data we engaged in constant comparison (Siggelkow, 2007) between prior data collected and new observations. Once we had coded the *Denver Post* data and our initial interviews we prepared a draft timeline and narrative history of wind energy in Colorado and validated this draft with informants. We then followed established procedures for inductive research, particularly the tenets of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss,

1  
2  
3 1967; Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2007; [Locke, 2001](#)). We utilized portions of this timeline, and  
4  
5 selective quotes from our early research as illustrative examples in a previously published  
6  
7 quantitative analysis ([Pacheco, York, & Hargrave, 2014](#)) that examined the co-evolution of  
8  
9 social movements and the wind industry in the United States.  
10  
11

12 We began by creating in-vivo ([Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013](#); [Glaser & Strauss, 1967](#);  
13  
14 [Locke, 2001](#)) first-order codes utilizing the language of our informants. The concept of a multi-  
15  
16 level process through which field-level changes co-evolved with organizational actions emerged  
17  
18 early, but the exact relationships remained unclear. We thus became aware that further review of  
19  
20 the literature on institutional logics would inform our theory as we continued our analysis.  
21  
22  
23

24 Two of the authors conducted the coding, with all three authors meeting regularly to  
25  
26 discuss the emerging themes. In this way, one author remained the “outsider” and ensured the  
27  
28 trustworthiness of our findings based on the evidence presented ([Strauss & Corbin, 1994](#)). As  
29  
30 themes emerged, we iteratively moved between the literature on institutional logics and our  
31  
32 emergent data in triangulating between theory, key events, and codes ([Gioia et al., 2013](#)).  
33  
34  
35

36 From this first-order coding we compiled an account of the events described in our  
37  
38 timeline, paying particular attention to responses to, and changes in, field-level logics and  
39  
40 centralization. We next began searching for relationships amongst our codes to group them into  
41  
42 second-order themes. Consistent with the principles of grounded theory, we entered our analysis  
43  
44 with a theoretical orientation towards understanding the role of responses to logic incompatibility  
45  
46 in altering the organizational field; however, our insights emerged inductively from our coding  
47  
48 ([Yin, 2002](#)). From the second-order coding we consolidated our 96 first-order codes to 13  
49  
50 themes. At this point, our theory had evolved to encapsulate the three overarching dimensions  
51  
52 that comprise our data structure and process model. The final data structure is illustrated in Table  
53  
54 2, which summarizes the themes we utilized in building our model of logic hybridization.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

-----  
*Insert Table 2 about here*  
-----

## WIND ENERGY IN COLORADO

Through our examination of the data, we developed a multi-level model that moves between the actor and field levels. This model has three dimensions and is illustrated in Figure 1. This model captures the recursive relationship between: (1) organizational responses to logic incompatibility (actor level), (2) changes in the relationship between logics (field level), and (3) field centralization (field level). We now explain how each of these dimensions, and sub-themes within them, emerged as we examined the field of wind energy in Colorado.

-----  
*Insert Figure 1 about here*  
-----

### **Logic Incompatibility and Conflict: Economizing versus Ecologizing**

In the beginning of our case study period, discussion in Colorado focused on whether wind energy could economically compete with carbon-based sources of energy. Colorado relied on its abundant coal and natural gas resources, which are attractive from an economic perspective, but have deleterious impacts on air, water, and land. Although some organizations promoted wind energy for its environmental benefits, debate centered on wind energy's economic viability and ability to compete with fossil fuel resources:

Colorado's growth has created unprecedented demand for electricity, which Public Service has largely met through use of coal, which meets more than 93 percent of our needs. Coal is clean, abundant and cheap and sufficient to meet our needs for several hundred years.... Wind power is not reliable... coal is the key to Colorado's energy needs. (The Denver Post, Wattenburg, 1998)

A similar argument was repeatedly espoused by Colorado's investor-owned electric utilities. One utility executive articulated his opposition to wind energy as follows:

1  
2  
3 The bill (*supporting wind energy*) would do little, if anything, ... to improve air quality. In truth, it  
4 is a Trojan horse for unprecedented government interference in energy markets that, if enacted,  
5 could worsen Colorado's energy crisis by raising energy costs for industrial and residential  
6 consumers alike. (The Denver Post, Sanderson, 2004)  
7

8 This focus on economic costs, and lack of concern for environmental impacts, reflects a  
9  
10 logic of *economizing*. In describing an economizing view, Frederick writes, “few beliefs are  
11 more deeply embedded in the modern business firm” (1995: 143). The goals of the economizing  
12 logic are linked to the ideals of efficiency, wealth creation, and speed. An economizing view of  
13 the human-environment relationship sees the natural environment as a resource to be used  
14 efficiently by business. These goals are in turn manifested in means that measure and prioritize  
15 economic profit. In the beginning of our case, economic goals were instantiated in fossil fuel-  
16 based technologies such as coal-fired power plants, which were considered an appropriate means  
17 towards achieving greater economic efficiency. The goals of economizing were also embedded  
18 in the governance of Colorado’s electricity industry through the CPUC. This regulatory agency  
19 consists of three commissioners appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the state senate.  
20 The CPUC oversees the rates and resource plans of all utilities and was charged by state law to  
21 require utilities to seek the “least-cost” option for energy production (Schmitz Consulting, 2008).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 In response to growing air pollution surrounding Denver and other areas throughout the  
40 front range of Colorado, environmental SMOs began to challenge the dominant logic of  
41 economizing in the early 1990s. For example, the Boulder-based Western Resource Advocates  
42 (WRA) was founded as Law and Water (LAW) Fund of the Rockies<sup>1</sup> to “...protect the West’s  
43 land, air and water...(*and*) advance clean energy to reduce pollution and global climate change”  
44 (Western Resource Advocates, 2011). WRA and other environmental SMOs in Colorado  
45 espoused a logic of *ecologizing*, emphasizing interdependence and maintenance of relationships  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

---

56  
57  
58 <sup>1</sup> Although quotes may refer to Western Resource Advocates as “WRA”, “Land and Water Fund”, or “LAW Fund”  
59 we refer to this organization as “WRA” throughout the text for the sake of simplicity.  
60

1  
2  
3 that perpetuate human and natural communities ([Frederick, 1995](#)). An ecologizing logic  
4  
5 prioritizes goals of environmental preservation, and recognizes nature's inherent moral value.  
6  
7 Practices that improve environmental conditions, such as renewable energy, are theorized as  
8  
9 means to achieve these goals. Wind energy development aligns with an ecologizing logic  
10  
11 because it does not have the negative environmental impacts associated with fossil fuel-based  
12  
13 energy, which is associated with air pollution and climate change (IPCC, 2011). An article in the  
14  
15 *Denver Post* articulated SMOs' ecologizing logic for wind energy:  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 Wind advocates say that head-to-head cost comparisons of wind versus fossil fuels fail to take into  
21  
22 account wind's environmental benefits...Wind produces no smog and adds nothing to global  
23  
24 warming, unlike coal-fired power plants that produce greenhouse gases and volatile organic  
25  
26 compounds, they note (The Denver Post, Raabe & Bunch, 2003).

27  
28 Environmental SMOs, led largely by WRA, began to lobby the state legislature to force  
29  
30 utilities to adopt wind energy. However, proponents of an economizing logic, specifically  
31  
32 utilities and the CPUC, viewed wind power as an expensive, unreliable technology which  
33  
34 conflicted with the goal of economic efficiency.

35  
36 Incompatibility between ecologizing and economizing logics is common in energy and  
37  
38 environmental policy debates. [Frederick \(1995\)](#) argues that the "ethical fault lines" between  
39  
40 economizing and ecologizing "generate enormous normative tensions that pose questions of  
41  
42 fundamental import for the future of business and society relations" (135). Hoffman (2011) asks  
43  
44 whether the "schism" between the market logic of actors who are skeptical of climate change and  
45  
46 the more communitarian logic of those who are convinced that climate change is real is now so  
47  
48 great that it may be irreconcilable (also see [Gladwin et al., 1995](#), [Hoffman, 1999](#); [Hoffman et al.,](#)  
49  
50 [1999](#); and [Wade-Benzoni et al., 2002](#)). Table 3 clarifies the conflict between the symbolic and  
51  
52 material elements of economizing and ecologizing logics, providing ideal types and examples of  
53  
54 how the logics were espoused in our data.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

-----  
*Insert Table 3 about here*  
-----

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

At the beginning of our case, economizing was the dominant logic of the Colorado wind energy field. As Figure 2 shows, our coding revealed that statements based in an economizing logic appeared with double the frequency of those espousing an ecologizing logic in 1998. Further, there was no utility-scale wind energy in Colorado and activists had twice failed in efforts to establish renewable energy requirements. “By fall of 1996,” activists concluded, “there was no viable path for developing regulatory policies to support renewable resources in Colorado” (Mayer, Blank, & Sweeney, 1999:3).

-----  
*Insert Figure 2 about here*  
-----

The efforts of Colorado environmentalists to challenge the dominant logic of economizing were made difficult by the centralization of the wind energy field in Colorado around powerful actors who espoused the logic of economizing. One of these was the chief governing organization, the CPUC, discussed above. The other was the largest utility, Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo), a subsidiary of Xcel Energy<sup>2</sup>, which held a 55 percent market share and serviced the majority of Colorado’s population (Komor, 2006).

Logic incompatibility, combined with high field centralization, set the initial conditions in our study. We now examine how organizations reacted to this setting, and how these actions recursively influenced changes in both field-level logics and in field centralization. In presenting these findings we utilize six integrated data displays: Table 2 showing the finalized data structure, Figure 1 showing key events and the induced process model, Figure 2 showing key measures over time, and Tables 4-6 which provide examples of data for each major theme.

---

<sup>2</sup> Although quotes refer to both “PSCo” and “Xcel”, in the text we refer to the utility and its subsidiary as “Xcel” for the sake of clarity.

-----  
*Insert Tables 4-6 about here*  
-----

### **Compromise Leading to Elaboration: The Windsource Program**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 By 1997, environmental SMOs had become frustrated with their inability to encourage  
12 wind energy adoption in Colorado. As described above, the CPUC and Xcel were largely  
13 unreceptive to the ecologizing arguments offered by SMOs. A WRA leader described his  
14 organization as “just exhausted from fighting them [*Xcel & CPUC*].” WRA and other  
15 environmental SMOs decided to accept Xcel’s offer to engage in a collaborative effort, to foster  
16 a voluntary “green pricing” program. Originally conceived by Xcel as a compromise in past  
17 regulatory battles, the Windsource program offered customers the option to pay a price premium  
18 to purchase electricity produced from wind energy. Windsource was the first investor-owned  
19 utility program in the U.S. to offer wind energy directly to consumers and a unique collaboration  
20 between the utility and SMOs. WRA announced it was “coordinating the efforts of...Boulder  
21 Energy Conservation Center, the Colorado Renewable Energy Society, and the Sierra Club  
22 [*which*] will include articles about Windsource in their newsletters and will potentially use their  
23 mailing lists to further promote the program” (Mayer, Blank, & Swezey, 1999: 12).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 From the utility’s perspective, Windsource was of little cost, presented no risk, and  
43 generated an entry into wind energy. Further, an earlier marketing study had suggested that their  
44 customers were interested in, and willing to pay a premium for, wind energy. However, just as it  
45 represented a compromise for environmentalists who preferred wind energy mandates as a means  
46 of achieving their ecologizing goals, the program also represented a compromise for the utility,  
47 because incorporating wind energy into its portfolio contradicted its standard practice of  
48 achieving its economizing goals through fossil fuel-based practices.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           ***Change in Field Conditions: Elaboration.*** While this compromise approach to logic  
4  
5 incompatibility required Xcel to partially conform to demands for wind energy by adopting new  
6  
7 practices, the program had the effect of *elaborating* the dominant economizing logic at the field  
8  
9 level. Windsource was not a departure by Xcel from the goals of economizing nor an attempt to  
10  
11 reduce logic incompatibility at the field level; the program was, and remains as of this writing, a  
12  
13 decoupled program that is justified as a “premium” product. As Xcel’s CEO reflected, “...we  
14  
15 would build as many wind turbines as customers are willing to pay for” (Xcel Energy, 2004).  
16  
17  
18  
19 Table 5 offers additional examples of how an economizing logic was elaborated through  
20  
21 Windsource.  
22  
23

24           Frustrated that the design and public justification of Windsource elaborated the goals of  
25  
26 the logic of economizing, some environmental advocates opposed the program. They recognized  
27  
28 that Windsource was not a means of promoting the goals of ecologizing, and therefore viewed it  
29  
30 “as being a poor substitute for regulatory requirements funded by all customers” (Mayer et al.,  
31  
32 1999:3). In sum, logic incompatibility was not reduced through the compromise because the  
33  
34 goals of economizing and ecologizing logics continued to be constructed as incompatible. Table  
35  
36 4 provides additional examples of how Xcel and environmental SMOs remained fully embedded  
37  
38 in the conflicting logics of economizing and ecologizing, while engaging in compromise.  
39  
40  
41

42           While Windsource did not significantly alter the centralization of power within the field, it  
43  
44 did increase the “credibility [of environmental activists] in the eyes of individuals, businesses,  
45  
46 local governments, and the media” (Mayer, Blank, Udall, & Nielsen, 1997). In addition, the  
47  
48 program generated a great deal of media attention for both Xcel and SMOs. This coverage raised  
49  
50 the public profile of SMOs and often portrayed them not only as advocates for wind power but  
51  
52 also as important partners of Xcel in provisioning it. Raising the profile of environmental SMOs  
53  
54 in Colorado was an unintended consequence with significant implications for Xcel.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### Reframing Leading to Assimilation: The Lamar Wind Farm

In 1999 Xcel filed a resource plan for CPUC approval that included a request for proposal for new electricity supply. Among the received bids was a proposal for a 162 MW wind farm located near Lamar, Colorado, which Xcel rejected in an “economic decision based on the cost of power.” It reasoned that “wind power will be more expensive than natural gas-generated electricity” (The Denver Post, Booth, 2001).

Environmental SMOs, including WRA, responded to this continued elaboration of the economizing logic by reframing wind energy. Rather than challenging the decision on ecological grounds, wind advocates adopted frames that were consistent with economizing goals, justifying the proposed wind farm on the basis of cost. Their analysis showed that wind power could be generated at two cents per kilowatt-hour less than a new natural gas plant (Raabe, 2001). CPUC commissioners sided with the SMOs’ analysis, concluding that the wind farm was cost effective:

We find that adding... (*the*) Lamar wind energy bid to PSCo’s preferred resource plan is in the public interest... This determination is based solely on our finding that the acquisition of the Lamar facility will likely lower the cost of electricity for Colorado’s ratepayers. After a careful analysis of the economics of the wind bid, we find that it is justified on purely economic grounds... (CPUC, 2001a).

The SMO’s reframing involved strategic appropriation of the goals associated with the dominant logic to advance the practice of wind energy. This reframing was made possible through the prior learning SMOs gained through the Windsource compromise. As shown in Table 4, SMOs learned to “speak the language of business” (Mayer et al., 1999). However, SMOs continued to utilize an ecologizing logic to critique utilities’ overall record:

“These are people who burn stuff,” Lehr said. ‘They are essentially an outlet for the primary fossil fuel extraction industries - coal, oil and gas. That’s what they do. That’s what they understand.’ (The Denver Post, Booth, 2001)

***Change in Field Conditions: Assimilation.*** Environmental SMOs’ reframing did not integrate the goals of economizing and ecologizing logics. Rather, the Lamar decision resulted in the *assimilation* of the means of the subordinate ecologizing logic (wind energy) into the goals of

1  
2  
3 the economizing logic (low cost energy) that still dominated the field. Wind energy was justified  
4  
5 on purely economic terms. Powerful actors in the field (CPUC) recognized the need for  
6  
7 renewable energy but *only* in cases in which it was the most economically effective option.  
8  
9  
10 While this shift was partially driven by technical improvements that reduced the cost of wind  
11  
12 power,<sup>3</sup> it occurred only after environmental SMOs challenged the Lamar decision by employing  
13  
14 an economizing frame. The CPUC demonstrated its continued commitment to an economizing  
15  
16 logic by explicitly stating “we ... adopt rules based on least-cost criteria alone” (CPUC, 2002).  
17  
18

19  
20 As Table 5 shows, the logic of economizing continued to dominate all formal  
21  
22 conversations and decisions in the field, limiting the growth of wind power to a fraction of the  
23  
24 potential SMOs envisioned. While environmental SMOs again bolstered their legitimacy,  
25  
26 authority continued to be centralized with the CPUC and Xcel. This centralization of power was  
27  
28 to be significantly reduced in the next phase of wind energy development in Colorado.  
29  
30

### 31 **Contestation Leading to Field Expansion: Amendment 37**

32  
33  
34 Angered from their “ten-year-long litigation and frustration experience” (interview with  
35  
36 Clean Energy SMO leader), environmental SMOs sought to foster a larger alliance to advocate  
37  
38 for a state-level renewable energy portfolio standard (RPS). An RPS passed by the state  
39  
40 legislature would mandate that utilities generate a defined percentage of their energy portfolio  
41  
42 from renewable resources. Such a mandate would significantly increase wind energy generation  
43  
44 in Colorado beyond the “least cost” scenario.  
45  
46  
47

---

48  
49 <sup>3</sup> From 2001-2002, the national price of wind power based on capacity weighted average decreased by about 28%  
50 (compiled from Wisser and Bolinger, 2012). Despite these reductions, these figures remained relatively stable until  
51 2009 when price increased again. Throughout the time period of our case, significant uncertainty remained on the  
52 ability of wind power to be competitive with fossil fuel-based electricity generation (Bolinger, 2010); to this date,  
53 the industry heavily depends on production tax credits to infuse development and growth (Wisser & Bolinger, 2012).  
54 In addition, the competitiveness of wind power prices depends on how prices are measured (Wisser & Bolinger,  
55 2012). As Figure 2 illustrates, when measured through national capacity weighted average by purchase power  
56 agreement dates (which is how Xcel Energy obtains most of its wind power), price figures actually increased from  
57 the years 2004-2009 (as compiled from Wisser & Bolinger, 2012). Therefore, while in the Lamar farm decision wind  
58 energy was considered the least cost alternative, this was not a universal conclusion, and varied over the time of our  
59 case study.  
60

1  
2  
3 To promote the RPS, environmental SMOs devised a slogan, “Colorado needs cleaner air  
4 and cheaper energy” (The Denver Post, Olinger, 2004), which included both economizing and  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

To promote the RPS, environmental SMOs devised a slogan, “Colorado needs cleaner air and cheaper energy” (The Denver Post, Olinger, 2004), which included both economizing and ecologizing logics. They took this approach because they concluded from their Windsource and Lamar experiences that they could not achieve their goal of establishing significant wind power development in Colorado unless they: 1) took action at the state level rather than engaging on a costly case-by-case basis, 2) began to promote the benefits of wind power development in ecologizing terms, rather than allowing the economizing logic to dominate, and 3) reduced the concentration of power in the hands of Xcel and the CPUC (Olinger, 2004). Table 4 provides additional examples of the motivations for SMOs’ decision to challenge utilities through legislative efforts under the “Contestation” heading.

Xcel and other utilities largely met efforts to promote RPS by arguing that renewable energy should be developed only when it offered economic benefits, and that much of the development required by the RPS would not be economically viable. Efforts to enact RPS legislation in both 2002 and 2003 failed. Wind advocates switched tactics in 2004, deciding to pursue an RPS by ballot initiative (a direct vote by Colorado citizens) rather than through the state legislature. One environmental SMO activist told us, “...we just got frustrated and... we have a record in Colorado of taking the issues that the legislature is not dealing with directly to the vote of the people.”

A coalition of SMOs led the campaign for Amendment 37, which would require utilities to acquire ten percent of their energy from renewable sources by 2010 and twenty percent by 2022. By utilizing both economizing and ecologizing arguments, environmental SMOs built a broad coalition including “...many traditionally conservative entities like the farmer’s union and others in the farm movement and agricultural industry” (Clean Energy SMO Board Member). Many other proponents were involved in the collection of the 60,000 required signatures to put

1  
2  
3 Amendment 37 on the ballot, including various cities in Colorado, economic development  
4  
5 councils, unions, and the ski industry (Komor, 2006). The ballot initiative was opposed by  
6  
7 utilities in the state, again based on an economizing logic. As Xcel articulated their position on  
8  
9 the corporate website:  
10  
11

12 We work hard to keep prices competitive. And we are especially careful to ensure that our customers  
13 don't bear the burden of a certain class of expensive renewable technologies. For example, there will be an  
14 initiative on the November ballot in Colorado for a renewable energy mandate...we're concerned about the  
15 potential price impact that this initiative could have on our customers. (Xcel Energy, 2004)  
16  
17

18 Amendment 37 passed by a 54 percent vote in November of 2004, making Colorado the  
19  
20 first state to create an RPS through a ballot initiative.  
21  
22

23 ***Change in Field Conditions: Reduced Power Concentration.*** Amendment 37 created  
24  
25 regulatory legitimacy ([Hiatt, Sine, & Tolbert, 2009](#); [Scott, 1995](#)) for an ecologizing logic at the  
26  
27 state level. Failed attempts to validate an ecologizing logic through compromise with electric  
28  
29 utilities (Windsorce) and reframing to regulators (Lamar decision) provoked SMOs to engage in  
30  
31 contestation by employing both economizing and ecologizing arguments to advance their claims.  
32  
33

34 One leader of the Amendment 37 ballot initiative told us:  
35  
36

37 We talked about basically three message points that we were using. One is that wind was economical...  
38 Two, it was really good for economic development, particularly in the rural areas where, even though  
39 Colorado had been going through a boom at that time, these rural areas were in many ways left  
40 behind...and the third piece was this was good for the environment as well. (Environmental SMO Leader)  
41

42 Wind energy advocates failed to pass a renewable energy standard in the Colorado  
43  
44 legislature, and were only successful when they expanded the field to include a broader coalition,  
45  
46 and eventually, the citizens of Colorado. This strategy is illustrative of how, in centralized fields,  
47  
48 incompatibility between institutional logics may motivate proponents of a subordinate logic to  
49  
50 try to alter the balance of power in the field ([Hiatt & Park, 2013](#); [Seo & Creed, 2002](#)). Figure 2  
51  
52 shows the increased use of hybrid statements, integrating economizing and ecologizing  
53  
54 arguments for wind energy in the wake of Amendment 37. As an environmental activist  
55  
56 described:  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ... we used to say that the power to choose where your power comes from is now a decision made at the  
4 living room level instead of the board room level... and then you go through Amendment 37... Amendment  
5 37's the voice of the people... Every time the public, or somebody outside that regulated monopoly,  
6 regulatory structure, has an opportunity to say it, they're like, 'Yes, do more. Yes please. Keep going.'  
7 (Environmental Activist/Wind Energy Executive)  
8

### 9 **Legitimation and New Forms: The Role of Hybrid Organizations**

10  
11 By reducing field centralization and fostering regulative legitimacy for an ecologizing  
12 logic for wind energy, environmental SMOs created an opportunity for entry by new  
13 organizations, including wind energy entrepreneurs and clean energy SMOs. As we describe  
14 below, these two sets of organizations played a critical role in establishing and building  
15 legitimacy for new linked frames, practices, and arrangements which incorporated the goals of  
16 both economizing and ecologizing, and which were to become the elements of a hybrid logic for  
17 wind energy in Colorado.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 The establishment of the ecologizing logic within the organizational field's governance  
29 structure through the RPS delivered sociopolitical legitimacy—acceptance by key constituents of  
30 the industry's practices, outputs, or goals ([Aldrich & Fiol, 1994](#)) - to wind energy entrepreneurs.  
31 Sociopolitical legitimacy is particularly important in emerging industries, which often confront  
32 the liability of newness ([Aldrich & Fiol, 1994](#); [Scott, 1995](#)) and must gather support from  
33 powerful actors to gain acceptance (Stinchcombe, 1965). This legitimacy in turn increases the  
34 ability for new firms to access critical resources such as funding and employees ([Zimmerman &](#)  
35 [Zeitz, 2002](#); [Zott & Huy, 2007](#)), and thus encourages growth. As outlined in Figure 2, the  
36 average number of clean energy firm foundings in Colorado prior to 2005 was 11.5; from 2005-  
37 2009 the average number of entries tripled to 35, creating 261 new entrants since 2005 (CORE &  
38 Levenson, 2009). An Amendment 37 campaign leader observed:  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 What's really struck me is that right after Amendment 37 passed, everybody became a wind developer...  
55 if you wanted to make your name in Colorado, for a long time it was real estate and development. Then it  
56 became wind... there was a big land rush where lots of people were going out and locking down areas for  
57 wind development...it just fed on itself. (Environmental SMO Leader)  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 By pursuing economic profits through environmentally beneficial technology, wind  
4 energy entrepreneurs tied means that had been associated with an ecologizing logic to the goals  
5 of the economizing logic. This was an important step in the hybridization of logics, because it  
6 linked a single set of practices to dual goals that previously had been perceived to be  
7 incompatible. One environmental activist characterized the wind energy industry as "...good for  
8 the environment but also good for the economy. This is like the ultimate win-win and it can't just  
9 be one or the other. It's really got to be both. That's the thing that gives its pizzazz."

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 After the passage of Amendment 37 wind energy advocacy shifted from a focus on broad  
21 environmental goals to a more developmental, wind energy industry-specific agenda. A group of  
22 SMOs with specialized knowledge and capabilities emerged to play this role. We refer to these  
23 organizations as "clean energy SMOs" because they advocated specifically for "clean" energy  
24 sources, including wind energy (Pacheco et al., 2014). Unlike traditional environmental SMOs,  
25 clean energy SMOs established identities, beliefs, goals, forms, and practices that combined the  
26 logics of economizing and ecologizing. As Figure 2 shows, from 1998 to 2009, clean energy  
27 SMOs in Colorado grew from nine to 25 (from authors' data compiled from the National Center  
28 for Charitable Statistics).

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Clean energy SMOs played a unique role in advocating for wind energy. One wind  
42 energy firm founder noted that because of time and resource constraints, wind power companies  
43 did not "engage directly in advocacy and instead let the NGOs be the ones fighting for increasing  
44 the RPS or increasing transmission planning." Nor could existing environmental SMOs play this  
45 role because they did not possess the legitimacy and knowledge needed to engage in specific  
46 issues, such as business development and economic incentives. One founder of the Interwest  
47 Energy Alliance stated that "We strongly support most of the goals that our environmental allies  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 advance but ...we're more business-oriented, in a nutshell." Within the "Legitimation" theme,  
4  
5  
6 Table 4 provides additional examples of clean energy SMOs' activities.  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
Clean energy SMOs stimulated the development of a hybrid logic in Colorado's wind  
energy field by arguing that wind energy could simultaneously – and not partially - achieve both  
ecological and economic goals. Their vision went well beyond the idea that wind had a place in a  
field in which economizing was the dominant logic; rather, they began to re-construct the  
relationship between economizing and ecologizing as compatible. They did so by establishing  
and disseminating a new frame, "the clean energy economy," which made sense of, and provided  
normative legitimacy for, the emergence of the wind energy industry. This new frame connected  
the goals associated with the economizing and ecologizing logics to each other, as well as to a  
single set of means, wind and other forms of clean energy. We found numerous examples of  
clean energy SMOs promoting the new clean energy logic and associated practice of wind  
energy through organizing press-friendly events, and directly editorializing in *The Denver Post*:

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Colorado stands at the center of a metaphorical "harmonic convergence" of global energy trends and both  
national and state energy policies. If the legislature responds to this fleeting opportunity ...Colorado can  
add jobs in economically depressed areas and buttress our energy security - while taking the point in the  
worldwide struggle against global warming. (*The Denver Post*, 2007)

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Clean energy SMOs often paired this symbolic work with employing their in-house  
technical expertise to foster the adoption of renewable energy technologies and practices. For  
example, the Colorado Clean Energy Cluster's (CCEC) worked to "attract, incubate and grow  
clean energy enterprises" in order to "catalyze economic vitality and generate community and  
environmental benefits" (CCEC, 2012). 4CORE offered training sessions featuring best practices  
for professionals in renewable energy. Similarly, CCEC fostered the creation and dissemination  
of knowledge through "research & workshops to assess smart grid workforce readiness and  
provide workforce training support to clean energy companies"...and sponsored a "Utilities  
Summit to discuss impacts of smart grid and distributed resources to electric utilities" (CCEC,

1  
2  
3 2012).

4  
5  
6 Clean energy SMOs also helped to establish new governance arrangements that promoted  
7  
8 and legitimated the new clean energy frame and associated practices, including wind energy.  
9

10 From 2006 to 2010, 16 separate pieces of wind energy legislation were passed in Colorado  
11  
12 (DSIRE, 2010; Office of the Governor of Colorado, 2010). These bills established tax incentives,  
13  
14 rebates, and government grants. A CPUC Commissioner attested to the role of the clean energy  
15  
16 SMOs in constructing the new, linked policies, markets, and technologies which constituted the  
17  
18 emerging clean energy hybrid logic for wind energy, saying:  
19  
20

21  
22 ... they know how to connect the dots. They can see that policy is very important. But you've got...to have  
23 the right markets. You've got to have the right kind of technology out there ... they interact closely with  
24 legislators. (CPUC commissioner)  
25

26 ***Change in Field Conditions: Hybridization.*** Clean energy SMOs played a key role in the  
27  
28 hybridization of economizing and ecologizing logics. These organizations established and built  
29  
30 legitimacy for a new set of interlinked symbolic elements (shared beliefs and goals) and material  
31  
32 elements (practices, governance arrangements, and organizational forms) that integrated logics  
33  
34 previously perceived as incompatible. According to the emerging clean energy frame, wind  
35  
36 power was constructed as simultaneously “good for the environment, and good for the economy”  
37  
38 (interview with clean energy SMO founder). As Table 3 illustrates, this hybridized logic had  
39  
40 distinct goals, governance, and practices that differentiated it from both economizing and  
41  
42 ecologizing logics. Table 6 provides examples of how organizational entry by wind developers  
43  
44 and clean energy SMOs expanded the number of stakeholders in CO wind energy, further  
45  
46 decentralizing the field, and setting the stage for embedding a hybridized logic across the field.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### Embedding: Institutionalization of a Hybridized Logic for Wind Energy

In the final stage of the logic hybridization process, the new logic was embedded in the field. *Embedding* refers to active infusing of the foundations of an institutional logic into practices and arrangements (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). Whereas in the legitimation stage clean energy SMOs and wind entrepreneurs began to establish a limited set of new hybrid practices and arrangements that instantiated the clean energy frame, in this final stage of the process, a hybridized logic was institutionalized throughout the organizational field. Clean energy SMOs continued to play a role in this embedding process. For example, CCEC established formal partnerships with organizations such as Colorado State University, the city of Fort Collins, and clean energy companies to embed these hybrid practices into the educational, governmental, and business sectors.

In the final stage of logic hybridization, even actors who had most strongly held an economizing view adopted a hybridized logic integrating economizing and ecologizing logics. For example, Xcel published a “triple bottom line” report in 2007 (prominently featuring a wind turbine on the cover) proclaiming the utility’s vision was to “be a responsible environmental leader, while focusing on our core business – reliable and safe energy at a reasonable cost” (Xcel, 2007:2). The report emphasized Xcel’s view of environmental and economic goals, as linked symbiotically to its core business:

Our corporate strategy, called Building the Core, has three primary focuses: 1) being an environmental leader, 2) achieving our financial objectives and 3) efficiently managing our operating utilities. Our objective is to embrace growing customer demand and environmental initiatives by investing in our core utility businesses and earning a reasonable return on our invested capital. (Xcel Energy, 2007:24)

In addition to stating these beliefs, Xcel engaged in practices consistent with the new hybridized logic. For example, in the 2008-2015 resource plan for Colorado, Xcel detailed plans for acquiring over 800 MW of wind energy, achieving a ten percent CO<sub>2</sub> reduction by 2017, while keeping incremental costs to less than two percent (Xcel

1  
2  
3 Energy, 2008). CEO Dick Kelly described wind energy as meeting "...needs of  
4  
5 customers, shareholders, environmental groups, regulators" (Xcel Energy, 2008:5).  
6  
7

8 The embedding of a hybridized logic for wind energy in Colorado is perhaps best  
9  
10 illustrated by Governor Bill Ritter's (2007-2011) successful campaigning, and subsequent focus  
11  
12 on, a "New Energy Economy" platform (Office of the Governor of Colorado, 2010). In 2007,  
13  
14 Governor Ritter's office issued a strategic plan for renewable energy in Colorado in which the  
15  
16 Governor stated, "We can reduce global warming and keep our economy strong and  
17  
18 vibrant...Developing new sources of clean renewable energy will grow the New Energy  
19  
20 Economy in Colorado" (Ritter, 2007: 2). To ensure the role of the CPUC in "building a clean  
21  
22 energy economy", Governor Ritter appointed Matt Baker, former Director of Environment  
23  
24 Colorado and leader of the Amendment 37 campaign, as the CPUC Commissioner:  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 "I am honored to be selected by Gov. Ritter for this position," said Baker, executive director of  
30 Environment Colorado. "Colorado is at a point where we can grow our economy, protect our environment  
31 and provide an affordable energy supply to the people and businesses of Colorado..." (Office of the  
32 Governor of Colorado, 2008)  
33

34 Further embedding of the hybridized logic was enforced through governance  
35  
36 arrangements focused on the expansion of wind energy, as described in the Denver Post in 2007:  
37  
38

39 A bill to double Colorado's mandatory renewable-energy standard sailed through a House  
40 committee Tuesday on unanimous, bipartisan vote. The legislation is considered a cornerstone of  
41 Gov. Bill Ritter's call to make Colorado a national leader in alternative energy. Supporters said the  
42 bill protects consumers from volatile coal and natural gas prices, cleans the air, and provides jobs  
43 from renewable energy projects.  
44

45 "This bill challenges the old idea that the environment and the economy can't prosper at the same  
46 time," said Will Coyne of advocacy group Environment Colorado....  
47

48 "We believe (this bill) will really be a big step in making Colorado a leader in renewable energy  
49 and the new energy economy," said Pat Vincent, president and chief executive of Xcel Energy's  
50 Public Service Co. of Colorado. (The Denver Post, Raabe, 2007)  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DISCUSSION

This study sought to increase understanding of the hybridization of field-level logics through a historical analysis of the wind energy field in Colorado. It is, to our knowledge, the first to examine the process of logic hybridization. Our process model offers several theoretical contributions.

First, we distinguish logic hybridization from similar concepts such as blending and assimilation, and offer a specific, tractable, and useful definition of hybridized logics for future theory building. Second, we show that logic hybridization is a recursive process between organizational responses and changes in field conditions. Contrary to the existing literature, our model suggests that successful compromise and contestation are not end points in field evolution but rather potential triggers for entry by new, hybrid organizations. When proponents of a subordinate logic gain legitimacy and learning through compromise, reframing, and contestation, they may successfully decentralize fields and set the conditions for entry by new organizations. Third, our case illuminates the critical role of hybrid organizations in this process, showing how they embody, legitimize, and embed the symbolic goals and material elements that came to constitute the hybrid of two conflicting logics. Thus, we expand the extant literature on hybrid organizations that has largely focused on organizational level outcomes (e.g. [Battilana & Dorado, 2010](#); [Mars & Lounsbury, 2009](#); [Pache & Santos, 2013](#); [Wry, Lounsbury, Jennings, 2013](#)). We now elaborate on each of these contributions.

### **Differentiating Logic Hybridization**

While the institutional logics literature has alluded to logic hybridization, it has not provided clarity regarding the concept's definition. Through our examination of the wind energy field in Colorado, we differentiated *hybridization* from previously offered concepts of combining institutional logics. In contrast to blending, which involves changes in discourse and practices to

1  
2  
3 incorporate existing elements of multiple logics (e.g. [Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005](#); Smets et al.,  
4 2011), and assimilation, which in our case involved the attachment of the means previously only  
5 associated with a subordinate logic to the goals of a dominant logic, this study revealed a process  
6 in which actors construct specific new frames, practices, and arrangements that integrate  
7 previously incompatible goals. While prior research has theorized logics that reconcile  
8 economizing and ecologizing ([Frederick, 1995](#); [Gladwin et al., 1995](#)) or shown such a logic  
9 operating at the organizational level ([Gao & Bansal, 2012](#)), this study reveals the hybridization  
10 processes through which such logics are constructed within a field.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
New governance arrangements, such as the unopposed increase in the RPS and the “clean  
energy economy” frame, were also deeply embedded in the field. Beyond aggregating specific  
dimensions of the ecologizing logic represented by SMOs (e.g., reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) with  
dimensions of an economizing logic proposed by the CPUC and utilities (e.g., profitable  
electricity generation), the hybridized logic that emerged in Colorado offered wind energy as the  
means to integrate the previously incompatible goals of economizing and ecologizing logics. As  
a result, we conclude that the formation of a hybridized logic is dependent upon the reduction of  
the incompatibility between the *goals* of previously incompatible logics, through specific *means*.

Following the literature on hybrid organizing ([Battilana & Dorado, 2010](#); [Battilana &  
Lee, 2014](#); [Besharov & Smith, 2014](#); [Smith, Gonin, & Besharov, 2013](#)) we propose that it is this  
integration of the goals of previously incompatible logics through the creation of a new logic that  
differentiates a hybridized logic. We also distinguish hybridization from assimilation, which is a  
form of blending but does not align conflicting logics. As we detailed above, assimilation in our  
case involved the attachment of the means previously only associated with a subordinate logic to  
the goals of a dominant logic. Logic assimilation took place when the CPUC enforced the  
adoption of wind energy in service to the “least cost alternative” mandated by an economizing

1  
2  
3 view. While the adoption of wind energy may have helped to achieve ecologizing goals, the  
4  
5 logic overriding the field remained firmly embedded within an economizing view that embraced  
6  
7 wind energy only in a limited manner. Whereas compromise entails concessions to competing  
8  
9 goals and the adoption of some means but deletion of others, hybridized logics do not involve  
10  
11 concessions, but rather posit that the goals of competing logics can be aligned through the  
12  
13 adoption of new, specific means.  
14  
15

16  
17 It is important to note that while the price of wind power did decrease over time (see  
18  
19 Figure 2), and this undoubtedly eased the transition, the actual practice of wind energy  
20  
21 development changed very little over the course of the case. Throughout this time period, the  
22  
23 future of wind energy continued to face uncertainty due to technical and economic circumstances  
24  
25 (Vasi, 2011). Wind energy's ability to compete with fossil fuel-based sources continued to be  
26  
27 questioned as illustrated by the industry's dependence on a federal production tax credit  
28  
29 ([Bolinger, 2010](#)). What did change is that wind energy shifted from being framed as a means for  
30  
31 ecological sustainability to a potential means for low cost electricity production, and finally, as  
32  
33 the means to simultaneously protect the environment and the economy of Colorado.  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **A Process Model of Logic Hybridization**

39  
40 According to our model, a hybrid of incompatible logics is the outcome of processes  
41  
42 involving the interplay of organizational responses and field-level conditions. By linking field-  
43  
44 level change to agency, we respond to recent calls to explain "field creation and change ... not  
45  
46 ... as an exogenous event, but as something that is socially constructed by organizations via their  
47  
48 decision-making and their ongoing and cumulative responses to institutional complexity"  
49  
50 (Greenwood et al, 2011: 357). In our case, the reduction of field centralization and the gradual  
51  
52 change in the relationship between field-level logics enabled actors to enact further changes, and  
53  
54 ultimately led to the emergence of a new hybridized logic. Without these earlier processes, it  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 seems unlikely that the field would have evolved to support the wind energy entrepreneurs and  
4  
5 clean energy SMOs that instantiated the hybridized logic.  
6  
7

8 Our findings suggest that logic hybridization is an emergent process. There were  
9  
10 numerous interdependencies in the process, as organizational actions triggered subsequent  
11  
12 changes, both intended and unforeseen. These interdependencies prevented actors from  
13  
14 predicting outcomes with certainty. Therefore, rather than planning for long term objectives,  
15  
16 actors continuously adapted to their new environments through different organizational  
17  
18 strategies. Whereas social movement scholars portray social change as produced through  
19  
20 intentional efforts by movement actors using established “repertoires of contention” (Tilly, 1986)  
21  
22 to replace formerly dominant logics (McAdam et al., 1996; [McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2001](#)),  
23  
24 this study shows that radical change at the field level may occur through ongoing  
25  
26 experimentation and numerous unintended changes. In our case, a hybridized logic eventually  
27  
28 developed in a fluid and emergent way out of a complex process. While our findings are derived  
29  
30 from a unique context, they suggest a broader, generalizable set of insights for logic  
31  
32 hybridization at the field level. We posit that a hybridized logic is likely to emerge through: 1)  
33  
34 attempts at field-level collaboration by proponents of incompatible logics, and/or 2) escalating  
35  
36 contestation and resultant field decentralization.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 First, related to a gap identified by Bromley and Powell (2014), our research speaks to  
44  
45 the field-level consequences of organizational decoupling and other forms of compromise. In the  
46  
47 Windsource compromise, the *means* of wind energy was utilized by Xcel to support the *goals* of  
48  
49 economizing; therefore, the goals of ecologizing and economizing remained incompatible from  
50  
51 the perspective of environmental SMOs. As Ashforth and Reingen observe, compromise is “a  
52  
53 choice of half of one and half of the other, integration involves both/and” (2014: 506). Our  
54  
55 findings suggest that, even in successful programs such as Windsource, compromise through  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 decoupling may not resolve conflict between representatives of incompatible logics because it  
4 does not integrate the goals of the two logics (Hallett, 2010; [Sauder & Espeland, 2009](#)).  
5  
6  
7

8         Rather, compromise can elaborate the dominant logic and preserve the power of  
9 dominant actors. In highly centralized fields, powerful actors espousing dominant logics are able  
10 to maintain autonomy over decision making ([Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009](#)) and the  
11 status quo (Leblebici, Salancik, Copay, & King, 1991). When logic incompatibility persists and  
12 the field remains centralized, dominant actors may continue to reinforce their preferred logics  
13 even when engaging in compromise. However, an unintended consequence of Windsource for  
14 Xcel was the creation of a more effective opponent. Windsource enabled environmental activists  
15 to achieve greater legitimacy in the eyes of the public and to learn how to reframe wind energy in  
16 economizing terms. These findings suggest that compromise, and other organizational responses  
17 to logic incompatibility, may not resolve conflict, but rather trigger unpredictable, and perhaps  
18 unintended, changes in field-level conditions. In sum, when prior attempts at collaboration result  
19 in organizational learning and reframing, as well as escalated contestation, field conditions may  
20 be set for subsequent field level changes such as entry by new organizational forms (hybrid  
21 organizations in our case).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40         Our study also enables us to speak to the field-level impacts of logic assimilation, which  
41 occurred when SMOs reframed their arguments in terms of economizing in the Lamar decision.  
42 While prior studies discuss assimilation as the end of a process of logic conflict (e.g. Arjaliés,  
43 2010; [Murray, 2010](#)), our findings suggest that assimilation may represent an important trigger to  
44 future field-level change, including logic hybridization. Assimilation of the means of wind  
45 energy into the goals of economizing increased the legitimacy of wind energy by reducing its  
46 perceived incompatibility with the dominant economizing logic.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

However, because assimilation also kept power in the field concentrated in the hands of the CPUC and the electric utilities, and justified wind energy only in terms of economizing, it left SMOs frustrated, and motivated their movement into direct contestation. The actions that produce assimilation of a subordinate logic (in our case, the justification of a wind project in terms of economizing) provide legitimacy to that logic and its advocates, yet may also leave these advocates dissatisfied and hungry for further change because they have suppressed their own beliefs. While the material *means* of wind energy were (partially) accepted, the symbolic *goals* of ecologizing were not acknowledged. Due to their increased legitimacy, advocates in such situations may find that external constituents are more receptive to subordinate logics ([Waldron et al., 2013](#)) and are willing to offer greater support, and, depending on the centralization of the field, may find that they can use this support to more aggressively influence their opponents.

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Thus, assimilation of a subordinate logic, rather than serving as a burial ground for that logic, may establish fertile ground for social movements to continue to drive change and ultimately hybridize incompatible logics. Surprisingly, the literature in social movements has not considered how assimilation and other developmental changes in field-level logics (Thornton et al., 2002) can be used as opportunities for movement intervention. Instead, most research in this domain addresses how movement activism drives the *replacement* of institutional logics in a field (e.g., Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002; Lounsbury, 2002; Rao et al., 2003; Thornton 2001, 2002; [Thornton & Ocasio, 1999](#)). In sum, we posit that logic assimilation can serve as an important intermediary step towards hybridization as it brings legitimacy to a subordinate logic. This is particularly relevant in centralized fields where subordinate logics may need to garner credibility through associations with dominant logics. In addition, under conditions of high logic incompatibility, assimilation may only represent a temporary step as it does not fully resolve



1  
2  
3 conflict between logics. Hence we address a gap in existing research, which recognizes that  
4 field-level logics evolve over time but does "...not offer an explanation of when one type of  
5 change is more likely to prevail than another" ([Thornton et al. 2012: 168](#)).

### 10 **The Role of Hybrid Organizations in Field-Level Logic Hybridization**

11  
12 Our study has specific implications for understanding the emergence of hybrid  
13 organizations and how they contribute to logic hybridization at the field level. We found that the  
14 passage of RPS in Colorado opened the door for the growth of organizations, specifically wind  
15 developers and clean energy SMOs, that combined economizing and ecologizing logics in their  
16 cores and therefore can be viewed as hybrid organizations ([Battilana & Dorado, 2010](#); [Besharov  
17 & Smith, 2014](#); [Pache & Santos, 2010](#)). Clean energy SMOs then worked to legitimize the  
18 emerging hybridized logic for wind energy, while wind developers contributed to logic  
19 emergence by demonstrating the economic viability of the wind energy industry.

20  
21 Our findings suggest that once a new field-level hybridized logic begins to emerge,  
22 organizational responses may diversify to include normative and cognitive legitimation of the  
23 emerging logic. This role is particularly apt for hybrid organizations because they are embedded  
24 in multiple rather than single logics and "...have access to a much broader repertoire of  
25 institutionalized templates that they can combine in unique ways" ([Pache & Santos, 2013: 37](#)).

26  
27 This competency is illustrated by clean energy SMOs' utilization of diverse knowledge and  
28 capabilities, strategies, and activities that are consistent with the integration of economic and  
29 environmental goals ([Pacheco et al., 2014](#)).

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Prior research indicates that hybrid organizations are "arenas of contradiction" ([Pache & Santos, 2013: 972](#)) in which actors must deal with the tensions arising from the incompatible logics that their organizations embrace. The literature portrays such tensions as originating from decisions regarding legal structure (e.g., for profit vs. nonprofit), financing, and organizational

1  
2  
3 cultural challenges (Battilana et al. 2012; [Battilana and Lee, 2014](#)). These tensions typically arise  
4  
5 when hybrid organizations take on distinct new organizational forms that combine existing forms  
6  
7 ([Battilana and Lee, 2014](#)). For example, social enterprises blend nonprofit with for-profit models  
8  
9 ([Moss, Short, Payne, & Lumpkin, 2011](#); [Miller et al., 2012](#); [Grimes et al., 2013](#)). Hence, these  
10  
11 types of organizations may face challenges in finding appropriate means (e.g., legal,  
12  
13 organizational structures) that best serve the integration of previously incompatible goals ([Smith](#)  
14  
15 [et al., 2013](#)). These means-goals misalignments may, in turn, prevent hybridized logics from  
16  
17 emerging and influencing decision-making within these organizations  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 In contrast, the hybrid organizations in our case likely experienced less internal identity  
23  
24 and cultural struggle because: 1) they adopted well-established organizational forms rather than  
25  
26 pioneering new ones, and 2) they were conceived for the express purpose of integrating distinct  
27  
28 logics within these forms. While clean energy SMOs may have experienced internal tensions,  
29  
30 these tensions were likely ameliorated by the legitimacy of the chosen organizational form (non-  
31  
32 profit model) and their central mission to advocate for the integration of economizing and  
33  
34 ecologizing logics. Thus, these hybrid organizations were well positioned to successfully  
35  
36 promote logic hybridization within their field.  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Consistent with our prior research ([Pacheco et al., 2014](#)) we demonstrate that hybrid  
42  
43 organizations, such as clean energy SMOs, are more likely to emerge under specific field  
44  
45 conditions, and that the emergence of these organizations then recursively influences the field.  
46  
47 However, we extend prior findings by demonstrating the important role that hybrid organizations  
48  
49 play in not only in altering the structure and material forms of a field (e.g., governance, policies,  
50  
51 incentives), but also in fostering the hybridization of logics more broadly.  
52  
53  
54

55 Our findings suggest that hybrid organizations may be far from homogenous in the  
56  
57 tensions they experience, and the capabilities they hold ([Besharov & Smith, 2014](#)). We observed  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 key differences in these aspects between the clean energy SMOs examined in this study and the  
4 social enterprises that abound in the hybrid organizations literature. These two types of hybrid  
5 organizations likely also have different levels of influence on field-level processes of logic  
6 hybridization. This does not imply that social enterprises cannot espouse or advocate for  
7 hybridized logics, but rather, that their ability to do so may be influenced by their internal  
8 dynamics. Our case primarily describes how *external* conditions can determine the success of  
9 hybrid organizations in contributing to field level hybridization processes. However, future  
10 research is necessary to understand how the *internal* environment and the tensions inherent  
11 within hybrid organizations may affect their ability to influence logic hybridization at the field  
12 level. We suspect that future studies will uncover significant parallels between the  
13 organizational- level struggles described in the prior literature, and the field-level processes of  
14 change detailed in this study.

### 31 **Boundary Conditions and Limitations**

32 We expect that the theoretical insights from this study may be applicable in  
33 organizational fields similar to the one we studied; that is, fields characterized by initial  
34 conditions of high centralization and dominance of a single logic. Contrary to prior work on  
35 compromise and logic assimilation, we find that attempts by less powerful actors to gain voice  
36 did not resolve incompatibility, but rather motivated eventual contestation. In a less centralized  
37 field, we would expect that proponents of a subordinate logic might not be sufficiently motivated  
38 to alter field structure, and (albeit unintentionally) create opportunity for hybrid organizations.  
39 As our case study shows, altering the structure of fields is a long and difficult process that  
40 occurred only when advocates were dissatisfied by compromise and assimilation. In addition, we  
41 believe that our theoretical contribution is more applicable to fields that, like the one we studied,  
42 are characterized by a high degree of perceived logic incompatibility. Fields with more  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 compatible logics may not require hybridization, as the goals of multiple logics can be  
4  
5 accommodated. Without high incompatibility, we would expect that assimilation or blending  
6  
7 would be the expected outcome of logic plurality. However, in fields with persistent logic  
8  
9 incompatibility, we note that assimilation may be only a precursor to logic hybridization, rather  
10  
11 than a sustainable solution.  
12  
13

14  
15 Finally, we believe that our refined definition of hybridized logics could be applicable to  
16  
17 other fields where practices are reconstructed to support previously incompatible goals. Future  
18  
19 studies could help to clarify how and when logic hybridization occurs, as compared to a narrower  
20  
21 blending of elements from diverse logics. Such studies could also shed light on the conditions  
22  
23 under which developmental changes such as assimilation are needed as intermediary steps to  
24  
25 eventual hybridization. It is likely that the dynamics (e.g., competition, cooperation) between  
26  
27 organizations in a field and other exogenous shocks, such as technological innovations, also  
28  
29 impact how developmental and transformational changes in institutional logics take place.  
30  
31 Potential applications include the current health care debate in the United States and the  
32  
33 incompatibility of market and social welfare logics in the international debate on climate change  
34  
35 ([Ansari et al., 2013](#); [Hiatt, Grandy, & Lee, 2015](#)).  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 A potential limitation of our study is the inherent retrospective bias of interviews  
42  
43 regarding past events. However, as detailed in Table 1 and Table 2, all of our themes were  
44  
45 triangulated from multiple archival sources as well as interviews. Because the goal of our case  
46  
47 study was to attain a rich, detailed understanding of the processes that unfolded within the wind  
48  
49 energy field in Colorado, we could not assess the role of external trends and forces that may have  
50  
51 impacted the relationships we explored. However, we gain comfort from prior empirical research  
52  
53 that has considered the influence of national-level economic and social factors, such as pricing  
54  
55 variations in wind power and the visibility of environmental issues. These studies have found  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 that controlling for these macro-level conditions, the actors in our case, environmental and clean  
4 energy SMOs ([Pacheco, York, & Hargrave, 2014](#); [Sine & Lee, 2009](#); [Vasi, 2009](#)) and electric  
5  
6 utilities ([Pacheco and Dean, 2014](#)), have played critical roles in driving the direction of the wind  
7  
8 energy industry.  
9  
10

### 11 12 **Conclusion**

13  
14  
15 With a focus on how actors respond to logic incompatibility, this study clarified how and  
16 why field-level logic hybridization occurs. Our findings suggest that the process of establishing  
17 practices, technologies, and organizations that provision both economic and environmental  
18 benefits is a complex one involving the participation of a variety of actors, each adapting their  
19 strategies as they learn and as field conditions change. With increasing calls for reforming  
20 economic systems and the rise of hybrid organizations, exploring and understanding these  
21 processes should be an integral part of organizational research. This study provides an early step  
22 towards understanding the complex interplay of field logics, structure, and organizational actions  
23 through which logic hybridization occurs.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Aldrich, H. E. & Fiol, C. M. 1994. Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4): 645-626 pages.
- 7  
8  
9 Ansari, S., Wijen, F., & Gray, B. 2013. Constructing a Climate Change Logic: An Institutional Perspective on the 'Tragedy of the Commons'. *Organization Science*, 24(4): 1014-1040.
- 10  
11  
12 Arjaliès, D. 2010. A social movement perspective on finance: How socially responsible investment mattered. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92: 57-78.
- 13  
14  
15 Ashforth, B. & Reingen, P.H. 2014. Functions of dysfunction: Managing the dynamics of an organizational duality in a natural food cooperative. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Forthcoming.
- 16  
17  
18 Barley, S. R. & Tolbert, P. S. 1997. Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, v18(n1): p93(25).
- 19  
20  
21 Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. 2009. How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1): 65-107.
- 22  
23  
24 Battilana, J. & Dorado, S. 2010. Building sustainable hybrid Organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6): 1419-1440.
- 25  
26  
27 Battiliana, J., Lee, M., Walker, J., & Dorsey, C. 2012. In search of the hybrid ideal. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 10(3): 50-55.
- 28  
29  
30 Battilana, J. & Lee, M. 2014. Advancing research on hybrid organizing– Insights from the study of social enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1): 397-441.
- 31  
32  
33 Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. 2000. Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 26: 611-639: Annual Reviews.
- 34  
35  
36 Besharov, M.L., & Smith, W.K. 2014. Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39. 364-381.
- 37  
38  
39 Bolinger, M. 2010. Revealing the hidden value that the federal investment tax credit and treasury cash grant provide to community wind projects. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. January. Available at <http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/emp>
- 40  
41  
42 Booth, M. 2001. Energy solution: Blowin' in the wind? Xcel seems reluctant to invest in cost-competitive power, *The Denver Post*, 2nd Edition ed.: A-01. Denver, CO: Media NewsGroup Inc.
- 43  
44  
45 Brandemuehl, M. J. 2005. A sustainable energy future possible, *The Denver Post*: E-04. Denver, CO: MediaNews Group Inc.
- 46  
47  
48 Bromley, P., & Powell, W.W. 2012. From smoke and mirrors to walking the talk: Decoupling in the contemporary world. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6: 483-530.
- 49  
50  
51 CCEC (Colorado Clean Energy Cluster), 2012. <http://www.coloradocleanenergy.com/home>. Accessed February 15, 2012
- 52  
53  
54 CORE & Levenson, J. 2009. Colorado Cleantech Cluster Analysis 2009: CORE.
- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Cox, C. 2006. Making renewable energy a reality, *The Denver Post*, Final Edition ed. Denver, CO:  
4 MediaNews Group Inc.  
5  
6 CPUC. 2001a. DECISION NO.CO1-295. Denver, CO: Colorado Public Utilities Commission.  
7  
8 CPUC. 2001b. PUC Approves Xcel resource plan with addition of wind project, *Press Release*. Denver,  
9 CO: State of Colorado Public Utilities Commission.  
10  
11 CPUC. 2002. Decision No. C02-793. Denver, Colorado: Colorado Public Utilities Commission.  
12  
13 CPUC. 2007. Testimony of Ronald J. Binz, Chairman, Colorado Public Utilities Commission: Renewable  
14 Energy: Complementary Policies for Climate Legislation, *Press Release*. Denver, CO: State of Colorado  
15 Public Utilities Commission.  
16  
17 CPUC. 2008a. DOCKET NO. 07A-447E. Denver, CO: Colorado Public Utilities Commission.  
18  
19 CPUC. 2008b. Decision No. C08-0929. In C. P. U. Commission (Ed.). Denver, CO: Colorado Public  
20 Utilities Commission.  
21  
22 Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. 2011. Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions.  
23 *Organization Science*, 22(5): 1203-1213.  
24  
25 Delbridge, R., & Edwards, T. 2013. Inhabiting institutions: Critical realist refinements to understanding  
26 institutional complexity and change. *Organization Studies*, 34: 927-947.  
27  
28 DiMaggio, P. 1988. Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional Patterns*  
29 *and Organizations*: 3-22. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.  
30  
31 DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W. W. 1983. The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and  
32 Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2): 147-160.  
33  
34 DSIRE. 2010. Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy and Efficiency  
35  
36 Dunn, M. B. & Jones, C. 2010. Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care  
37 and science logics in medical education, 1967–2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(1): 114-149.  
38  
39 Eisenhardt, K. & Graebner, M. 2007. Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges.  
40 *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 25-32.  
41  
42 Elsbach, K. D. & Sutton, R. I. 1992. Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate actions: A  
43 marriage of institutional and impression management theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(4):  
44 699-738.  
45  
46 Ewgen, B. 1999. Buying Power: Ideological sparks fly over electrical deregulation, *The Denver Post*  
47 Denver, CO. MediaNews Group Inc.  
48  
49 Fligstein, N. 1996. Markets as politics: A political-cultural approach to market institutions. *American*  
50 *Sociological Review*, 61: 228-244.  
51  
52 Friedland, R. 2002. Money, sex, and god: The erotic logic of religious nationalism. *Sociological Theory*,  
53 20(3): 381-425.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Frederick, W. C. 1995. *Values, nature, and culture in the American corporation*. New York: Oxford  
4 University Press.  
5  
6  
7 Friedland, R. & Alford, R. R. 1991. Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional  
8 contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. Dimaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational*  
9 *Analysis*: 232-263. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.  
10  
11 Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. 2013. Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research:  
12 Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1): 15-31.  
13  
14 Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T.-S. 1995. Shifting paradigms for sustainable development:  
15 Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4): 874-907.  
16  
17 Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative*  
18 *research*: Chicago, IL: Aldine Transaction.  
19  
20  
21 Glynn, M. A. & Lounsbury, M. 2005. From the critics' corner: Logic blending, discursive Change and  
22 authenticity in a cultural production system. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5): 1031-1055.  
23  
24 Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. London, UK: Harper &  
25 Row.  
26  
27 Golden-Biddle, K. & Locke, K. 2007. *Composing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.  
28  
29 Goodrick, E. & Reay, T. 2011. Constellations of institutional logics: Changes in the professional work of  
30 pharmacists. *Work and Occupations*, 38(3): 372-416.  
31  
32 Greenwood, R., Díaz, A. M., Li, S. X., & Lorente, J. C. 2010. The multiplicity of institutional logics and  
33 the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization Science*, 21(2): 521-539.  
34  
35 Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. 2011. Institutional  
36 complexity and organizational responses. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1): 317-371.  
37  
38 Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., Vogus, T. J., & Miller, T. L. 2013. Studying the origins of social  
39 entrepreneurship: Compassion and the role of embedded agency. *Academy of management review*, 38(3):  
40 460-463.  
41  
42 Haigh, N. & Hoffman, A. J. 2012. Hybrid organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 41(2): 126.  
43  
44 Hargrave, T. J. & van de Ven, A. H. 2006. A collective action model of institutional innovation. *Academy*  
45 *of Management Review*, 31(4): 864-888.  
46  
47 Hiatt, Shon and Grandy, Jake and Lee, Brandon H., 2015. Organizational Responses to Public and Private  
48 Politics: An Analysis of Climate Change Activists and U.S. Oil and Gas Firms (May 2, 2015). Available  
49 at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2601797>  
50  
51  
52 Hiatt, S. R. & Sangchan, P. 2013. Lords of the harvest:: third-party influence and regulatory approval of  
53 genetically modified organisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4): 923-944.  
54  
55  
56 Hiatt, S., Sine, W., & Tolbert, P. S. 2009. From Pabst to Pepsi: The Deinstitutionalization of Social  
57 Practices and the Creation of Entrepreneurial Opportunities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(4):  
58 635-667.  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Hoffman, A. J. 1999. Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the U.S. chemical  
9 industry. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4): 351-371.
- 10  
11 Hoffman, A.J. 2011. Talking past each other? Cultural framing of skeptical and convinced logics in the  
12 climate change debate. *Organization & Environment*, 24: 3- 33.
- 13  
14 Hoffman, A. J., Gillespie, J. J., Moore, D. A., Wade-Benzoni, K. A., Thompson, L. L., & Bazerman, M.  
15 H. 1999. A mixed-motive perspective on the economics versus environment debate. *American*  
16 *Behavioral Scientist*, 42(8): 1254-1276.
- 17  
18 Hoffman, A. J., Badiane, K. K., & Haigh, N. 2012. *Hybrid organizations as agents of positive social*  
19 *change: Bridging the for-profit & non-profit divide*: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- 20  
21 Holm, P. 1995. The dynamics of institutionalization: Transformation processes in Norwegian fisheries.  
22 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 398-422.
- 23  
24 IPCC. 2011. The IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation:  
25 New York, NY: United Nations Environment Programme.
- 26  
27 IPCC. 2013. Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. In T. F.  
28 Stocker & D. Qin (Eds.). Switzerland: IPCC.
- 29  
30 IPCC. 2014. Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. In W. G. II (Ed.), *Fifth*  
31 *Assessment Report (AR5)*. Geneva, Switzerland: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- 32  
33 IREA. 2004. Does the wind really blow for free?, *Watts & Volts* Sedalia, CO: Intermountain Rural  
34 Electric Association.
- 35  
36 Komor, P. 2006. Wind power in Colorado: Small steps towards sustainability. *Sustainable Energy and*  
37 *the States*. London, UK: McFarland & Company Inc.
- 38  
39 Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. 2013. Process studies of change in  
40 organization and management: unveiling temporality, activity, and flow. *Academy of Management*  
41 *Journal*, 56(1): 1-13.
- 42  
43 Lawrence, T.B. 2008. Power, institutions, and organizations. In Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R.,  
44 & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (Ed.). *The Sage Handbook of Organizational institutionalism*: 170-197.  
45 London, UK: Sage.
- 46  
47 Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. 2011. Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of  
48 organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1): 52-58.
- 49  
50 Lawrence, T. B. & Suddaby, R. 2006. Institutions and institutional work. *The Sage Handbook of*  
51 *Organization Studies*: 215-254.
- 52  
53 Leblebic, H., Salancik, G. R., Copay, A., & King, T. 1991. Institutional change and the transformation of  
54 interorganizational fields: an organizational history of the US radio broadcasting industry. *Administrative*  
55 *Science Quarterly*, 36(3).
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Lee, M.P., & Lounsbury, M. 2015. Filtering Institutional Logics: Community Logic Variation and  
4 Differential Responses to the Institutional Complexity of Toxic Waste. *Organization Science*, Articles in  
5 Advance 11 Feb 2015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0959>  
6

7 Lehr, R. L., Nielsen, J., Andrews, S., & Milligan, M. 2001. Colorado Public Utility Commission's Xcel  
8 wind decision, *AWEA's Windpower 2001 Conference*. Washington, D.C.: National Renewable Energy  
9 Laboratory.  
10

11 Leib, J. 1998. PSC aims to boost power Utility's plan includes renewable sources, *The Denver Post*: C-  
12 01. Denver, CO: MediaNews Group Inc.  
13

14 Lepoutre, J.M.W.N., & Valente, M. 2012. Fools breaking out: The role of symbolic and material  
15 immunity in explaining institutional nonconformity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 285-313.  
16

17 Levy, D. & Scully, M. 2007. The institutional entrepreneur as modern prince: The strategic face of power  
18 in contested fields. *Organization Studies*, 28(7): 971-991.  
19

20 Locke, K. 2001. *Grounded theory in management research*. London, UK; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage  
21 Publications.  
22

23 Lounsbury, M., Ventresca, M., & Hirsch, P. M. 2003. Social movements, field frames and industry  
24 emergence: a cultural-political perspective on US recycling. *Socio-Economic Review*, 1(1): 71-104.  
25

26 Lounsbury, M. & Crumley, E. T. 2007. New practice creation: An institutional perspective on innovation.  
27 *Organization Studies*, 28(7): 993-1012.  
28

29 Marquis, C. & Lounsbury, M. 2007. Vive la resistance: Competing logics and the consolidation of US  
30 community banking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 799-820.  
31

32 Mars, M. M. & Lounsbury, M. 2009. Raging against or with the private marketplace? Logic hybridity and  
33 eco-entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 18(1): 4-13.  
34

35 Mayer, R., Blank, E., & Swezey, B. 1999. The grassroots are greener: A community-based approach to  
36 marketing green power, *Renewable Energy Policy Project Research Report*. Washington, DC:  
37 Renewable Energy Policy Project.  
38

39 Mayer, Blank, Udall, and Nelson. 1997. Promoting renewable energy in a market Environment: A  
40 community-based approach for aggregating green demand. *Land and Water Fund of the Rockies/U.S.*  
41 *Department of Energy Report*. Boulder, CO: Land and Water Fund of the Rockies.  
42

43 McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. 1996. Introduction: Opportunities, mobilizing structures,  
44 and framing processes--toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements. In D.  
45 McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements:*  
46 *Political opportunities, mobilizing structures and cultural framings*: 1-20. New York: Cambridge  
47 University Press.  
48

49 McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly C. 2001. *Dynamics of contention*. New York: Cambridge University  
50 Press.  
51

52 McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. N. 1973. *The trend of social Movements in America: Professionalization*  
53 *and resource mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 McKinnon, J.T. & Hart, G. 2008. Guest Commentary: Our new energy economy. *The Denver Post*  
4 Denver, CO. MediaNews Group Inc.  
5  
6 Meyer, J., Scott, W. R., & Strang, D. 1987. Centralization, fragmentation, and school district complexity.  
7 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 186-201.  
8  
9 Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony.  
10 *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2): 340.  
11  
12 Meyer, R. E. & Hammerschmid, G. 2006. Changing institutional logics and executive identities A  
13 managerial challenge to public administration in Austria. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(7): 1000-  
14 1014.  
15  
16 Murray, F. 2010. The oncomouse that roared: Hybrid exchange strategies as a source of distinction at the  
17 boundary of overlapping institutions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 116(2): 341-388.  
18  
19 Miller, T., Grimes, M., McMullen, J., & Vogus, T. 2012. Venturing for others with heart and head: How  
20 compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(3): 460-463.  
21  
22 Moss, T. W., Short, J. C., Payne, G. T., & Lumpkin, G. T. 2011. Dual Identities in Social Ventures: An  
23 Exploratory Study. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(4): 805-830.  
24  
25 Nigam, A. & Ocasio, W. 2010. Event attention, environmental sensemaking, and change in institutional  
26 logics: An inductive analysis of the effects of public attention to Clinton's health care reform initiative.  
27 *Organization Science*, 21(4): 823-841.  
28  
29 Office of the Governor of Colorado. 2008. Gov. Ritter names Matt Baker to Public Utilities Commission.  
30 Denver, CO: Office of the Governor of Colorado.  
31  
32 Office of the Governor of Colorado. 2010. Colorado's new energy economy. Denver, CO: Office of the  
33 Governor of Colorado.  
34  
35 Olinger, D. 2004. Statewide ballot issues Amendment 37 10 percent by 2015: Energy initiative would  
36 force Colo. to reap renewables, *The Denver Post*. Denver, CO: Media News Group Inc.  
37  
38 Oliver, C. 1991. Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*: 145-  
39 179.  
40  
41 Pache, A.-C. & Santos, F. 2013. Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to  
42 competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4): 972-1001.  
43  
44 Pache, A. C. & Santos, F. 2010. When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses  
45 to conflicting institutional demands. *Academy of Management Review (AMR)*, 35(3): 455-476.  
46  
47 Pacheco, D. & Dean, T.J. 2014. Firm Responses to social movement pressures: A competitive dynamics  
48 perspective. *Strategic Management Journal*, Forthcoming.  
49  
50 Pacheco, D. F., York, J. G., & Hargrave, T. J. 2014. The Coevolution of Industries, Social Movements,  
51 and Institutions: Wind Power in the United States. *Organization Science*, 25(6): 1609-1632.  
52  
53 Partnership for Sustainability, 2012. <http://www.partnershipforsustainability.org/whoweare>. Accessed  
54 February 15, 2012  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Plowman, D. A., Baker, L. T., Beck, T. E., Kulkarni, M., Solansky, S. T., & Travis, D. V. 2007. Radical  
5 change accidentally: The emergence and amplification of small change. *Academy of Management*  
6 *Journal*, 50(3): 515-543.  
7

8  
9 Raabe, S. 2001. Xcel, wind-power group hope to sway PUC with energy plans, *Denver Post*, 1st Edition  
10 ed.: C-01. Denver, CO: Denver Newspaper Group.

11  
12 Raabe, S. 2003. Colorado gets and F on renewable energy: Group criticizes state policies amid 'green  
13 power' success, *The Denver Post*: C-01. Denver, CO: MediaNews Group Inc.

14  
15 Raabe, S. & Bunch, J. 2003. Project a winner, advocates say, *The Denver Post*: K-01. Denver, CO:  
16 MediaNews Group Inc.

17  
18 Raabe, S. 2006. Steady wind means pricier power: Customers lose cost advantage of green source Natural  
19 gas and coal got cheaper again. Xcel now wants Windsource to be always more expensive., *The Denver*  
20 *Post*: C-01. Denver, CO: MediaNews Group Inc.

21  
22 Raabe, S. 2007. Bill gains to double renewable energy In line with Gov. Ritter's goals, a House panel  
23 passes a measure raising the state's mandatory standard to 20 percent by 2020, *The Denver Post* Denver,  
24 CO. MediaNews Group Inc.

25  
26 Reay, T. & Hinings, C. R. B. 2005. The recomposition of an organizational field: Health care in Alberta.  
27 *Organization Studies*, 26(3): 351-384.  
28

29  
30 Reay, T. & Hinings, C. R. 2009. Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization*  
31 *Studies*, 30(6): 629-652.  
32

33  
34 Sanderson, S. A. 2004. Energy market created by fiat?, *The Denver Post*: E-04. Denver, CO: MediaNews  
35 Group Inc.

36  
37 Sauder, M., & Espeland, W.N. 2009. The discipline of rankings: Tight coupling and organizational  
38 change. *American Sociological Review*. 74: 63-82.

39  
40 Schneiberg, M. & Lounsbury, M. 2008. Social movements and institutional analysis. *Handbook of*  
41 *Organizational Institutionalism*: 650–672.  
42

43  
44 Scott, W. R. & Meyer, J. W. 1991. The organization of societal sectors: Propositions and early evidence.  
45 In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*: 108-142.  
46 Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

47  
48 Scott, W. R. 1995. *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

49  
50 Scott, W. R. 2008. Lords of the dance: Professionals as institutional agents. *Organization Studies*, 29(2):  
51 219-238.

52  
53 Seo, M. G. & Creed, W. E. D. 2002. Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A  
54 dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2): 222-247.

55  
56 Shipilov, A.V., Greve, H.R., & Rowley, T.J. 2010. When do interlocks matter? Institutional logics and  
57 the diffusion of multiple corporate governance practices. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 846-  
58 864.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Siggelkow, N. 2007. Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 20-24.
- Sine, W. D. & Lee, B. 2009. Tilting at windmills? The environmental movement and the emergence of the U.S. Wind Energy sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54: 123-155.
- Smets, M., Morris, T., & Greenwood, R. 2012. From practice to field: A multilevel model of practice-driven institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4): 877-904.
- Smith, W.K., Gonin, M., & Besharov, M.L. 2013. Managing social-business tensions: A review and research agenda for social enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23, 407-442.
- Staggenborg, S. 1988. The consequences of professionalization and formalization in the pro-choice movement. *American Sociological Review*: 585-605.
- Stinchcombe, A. L. 1965. Social Structure and Organizations. *Handbook of Organizations*: 142-193. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. 1994. Grounded theory methodology. *Handbook of qualitative research*: 273-285. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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. 2008. Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Sage.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. 2012. *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tracey, P., Phillips, N., & Jarvis, O. 2011. Bridging institutional entrepreneurship and the creation of new organizational forms: A Multilevel Model. *Organization Science*, 22(1): 60-80.
- van de Ven, A. H. v. d. & Poole, M. S. 1995. Explaining development and change in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 510-540.
- Vasi, I. B. 2009. Social movements and industry development: the environmental movement's impact on the wind energy industry. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 14(3): 315-336.
- Wade-Benzoni, K. A., Hoffman, A. J., Thompson, L. L., Don, A. M., Gillespie, J. J., & Bazerman, M. H. 2002. Barriers to resolution in ideologically based negotiations: The role of values and institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1): 41-57.
- Wattenburg, D. 1998. Coal is still king, *The Denver Post*: B-07. Denver, CO: MediaNews Group Inc.
- Western Resource Advocates; <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/about/>; 4/26/2011, 2011.
- Westphal, J.D., & Zajac, E.J. 1994. Substance and symbolism in CEOs' long-term incentive plans. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 367-390.
- Wiser, R. & Bolinger, M. 2012. *Wind Technologies Market Report. U.S. Department of Energy*. Oak Ridge, TN: U.S. Department of Energy.

- 1  
2  
3 Wooten, M. & Hoffman, A. J. 2008. Organizational Fields. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational*  
4 *Institutionalism*: 130-147.  
5  
6 Waldron, T., Navis, C., & Fisher, G. 2013. Explaining Differences in Firms Responses to Activism  
7 *Academy of Management Review*, 38(3): 397-417.  
8  
9 Waldron, T. L., Fisher, G., & Navis, C. 2015. Institutional entrepreneurs' social mobility in organizational  
10 fields. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(1): 131-149.  
11  
12 Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Jennings, P. D. 2014. Hybrid Vigor: Securing Venture Capital by Spanning  
13 Categories in Nanotechnology. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5): 1309-1333.  
14  
15 Wry, T., Cobb, J. A., & Aldrich, H. E. 2013. More than a metaphor: Assessing the historical legacy of  
16 resource dependence and its contemporary promise as a theory of environmental complexity. *Academy of*  
17 *Management Annals*, 7(1), 441-488.  
18  
19 Xcel Energy. 2001. Denver: Xcel Energy expands Windsource. <http://www.xcelenergy.com>.  
20  
21 Xcel Energy. 2004. Wayne Brunetti remarks - World Energy Congress. <http://www.xcelenergy.com>.  
22  
23 Xcel Energy. 2007. A Report on the Economic/Environmental/Social Impacts of Xcel Energy.  
24 <http://www.xcelenergy.com>.  
25  
26 Xcel Energy. 2008. Responsible by Nature: 2008 Corporate Sustainability Report.  
27 <http://www.xcelenergy.com>.  
28  
29 Yin, R. K. 2002. *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE  
30 Publications Incorporated.  
31  
32 Zajac, E.J., & Westphal, J.D. 1995. Accounting for the explanations of CEO compensation: Substance  
33 and symbolism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(2): 283-308.  
34  
35 Zietsma, C. & Lawrence, T. B. 2010. Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field:  
36 The interplay of boundary work and practice work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(2): 189-221.  
37  
38 Zimmerman, M. A. & Zeitz, G. J. 2002. Beyond survival: Achieving new venture growth by building  
39 legitimacy *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3): 414-431.  
40  
41 Zott, C. & Huy, Q. N. 2007. How entrepreneurs use symbolic management to acquire resources.  
42 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(1): 70-105.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**TABLE 1**  
**Description of Data**

Data Types and Dates	Amount and Location	Use in Analysis
<u>Primary Data</u>		
<i>Semi-structured interviews</i>		
34 interviews lasting between 60 minutes and 3 hours (July 28, 2010 – April 18, 2014)	379 pages (transcriptions from digital recording)	Insight into the beliefs, motivations, and strategies of actors regarding logic incompatibility surrounding wind energy.
<i>Naturalistic observation</i>		
National Renewable Energy Lab Tour (September 3, 2010; December 7, 2012; November 20, 2013)	3 tours (Golden, CO)	Participant observation and informal discussion building insight into how wind energy research and policy is articulated to the public in Colorado.
National Wind Technology Center (August 2, 2010)	1 visit (near Boulder, CO)	Informal discussion building insight into policy and technology barriers to wind energy adoption.
Visits to Xcel Energy (January 24; April 8, 2014)	2 visits (Denver, CO)	Presentation of research for feedback from utility executives building insight into past and current views of wind energy, accuracy of findings.
Attendance of CORE Sustainable Opportunities Summit (February 27, 2008; March 17, 2009; March 2, 2010)	3 annual meetings (Denver, CO)	Participant observation building understanding of usage of economizing, ecologizing, and hybrid arguments.
<u>Secondary Data</u>		
<i>Newspaper articles</i>		
All articles concerning wind energy in <i>The Denver Post</i> (October 22, 1996 – January 9, 2009)	546 articles (accessed via LexisNexis)	Coded for frequency of economizing, ecologizing, and hybrid logic usage and field-level interpretation of wind energy over time. Triangulations of informant reports.
<i>CPUC press releases</i>		
All Colorado Public Utilities Commission press releases on wind energy (October 18, 2000 – August 30, 2009)	58 pages (accessed online through CPUC archive)	Coded for relationship between logics and field centralization.
<i>Archival websites</i>		
All Colorado utility home page mentions of wind energy (July 1, 1999 – October 29, 2009)	31 press releases (accessed online archive.org)	Coded for utility perspective on wind energy, arguments against Amendment 37.

**TABLE 1**  
**Description of Data (cont.)**

Data Types and Dates	Amount and Location	Use in Analysis
<u>Secondary Data (cont.)</u>		
<i>Resource plans</i>		
All available Colorado Utilities resource plans (December 12, 2002 – February 8, 2008))	10 documents, 364 pages (accessed online through CPUC archive)	Insight into utilities' plans regarding current and future adoption of wind energy.
<i>Archival documents and reports</i>		
A variety of reports and archival documents provided or authored by:		Coded for insight into perspective of various actors, arguments, and strategies utilized to promote their views.
<i>Researchers</i>	4 docs/136 pages	
<i>Clean Energy SMOs</i>	4 docs/117 pages	
<i>Environmental SMOs</i>	6 docs/126 pages	
<i>Government Agencies</i>	2 docs/38 pages	
<i>CPUC</i>	2 docs/35 pages	
<i>Xcel Energy</i> (May 1997 – November 2009)	10 docs/153 pages	
<i>Archival video footage</i>		
Video footage related to coverage and promotion of the Windsource program (May 1999 – August, 2003)	12 videos / 32 minutes (provided by Xcel Energy)	Insight into public promotion and perception of Windsource program and wind energy.



**TABLE 2**  
**Data Structure**

Evidence by Source <sup>4</sup>							First Order Codes	Second Order Themes	Aggregate Theoretical Dimensions
Interviews	Newspaper	Archival Websites	Reports	CPUC	Resource Plans	Video			
28	44	13	3	5	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution</li> <li>• Health Issues</li> <li>• Climate Change</li> </ul>	Ecologizing	Logics Espoused by Field Actors (Actor Level)
19	65	39	4	10	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in electricity rates</li> <li>• Low-cost alternative mandate</li> <li>• Wind energy unreliable</li> </ul>	Economizing	
59	162	13	3	15	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Clean Energy Economy”</li> <li>• Job creation through wind energy</li> </ul>	Hybridized	
13	0	12	23	0	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wind as a “premium” product</li> <li>• “Positive” marketing by SMOs</li> <li>• Tired of fighting</li> <li>• Chance to learn</li> </ul>	Compromise	

<sup>4</sup> Each number is the count of passages of text coded by source for a given theme.

TABLE 2  
Data Structure (cont.)

Evidence by Source							First Order Codes	Second Order Themes	Aggregate Theoretical Dimensions
Interviews	Newspaper	Archival Websites	Reports	CPUC	Resource Plans	Video			
10	13	2	2	3	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wind is least-cost</li> <li>• Wind is competitive</li> <li>• “Solely” economic decision</li> <li>• SMO use of utility tools</li> </ul>	Reframing	Organizational Responses (Actor Level)
24	14	26	0	8	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coalition of diverse interests</li> <li>• Renewables solve environmental challenges</li> <li>• Voice of the people</li> <li>• Renewables required</li> </ul>	Contestation	
45	39	3	3	17	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Opportunity after Amendment 37</li> <li>• Media usage</li> </ul>	Legitimation	
21	24	1	3	14	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy for a clean energy economy</li> <li>• The future of Colorado</li> <li>• Wind is good for the environment and the economy</li> </ul>	Embedding	

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49


**TABLE 2**  
**Data Structure (cont.)**

Evidence by Source							First Order Codes	Second Order Themes	Aggregate Theoretical Dimensions
Interviews	Newspaper	Archival Websites	Reports	CPUC	Resource Plans	Video			
2	0	12	13	2	0	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Windsource price increase</li> <li>• Wind cannot compete on price</li> <li>• “Pay a little more” to support wind energy</li> </ul>	Elaboration	Logics Relationship (Field-level)
13	0	5	2	4	7	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wind when least-cost</li> <li>• Symbolic embrace of ecologizing across field</li> </ul>	Assimilation	
1	0	5	5	22	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration of logics of economizing and ecologizing</li> <li>• Wind power is good for business and good for the environment</li> </ul>	Hybridization	
25	0	0	0	5	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exercise of formal authority</li> <li>• Power of actors through new governance arrangements</li> </ul>	Direct Influence on Actors <sup>5</sup>	Field Centralization (Field-level)
27	1	1	3	9	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New networks, alliances, and legitimate actors</li> <li>• Firm and SMO entry</li> </ul>	Stakeholder Expansion <sup>6</sup>	

<sup>5</sup> Role of direct influence on field power concentration

<sup>6</sup> Role of stakeholder expansion on field power concentration


FIGURE 1  
A Process of Logic Hybridization



**TABLE 3**  
**Logic Ideal Types and Implications for the Wind Energy Field**

Logic	Symbols/Goals	Material Elements		
		Governance	Practice	Organizational Forms
<i>Economizing</i>	- Seek the efficient use of resources for material improvement	- Regulatory interference with free markets regarding wind energy will lead to inefficiency and human needs not being met	- Wind energy should only be adopted when customers demand it and are willing to pay and cost is acceptable	- Investor owned utilities - CPUC
	- Measure progress through economic profits	“...mandating the use of this expensive, fluctuating energy source will not only increase electricity rates, it will wreak havoc on the reliability of the electric grid.” (IREA, 2004)	“If we’re going to have to compete for customers, we better understand who they are, what they want, what we could offer them, how we could make money off of them... Some alternative ways of utilities making money.” (Utility Executive)	
	- Natural environment is a resource to be utilized by business and society			
<i>Ecologizing</i>	- Values focused on life preservation through community and linkage to nature	- Regulatory intervention is required to increase adoption of wind energy	- Wind energy should be adopted to reduce environmental degradation	- Environmental SMOs
	- Measure progress through conservation of nature and life	“We need a federal policy that recognizes the true costs of our energy appetite - ... the impact on the global environment and the lives of our sons and daughters.” (Brandemuehl, 2005)	“...do something about climate change as well as all the other external costs related to our heavy reliance on fossil fuels...wind energy has been a big part of that.” (Environmental Activist)	
	- Natural environment is under attack by negative externalities of business			
<i>Hybridized</i>	- Values simultaneous achievement of economic gains and environmental welfare	- Market players and governments can work together to increase adoption of wind energy	- Wind energy provides opportunities for entrepreneurship, jobs, and overall improvement of the economy, while enhancing environmental conditions	- Clean Energy SMOs - Wind Energy Firms - Investor owned utilities - CPUC - Government authorities - Environmental SMOs
	- Measure progress through long-term economic gains through environmentally responsible practices	"I am honored to be selected by Gov. Ritter for this position," said Baker, executive director of Environment Colorado. "Colorado is at a point where we can grow our economy, protect our environment and provide an affordable energy supply to the people and businesses of Colorado." (Office of the Governor of Colorado, 2008)	“Because I think the public needs to perceive ( <i>wind energy</i> ) as, good for the environment but also good for the economy. This is like the ultimate win-win. It can’t just be one or the other. It’s really got to be both. That’s the thing that gives it its pizzazz.” (CPUC Commissioner)	
	- Business practices can be part of the solution to environmental problems			

FIGURE 2  
Emergence of Wind Energy in Colorado<sup>7</sup>



<sup>7</sup> The right axis is a count of codes for statements based in logics; all others are measured on the left axis. Data sources: Clean Energy SMOs: author compiled data from the National Center for Charitable Statistics. Wind Policies: author compiled data from the Database of State Incentives in Renewable Energy. MW of Wind and Firm Foundings: from CORE and Levenson (2009). National capacity average price by power purchase agreement (PPA) date and cumulative national capacity weighted average price from Wisser & Bolinger (2012).

**TABLE 4**  
**Illustrative Evidence Supporting Interpretation of Organizational Responses and Logic of Actors<sup>8</sup>**

Theme	Representative Quotations
Compromise	<p>“But we have something in common now...that odd coalition between environmentalists on the one hand and utility on the other... It was a combined effort to do something a little different and good.” * (Environmental SMO Leader)</p> <p>“... we agreed to emphasize the positive aspects of the product. And not everybody emphasize the negative parts about it.” * (Utility Executive)</p> <p>“The best outcome for advocates would have been regulatory mandates for renewable energy. Failing that, partnering with the utilities in their green pricing programs enhanced the regulatory outcome in the most recent integrated resource planning process and led to further renewable energy commitments.” ** (Mayer et al., 1999)</p> <p>“LAW Fund (<i>WRA</i>) and PSCo (<i>Xcel</i>) learned how to work together as a team, and the partnership started to run more smoothly. This involved open-mindedness and a willingness to respect different organizational goals and beliefs — protecting the environment for the LAW Fund versus making a profit for PSCo.” ** (Mayer et al., 1999)</p>
Reframing	<p>“To estimate dollar values of the avoided capacity savings, the LAW Fund (<i>WRA</i>) used the same \$7/kW/month capacity cost ...that Xcel had used in its portfolio evaluation process. The LAW Fund's analysis concluded that the wind bid would be a cost-effective addition...” ** (Lehr, Nielsen, Andrews, &amp; Milligan, 2001)</p> <p>“Advocates for alternative energies no longer make their arguments for wind on clean-air claims alone. They say the tripling of natural gas costs in the past year and widespread agreement that gas demand will outstrip supply in coming years makes wind a clear winner in a cold, hard price comparison.” *** (1/7/2001)</p> <p>“As we stripped away the fabricated assumptions that the utilities made to come up with that addition to the bid price...we found out that the real cost of the additional variability added by the wind plant were in the \$3- to \$5-million range, making the wind bid the lowest-cost resource that the utility had in the bid stack.” * (Environmental SMO Attorney)</p>

<sup>8</sup> A single asterisk denotes evidence from interview data followed by the speaker's role(s) in wind energy in Colorado; a double asterisk denotes evidence from archival data followed by the author and year of publication; a triple asterisk denotes evidence from Denver Post newspaper articles denoted with author and year of publication.

**TABLE 4**  
**Illustrative Evidence Supporting Interpretation of Organizational Responses and Logic of Actors (cont.)**

Theme	Representative Quotations
Reframing (cont.)	<p>“The LAW Fund learned the importance of being able to speak the language of business and to temper the passion and zeal that can make the corporate world uncomfortable.” (Mayer et al., 1999)</p> <p>“So it was an economic decision by economic regulators.* (Environmental SMO Leader)</p>
Contestation	<p>“... it was that experience, then, that led us to write some legislation that was considered three subsequent sessions of the legislature where we drafted and some legislators proposed a renewable energy standard for the state, because we had had this 10-year-long litigation experience, frustration experience, with the low-cost resource being rejected. And it was time that the policymakers, who set up the monopoly structure for electric utilities said that it would be required that they buy a minimum amount of renewable energy since it had proven itself to be low cost, and they had proven themselves to be unwilling to buy it voluntarily.” * (Environmental SMO Leader)</p> <p>“We told them, ‘Look, we don’t want this just to be a bake sale where only 1% of the altruistic, more conscientious members of your customer base decide to give you more money to do the right thing. Why don’t we just tap everybody?’ And nothing really happened until we made it the law of the land in Colorado through the Amendment 37 in 2004 that there was no ifs, ands, and buts about it, and this is not a bake sale. This is the real thing. You have to have 10% of your power coming from renewable energy by the year 2015.” * (Environmental SMO Leader)</p> <p>“And we are especially careful to ensure that our customers don’t bear the burden of a certain class of expensive renewable technologies. For example, there will be an initiative on the November ballot in Colorado for a renewable energy mandate. It would require the state’s largest energy providers to get 10 percent of their electricity from renewable sources by 2015...But we’re concerned about the potential price impact that this initiative could have on our customers.” ** (Xcel Energy, 2004)</p> <p>“While wind advocates claim that wind is competitive with conventional generation, they fail to reveal its true costs. While the wind does blow for free, the initial cost of wind farms is much higher than other forms of generation. The cost per kilowatt of electricity is about \$4,000—triple the cost of a coal-fired plant.” ** (IREA, 2004)</p>



**TABLE 4**  
**Illustrative Evidence Supporting Interpretation of Organizational Responses and Logic of Actors (cont.)**

Theme	Representative Quotations
Legitimation	<p>"No growing industry is subject to so much uncertainty as the renewable-energy industry," said Craig Cox, executive director of the Interwest Energy Alliance, which represents wind producers in the Rocky Mountain West. "The tax credit is a political football," Cox added. "If it's not resolved, these industries and consumers will lose." *** (7/27/2008)</p> <p>"We work very closely with those environmental groups, but our focus is primarily on market development, on issues that are of great concern to the industry. We strongly support most of the goals that our environmental allies advance but we aren't grassroots... we don't have the kind of non-profit orientation that a lot of our allies do in the environmental community. We're more business-oriented, in a nutshell." * (Clean Energy SMO Leader)</p> <p>"...there wasn't an industry to advocate on its own behalf...But the NGOs played absolutely critical roles...And we know that. We know they brought us to the party. Their advocacy devised the party. So we stick close to them... They have impact. So we know that the brand we carry into the market is about clean energy and environment and hope, basically. And we don't want to lose that. So we stick close to those people and try to work those issues with them as much as we possibly can." * (Wind Energy Firm Founder)</p>
Embedding	<p>"...the unforeseen political ramifications of that success (<i>Amendment 37</i>) was having people running for office as senators or representatives or even the governor who... added, "And I will, if you elect me, I will ensure that we continue down this path of renewable energy"... We who campaigned for Amendment 37, we never knew that we were also setting up a political dynamic. We pretty much thought it was literally going to be resulting in 10% by 2015, and that would be the end of our efforts. But we pretty quickly realized that the political environment was paying attention. So that's number two, is the elections in 2006 by a crop of legislators who could talk in some detail about how renewable energy is going to advance a new energy economy in Colorado." * (Environmental SMO Leader/PUC Commissioner)</p> <p>"Two years after voters passed the original RES, newly-elected Governor Bill Ritter championed legislation, passed by the general assembly, which doubled the RES requirement to 20% by 2020, and expanded its application to all Colorado's rural electric cooperatives. The legislation increasing the RES was supported by the state's utilities." ** (CPUC, 2007)</p> <p>"The Commission's decisions in Phase I and II must also consider new issues, including possible federal carbon regulations, the Governor's Climate Change Action Plan goal of CO2 reduction goal of 20 percent by 2020, the 2 percent renewable rate cost cap, DSM potential, new renewable resources such as concentrating solar power (CSP) which may include energy storage, as well as many other electricity supply and demand variables." ** (CPUC, 2008a)</p>

**TABLE 5**  
**Illustrative Evidence Supporting Interpretation of Change in Field-level Logics Relationship**

Theme	Representative Quotations
Elaboration	<p>“Wind-generation proponent Rick Gilliam of Boulder-based Western Resource Advocates takes issue with Xcel's position. "The goal is not to have people pay a premium," he said. ‘They signed up to use a renewable resource, and if that cost is cheaper, so much the better.’ *** (5/25/2005)</p> <p>“"This is a premium price program, and customers that elect to join the Windsource program have decided to pay more to build up wind power in the state," Xcel spokeswoman Ethnie Groves said. "This was never designed to be competitive with traditional generation.” *** (6/14/2006)</p>
Assimilation	<p>“It shows that wind is cost-effective. And it will open the door for other renewable-energy projects,' said Rudd Mayer of Boulder's Land and Water Fund. “ *** (2/24/2001)</p> <p>“... the PUC concluded that Xcel’s preferred plan...was a reasonable plan for meeting the company’s supply needs at the least cost to consumers. But the PUC also ruled that the proposed wind project was a cost-effective bid that should be included in the company’s portfolio.” ** (CPUC, 2001b)</p> <p>It was one of the first times that I know about where the costs of wind were actually litigated on a public record. And the costs were found to be lower than the cost of competing resources; it was an economic decision by economic regulators.* (Environmental SMO Leader)</p>
Hybridization	<p>“Therefore, we find that the following externalities shall be factored qualitatively into the Phase II decision: a) b) c) Economic development (rural impact; job development; tax base; etc.); Resource diversification; and Environmental benefits associated with emissions reductions and other environmental impacts beyond permit compliance.” ** (CPUC, 2008a)</p> <p>“The PUC chairman will also talk about how Colorado’s renewable energy standard has served to jump-start the state’s renewable energy industry, creating an estimated 22,000 direct “green-collar jobs,” and how it has helped the state make progress towards the goals of Gov. Ritter’s Climate Action Change Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.” ** (CPUC, 2007)</p> <p>“Over the past several years, renewable energy has become the great unifier in Colorado politics, an issue so popular and so multifaceted that just about every lawmaker can find something there to like. Environmentalists love its eco-friendliness. ... Economy wonks love the promise of new jobs that come with the burgeoning industry. Support in some form or another for renewable energy bridges party and geographic lines.” *** (3/31/2008)</p>

**TABLE 6**  
**Illustrative Evidence Supporting Interpretation of Changes in Field Centralization**

Theme	Representative Quotations
Reduced Power Concentration	<p>“What Amendment 37 did was because the voters actually voted for it. And the utilities opposed it, and they spent money to oppose it ... basically kind of put the imprimatur of an election on this decision to get a fairly modest amount of renewables from wind... that basically kind of enshrined wind as something that not only did technically it make a lot of sense but also the people actually voted on it.” * (Environmental SMO Leader/PUC Commissioner)</p> <p>“This election has placed the public back in public utilities,” said Manolo Gonzalez-Estay, co-director of the Amendment 37 campaign.” *** (11/4/2004)</p>
Increased Number of Stakeholders	<p>“If there is a wind energy company that’s going to move from Austin, Texas to Denver, Colorado, and they’re bringing 20 people with them, you can rest assured that they just have to give us a call here at the Governor’s Energy Office and we’ll ensure that the governor’s going to greet them with the media attention and press releases that are congratulating that Austin company from deciding to move to Colorado... that sounds kind of superficial. But when you talk about a company like Vestas that is bringing in 2,500 jobs and has the world’s largest wind factories here in Colorado, and you ask them straight up, ‘Why did you move to Denver, Colorado?’ Well, the answer is because ‘We felt like we were at home here, because we recognize that the leadership and the government and the policies and the people want us to be here. And that’s the kind of place where we want to do business.’” * (Governor’s Energy Office Official)</p> <p>“Members of the public who attend a town meeting on energy issues in Windsor will be able to trade their bright ideas for energy-efficient light bulbs. The Colorado Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC) of the Colorado Department of Regulatory Agencies are hosting the meeting... The first 50 people who show up at the town meeting will receive a free compact fluorescent light bulb. The PUC and OCC have teamed up with Lowe’s hardware stores and the Governor’s Energy Office to sponsor the light bulb giveaway. Along with the rest of the nation and the world, Colorado is facing unprecedented change in terms of selection of electric generation resources, transmission, and clean energy goals.” ** (CPUC, 2008b)</p>

**APPENDIX A****Baseline Interview Protocol****Interview Protocol v.3****Q.1 Background**

*Can you tell me about your background and how you came to be involved in wind energy?*

**Q.1a Early Involvement**

*How were you involved in the early days of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1b Current Involvement**

*Could you describe your current involvement with wind energy?*

**Q.1c CO Wind Story**

*How would you tell the story of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1d Key Events**

*What were the key events in the history of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1e NGOs**

*To what extent are NGOs responsible for the adoption of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1f Businesses**

*To what extent are business and entrepreneurs responsible for the adoption of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1g Government**

*To what extent is the government/policy responsible for the adoption of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1h Utilities**

*To what extent are utilities responsible for the adoption of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1i Technology**

*To what extent is technological change responsible for the adoption of wind energy in Colorado?*

**Q.1j Field Change over Time**

*How would you say the field of wind energy in Colorado has changed since your involvement began?*

**Q.1k Organizational Change over Time**

*How has your organization's view of wind energy in Colorado changed since your involvement began, if it has?*

**Q.1l Other issues**

*Are there any other issues regarding wind energy in Colorado that you feel we should have discussed?*

**Q.1l Snowball**

*Whom else would you suggest we interview?*

### Biographical Sketches

**Jeffrey G. York** (jeffrey.york@colorado.edu) is an assistant professor of management and entrepreneurship and the Shane Faculty Scholar at the University of Colorado Boulder. His research interests include environmental entrepreneurship, collective action, identity theory, and the evolution and emergence of new, environmentally relevant sectors. He received his Ph.D. from the Darden School of Business at the University of Virginia.

**Timothy J. Hargrave** is a lecturer at the Albers School of Business, Seattle University, and the Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota's Carlson School of Management. His research interests include institutional change, sustainability, and business ethics.

**Desirée F. Pacheco** is an assistant professor of management at Portland State University and the Hanna Andersson Scholar in Management and Sustainability. She received her Ph.D. from the Leeds School of Business at the University of Colorado. Her research interests are at the interface of institutions, entrepreneurial innovation, and firm strategy. She applies these areas of research to the study of sustainable business.