Safe Hands

Institutional Dynamics of Work Environment Management

Madsen, Christian Uhrenholdt

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
10.5278/vbn.phd.eng.00023

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

SAFE HANDS

INSTITUTIONAL DYNAMICS OF WORK ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT

BY
CHRISTIAN UHRENHOLDT MADSEN

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED 2017

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

SAFE HANDS

INSTITUTIONAL DYNAMICS OF WORK ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT

by

Christian Uhrenholdt Madsen

Department of Materials and Production

Aalborg University

Dissertation submitted

August 2017

.

Dissertation submitted:	August 2017
PhD supervisor:	Professor Peter Hasle Aalborg University
Assistant PhD supervisor:	Associate Prof. Susanne Boch Waldorff Copenhagen Business School
PhD committee:	Professor Susse Georg (chairman) Aalborg University, Copenhagen
	Associate Professor Paul Swuste Delft University and Technology
	Professor Rick Delbridge Cardiff University
PhD Series:	Faculty of Engineering and Science, Aalborg University
Department:	Department of Materials and Production

ISSN (online): 2446-1636
ISBN (online): 978-87-7210-048-7

Published by:
Aalborg University Press
Skjernvej 4A, 2nd floor
DK – 9220 Aalborg Ø
Phone: +45 99407140
aauf@forlag.aau.dk
forlag.aau.dk

Printed in Denmark by Rosendahls, 2017

Abstract

This dissertation investigates intra-organizational work environment experts in large Danish organizations and their efforts to improve work environment for employees. The presence of these intra-organizational experts has increased in a Danish context over the last decade, where historically the main drivers of work environment efforts within organizations have been members of 'work environment organizations', i.e. participatory structures consisting of line management and employee representatives. In other words the internal management of work environment issues has been professionalized and the purpose of my research is to investigate how this professionalization influences concrete organizational efforts towards improving the work environment.

To investigate the role of the intra-organizational experts I have investigated both the changes and developments in the field of work environment management, as well as the concrete work environment efforts of the experts in their organizational contexts. To do this I have utilized historical field level data as well as interview data from intra-organizational experts.

The dissertation draws on institutional theory, more specifically on the 'institutional logics' perspective. I investigate how different institutional logics have defined the field of work environment in Denmark in the past, and how these are enacted on the organizational level. The logics of work environment management are: *the logic of commitment* that is focused on creating employee commitment and engagement toward the workplace, *the logic of compliance* that is characterized by rational and systematic approaches to work environment management where compliance with external institutional demands is the guiding principle, and finally *the logic of advocacy* is characterized by a motivation to improve work environment inside the organizations as well as increase awareness and activity by other organizational actors. Furthermore I use theoretical concepts from critical realism to theorize the relationship between the analytical levels of institutional orders and field level logics. The dissertation describes how the intra-organizational experts are positioned between the field level logics and the concrete organizational environment they are a part of. In their daily work the work environment experts draw on multiple institutional logics with different roots, means and ends. These field level logics are emergent social structures that are the results of interactions between historical developments and events within the field of work environment in Denmark, broader societal institutional orders, and the continuous enactment by individual actors and organizations.

Finally the dissertation describes how the intra-organizational experts themselves are reflexive actors. By examining the intra-organizational experts' own accounts I describe four different ideal typical reflexive positions from which the intra-organizational experts can conduct their 'internal conversation' while interpreting institutional logics at the field level. The framework of reflexive positions is based

upon actors' accounts of their orientations towards the organizational field of work environment and the organizational hierarchy within their own organizations.

Dansk resume

Denne afhandling undersøger, hvordan intra-organisationelle arbejdsmiljøeksperter i danske virksomheder arbejder, for at implementere arbejdsmiljøpraksis internt i virksomhederne. I de seneste årtier er brugen af disse interne eksperter vokset i Danmark. Hvor den primære ekspertise traditionelt har været uden for organisationerne – hos arbejdsmarkedets parter, i branchearbejdsmiljøråd og hos bedriftssundhedstjenesterne, og hvor den primære intra-organisationelle arbejdsmiljøaktivitet primært har været i sikkerhedsorganisationerne på virksomhederne, findes den nu i højere grad internt i virksomhedernes stabsafdelinger. Med andre ord kan man sige, at det interne arbejdsmiljøarbejde er blevet professionaliseret. Denne afhandling er et forsøg på at undersøge, hvordan de konkrete arbejdsmiljøindsatser i virksomhederne, og opfattelsen af arbejdsmiljøet i feltet er blevet påvirket af denne professionalisering. For at undersøge dette, har jeg både anvendt historisk data om arbejdsmiljøfeltet og ændringer i dette samt kvalitative interviewdata fra intra-organisationelle eksperter i fire store danske virksomheder.

Afhandlingen er funderet i sociologisk institutionel teori, og i særdeleshed teorier om 'institutionelle logikker' og deres indflydelse på social handlen og praksis i arbejdsmiljøfeltet. I afhandlingen undersøger jeg, hvordan tre institutionelle logikker på feltniveau har udviklet sig i forhold til dansk arbejdsmiljøledelse. De tre logikker er en: '*compliance'-logik* i hvilken der lægges vægt på rationaliserede og systematiske metoder og systemer, til at sikre, at virksomhedens systemer og de lovgivningsmæssige krav samkøres, en *'commitment'-logik* i hvilken der lægges vægt på hvordan arbejdsmiljøarbejdet fokuseres på enkelte medarbejderes velfærd, og hvor målet især drejer sig om at skabe tilknytning og engagement fra medarbejderne til deres arbejdsplads, og der igennem at sikre produktivitet, og endelig en '*advocacy'-logik,* der lægger vægt på at sætte internt fokus på arbejdsmiljøet i virksomhederne, og skabe alliancer mellem grupper i virksomheden for at gøre dette. Institutionelle logikker skal forstås som samlinger af praksis og mening, som sociale aktører trækker på i deres ageren i den sociale orden. Jeg konceptualiserer i afhandlingen institutionelle logikker som 'emergente sociale strukturer', som illustrerer hvordan abstrakte samfundsmæssige 'ordener' eller ideer som 'staten' eller 'virksomheden' gøres konkrete, når de kommer på banen i arbejdsmiljøfeltet.

For at forklare relationen mellem disse logikker på feltniveau, og de mere abstrakte institutionelle ordener i samfundet benytter jeg teoretiske koncepter fra kritisk realisme. I afhandlingen viser jeg dermed, hvordan arbejdsmiljøeksperterne er placeret mellem deres respektive organisationer, og de institutionelle logikker på feltniveau, som de inddrager og bruger som linser til at forstå deres roller, samt til at vurdere praksis og indsatser til at forbedre arbejdsmiljøet.

En sidste pointe i afhandlingen er, at de intra-organisationelle eksperter ikke er komplet indspundne i de institutionelle logikker, og at disse derfor ikke alene kan forklare aktørers handlinger. Derimod er aktørerne selv i besiddelse af en refleksivitet igennem hvilken de foretager en såkaldt 'indre samtale' (Margaret S Archer, 2003). Igennem en undersøgelse af aktørernes egne fortællinger beskriver jeg fire idealtypiske refleksive positioner, som de intra-organisationelle eksperter kan agere ud fra, når de fortolker institutionelle logikker.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

My PhD dissertation is the result of three years of work, but more importantly the result of support, encouragement and interactions from and with numerous people. I am deeply indebted to all of you.

I am grateful for the generous support from The Danish Working Environment Research Fund, without which this project had not been possible. Also I want to extend my thanks to the employees at the fund who during the process have been helpful. Also I want to express my gratitude to the former Center for Industrial Production at Aalborg University (current Department of Materials and Production) for granting me the opportunity to work on my PhD dissertation, and for providing resources and a place for me to do so.

First and foremost I am grateful to my main supervisor Professor Peter Hasle for his support. His expertise on my empirical field and his experience from more than three decades at the forefront of Danish work environment research has meant that his supervision always has left me more clarified than before, and has on more than one occasion eased my mind when I needed that. I also owe a ton of gratitude to my co-supervisor Associate Professor Susanne Boch Waldorff from Copenhagen Business School. Susanne generously helped me by sharing her extensive knowledge on institutional theory, on the art of writing papers, and on organizational theory. With Susanne's help I was able to clarify the theoretical discussions and implications of my research.

I have had the good fortune working alongside a great group of colleagues here at Aalborg University. All of whom have been helpful and inspiring company during the three years. I am especially grateful to Thim Prætorius and Bjarke Refslund for carefully reading and reviewing the preliminary draft for this dissertation in the spring of 2017. It is safe to say that their constructive and careful comments have made this a better dissertation than it would have been otherwise. Also I want to give my warmest thanks to our administrative staff Maia Tarnow Ingvardson, Charlotte Søndergaard and Trine Kort Lauridsen who have always been very helpful during the process with answers to any administrative question that a PhD student might have.

During the process I have been lucky enough to meet a number of great PhD students (from Aalborg University and beyond), who have provided me with advice, comments and perspectives on my research. My warmest thank you to Vibeke Kristine Scheller, Thorben Peter Simonsen, Anders Dahl Krabbe, Andreas Birkbak, Mathias Herup Nielsen, Elisabeth Framke, Solmaz Sajadirad, Dorian Mark Notman, Laura Veng Kvorning, Anne Helbo Jespersen and Lander Vermeerbergen.

I was fortunate to spend time working and researching in universities outside of AAU. First of all I had a great time at KU Leuven at the HIVA Research Institute for Work and Society. Here I met regularly to discuss my research and sociological

theories of work with Monique Ramioul, who is the head of the Work and Organization research group. These talks were very inspiring and I learned a lot from them. Also my warmest thanks to Laurianne Terlinden, Maarten Hermans and their colleagues for being very welcoming and making my stay in Belgium such a great experience. I also had a great time staying at Department of Organization at Copenhagen Business School. Besides my regular supervisor meetings with Susanne Boch Waldorff I had the privilege of meeting a lot of great researchers who generously listened to my ideas and gave me feedback. Therefore I want to thank Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen, Eva Boxenbaum and Frans Bevort for sharing their insights on institutional theory with me. Also I have to give warm thanks to the PhD students at IOA who allowed me to participate in their community and invited me to seminars, workshops, meetings and after-work socializing during my stay. Thank you all for that.

I want to extend my gratitude to the Danish organizations that opened their doors for me and to the employees who granted me their time and expertise to use in my project. Even though you remain anonymous in this dissertation please know that I am deeply thankful for your help.

During the process I drew upon the knowledge and experience from people with keen insights and deep knowledge on the field of work environment in Denmark. Here I would be remiss not to mention Anders Kabel and Niels Møller. Hans Jørgen Limborg provided me with his insights on the developments in the field, and allowed me to share my preliminary findings with him and gave me feedback. His help has been invaluable to my project.

I want to express just how important the support from my family and friends has been. Thank you for providing kind words of encouragement, and for being constant reminders that life is more than organization theory.

Finally my biggest thank you goes to Line who has been unbelievably patient, supportive, kind and loving during the process and beyond. Thank you.

Introduction

Factory takes his hearing,
Factory gives him life
The work, the work,
The working life
Bruce Springsteen – Factory (1978)

Almost forty years after Bruce Springsteen wrote the lines above, work can still be a dangerous business to engage in, and it can cost both employees and their organizations more than their hearing.

In 2013 European workplaces were marred by 3.1 million non-fatal workplace accidents[1], and 3674 fatal accidents (EU-OSHA, 2017). Furthermore the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA) states that the percentage of the populations of the 28 member countries who suffer from "…one or more work-related health problems, caused or made worse by work, was on average 7.4%" (EU-OSHA, 2017: 6). Besides the obvious human consequences, health and safety also have great economic costs for both companies and societies in lost workdays, lost productivity, healthcare, and compensation costs.

Thus politicians, regulators and organizational actors all over the world are looking for ways to improve health and safety in the workplace and prevent accidents and risks. Work environment however is not an issue with any quick fixes or panaceas – it is complex and many facetted and requires knowledge from many different disciplines to properly understand. Work environment requires biomedical knowledge on the nature of risks to the human body at work; it requires knowledge about the human psyche and its reactions to stress, depression and anxiety. It requires technical insights on machinery, safe production methods and design of work spaces, as well as a keen understanding of organizations as both sociological and political entities with all the complexities that has been unearthed by organizational sociology and industrial relations research.

The scientific literature on risk, health and safety at work has mainly been focused on what causes accidents and health risks (Zanko & Dawson, 2012), therefore there is quite a large body of work concerned with exposure, risks and occupational health and safety (Nielsen, Taris, & Cox, 2010). These findings are rooted in the biomedical paradigm which has dominated the field for many years (Hasle, Limborg, & Nielsen, 2014). This biomedical bias has resulted in a perception of organizations as 'patients' and work environment interventions as 'double-blind interventions'

[1] Resulting in at least four days of absence

(Hasle et.al 2014: 74) where causes and effects can be isolated. However organizations are living social systems with real human beings that react to said interventions, and where issues of power, issues of communication and of social relations cannot be properly accounted for in the proper 'randomized-controlled-manner that is the modus operandi for biomedical researchers.

At the same time a large body of research has emerged on organizational interventions and systems that can mitigate risks and dangers at the workplace. Whether it is certified management systems (Robson et al., 2007), ergonomic principles (Westgaard & Winkel, 2011), LEAN-based approaches (Hasle, Starheim, Jensen, & Diekmann, 2016), or interventions aimed at improving the organizational 'safety culture' (A. R. Hale, Guldenmund, van Loenhout, & Oh, 2010).

However there is a noted gap in the literature on work environment and health and safety regarding the implementation of policies and interventions into organizational practices. What characterizes the intra-organizational processes in which these policies and prescriptions of health and safety are implemented (Hasle et al., 2014; Rocha & Granerud, 2011; Zanko & Dawson, 2012)? And this knowledge is crucial as researchers describe how the effects of policies and interventions regarding health and safety are often rather limited and highly contingent upon contextual factors that are rarely factored into these in the first place (Cox, Taris, & Nielsen, 2010; Hasle et al., 2014; Nielsen et al., 2010).

In their review of scientific literature on occupational health and safety[2] Zanko and Dawson (2012) lament this gap and describe how these issues are in many ways central to theories of organizational behavior and management, but that health and safety has not been sufficiently included in studies of either. This has meant that the literature on health and safety has been left to literature with a specialist and 'piecemeal' character that has not provided the necessary "contextually based narrative perspective" that can help us understand the issues outlined above (Zanko & Dawson, 2012: 329). It is thus evident that there is a need for more knowledge on health and safety practices within organizations. We need to understand:

"…individuals in work settings, the social relationships that exist at various levels, the workplace and business environment, regulatory practices and daily operating procedures, as well as the tasks and activities that occur within context…." (Zanko & Dawson, 2012: 332).

In short there is a need to understand the managerial and organizational challenges of work environment interventions and implementations, to better understand the contexts and their influence on interventions to improve the work environment for employees.

[2] Clarification: While work environment is the term used in Denmark and in the other Scandinavian countries, occupational health and safety is the term used in the rest of the world. I discuss the semantics of this in Section 1.1. The two concepts are however used rather liberal in the scientific literature.

The present PhD dissertation is an attempt to improve our knowledge of the organizational factors and practices surrounding work environment, and how organizations adapt and implement work environment policies and prescriptions into coherent organizational practices.

My research focus on how actors inside Danish organizations understand and interpret both regulations and expectations on how to improve the work environment and thereby prevent health and safety risks for employees. The actors I focus on are intra-organizational experts with work environment as either their main task or one of them. By focusing on these actors I gain a unique perspective on how work environment transforms from abstract policies and regulations into concrete organizational practices. I also gain an insight into which challenges such implementations meet within the organizations.

In the dissertation I employ a theoretical framework of organizational institutionalism (Royston Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008) to conceptualize and explain how values and policies from the wider institutional environments are implemented and transformed into organizational practice by actors within the organizations. The institutional perspective is ideal to investigate the way work environment ideas and practices are implemented in organizations as it describes how organizational actions and efforts are as much rooted in interpretations of norms and values from a given field, as it is rooted in economic calculations. And furthermore the perspective can illuminate how organizations react to pressures and ideas from regulators and the state when trying to implement them into coherent organizational practices within their own organizational contexts. Thereby the institutional perspective is an appropriate lense to through which one can understand the gap in work environment research that I described above.

In my dissertation I focus specifically on three different concepts from institutional theory: Institutional logics (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), organizational fields (Wooten & Hoffman, 2008) and the roles and reflexivity of institutional actors within organizations (Delbridge & Edwards, 2013). This framework allows me to describe and analyze how work environment practices occur and are enacted simultaneously on multiple levels; how work environment relates to fundamental 'institutional orders' of the state and the corporation (Thornton et al., 2012), as well as to the day-to-day operations and mundane work activities on the factory floors and in hospital wards; how organizational practices of work environment are the result of historical dynamics in the Danish labor market; and how they are the result of the very concrete enactments of different organizational actors with different backgrounds and outlooks. The theoretical framework makes it possible for me to answer the following research question that has guided my research:

How do intra-organizational experts in work environment manage institutional pressures and demands of work environment improvements, and how do these institutional pressures and demands change over time in the field of work environment management?

The research question thus outlines the content of my dissertation. It implies that intra-organizational experts are a key group of actors positioned between the wider organizational field of work environment, and the internal workings of large companies and organizations. Furthermore the research question also implies that these actors interpret external policies and practices before they are implemented in their organizations, thereby underlining the fact that the institutionalization of work environment practices is a highly complex and multifaceted process, and not a simple dose-response relationship as it is sometimes envisioned by policymakers and regulators (Hasle & Petersen, 2004).

Third the research question implies that I specifically research work environment management and the way it has developed. The field of work environment is broader than the organizational management of the issues, i.e. it also contains occupational medicine, toxicology, ergonomics, psychology and a multiplicity of other specialized technical topics. Each of these has their own interesting history of genesis and development. However my research interest lies solely in how organizations and intra-organizational actors implement prescriptions into practices. Therefore my dissertation will not go further into depth with the developments in occupational medicine or ergonomics.

Finally the research question describes the historical dimension of institutionalization, outlining how the institutionalization of policies occurs over long periods of time where meaning and values are shaped, negotiated and end up being taken for granted by actors and organizations.

Through three distinct but related papers I seek to answer my research question. In the first paper *Ordering Work Environment: An integrated framework of institutional logics and critical realism* I analyze how institutional conceptions of work environment management have evolved since the passing of the first comprehensive Work Environment Act of 1975. In this paper I use historic data as well as qualitative data from intra-organizational actors to describe how three institutional logics of work environment management have emerged in the field, and how they exist side-by-side in the field for contemporary actors to draw upon when formulating work environment practices within their organizations. I also show how the management of work environment has moved from being an issue solely concerning employee rights and regulatory law, to an issue being dealt with in more traditional corporate structures and frameworks.

How these novel corporate logics of compliance and commitment respectively conceptualize work environment, employees and the role of management is described in my second paper: *Commitment or Compliance? Institutional Logics of Work Environment Management.* Here I describe how the two novel work environment logics are rooted in different managerial approaches and historical events. I also discuss potential consequences for work environment management in Danish companies.

Finally in my third paper, *Institutional Actorhood: Intra-organizational experts in the face of institutional complexity,* I describe the role of the individual work environment experts and how they interpret their own work, and how they have different relations to the organizational field of work environment. Using qualitative interview data I explore the experts' reflexivity, and what their institutional and organizational positions mean for their views on work environment, their organizations and the employee.

All in all the three papers in this dissertation illuminate the complexities and multi-level character of institutional dynamics, and thereby describes the complexity of implementations of work environment practices in Danish organizations.

1.1 Empirical Field: Work environment management in Denmark

In the following section I describe my empirical research field of interest: the management of work environment in Denmark. First I describe what the concept and regulation of work environment entails for Danish companies. Afterwards I give a brief historical overview of the development of the field of work environment management throughout Danish history. Then I proceed to describe what areas of organizational life work environment is a part of, and finally I describe the professionalization of intra-organizational work environment efforts and the internal and external dynamics that have led to the professionalization of this.

Each of the three papers that is a part of this dissertation also expands upon the descriptions in this section. Paper 1 describes the developments and changes in the field of work environment since the passing of the law of 1975, and the way these have led to the emergence of three different institutional logics in the field. Paper 2 expands further upon how work environment management shares concerns with both 'softer' organizational theories such as the theories of human resource management and human relations, as well as with 'harder' and more rational engineering approaches that can be found in more operational functions such as quality, environment and risk functions. Finally Paper 3 describes the individual actors involved in the work environment efforts, and their backgrounds and relationships with the field described in this section.

1.1.1 What is work environment and how is it regulated?

The professionalization (Hasle, Møller, Refslund, et al., 2016; Hasle, Seim, & Refslund, 2016; Rocha & Granerud, 2011; Seim, Møller, & Limborg, 2016) is the result of developments in the field of work environment management since the passing of the first comprehensive work environment act in Denmark in 1975. The act of 1975 is the perfect historical starting point for my research. The passing of the law marks the point in time when organizational responses went from being a rather

simple issue of following guidelines and lists, to being a complex governance issue where organizations must implement so-called reflexive processes and systems. Therefore the law is also the point in time when work environment management became a topic in its own right. Since then the complexity and scope of what is considered work environment has seen an expansion. Work environment has developed from being a peripheral issue dealt with by 'safety organizations[3]', trade unions and public occupational health service consultants, to being a core operational and strategic issue integrated into the overall planning and decision making in Danish organizations.

A safe and healthy work environment is the duty of all organizations with employees in Denmark – both public and private, to make sure that their employees are not harmed or become ill from going to work. No more and no less. This abstract demand has thus been subject to innumerable discussions, translations and negotiations since the law was first passed in 1975.

In the current work environment act (revised in 2010) the first paragraph states that the intent of the law is to secure a "…safe and healthy work environment that at any given time is in concordance with the technical and social development in society" and furthermore to ensure that all Danish organizations themselves have the possibility to: "…solve safety and health questions with advice from the labor market parties and with advice and control from The Work Environment Authority" (Beskæftigelsesministeriet, 2010: §1). In these two sentences the wide-reaching and complex nature of the field is demonstrated.

In these formulations some very central and fundamental tenets of work environment regulation are demonstrated. These are: the employers' general responsibility for work environment; the use of the term 'work environment' instead of the narrower 'occupational health and safety'; and finally the institutionalized presence of multiple actors in the field of work environment management.

First of all the formulation demonstrates that employers always have a responsibility to ensure their employees' health and safety from all potential risks and dangers in the workplace. This means that individual organizations have to be somewhat proactive and actively engage in prevention and detection of risks, as well as maintain processes and systems to do this. Historically this is contrary to 'command-control' systems of health and safety regulation where the state prohibited certain substances or practices and mandated the use of certain safety equipment. Then the organizations could only be punished for not following these specific instructions (Aalders & Wilthagen 1997).

Secondly, the use of work environment instead of the internationally-used term "health and safety" is a unique feature of the way that Scandinavian countries have dealt with the issues of health and safety (Hasle & Sørensen 2013). When the act

[3] From 2010 'safety organizations' changed name to 'work environment organizations'

was passed by the Danish parliament in 1975, the new term 'work environment', replaced 'safety', which had been the title of previous regulations. This signaled a shift to a conception of not only issues of safety from accidents but a conception of a holistic environment in which employees could work securely. Of course safety from harm and accidents is still a prominent feature of this environment, but nonetheless the shift in terminology was and is significant (Jacobsen, 2011). This was also demonstrated in the latest revision of the law in 2010 where the mandatory 'safety organizations' were changed to mandatory 'work environment organizations' in all Danish organizations. Furthermore the passages signal a dynamic and reflexive feature of the legislation that emphasizes employers' continuous duty to assess the risks and issues that change along with the technical and social fabric of society. Finally the passages also give an indication of the breadth of the institutional field surrounding the regulation. Both the state authorities and non-state actors of labor market parties have the duty to advice organizations in their work environment efforts, along with the authorities' duty to control these.

The regulatory framework that companies have to live up to consists of a range of instructions, specifications and prohibitions. Some are directed at very concrete risks such as work done with dangerous chemicals and the required protective equipment, or the exact specifications for construction sites about scaffolding and the proper measures to prevent falls. Other parts of the regulatory framework are more reflexive in nature (Gunningham, 2011) and thus mandate various internal processes e.g. management's assessment of all potential safety and health risks in the organization, and employee participation through internal 'work environment organizations'. Furthermore the law mandates that a number of quasi and non-governmental actors participate in the field as knowledge disseminators and supervisors such as a research center i.e. The National Research Center for Work Environment, as well as the ministerial appointments of multiple sectoral work environment counsels in which representatives from both employers' associations and trade unions cooperate to develop and disseminate knowledge and instructions for organizations in their particular sector about risks and issues relating to work environment. Finally the law mandates that an overall work environment counsel with representatives from unions and employers associations is appointed to advise the parliament and the Minister of Employment on the development of rules and regulations in the field.

Finally the direct task of regulating, controlling and supervising organizations is carried out by the Work Environment Authority, except for organizations who have obtained a certified standardized management system on work on health and safety (Hohnen & Hasle 2011).

1.1.2 Historical development of work environment regulation

On 17 December 1975 the Danish parliament passed the first comprehensive work environment act regulating all Danish organizations' health and safety efforts. However the first law regulating working conditions was passed a little over a hundred years earlier. In 1873 the Parliament passed the first 'Factory Law' that

prohibited the employment of children under the age of ten in factories and workshops, and the employment of children under the age of fifteen for more than six hours a day (Jacobsen, 2011). To make sure that factories and workshops complied with the law, the very first oversight body was formed, consisting of one director and three inspectors.

After this very early legislation the regulations and thus the manpower, expertise and jurisdiction of the overseeing authorities were gradually expanded with a 'Machine Act' in 1889 that regulated the use of mechanical equipment (Sonne Nørgaard, 1997), two consecutive occupational health and safety acts of 1901 and 1913 respectively, and finally reaching the pre-1975 apex with the passing in 1951 of three parallel worker protection acts that regulated working conditions in different sectors. One for the white-collar sectors, one for the agricultural sector and one generic law for everyone else (Jacobsen, 2011; Sonne Nørgaard, 1997).

The common denominator for all of the above was that they were all 'command-control' legislations that 'commanded' various prohibitions and safety instructions and then 'controlled' compliance – or non-compliance, through fines (Aalders & Wilthagen 1997).

However, as mentioned above, with the passing of the comprehensive Work Environment Act of 1975 the same regulatory framework became mandatory for all organizations, and the framework furthermore prescribed more processual elements of self-governance and self-control.

In 1980 a group of new actors emerged in the field besides the public work environment authorities; the Occupational Health Services (OHS). The OHS were complex organizations co-owned by all organizations in certain sectors that were legally mandated to seek consultancy from OHS (Kabel, Hasle, & Limborg 2007). The board of directors for each OHS was equally divided between employers and employees. Each OHS employed a varied number of work environment specialists who would then help and counsel member-organizations about risks, preventive measures and health issues. Initially, these specialists mostly had backgrounds as either nurses or doctors. But over the years, engineers, machinists, occupational therapists and university candidates from the social sciences were hired as well (Limborg, 2001). Thereby the OHS specialists developed a rather unique cross-disciplinary occupational identity. Instead of a narrow health-professional role as occupational doctors and nurses, the OHS consultants increasingly became focused on organizational development under the 'slogan', "The workplace is the patient, not the worker" (Limborg, 2001). The development of this cross-disciplinary occupational identity was also sustained by annual meetings and conferences and other events (Limborg, 2001). Through the 1980s the OHS provision was gradually expanded to cover more and diverse sectors and industries. This furthered the development of an independent consultant identity in OHS; as the risks and organizational factors multiplied, the consultants focused even more on

organizational culture, systems and developments, than technically-specific solutions in their professional repertoires (Limborg, 2001).

In 1989 the European Community issued framework directive '89/391/EEC', that was to be implemented in all member states in the following years. This was a significant development in the field of work environment in Denmark as well. The framework directive mandated the implementation of workplace assessments in all organizations and was implemented into Danish law in 1992 (Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002). Simultaneously, and partly because of this new demand, larger organizations started to integrate work environment efforts into their overall management systems already in place to ensure compliance in relation to the external environment (Kamp & Le Blansch 2000).

The 1990s also saw an increase in the amount of attention paid to psycho-social issues such as bullying and stress by regulators, field actors from OHS, and especially the public sector social parties. While the Act of 1975 mentioned a safe and healthy work environment as the goal, and therefore encompassed all risks to health (and therefore also psycho-social risks), the legally binding 'comments' to the first legislation specifically exempted issues of psycho-social risks from being enforceable by the authorities (Rasmussen, Hansen, & Nielsen 2011). The distinction was the result of a political compromise on the part of the legislator. The employers saw issues of psycho-social character as being an important part of their prerogative to manage their employees, a prerogative which is one of the most fundamental tenets of the Danish labor market structures (Due & Madsen 2008). Thereby they opposed any legally binding regulation that would put fundamental issues of people management under legal supervision. In practice this meant that the work environment authorities could only advice and counsel, but not enforce when it came to issues of psycho social risks (Jacobsen, 2011).

However, in the public sector especially, issues of well-being and psycho-social work environment became increasingly unavoidable, and after the Ministry of Labor commissioned a report from the so-called 'methods committee' with representatives from trade unions, employers' associations and the authorities as its members, the boundaries between what was the prerogative of management and authorities when it came to psycho-social risks were drawn anew (Arbejdsministeriet, 1995).

Since its founding in 1980, the OHS grew to employ more than 500 work environment specialists, and to cover more than 40% of Danish organizations (Kabel, Hasle, & Limborg 2007). However the services were the target of criticism from employers' associations and from center-right politicians. And in 2008 the mandatory OHS services were disbanded altogether. Instead private counseling services could obtain a license to counsel companies that had received an enforcement notice to seek counseling from the work environment authorities.

An important innovation in the field of work environment over the last decades has been the increasing use of certified management systems. Since 1999, when the

OHSAS18001 standard of occupational health and safety was published, more than 3000 Danish organizations have obtained a certificate to approve their internal work environment management systems[4]. To obtain the certificate, organizations must have all the processes, systems, plans and registration schemes they have in place to ensure work environment efforts audited by an external private certification agency. Thus the certified management systems is meant to ensure a companywide systematic integrated effort of work environment management that can be integrated into other organizational surveillance systems of e.g. quality management or external environmental management systems (ISO9001 or ISO14001). The use of CMS has been widely encouraged by work environment regulators in Denmark. From 2005 organizations with a valid OHSAS18001 certificate have been exempt from inspections from work environment authorities.

1.1.3 Work environment and organizational processes and sub-systems

Work environment regulation concerns the central operational processes in any modern organization. However work environment is not solely the concern of production planners and line managers. Increasingly it also concerns the overall strategic goals and the external reputation of Danish organizations and thus catches the interest of HR managers (Kamp & Nielsen 2013) and CSR consultants (Dyreborg, 2011) as well.

It is self-evident that work environment demands and prescriptions concern the operational functions and processes in Danish organizations. Whether it is issues of machine safety, repetitive stress injuries on production lines, heavy lifting in hospitals, fall accidents on constructions sites or the use of dangerous chemicals and substances in workshops and factories, all impinge upon the operational choices made by the organizations. Preventive and protective equipment must be purchased and implemented, ergonomic systems must be outlined, work spaces must be safely designed and detailed internal feedback systems must be implemented to make sure that any accident does not happen twice. As described above the mainstreaming of work environment into these operational functions has been furthered by the introduction of mandatory and voluntary systematic management tools. The use of certified management systems, for an example, is fully compatible with other certified management systems such as ISO9001 quality management standard, as well as ISO14001 for environmental concerns. However nothing in these processes inherently makes work environment issues any different to any other operational concerns such as quality management or complex logistic planning.

However, human resource management strategies have also meant that work environment and adjacent issues of well-being and organizational culture have become a focal point for more strategic concerns in organizations. Work environment is therefore not only an issue of technical compliance with legislation, but increasingly it is a competitive parameter to increase the performance of

[4] From www.arbejdstilsynet.dk (the work environment authorities' website)

employees and attract the best employees available. And with the emergence of psycho-social issues this development has been cemented. An example of this 'HR-fication of the work environment' (Kamp & Nielsen 2013) can be seen in the widespread use of 'workplace health promotion' schemes (Kamp 2009; Bjørnstad & Steen-Johnsen 2012). Another example is the increase in strategies meant to improve employees' 'work-life balance' (J. Hyman & Summers 2007) or 'social capital' (Hasle, Thoft, & Gylling Olesen 2010) in order to improve performance. Thereby work environment becomes entangled in discussions about sustainable organizational culture, employee development, competencies, and strategies to enhance employees' 'abilities, motivation and opportunities' (Guest, 2011).

Finally, work environment is an issue still embedded in the industrial relations model, and therefore also a question of managerial discretion, employee rights and finding a compromise between these two positions.

As I describe in the papers, the fact that work environment is embedded in these different organizational sub-systems, as well as in the actors that populate these, means that the prescriptions and possible practices for intra-organizational actors to implement are characterized by different and often competing 'logics' about what is the right way to achieve work environment goals, and more fundamentally what these goals are. This institutional complexity is the reality that all the intra-organizational actors in my study face.

Theoretical framework

This section presents my theoretical framework. The analyses of my dissertation are all inspired by the theoretical tradition known under various titles as either 'organizational institutionalism' (Royston Greenwood et al., 2008), 'sociological' institutional theory (W. Richard Scott, 2014) or 'new institutionalism' (Powell & DiMaggio 1991). In my dissertation I decided to refer to it simply as institutional theory[5].

First, I describe overall tenets of what institutional theory is, and its development over the last decades from being a theory primarily concerned with explaining homogeneity of organizations, to one incorporating notions of institutional pluralism.

I describe specific topics of relevance to my analyses. These are: Institutional fields, institutional logics and institutional actorhood within organizations. Each subsection consists of an overview of the topic as well as of current theoretical discussions and tensions in defining the concept. Furthermore each subsection contains a short summary of my own understanding of the topic, as well as my position in terms of the theoretical discussions and tensions mentioned above.

Finally, I describe my use of critical realism as a meta-theory and philosophical underpinning to my framework. While I am by no means the first to notice the links and possible coupling of institutional theory and the philosophy of science known as critical realism (Palmer, Biggart, & Dick 2008; Leca & Naccache 2006; Delbridge & Edwards 2013), I still deem it necessary to present critical realist ideas used in my framework, as well as explain why I believe that critical realistic concepts can strengthen institutional theorizing in general and mine in particular.

2.1 Institutional theory – Stability and change in organizations

What are institutions? In institutional theory they are the social and symbolic structures that provide societal actors with meaning and practices in a given social context. I lean on the definition given by Scott (2014):

[5] I am fully aware that there other institutional theories exist (e.g. historic institutionalism or economic institutionalism). But since I do not refer to them in my thesis I believe I can avoid any confusion. See Scott 2014 for a full review of different kinds of institutional theories.

"Institutions comprise regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life" (Scott 2014: 57)

In this poignant formulation a number of key issues are defined. Institutional theory concerns the institutionalization of meanings and structures in modern organizational environments, and the organizational responses to the various institutional pressures and complexities surrounding them. Furthermore an institutional theory must simultaneously describe how institutions are transmitted through regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements at the same time. While one element can be emphasized more, or appear stronger in certain contexts (W. Richard Scott, 2014), it is a fundamental tenet of institutional theory that institutions are transmitted by all three simultaneously. Finally the definition makes it clear that institutions also prescribe practices or activities to organizational actors, as well as provide resources to their social interactions as well.

First, institutional theory is rooted in what scholars refer to as 'old' institutionalism (W. Richard Scott 2014; Hirsch & Lounsbury 1997). Old institutionalism is particularly characterized by the works of Selznick (Selznick, 1953), but other scholars such as Gouldner (Gouldner, 1964) and Merton (Merton, 1940) are often mentioned as well (W. Richard Scott, 2014). These approaches draw on Weber's descriptions of bureaucracy and formalization, and describe how individual organizations over time are infused with values and beliefs beyond those intended at the time of foundation. The 'old' institutionalism does not operate with any distinctive analytical levels beyond the individual organizations. Therefore it is mainly the 'open systems' character that distinguishes the new institutionalism from the old, and thus the analysis of the relationship between organizational actions and the institutionalized environments that is the novel insight. Institutional theory also has roots in Berger & Luckmann's phenomenological interactionism from *The Social Construction of Reality* (Berger & Luckmann 1966) and their concepts of habitualization and institutionalization (R. E. Meyer, 2008), Max Weber's description of rationalization (J. W. Meyer & Rowan 1977), and Bourdieu's concept of the field (DiMaggio & Powell 1983).

Institutional theory recognizes the environments of organizations as a key variable in any understanding of organizational behavior. But in opposition to other open systems theories institutional theory does not see technological and structural facts of the environment as the sole determinants of organizational behavior. Rather one of the key insights is that organizational behavior to a large degree is determined by the organizations' quest for legitimacy in the eyes of the rest of the world. Therefore organizations will adopt policies, structures and forms, not because of actual technical needs, but because these issues becomes 'rational myths' (J. W. Meyer & Rowan 1977) that are spread among organizations through networks, professions and state regulations (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). These insights of institutional adaption of policies and organizational structures were furthered through large scale empirical studies of organizational populations (Tolbert & Zucker 1983; Fligstein

1990) and their historical adoptions of public reforms and corporate governance forms respectively.

Over the last twenty years more and more scholarly work has tried to explain why institutions and institutional fields change, why complexity and pluralism of institutional environments emerge and finally why organizations respond differently to institutional pressures. Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorff (2015) describe this as a shift from a new institutionalism to a "change and complexity institutionalism" (Berg Johansen & Waldorff 2015: 5). The former describes how environmental pressures on organizations to conform leads to isomorphism and uniformity of organizations.

The expression 'change and complexity institutionalism' describes how the institutional environment that organizations face is not uniform in any way, but presents organizations with multiple and often contradictory institutional logics, pressures and scripts to navigate between (Kraatz & Block 2008). The shift from institutional uniformity to pluralism and complexity therefore means that organizations must manage these complexities with different strategies, and forge organizational identities and governance models that balance demands from various social and institutional stakeholders (Kraatz & Block 2008; Royston Greenwood et al. 2011). This shift has been triggered by the emergence of various streams of research within the boundaries of institutional theory with a stronger emphasis on social and symbolic interactions (Hallett, Shulman, & Fine 2009; Hallett & Ventresca 2006), on how institutional ideas and prescriptions are translated locally in fields and organizations (Sahlin-Andersson & Wedlin 2008; Eva Boxenbaum & Strandgaard Pedersen 2009; Boch Waldorff 2013; Pallas, Fredriksson, & Wedlin 2016), on how institutional logics exist, compete and co-exist in various fields (Goodrick & Reay 2011; Besharov & Smith 2014; Royston Greenwood et al. 2011), and how individual actors play important roles in the dynamics of institutionalization (Julie Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum 2009; T. Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca 2011; Delbridge & Edwards 2013; Roy Suddaby, Viale, & Gendron 2016).

The management of work environment in Denmark is a good case for exploring the abovementioned tensions in institutional theory, and the institutional aspects of modern organizations' challenges and issues. It illustrates how institutional dynamics happen simultaneously on varying analytical levels (W. Richard Scott, 2014) from the 'societal' level of legislation and work environment regulations, down to the level of organizational subsystems where the intra-organizational experts are employed.

Work environment management in large organizations also highlights the abovementioned tensions between institutionalization as isomorphic external pressures that *"….[force] one unit in a population to resemble other units"* (DiMaggio & Powell 1983) on the one hand, and on the other, more agentic conceptions that leave organizational actors with more wriggle room when presented

with a pluralistic institutional environment with a wide array of varying and often contradictory institutional prescriptions (see e.g. Besharov & Smith 2014; Kraatz & Block 2008; Delbridge & Edwards 2013). The former isomorphic institutional pressure is an element of work environment management. Strong isomorphic pressures exist in the field (Hasle, Limborg, & Nielsen 2014). Coercive pressures in the form of legislation, an elaborate inspection regime, and numerous collective bargaining agreements between the social parties all coexist and make participatory systems, mandatory workplace risk assessments and yearly work environment status meetings on management levels standardized formal features of any Danish company or organization, to name a few.

But work environment management as a topic also highlights the need for theories that emphasize local processes, organizational agency and the co-existence of different symbolic and meaning structures in the field simultaneously. First of all scholars of Scandinavian work environment management have pointed out that while some examples show that the aforementioned systems have been implemented into central strategic decision-making bodies such as line management or boards, just as many examples can be found of organizations employing a 'decoupling' strategy (Eva Boxenbaum & Jonsson 2008), what work environment scholars have dubbed 'the sidecar' position (see e.g. Hasle et al. 2016; Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002). Furthermore studies have shown how, historically, differing institutional logics (Friedland & Alford 1991; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012) defined the field (Dyreborg, 2011; Limborg, 2001). This shows that work environment actors' conceptions of goals, strategies and risks are historically contingent and thus ample opportunities exist for studying organizational choice and adaptations in the face of these competing institutional logics. Finally, and maybe most central to my research, the field of work environment management is an illuminating case of how institutional prescriptions are carried out and implemented in concrete organizations.

2.1.1 Organizational fields

My PhD dissertation is mainly concerned with the intra-organizational experts who work inside the organizations, transforming abstract institutional prescriptions and policies into concrete practices. But as we will see in the analyses their actions are bound and conditioned by relationships both outside and inside the company walls. First of all the state and the inspection authorities maintain the legal aspects, as well as collaborate with the social parties from trade unions and employers' associations in setting the strategic directions for research, new initiatives and potentially legal developments. Besides these 'official' actors, a number of private, semi-public and public consultancies exist to provide counselling and concrete solutions to everything from chemical safety to building cooperative corporate cultures. The mandatory work environment organizations inside the companies also have to be involved in any policy or practice implementation. What unites all these various groups and actors is that they have to interact with each other, but also that, in some

way they share a notion of work environment as their main occupational interest. Many of them meet at field configuring events (Lampel & Meyer 2008) such as the annual Work Environment Conference. In this way work environment actors are of course in many ways a homogenous group. They share esoteric concepts and abbreviations that are not necessarily easy for 'outsiders' to understand, but which are used frequently and naturally by initiated actors of the field such as APV, MSB and MTU[6]. On the other hand the notion of work environment is itself rather abstract and something of an empty signifier, which contains widely differing meanings and practices when it comes to both the means and ends of work environment. Ask a psychologist, an employee safety representative, an engineer, a manager or an official from labor inspection about the most important problem to solve and the way to do it and the answers would not be even remotely similar. Taken together this myriad of actors, organizations, meanings and practices constitutes the organizational field of work environment management. And as the description above illuminates, two important tensions must be understood in order to understand the dynamics of institutionalization in fields. First is the tension between fields as relations and fields as shared meanings, and secondly the tension between homogeneity and heterogeneity.

One of the central differences between the 'old' institutionalism and the 'new' institutional theorizing was the emphasis the latter put on the environment of the organizations. The old institutionalists such as Selznick (1980) and Gouldner (1964) mainly focused on single organizations and the processes of value infusion, decoupling and mock bureaucracy happening in the Tennessee Valley Authority or in the Gypsum mining company. Therefore one of the main theoretical innovations of new institutionalism was the concept of the organizational field (W. Richard Scott 2014; DiMaggio & Powell 1983).

A field can been defined as organizations and actors participating in "a common meaning system and whose participants interact more frequently and fatefully with one another than with actors outside of the field" (W. Richard Scott, 1995). This broad definition simultaneously describes two different dimensions of fields: an ideational and a relational dimension. Previous research has tended to emphasize either one or the other. Both however are important aspects of fields, and as such the ideational and the relational aspects will intertwine, but must be separated to better understand the dynamics of each (R. E. Meyer, 2008). In my story both are equally important in order to understand the field of work environment management and how this influences organizational work environment practices. The different aspects of the field have been emphasized by different scholars, which makes it necessary to present studies that sees a field as mostly relational or ideational. To reiterate I follow Scott (2014) and Meyer (2008) in my view that fields and the dynamics of institutional change and stability within fields are necessarily both relational and ideational.

[6] Danish abbreviations for 'workplace assessment', 'muscular-skeletal disorder' and 'employee satisfaction survey' respectively.

The double character of the field is elaborated more in Paper 3 in the dissertation, where I demonstrate how the intra-organizational work environment experts relate to the relational field through institutional biography, and how this shapes their outlook on the logics they have to implement into practice.

While absent from Rowan and Meyer's 1977 paper, the field concept was first introduced into institutional theory by DiMaggio and Powell as the central environmental concept in which isomorphic processes play out. This first conception of the field emphasized the relational aspect which they understood to consist of *"key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products" (DiMaggio & Powell 1983: 148)*. In this way the field becomes a network of actors connected by their interactions and shared markets. In their view the primary dynamics behind institutionalization thus stem from relations between actors in the field. Coercive pressures stem from an organization's relationship with regulating agencies, the normative pressures from relationships with professional bodies and organizations, and mimetic pressures especially come from organizations' relations with other more successful organizations. In this way institutionalization becomes a question of networks between actors. The relational aspect was also dominant in J. W. Meyer and Scott (1983) and their concept of 'societal sectors' that especially paid attention to the way relations between organizations and regulative forces appeared, and what this meant for the organizations in terms of structure and resources (W. Richard Scott, 2014).

The relational aspects were supplemented by scholars who emphasized the more ideational aspect of fields, and how it relates to the dynamics of shared meanings and typifications by a group of actors, and how these are translated and interpreted. In more ideational accounts of fields, institutionalization occurs as the diffusion and sedimentation of symbols, rituals and practices is carried from the field and into the individual organizations. The institutional logics perspective especially emphasizes ideational aspects of fields. In recent decades institutional theory has moved from a strong focus on homogeneity in the institutional environment, hereunder institutional fields, to a stronger emphasis on institutional pluralism, which describes how organizations belong to multiple fields simultaneously (Kraatz & Block 2008; Royston Greenwood et al. 2011).

Organizations belong to a multiplicity of different fields (Kraatz & Block 2008). Any organization will belong to any number of different fields, with their own set of prescriptions, values and traditions (Hoffman, 2001). A hypothetical Danish organization producing consumer electronics will of course belong to a field of other electronic producers, a field of Danish manufacturing companies, a field that consists of local businesses in its geographic region and so on. In each of these fields the organization is faced by institutional expectations of appropriate behavior and furthermore with inspirations for practices and new organizational structures. Furthermore organizations themselves consist of a number of different specialized functions, each of which will have to be part of a field on behalf of the organization.

The HR department, the environmental compliance department or the legal department will each connect the organization respectively to the fields of HR and personnel management, to the field of environmental protection and to the legal field. All of which again come with their own institutional expectations and prescriptions.

But the complexity argument goes further than this. Each of these fields in their own right will also be characterized by institutional complexity and contestation between groups of actors, interests, heterogeneity and complexity of logics within fields (Besharov & Smith 2014; Royston Greenwood et al. 2011; Raynard 2016). Therefore fields themselves are not arenas that foster uniformity and isomorphism, but are arenas of contestation and conflict between different actors and between diverging meaning structures and institutional logics (Royston Greenwood et al. 2011; Kraatz & Block 2008). There is complexity at every level.

The complexity of the field of work environment is described in both Paper 1 and Paper 2. Here I describe the different institutional field level logics that are available to the intra-organizational experts as meaning and practices to implement.

Studies have shown how fields are often the site of relational conflicts between various actor groups around the definition and solution of central issues in the field. Andrew Hoffman (2001; 1999) investigated how the field surrounding environmental protection and organizational environmentalism was formed of various actor groups of industry representatives, regulators and activists. Over four decades he showed how the field, and the prescriptions of practice and identity were changed and contested in power struggles between regulators, organizations and activist groups. Fields in Hoffman's view resemble "*institutional war"* and not *"isormorphic dialogue"* (Hoffman 1999: 352). Fligstein and McAdams (2012) describe fields as arenas of relational struggles between actors and therefore as: "constructed social orders that define an area within which a set of consensually defined and mutually attuned actors vie for advantage" (Fligstein & McAdams 2012: 64)

2.1.2 Institutional Logics

To describe the different ideational structures in the field of work environment, I draw on the 'institutional logics perspective' (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012; Friedland & Alford 1991). Since Friedland and Alford's seminal publication (1991), the logics perspective has been widely disseminated and utilized to describe a wide array of issues and empirical areas of organization theory, including culinary innovations (Rao, Monin, & Durand 2003), the legal field of substance abuse programs (McPherson & Sauder 2013), health care management (T Reay, Goodrick, Boch Waldorff, & Casebeer, 2016) and industrial design (Durand, Szostak, Jourdan, & Thornton, 2013).

With the wide dissemination the perspective is one of the theoretical innovations within institutional theory that helped broaden analysis from isomorphism and organizational homogeneity within fields, to encompass analyses of both institutional change and institutional complexity within the overall theoretical tradition (Berg Johansen & Boch Waldorff 2015; Lounsbury & Boxenbaum 2013).

In my dissertation I utilize the perspective to describe which institutional forces help shape the way intra-organizational experts manage work environment in their respective organizations, and how these institutional forces are the result of an interplay of in-field historic sequences of events, of broader tendencies in terms of management practices, and finally overall societal institutional orders. I also show how these field level logics are enacted by actors with their own institutional backgrounds and reflexivities in Paper 1 and Paper 3. In this section however my main focus is on describing what I term 'field level logics' (Thornton et al. 2012), their genesis and relationship to the wider institutional environment.

In their influential chapter, 'Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices and Institutional Contradictions' (Friedland & Alford 1991), Friedland and Alford stated that the organizational theory of the time was too focused on developments in the markets and the immediate fields that surrounded organizations, and mainly sought rationalized and 'utilitarian' explanations of organizational behavior. This meant that the theory did not account for the influence of wider societal institutions on organizational practice. Friedland and Alford posited that western societies consisted of an interconnected system of differentiated overall ideational structures consisting of meanings, practices and symbols – in short institutional orders. These orders were: democracy, capitalism, Christianity, nuclear family, bureaucratic state. These are reservoirs of meaning and practices that again inform the actions of organizations and actors and give meaning to these actions. In this way Friedland and Alford show how dynamics of institutionalization occur on multiple levels: on the wider societal level, the organizational and the individual (Friedland & Alford 1991: 240).

The institutional logics perspective is as an alternative to institutional theories that focus on isomorphic pressures of institutional environments, with increasing organizational similarity as an outcome (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012). The perspective instead shows how society always consist of different and often competing institutionalized values and practices, and how organizations and individuals are embedded in more than one institutional context which can lead to institutional change or conflict.

After laying 'fallow' for most of the 1990s (Thornton et al. 2012: 41) the institutional perspective was revitalized and reinterpreted by a number of organizational scholars, most notably Patricia Thornton, William Ocasio and Michael Lounsbury (Thornton, Ocasio, & Ocasio 1999; Thornton & Ocasio 2008; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012). They shaped Friedland & Alford's ideas into a coherent and dynamic analytical framework to draw upon in organizational and institutional analyses.

First of all Friedland and Alford's institutional orders only describe western democracies, therefore they are reformulated into seven ideal types to make the framework more 'amenable' (Thornton et Al. 2012: 68) to empirical and theoretical studies of organizations and institutions, and to be applicable across a variety of contexts. Seven ideal types of institutional orders were therefore suggested: state, religion, family, community, market, corporation, profession.

Furthermore the perspective suggests that institutional dynamics happen on multiple levels simultaneously. These analytical levels are societal level, the level of the institutional field, the level of the organization and finally the level of the individual. These are furthermore nested within each other (Thornton & Ocasio 2008), so that orders of the societal level are instantiated into more concrete logics of the field, which again are interpreted by organizations and individuals and put to use in their concrete contexts. In this way the perspective has been transformed into a far more dynamic one (Christiansen & Lounsbury 2013) that explains social actions and meaning as institutional phenomena, without sacrificing agency and strategic action from actors in the analyses.

When it comes to my PhD dissertation there are three important theoretical issues in the logics perspective that have to be explained and discussed. 1) The relationship between institutional orders and field level logics, 2) the question of institutional complexity in fields, and finally 3) the split between macro and micro level studies.

One issue has been the relationship between field level logics and institutional orders.

In a review of empirical studies of institutional logics Berg Johansen and Waldorff (2015) show that the relationship between the orders and field level logics is not clear in the majority of studies. They identify how authors either simply conflate orders with field level logics finding examples on e.g. market or community logics in concrete institutional fields, or how studies mix orders and logics by finding examples of both orders and field level logics at the same analytical level (Berg Johansen & Waldorff 2015: 12).

Daudigeos et al. (2013) raise the same point and argue that there is a need for more studies that combine the various analytical levels in which institutional dynamics occur. Specifically more studies that connect the logics of the particular fields in focus to the overarching institutional orders of the inter-institutional system. They write:

"Indeed, if institutional logics are to be understood as field-level specific compositions of broader societal orders, the analysis of their composite nature should prove to be key in grasping when some logics may complement or reinforce – rather than oppose – each other" (Daudigeos et al. 2013: 324)

In this way they emphasize the explanatory power of the institutional part of the 'institutional logics' moniker, but at the same time underline that logics are to be understood as 'field-level specific compositions', which refer back to the institutional orders, but are in themselves different ideational structures.

While institutional orders are rather abstract and overarching, field logics are always instantiated in a concrete institutional field. Field level logics offer participants in the field a "shared understanding of what is going on in the field" (Fligstein & McAdams 2012: 10-11) and provide them with frames (W. Richard Scott, 2014) and means-end relationships (E. Boxenbaum, 2006) to enact. Paper 1 is a good example of this dynamic. Here I describe how logics on the field level always refer back to the abstract orders in society. However to influence a particular field such as work environment management obvious the abstract societal level values of the corporate order or the state order cannot in any meaningful way provide concrete means and ends in work environment management. Instead in the interaction with historical developments and actors enactment a field level logic emerges. One that is related to the order, but in no way conflated with it.

The relationship between field level logics and institutional orders is thus characterized by 'near-decomposability' (Thornton et al. 2012: 60). This means that while there is certainly a link between the orders and their instantiated logic within a concrete field, the field level instantiation is not a complete copy of the values and practices that constitute the order. Therefore the genesis of field level logics has to be seen as the result of conditioning from a higher analytical level (the institutional orders) but also from the concrete sequence of events, traditions and practices that exists within the concrete field. What this means in practice is that logics on the field level can appear as compositions or blends of elements from two orders, or appear as segregations where only one part of an order is a part of the field level logic (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012).

As I describe below this relationship is important to my analysis of the field of work environment management. But for now it suffices to say that while the near-decomposability is an integral part of the analytical framework, it has not played a major role in empirical studies, as noted by Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorff (2015) and Daudigeos et al. (2013).

A second point of importance to my dissertation is that institutional fields are composed of multiple, often contradictory logics simultaneously.

Early efforts (Rao, Monin, & Durand 2003; Thornton, Ocasio, & Ocasio 1999; Townley 1997; Seo & Creed 2002) posited that one dominant logic in various institutional fields are met with contestations and then replaced by a new logic, which again then becomes the dominant logic of this particular field. This change model of 'punctuated equilibrium' (Roy Suddaby & Foster 2016), however has increasingly been challenged by descriptions of how institutional fields consist of many and often competing institutional logics, all of which provide actors and

organizations with strategies, practices and reservoirs of meaning to enact in practice (Royston Greenwood et al. 2011; Besharov & Smith 2014).

A multiplicity of logics in fields presents actors with multiple possible responses, practices and meanings to guide their actions. Therefore a lot of scholarly work has investigated how organizations and other field actors respond to institutional complexity of fields. Competing logics can therefore lead to a number of organizational problems from intra-organizational power struggles where different logics are enacted by different organizational coalitions (Pache & Santos 2010), to processes of decoupling (Misangyi, 2016), and to declining performance (Besharov & Smith 2014). On the other hand much research has highlighted that organizations can manage competing logics (J. Battilana & Dorado 2010; T. Reay & Hinings 2009; Raynard 2016), and that multiple logics in fields can co-exist in cooperative constellations, or in competitive constellations depending on field and organizational contingencies (Boch Waldorff, Reay, & Goodrick 2013; Goodrick & Reay 2011; T. Reay et al. 2016). The tensions between the various logics of work environment management highlight this point. Is proper work environment management a question of designing tight and failsafe systems that can be applied throughout the entire organization, of actively engaging in advocating work environment as a political issue within the company, or of creating organizational cultures that foster well-being and thereby counteract stress and psycho-social risks? All of these means are present in the form of logics in the field of work environment, and actors have to combine, separate and sample them to create meaningful practices in their own daily work. This again sometimes leads to conflicts between various actors in the organizations when means collide in the organizational work environment efforts.

Finally there is the issue of a split between micro level studies of how institutional logic 'plays out' inside organizations, and more macro level studies of historical developments of logics in broader fields and societies.

Delbridge and Edwards 2013 describe how empirical investigations of institutional logics have "…bifurcated along micro-/macro lines" (2013: 927).

A number of studies have presented large historical analyses of the developments of logics within fields (e.g. Jonsson & Lounsbury 2017; Greenwood & Suddaby 2006; Daudigeos et al. 2013; Dunn & Jones 2010; Lounsbury 2007). Here especially content analysis has been utilized with large bodies of text to describe grand narratives of logics within a particular field.

Contrasting this more structural focus on institutional logics, several studies have focused on the enactment of logics within individual organizations (Binder 2007; Delbridge & Edwards 2013; Currie & Spyridonidis 2016; Pallas, Fredriksson, & Wedlin 2016; T. Reay et al. 2016; Christiansen & Lounsbury 2013; Pache & Santos 2013).

The split between micro and macro level studies means that few studies incorporating data on both exist within the logics stream. Even though institutional logics in the foundational texts emphasizes multilevel analysis on different societal levels as an analytical consequence of these insights (Friedland & Alford 1991), and underlines how the theoretical framework provides a theory of how agency is embedded in institutional logics without providing primacy to structural explanations (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012), the lack of empirical studies that combine data of logics on both levels (micro-/macro) means that the integrative promises of the institutional logics perspective have not been fully realized yet.

2.1.3 Institutional actorhood in organizations

Finally to answer my research question it is important to understand the role of individual actors in institutional dynamics and their enacting of prescriptions from the institutional fields in concrete organizational contexts. More specifically how individual actors relate to institutional fields, and how they enact institutional prescriptions inside the organizations in which they work.

Understanding individual actors and the social and symbolic interactions they engage in is a foundational aspect of institutional thinking. Berger and Luckmann (1966) describe dynamics of institutionalization as: "…reciprocal typification of habitualized action by *types of actors*…[my emphasis]" (Berger & Luckmann 1966: 54). However in the foundational works of new institutional theory (J. W. Meyer & Rowan 1977; DiMaggio & Powell 1983), the analytical lenses focus on the levels of organizations and institutional fields, and how dynamics of institutionalization occur between larger populations of organizations (a notable exception can be found in Zucker 1977). This explains the rather heavy reliance on quantitative large N-studies of organizational populations that characterized the earliest institutional empirical papers (F. Dobbin & Schoonhoven 2010)

However later in multiple streams of literature, scholars have been trying to consider individual actors when theorizing on institutionalization and social action, under the banners of both 'institutional work' (T. Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca 2011) and 'institutional entrepreneurship' (Julie Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum 2009), both of which primarily describe how individuals and coalitions of actors work to change and contest primarily institutional fields, not individual organizations.

However intra organizational actors play important roles in the dynamics of institutionalization. Especially in the face of the institutional complexity and pluralism that characterize the environments of many contemporary organizations (Royston Greenwood et al., 2011), which leave actors inside organizations with choices, ambiguities and conflicts (Pache & Santos 2013).

A number of studies have shown how organizational actors become instrumental in the institutionalization of new regulations and legal requirements in organizations

and institutional fields. Dobbin (2009) describes how the US government's efforts to make companies comply with equal opportunity legislation were greatly aided by intra-organizational actors in the same companies. Therefore the newly created occupational group of 'diversity' managers in large US companies helped institutionalize rather abstract and vague legislation on diversity into concrete organizational practice. A similar conclusion has been put forward by other scholars as well (Edelman 1992; Kraatz & Block 2008).

When it comes to the institutional logics the notion of embedded agency of actors plays a significant role in the theoretical framework (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012).. The relationship between logics and individuals is thus characterized by embedded agency and 'partial autonomy' (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012). Thornton and colleagues posit that institutional logics from the institutional environment present actors with different frames and lenses through which to understand the world, and the tools to act in it. However many empirical studies of logics have had a "'downward' reading of action" (Delbridge & Edwards 2013) i.e. that agency is seen as an outcome of logics and frames from the field level.

A stream of research known as 'inhabited institutions' points to how broader institutional forces such as field level logics always become part of localized processes of social and symbolic interactions between people (Hallett & Ventresca 2006). In this way logics and institutional prescription play out in an organizational context. In short the 'inhabited institutions' stream wants to repopulate institutions with actual people (Hallett, Shulman, & Fine 2009) by increasing focus on the local social and symbolic interactions that are the actual processes by which institutions are enacted inside organizations. As examples of these processes, Hallett and colleagues provide organizational actors' own interpretations of their work situations, how these actors organize the institutionalized prescriptions into work practices locally, and finally local patterns of interactions and orders and the actors' own interactions with broader institutions (Hallett, Shulman, & Fine 2009)

Binder (2007) finds that actors always carry multiple scripts from multiple logics, and therefore that individual actors are never simply "cultural dopes" automatically enacting taken-for-granted cognitive schemes, but rather are actors who consciously sample different scripts or enact parts of them into coherent day to day practices. Hallett & Ventresca (2006) reinterpret the classic work 'Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy' by Gouldner (1964) as an early description of an inhabited institutionalism. They describe the gypsum mine in question as "a world that is complexly textured" (Hallett & Ventresca 2006: 228) and write that the new forms of bureaucracy presented by the new management are interpreted into this world and enacted into a form of their own. Thereby the institutional value and system of bureaucracy finds its own form and shape through the local symbolic interactions between actors, and in the concrete context of the particularities and traditions that had emerged over the years within the specific organization.

It is known that actors are important as carriers of institutional logics and prescriptions from a field and into an organization, and that these will be subject to local interpretations in interactive processes. Furthermore studies have shown how intra-organizational actors can be more or less connected to institutional values (Lounsbury 2001; Pache & Santos 2013), and the question somewhat remains how this impinges on dynamics of institutionalization in organizations, and how different actor positions and roles impact these dynamics.

Actors' backgrounds and positions in relation to a field are important to consider when explaining the local interactive enactments of wider field level logics and practices. Lounsbury (2001) and Lounsbury and Kaghan, (2001) describe how the new institutional innovation of special recycling departments in American universities was either put in the hands of new departments consisting of activists and recycling enthusiasts, or in the hands of already existing administrative or technical departments on campus. The members of the latter were not particularly fired up about recycling, and did not come from any background in the recycling field. Pache and Santos (2013) in a similar vein describe how actors can either be 'identified', 'familiar' or 'novice' in relation to institutional logics. These three labels categorize the actors' relations based on the degree to which actors identify and thereby share the norms and practices of a particular institution or institutional logic.

Delbridge and Edwards (2013) give an example of this in their study of yacht designers and the institutional logics influencing this particular field. Through a critical realist understanding the authors show that agency is conditioned by logics from the wider institutional field, but also by those which emerge from actors' various degrees of reflexivity about the social context and structures they interact with. Thereby they show how the individual positions, biographies and skills of the actors are constitutive for the interpretation and thereby the translations into concrete practice.

2.2 Critical realism

Critical realism informs how I understand institutions, actors and structures in my dissertation. By incorporating it into institutional theory it can contribute to a refined understanding of the multilevel character of institutional dynamics, and clarify central questions in institutional theory. As written in the introduction to my theoretical framework I am by no means the first to do this. Palmer, Biggart, and Dick (2008) mention CR as a possible fruitful road to take for institutional theory in order to present a coherent framework of institutional dynamics and generative mechanisms in institutionalization. Both Leca and Naccache (2006) and Delbridge and Edwards (2013) utilize CR in concrete empirical analyses of institutional entrepreneurship and enactment of institutional logics respectively.

Critical realism is a philosophy of science originally conceived by Roy Bhaskar (1997), that tries to find a path between what Sayer calls: "spurious scientificity" and "…idealist and relativist reactions to positivism" (Sayer 2004: 6). In short this means that critical realism recognizes that there is an objective reality independent of human perception, but that there is no unmediated "theory-neutral description, interpretation, theorization, explanation…" through which researchers have access to it (Fleetwood 2005: 199). Obviously this distinction leads to an epistemological paradox. How can a theory of science on the one hand posit that an independent reality exists as a 'intransitive object' (Danermark, Ekström, Jacobsen, & Karlsson, 2002), but on the other hand that researchers, do not have immediate and unmediated access to it? Where does that leave scientific inquiry?

The paradox is solved in CR by the introduction of the stratified ontology that distinguishes between three ontological domains: the empirical domain, the actual domain, and the real domain (Leca & Naccache 2006).

The empirical domain is the domain that is immediately available to actors in a social situation. The actual domain describes all observable events that are happening in the field of interest, whether they are observed by actors or not. And finally the domain of the real describes the 'deeper' domain where deeper social structures reside such as economy, gender roles, and psychological mechanisms. Contrary to the two former, the latter domain can only be accessed through theories and abstractions, not through immediate empirical validation (Danermark et al., 2002). Together these three domains form the stratified ontology of critical realism (see Paper 1 for a further elaboration of these domains). Fleetwood (2005) furthermore clarifies that the 'real' level of reality encompasses artefacts, social relations, materials, ideas and discourses. Everything that has a 'causal efficacy' in the world should be considered 'real' (Fleetwood, 2005: 200).

Thus the main idea of critical realism is that social inquiry and explanations must always take into account the relationships and connections between the concrete observed events and data (the empirical), the context that these are a part of and that surrounds the observed events (the actual) and the abstract structures and modes of reality working 'behind the scenes' of the observed reality (the real).

What connects the different domains are what are sometimes called 'generative mechanisms' (Danermark et al., 2002; Sayer, 1992), but I, following the lead of Margaret Archer, choose to call them 'mediating concepts' (Margaret S. Archer 1995)[7]. Mediating concepts are what carries influences from deeper social structures to the concrete human actors, thus influencing social action. Mediating concepts themselves are the result of interactions between elements from deeper levels with the concrete world and are furthermore to be considered 'emergent' social structures, meaning that they contain influences that cannot be explained by the composition of either of the constitutive subparts (Margaret S. Archer 1995). In Paper 1 I describe

[7] Archer describes the term mechanism as a misnomer because of its technical and mechanistic connotations (Archer, 1995: p. 153)

how institutional logics in the field are to be understood as mediating concepts mediating between the abstract orders in the 'real' domain, and the concrete 'empirical domain' of the concrete organizational contexts. Furthermore I describe how these mediating structures have emergent properties in the sense that they contain values from the abstract orders, as well as concrete historical work environment events in their genesis, but that they cannot be understood as simply the sum of the two – in the interaction new properties and causal efficacies emerge and work in the world.

Another important point is Archer's insistence that agency and structure are two separate things that interact, but that should be understood as separate entities and not as one inseparable entity (Margaret S. Archer 1995). Actors are reflexive and not fully embedded in the structures that surround them, but on the other hand interpret these into social action. In Paper 3 I discuss the reflexivity of the intra-organizational actors, and especially how different reflexive positions within the institutional field and within the organizational hierarchies afford actors differentiated outlooks in their work environment efforts.

Critical realist thinking can help to strengthen conceptions of institutional orders, field level logics and the enactment in real organizational settings, without giving explanatory primacy to either, as I set out in the following section.

2.3 The assembled theoretical framework

I am concerned with institutional dynamics of work environment management on multiple analytical levels. This means that I am interested in the relationship between organizations, their individual members and the surrounding society. To understand this complex relationship I investigate how institutional dynamics occur on three distinct analytical levels, and the interdependent relationships between these. These levels are: the societal level, the level of the organizational field, and the level of the organizations and their actors. In three different papers I investigate how the various levels influence how work environment in Danish organizations is managed – how a deeper societal reality is mediated through emergent mediating concepts to the empirical domain.

On the overall societal level the ideal typical institutional orders of state, market, corporation, religion, family, profession, and community can be found. Each of them represent key institutions in our society and can be easily recognized as distinct areas of society, or they are, as Roger Friedland describes, *"joined in the social imagination"* (2012: 588). These orders are the most fundamental orderings of the social world. While immediately recognizable and distinguishable for all social actors, they are also abstract, and cannot as such be enacted in themselves by actors. Not even the most fervent free market adherent or religious zealot wakes up in the

morning and starts to exclusively enact the orders of the markets or religion. Instead they will enter the various organizational fields that they are a part of, and this is where the abstract orders are transformed into more concrete forms in the interactions with historicity, structures and actors.

Then in the field of work environment I place the field level institutional logics. They are the result of an interactive process in which the field history, technical and structural contents, and the values, practices and governance mechanisms that the orders provide come together and form these field level logics.

The relationship between orders and logics is characterized by near-decomposability. There are more localized processes happening both in the field and inside the local organizations that shape how the logics end up being enacted in the different organizations by the work environment specialists.

Finally organizational and individual actors who participate in the field enact practices and theories associated with these logics inside the organizations and in field institutions. Again these enactments are interactive processes between the logics, and the reflexivity of the actors.

In this way I posit how an institutional field contains multiple logics that all provide different recipes for practice and meaning to the involved actors, and how these can be understood and analyzed without giving primacy to either structures or actors in the process, while recognizing the fundamentally interactive nature of society.

Thus field level logics are available to actors and organizations of the field, and are enacted by them in various ways. Actors are, as stated in the last section, separable from the social structures and institutions they inhabit, and are as such reflexive about the institutional demands and prescriptions that are available at the field level. Reflexivity means that actors are real persons with biographies, emotions and varying positions within their own organizations. As such they have differentiated responses to prescriptions from the field.

The relationship between field level logics and organizational actors and enactments is thereby characterized by ‘partial autonomy’ (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012) meaning that local social interactions between ‘real people’ (Binder, 2007) with biographies, feelings and differing institutional loyalties are just as important to understand, when one looks at the dynamics of institutionalization on the ‘ground floor’ of the organizational efforts in work environment management.

..

Methodology

First, I describe my overall analytical strategy in the dissertation and how I designed a multilevel study of institutional dynamics in both the institutional field and in four organizational contexts. This section also describes in detail how the analyses in the dissertation are the results of iterative abductive leaps between different data sources, and theoretical concepts. Then, I describe my data collection in terms of contemporary qualitative data from semi-structured interviews and historic data from various sources. Finally, I describe the analysis of the data and the coding strategy I have used.

3.1 Research strategy

My research strategy is designed to capture dynamics in both the field of work environment management in Denmark and on the organizational level simultaneously. This multilevel approach necessitated a multimethod approach to data collection, and a pragmatic stance that was informed by methodological sources from both critical realism (Sayer 1992; Thursfield & Hamblett 2004) and institutional theory (Haedicke & Hallett 2015; Thornton, Jones, & Kury 2005; Thornton & Ocasio 2008).

To capture the institutional dynamics of the field I turned to the historical developments in work environment management over the last forty years. In this way the method and the strategy here resemble what Thornton et al. call 'event sequencing' (Thornton, Jones, & Kury 2005), i.e. a sequence of events that together shape and change the institutional logics governing a particular field, or in their own words: '…occurrences that dislocate, rearticulate and transform structures' (Thornton et al. 2005: 130). Individual events can take the form of changes in which field actors control certain resources and powers, changes in regulation, changes in compositions of actors, or changes in vocabularies and cultural repertoires of the field (Sewell, 1996). Together in sequences these events then form the structural backdrop to a change in field level logics (Thornton, Jones, & Kury 2005).

In my dissertation I have therefore focused on significant events in the field of work environment management in Denmark, and more specifically on events that can be said to form distinct institutional logics of means-ends relations in the field. I interpret events in the broadest possible sense, so events can be concrete instances of change (e.g. the passing of the work environment act in 1975) or more diffuse events which cannot be pinpointed to one particular time and place (e.g. growing critique of 'side-car place' of work environment within organizations).

I have utilized a 'macro-causal' narrative analysis to capture these sequences as Thornton and Ocasio (2008) suggest doing when conducting institutional historical analyses. Mahoney (1999) describes the narrative mode of macro-causal' analysis as a method to assess how different events come together in 'conjunctural' and complex sequences and together cause historic changes (Mahoney 1999: 1165). In other words it is used to '…understand the ordering of circumstantial detail in searching for analogies that are the foundation for new and convincing accounts…' (Thornton & Ocasio 2008: 117). In this way this analytical framework complements critical realist ideas on how social and ideational structures are shaped by many different underlying events and structures, but at the same time have emergent properties in their own right and are thus irreducible. The French Revolution, according to Sewell (1996), could not be reduced to only economic, social or cultural factors, but it was only in conjuncture that events and factors shaped a path towards a revolution, that again in itself had emergent properties and effects on the surrounding societies. In the same way we will see that the institutional logics of work environment management cannot be said to be the result of just one societal development, but on the contrary are the result of both multiple historical events in the field of work environment, and the continuing enactment of actors and organizations.

The question remains how to analyze which events should be assigned into what event sequences in a narrative macro causal analysis. Mahoney describes the narrative method as 'always contingent on theory…' (Mahoney 1999: 1165). In this way the researcher switches back and forth between theory and the historical data and then theorizes how events together produce an outcome. As Thornton and Ocasio write the inter-institutional system of the institutional logics perspective is especially appropriate as a theoretical framework to guide historical analyses (Thornton & Ocasio 2008). Besides comparing historical data to the institutional orders, I iteratively compared my historical sources and other research descriptions of work environment history to contemporary accounts from intra-organizational experts about means and ends in their day-to-day efforts inside organizations. In this way I could determine how three sequences of events helped shape three competing institutional logics that are enacted in the field of work environment today.

To capture the institutional dynamics on the organizational level I utilized an interpretive strategy (Roy Suddaby & Greenwood 2009), in the sense that I focused on collecting data that highlighted how institutional logics are experienced and enacted on the ground level by organizational actors. In this way I can capture the '…subjective experiences such as social roles, routines, and patterns of interaction…' (Suddaby & Greenwood 2009: 181) that are the foundations of institutional dynamics in organizations. Furthermore I designed my research to capture these dynamics enacted in their real-life contexts and thus needed to understand these contexts in depth.

3.1.1 Abductive process

The dissertation is the result of multiple iterations and comparisons between theory and different data sources. Only in this way was it possible for me to provide accounts of both 'locally-situated interactions, and the extra-local world of institutionalized meanings and patterns' (Haedicke & Hallett 2015: 104). My analytical position throughout the process can therefore be described as that of abduction, i.e. a middle ground between pure deductive and inductive approaches respectively. Other organizational scholars have proposed abductive reasoning as a fruitful analytical approach to organizational and institutional analyses (R. Suddaby 2006; Haedicke & Hallett 2015; Timmermans & Tavory 2012) and I concur with their views on the matter, and will therefore give a brief description of the overall abductive process that has led to the analyses and conclusions presented in my three papers in this dissertation.

As an analytical approach abductive reasoning describes how researchers make creative leaps from data to theory and back in a continuous process until a satisfactorily detailed explanation or hypothesis has been reached (Timmermans & Tavory 2012; R. Suddaby 2006). In this way abduction is far removed from both purely 'inductive' approaches, where any researchers are supposed to 'ignore' previous theory and investigations, in order not to 'contaminate' concepts that might emerge from data analyses (Timmermans & Tavory 2012), and from the 'deductive' approach of solely testing theoretical hypotheses (Haedicke & Hallett 2015).

More specifically Haedicke and Hallett (2015) describe the process as a continuous switching between deduction and induction in different phases of the investigation.

My investigation started in deductive mode. Theory and previous empirical research are obviously the deciding factors when formulating research questions and deciding on a research context (Haedicke & Hallett 2015). Therefore my field of study, the work environment management in Danish organizations, and the individual research sites were chosen based on my immediate assumptions about the field. These assumptions were 1) that the institutional complexity of the field had increased since the passing of the work environment act of 1975, 2) that this institutional complexity has led to the emergence of intra-organizational experts functions, and 3) that this professionalization resulted in more corporate approaches to work environment management replacing the more participatory approach that previously had dominated the field, illustrated by the incorporation of HR departments into work environment efforts (Dyreborg 2011; Limborg 2001; Kamp & Nielsen 2013).

After collecting historic data from the field and qualitative data from the chosen research sites, my analytical mode shifted to a more inductive mode where I tried to keep my eyes open to any surprises that might challenge the abovementioned assumptions and generate new creative insights (R. Suddaby, 2006). Simultaneously I studied the historical sources and the interviews and compared them to my theoretical framework of institutional logics, as well as to other empirical analyses of the field (Dyreborg, 2011; Limborg, 2001).

Two ‘abductive moments’ (Haedicke & Hallett 2015) dawned on me in this phase. One was that a number of accounts pointed towards a logic being enacted that was more in line with the kind of work environment approach of the ‘occupational health services’ that had previously been dominating the field before the professionalization. Therefore I had to revisit my initial idea that the participatory approach that had previously dominated the field had been eroded by the entrance of professional intra-organizational experts. Instead I could see that this ‘logic of advocacy’ was enacted side-by-side with the logics of compliance and commitment in the accounts. The second abductive moment in my analyses was that the institutional logics could not be said to correspond simply with the institutional orders of the inter-institutional system. They were not merely field level instantiations of the orders of corporation and state, but instead were both ‘blended’ and ‘segregated’ (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012). The logic of compliance as it emerged from my historic and qualitative sources incorporated both elements from both abovementioned orders, while the logic of commitment and advocacy only incorporated some elements of their root orders.

These abductive moments of ‘empirical pushback’ (Haedicke & Hallett 2015) led me back to the books, to read and refine my understandings of the field and of my theoretical framework. First of all it led to a revision of the main ‘story’ of my PhD dissertation. Initially, I thought that I was researching a case of institutional change where the entrance of intra-organizational experts would lead to a ‘rationalization’ (Hwang & Powell 2009) of the fields’ institutional logics, and replace more idealistic actors as protagonists with rational safety engineers and HR managers respectively. Instead I could see that the real story was one of how historic tensions in the field of work environment were still being enacted inside the companies, and that a number of accounts maintained an ‘idealistic’ disposition even though the formal roles of the intra-organizational experts were now those of staff managers and specialists.

As to the second abductive ‘surprise’, to better understand the relationship between field level logics and institutional orders, and how they developed over time in a field, I incorporated the concepts of ‘near-decomposability’ of Thornton and colleagues (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012), as well as analytical concepts from critical realism that could help me better understand the relationships and mediators between different analytical levels and ontological domains.

This critical realist refinement of my theoretical framework made it clear that it was necessary to understand how the individual actors were related to the institutional field of logics as well. If all analytical levels were only partially connected to each other in a ‘near-decomposed’ system, I also had to understand how the individual actors were embedded and reflexive of their institutional place and relations. Therefore I went back to my data to investigate these issues as well.

In this way the abductive process resulted in a continuing interpretive process in which I constantly compared theories, historic data sources and qualitative data sources, and in this way made the picture ever more detailed and complex.

3.2 Data sources

3.2.1 Historical data

To understand the historical developments and key sequences of events that have defined the field of work environment management from 1975 up until today I have collected different types of materials.

First of all I have found multiple reports published in the time span by either government agencies, ministries or other central organizations from the field of work environment. Since many reports are not indexed in any searchable form I had to rely on a snowball method to find out which reports were necessary to read in order to understand the development of the field. Therefore I reached out to central actors and researchers from the field of work environment and asked for suggestions. I only focused on reports that specifically described the relationship between organizations and regulators or intra-organizational forms of governance. I ended up with nine historic reports (Limborg & Voxted 2008; Møller Christiansen & Limborg 2005; Limborg et al. 1994; Hasle, Møller, Hvid, et al. 2016; Stranddorf, Møller, & Langaa Jensen 1992; Møller, Langaa Jensen, & Broberg Jensen 1988; Simmons & Stampe Øland 1992; Arbejdsministeriet 1995).

Furthermore I relied on other sources such as popular history about work environment in Denmark (Hasle, 2010; Jacobsen, 2011, 2016; Kabel, Limborg, Møller, Porse Sørensen, & Kragh, 2008) and other peer-reviewed papers on the subject as well (Dyreborg 2011; Kabel, Hasle, & Limborg 2007; Kamp & Le Blansch 2000; Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002; Seim, Møller, & Limborg 2016; Rasmussen, Hansen, & Nielsen 2011; Limborg 2001).

Finally I did two interviews with researcher and practioner Hans Jørgen Limborg about the historical developments and events that shaped the field of work environment in 2015 and in 2016.

3.2.2 Research sites

I chose four research sites where I expected to find the phenomenon in question in an intense form (see also Reay and Jones 2016), to better 'catch complexity' of work environment management (Stake 1995: xi). Therefore I tried to balance my selection between 'variation' (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Stake, 1995) to catch the complexity of the field, and 'comparability' to ensure that it was still possible to see commonalities and related issues across the research sites. To ensure the latter I chose organizations of a certain size in terms of capacity, manpower, and resources to ensure the research sites were big enough to have multiple intra-organizational experts with

responsibility for their work environment efforts. Furthermore it was also important that the organizations had to deal with work environment issues of technical, physical and psycho-social character at the same time, to better understand how this multiplicity of issues in work environment management was handled by the specialists. In this way I ended up with four large-scale bureaucracies characterized by a high technical and organizational complexity divided in public and private sector.

To ensure variation I varied my site selection in terms of sector and HR involvement. Therefore I decided to sample two research sites from a public sector setting and two from a private sector setting. Thus my research sites ended up being two manufacturing organizations and two large hospitals respectively. Scholars had previously described how HR departments increasingly played a larger role in work environment efforts; therefore another factor in my selection process was to find two sites where HR played a role in work environment efforts, and two where they did not play any role. Whether they played a role or not was determined based on whether HR managers and specialists were formally responsible for parts of the legally mandated work environment efforts in the organization (i.e. workplace assessments, registration of accidents, prevention of health risks etc.).

Table 1: Sample strategy for research sites

	Public	**Private**
No HR involvement	Hospital 1	Company 1
HR involvement	Hospital 2	Company 2

I proceeded with a snowball strategy where I contacted multiple different key actors in the field work environment who I deemed to be centrally placed and possessing in-depth knowledge of work environment efforts in concrete organizations (i.e. researchers, trade union consultants, employers' association consultants). Furthermore I consulted publically available information from potentially appropriate organizations such as CSR reports, work environment strategies and interviews and articles in various trade journals about work environment efforts.

3.2.3 Interviews

Within each of the four organizations I proceeded to do a varying number of qualitative interviews with intra-organizational experts in work environment (n=23). While both hospitals (H1, H2) had all their experts employed in the same functions, the responsibility was dispersed across various staff functions in the two manufacturing companies (C1, C2). Therefore I relied on my initial contacts in the

organizations to point me to other staff functions responsible for work environment efforts. Furthermore both manufacturing companies had local safety managers employed directly on the individual production sites. I chose therefore to interview two local managers in both C1 and C2 as well.

All interviews were semi-structured, whereby I relied on predefined interview guides to make sure that all relevant research themes were covered, but at the same time leave the interview open to explore additional topics raised by the interviewees. Interview guides included the same overall research themes, but were revised based on what position the informant had in the company to make sure that the everyday work of the professional specialists were covered. I ended up with detailed interviews from twenty-three staff professionals across the four companies.

Table 2: Interviewees

Informants	**Job description**	**Company**
Manager, work environment function	Managing staff work environment staff function	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 1, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 2, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 3, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 4, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 5, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Manager, HR function	Managing HR function	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 1, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 2, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 3, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 1, Risk function	Full time work environment consultant	Company 1 (C1)
Consultant 2, Risk function	Full time work environment consultant	Company 1 (C1)
Data consultant, Risk function	Data consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 1 (C1)

Manager, Management systems function	Managing the staff function responsible for all management systems (among them work environment management system)	Company 1 (C1)
Local site consultant 1	Consultant for local site with work environment as main responsibility	Company 1 (C1)
Local site consultant 2	Consultant for local site with work environment as main responsibility	Company 1 (C1)
Manager, safety, health and environment function	Managing staff function responsible for safety, health and external environment	Company 2 (C2)
Consultant 1	Full time health and safety consultant	Company 2 (C2)
Consultant 2	Full time health and safety consultant	Company 2 (C2)
Local safety consultant 1	Full time health and safety consultant at local site	Company 2 (C2)
Local safety consultant 2	Full time health and safety consultant at local site	Company 2 (C2)
HR consultant 1	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 2 (C2)
HR consultant 2	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 2 (C2)

These interviews provided me with detailed qualitative data about the meanings, values and practices of intra-organizational experts at my research sites. These interviews were the basis of my formally coded analysis. However to better understand the organizational contexts of my four research sites I also collected additional data from both local line managers and local employee representatives at all four research sites (n=15). In this way I had detailed knowledge about the operational context of each of my research sites. However these were solely used for background information about the research sites.

The quality of my data collection rested among other things upon whether or not the intra-organizational experts were providing me with personal and therefore potentially sensitive data that included their opinions on office politics, the supervisors, and the general management of the companies. I have taken steps to ensure full anonymity for all participants and the companies they represent. This means that I have not provided any detailed descriptions of the production processes in the companies, or what they produce, nor have I provided any detailed geographical details about them. As for the informants I have made sure that they cannot be identified in any way in my dissertation.

3.3 Coding of qualitative data

I transcribed all interviews with my informants into text, and used Nvivo 11 to structure and code the data afterwards. To do this I used the coding strategy prescribed by Miles and Huberman (1994). This means that the data was initially structured by using an open descriptive coding strategy. This means a process developing codes that purely describes the content of a particular sentence or section of text (e.g. 'history of work environment function', 'organization of the work environment function', 'educational background'). Furthermore I developed a set of interpretive codes where I interpreted the content into very basic but nonetheless analytical categories (i.e. 'operational task', 'strategic task' 'occupational identity'). Both coding processes were done simultaneously and in iterations to make sure that all qualitative data was coded with the same codes. Furthermore in this process I would frequently delete redundant codes, merge related codes or divide codes into subcodes to clarify differences.

Finally besides this iterative process of structuring and developing a coding scheme, I also employed explanatory pattern coding schemes (Miles & Huberman 1994; Silver & Lewins 2014) for each of the analyses of Paper 1 and Paper 3. Both are further explained in the papers themselves.

The three papers of the dissertation – outline and abstracts

The main analyses of my dissertation are found in the three following papers, each of which are complete papers in their own right when it comes to topics and research questions. However, at the same time, all are interrelated as they contribute to answering my overall research question and together illustrate the development of work environment management in Denmark.

In this dissertation I investigate how institutional dynamics occur on multiple analytical levels, from the societal abstract values to concrete enactment by individual reflexive actors on the organizational level. The papers each address dynamics on and between the levels, and together they explain the dynamics on all levels.

The first paper is *Ordering Work Environment: An integrated framework of institutional logics and critical realism.* The paper is in many ways the central piece in my dissertation, as it can be seen as foundational for the two other papers. The contribution of the paper is twofold. First it contributes to the theoretical discussions on institutional logics by combining the perspective with a critical realist framework. Thereby the paper provides a way to understand institutional logics and social structures composed of elements from multiple analytical levels and ontological domains. The paper proposes a distinction between abstract institutional orders on a societal level and their mediation on the field level through emergent social structures called institutional logics that are enacted inside organizations into real practice. Empirically the paper tells the story about how the field of work environment management has developed since the passing of the work environment act of 1975, and how three institutional field level logics have emerged historically in the field, and how these all offer intra-organizational actors and organizations distinct means and ends in work environment efforts. These logics are the *logic of advocacy* that evolved around values of participation and impartiality in the work environment efforts, the *logic of compliance* that emphasizes systematic and rational approaches to work environment within the organizations, and finally the *logic of commitment* that combines work environment management with performance enhancing management practices of individuality and competence development. Each logic is analyzed through an iterative analytical comparison between historical event sequences, contemporary qualitative interviews with intra-organizational experts and the ideal typical institutional orders of the inter-institutional system. Through this process three distinct logics emerged. The paper offers both a historical analysis of the emergence of the social structures, as well as examples on the concrete contemporary enactment inside organizations. The paper is co-authored by

Associate Professor Susanne Boch Waldorff from Copenhagen Business School. The paper is currently submitted and under review.

The second paper in my dissertation is *Commitment or Compliance? Institutional Logics of Work Environment Management.* In this paper I focus on two of the three logics mentioned above, the logics of compliance and commitment. These are the two logics that are linked to the corporate order, and each can be seen as the result of the mainstreaming and professionalization of work environment management. Therefore this paper focuses on the managerial aspects of the two logics and their roots in different management theories with all the resulting implications for their stance on employees, managerial roles and work environment itself. The two logics, compliance and commitment, have their roots in the rational systems approach that emphasizes goal specificity, rational behavior and systematic procedures in the case of the former, and in a natural systems approach with a focus on human relations, informal hierarchies and groups, and therapeutic managerial practices in the case of the latter. The paper is an investigation into the mainstreaming of the work environment (Hasle, Seim, & Refslund 2016) into central organizational functions and structures, and both the ideational developments that this entails, as well as the potential practical consequences for organizational work environment practices. The paper is a theoretical paper that uses the institutional logics perspective as a framework through which to discuss how work environment management has developed and the potential ramifications of this development. To underpin this discussion the paper uses examples from Scandinavian empirical work environment research that highlights some of these mainstreaming tendencies. The paper is co-authored by Professor Peter Hasle, Aalborg University, and has been published in the Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies.

The third paper is called *Institutional actorhood: Intra-organizational experts in the face of institutional complexity*. Where the two abovementioned papers investigate the 'upper' levels in the figure above, the third paper especially focuses on the individual actors within the organizations, their relationships with the field of work environment and their roles in the organizational hierarchies they are a part of. The paper shows that the roles of the actors are more complex and layered than what previous descriptions of professionals, occupational groups and institutional fields have shown, and thus my paper expands the literature on organizational actors and institutional fields. Being an intra-organizational actor is not just a question of belonging to an institutional field and trying to impose its norms, practices and values into the individual organization. On the contrary the paper provides empirical examples of how existing tensions between the field and organizations are actually enacted in modern organizations by intra-organizational experts as well. Through an analysis of the experts' accounts of both their relationship to the organizational field of work environment as well as to their own organization I end up describing four possible reflexive positions which the role of intra-organizational expert can be approached from. Furthermore I describe how the widely diffused practice of 'certified management systems' (CMS) is interpreted from each of these reflexive positions. Thus this third and final paper clarifies the separation and foundational

difference between actors and social structures, and how actors' reflexivity is something more than institutional logics and that this is what determines the difference in enactments of said logics within organizations.

Concluding discussion

In my dissertation I investigate the multi-level institutional dynamics that simultaneously constitute work environment management in Danish companies and organizations. I explore how work environment management and the developments in this field are an illustration of inherent tensions between the institutional orders of the state and the corporation, but also how abstract institutional orders filter into the organizational field and how these abstract tensions result in emerging institutional logics that provide field actors with values and lenses through which to understand work environment management. Finally I investigate how actors within companies and organizations are positioned to understand and interpret these logics. In combining these perspectives I seek to answer my research question:

How do intra-organizational experts in work environment manage institutional pressures and demands of work environment improvements, and how do these institutional pressures and demands change over time in the field of work environment management?

Through the dissertation I have shown how work environment professionals draw upon available institutional logics in the field when they have to implement practices and policies into organizational practice. Logics that contain a wide array of distinct means, ends, organizational theories and values. At same time the intra-organizational experts also have different reflexive positions from which they can engage with the field level logics. Reflexive positions that can be explained based on whether or not the experts are closely aligned with the field of work environment, and whether they orient themselves towards strategic or operational processes within their own companies. Logics in the field are themselves emergent social structures based on both the overarching institutionalized orders in society, as well as historic tendencies and developments within the work environment field.

In the following subsections I highlight the collected contributions that my study brings to the table, both in terms of theoretical and practical implications. Furthermore I dedicate a subsection to discuss the limitations of my study and how my findings in the dissertation point towards new research possibilities.

5.1 Theoretical contributions

To answer my research question I have used different theoretical constructs on multiple levels of analyses. I have investigated the character of the changes in the

external institutional pressures and demands to companies, how these are mediated to organizations, and last but not least how intra-organizational actors interpret and enact these into their organizations. This also means that my PhD dissertation contributes to theoretical discussions in the field of organization and management studies (OMT) in general, and institutional theory in particular.

5.1.1 Institutional logics

First of all my research contributes to the further development of the concept of institutional logics. I initially came across the concept early on in my PhD research, when I was still a novice regarding institutional theory, but sensed that the perspective might be useful to explain differences in the way that actors understood and conducted work environment efforts within companies and organizations. However, as my dissertation describes, central concepts and relationships in the logics perspective were, and still are, in need of clarification and re-evaluation, which proved challenging to my initial analytical endeavors. My dissertation therefore clarifies some of these weaker links.

The relationship between the institutional orders and institutional logics on the field level is a good example of this. As Berg Johansen and Boch Waldorff (2015) point out in their review, many studies do not acknowledge the divide between these two levels of analysis, leading either to the conflation of orders and logics, or to the description of logics in fields or even in organizations without connecting them to the inter-institutional system of orders. The very thing that puts the 'institutional' in 'institutional logics', one might add.

To describe how work environment management in Denmark has evolved it was necessary to clarify these issues. One could not simply see the development in the field as a shift from a state order to a corporate order. First of all two separate logics evolved in the field as the order of the corporation became more integrated into the work environment management. So the order of the corporation did not translate into one field level logic, but into two, simply because the values and practices encompassed in an institutional order are always broad and can be interpreted in many ways (see the intra-institutional complexity argument of Meyer and Höllerer, 2016). Importantly, while my analysis in Papers 1 and 2 shows that the logic of compliance is related to the order of the corporation, I also describe how it relates to the order of the state as well (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012: 164). This point to the fact that while the field level logics are interconnected with institutional orders, they are by no means identical to them. Their relationship is instead characterized by what Thornton et al. (2012) refer to as 'near decomposability' (p. 60), a concept which has been overlooked in later logics studies, but that in my view is crucial to the analytical and explanatory power of the perspective, and which I have therefore used and empirically underpinned in my dissertation. By restating and empirically illustrating the near decomposable and therefore 'analogous' (Thornton et al. 2012: 60) composition of the inter-institutional system my dissertation can therefore be seen as an argument against atomistic use of the logics concept in analyses that do not connect local field logics to their institutional root

orders Furthermore against downwards conflationary analyses using the perspective that describe abstract orders such as the market or the profession as directly and solely responsible for social action in different fields.

Following this I also seek to explain the process of emergence of field level logics. In Papers 1 and 2 I show how field level logics can be seen as historic dynamics contingent on specific events and developments within the field of work environment, and how the field level logics of advocacy, compliance and commitment are therefore to be seen as emergent ideational structures that enable and inhibit action within the field of work environment. As such the concrete developments and structures in Danish society in general, and on the labor market in particular, shape how the orders are interpreted. Therefore the shift from a state order to a corporate order in itself is not by any means a new or surprising development, as this has been the case in regulation and governance in the majority of developed countries over the last twenty years. However the concrete flavor, the concrete blends and segregations that constitute the field level logics and their particularity is caused by the concrete Danish context. The logic of advocacy is contingent on specific traditions and negotiations on the Danish labor market, that led to the formation of an independent participatory OHS, instead of company centered safety engineers as has been the case in other comparable countries (Daudigeos 2013; Hale 2014; Swuste et al. 2014; Swuste, Gulijk, & Zwaard 2010). The same goes for the logics of compliance or commitment. This contribution therefore highlights the historicity of institutional field level logics, and how the historical emergence and the analysis of this "…analytical history of emergence" (Margaret S Archer 1995: 91) becomes an unavoidable part of working with the institutional logics perspective. By doing so the perspective can truly explain how larger societal developments and smaller organizational developments are interconnected, without giving explanatory primacy to either, thereby fulfilling the promises of Friedland and Alford's original paper of both 'bringing society back in' and of a multi-level analysis that can explain how society, organizations and individuals are interconnected (Friedland & Alford 1991).

5.1.2 Organizational fields

These logics are mediated through the organizational field - a central theoretical construct of institutional theory. The concept describes how, through closeness and relatedness, groups of organizations, regulating bodies, customers and civil society organizations share institutional logics that guide their behavior and organizing. My research contributes to the concept of organizational fields by exploring how logics emerge as and stabilize the ideational content in fields, as well as how actors are related to each other and to the fields' institutions and organizations and what this means for actor practices within organizations. Therefore my research also highlights an unexplored paradox within institutional theory: the role of institutional carriers within organizations, when fields are not transmitting one settled logic, but are defined by institutional complexity and multiple logics.

The paradox rises because of the double character of organizational fields, and the fact that institutional scholars have tended to focus on one side without the other. Organizational fields have an ideational dimension of shared meanings and institutionalized logics, and a relational dimension of networks, organizations and structural arrangements. These two dimensions are both integral parts of the field concept (Hoffman & Ventresca 2002; R. E. Meyer 2008). On the one hand the field of work environment management is an ideationally complex field of three different institutional logics of advocacy, compliance and commitment. On the other it is a hodgepodge of different actors, regulating bodies, and field-configuring events all related to each other in a network. Both are equally important to understand why work environment management is carried out the way it is in Danish organizations.

On the one hand the relational composition of the field is important for the development of institutional logics. An example is the development of the logic of advocacy that had to do with the strong Danish traditions of corporatism and thus of the social parties helping formulate and execute legislation. The same goes for how the logic of commitment gradually emerged helped by the entrance of organizational psychologists and HR-departments into the management of psycho-social issues. On the other hand however the ideational composition and development in the field have also drawn new entrants into work environment management. Take for example how new regulation and an internal wish from within the work environment field resulted in a stronger emphasis on systems, registration and bureaucracy in the form of the logic of compliance, and how this again drew private certifying agencies without any work environment connections into the field level, and environment, risk and quality managers into the organizational management of the issues as well. I thereby show in my research that fields must be conceptualized as two distinct but closely related concepts (as also suggested by Meyer (2008)), where changes and challenges in one will create a ripple effect that changes and challenges the other as well. However if studies continue to keep either a strict focus on only ideational or relational changes in the institutional composition of organizational fields, then this interdependency will not be clear, and as a result we could potentially lose important insights theoretically and practically. In my PhD this double character of the field was key to my understanding of why the intra-organizational actors whose practices and interpretations of work environment I was interested in would not identify as work environment actors within the company even though their jobs and tasks by all accounts should identify them as such. Or on the other hand why work environment actors who were strongly embedded in the field and its institutions, had a hard time cooperating with other organizational actors who they, at least on paper, were equal to in the organizational hierarchy.

5.1.3 Institutional actorhood

This also leads to the third theoretical contribution of my research. The analysis of intra-organizational experts as institutional actors in their own right, and not just as carriers of institutional meaning (W. R. Scott, 2008; Zilber, 2002).

Even though the actor's individual agency is emphasized in both Friedland and Alford's (1991) and Thornton and colleagues' (2012) foundational texts on the logic perspective, individual agency has been somewhat overlooked in many empirical logics studies (Delbridge & Edwards 2013). Agency has often been conflated into the institutional logics competing in a given field, so for example a professional logic is made inseparable from the professionals in the organization (W. R. Scott 2008; Pallas, Fredriksson, & Wedlin 2016), or that different logics can be found in different organizational sub-systems, and that the logics therefore only interact when the actors of the sub-systems interact (Pache & Santos, 2010). However, as Delbridge and Edwards (2013) point out, this does not fulfill the theoretical promises of the logics perspective, which (as described above) are characterized by not only 'near-decomposability' between orders and field level logics, but more importantly in this regard also by 'partial autonomy' between institutional structures and actors (Thornton et al., 2012: 60).

In my research I have shown how the institutional logics of the field do not fully explain intra-organizational behavior. The values and practices within the logics are enacted from various angles by the agents as I show in Paper 3. These angles stem from the differentiated reflexive positions that the intra-organizational experts can assume in the organization. Each ideal-typical reflexive position is comprised of both institutional and organizational orientations which again are composed of both formal and structural places in the field and the organization, as well as subjective orientations toward both. These ideal-typical reflexive positions then show that actors are not fully embedded in institutional logics of the field, but that they can 'plug into' them and enact them with the positions as their point of reference.

5.1.4 Institutional theory and critical realism

Critical realism has informed many of the theoretical discussions and questions I raise in this dissertation. As stated prior this is not by any means a combination that is my idea alone. Delbridge and Edwards (2013), Leca and Naccache (2006) and Palmer, Biggart, and Dick (2008) present a similar theoretical combination as potentially rewarding, and Suddaby, Viale, and Gendron (2016) while not stating it explicitly also draw upon realist conceptions of reflexivity in their work. My PhD can be seen as a furthering and exploration of this theoretical combination, and as an argument for a closer relation between institutional theory on the one hand and critical realist thought on the other. This is therefore the fourth theoretical contribution of my dissertation.

Institutional theory has its roots in symbolic interactionism and therefore naturally the main concern has been the institutionalization of meaning and symbols within organizations and organizational life. However it is important to remember that the symbolic and habitual explanatory models cannot explain every detail of organizational dispositions. Organizations are more than just meaning and ideational negotiations and processes. Organizations are also power relations, economic relations, technology, tightly coupled productions systems, ICT-structures and supplier relationships, machines, raw materials and so forth. And while a great many

of these areas are of course subject to institutionalized beliefs and symbolic actions, they are by no means the only factors that make organizations function. Critical realism is a framework through which we can understand the role of institutional logics in organizations today, and how they can 'work' in concert with other mechanisms such as the ones listed above here.

First of all, as I describe in Paper 1, critical realism can help us understand institutional logics and their effect on the world around them and on actors in the world. The argument that I present in this paper is that institutional logics on the field level are so-called 'mediating concepts' between overall abstract values in society and the social action concretely happening on the ground, thus mediating between the 'real' domain and the 'empirical' domain. Or put in another way these field level logics are how abstract values become real, how they manifest themselves and thereby how they exercise their causal efficacy in the social world and condition actions within this. The institutional field level logics are therefore to be considered as emergent social structures in the words of Archer (Margaret S Archer, 1995). Crucially a critical realist reading of the logics concept recognizes that the socially discursive reality only accounts for one part of the 'real' that conditions actors' possibilities and reflections in the world – nature, materiality and practical skills are also their own kind of 'real' as both Fleetwood and Archer state (Margaret S Archer, 2010; Fleetwood, 2005). And therefore institutional logics in a field do not explain everything about social outcomes in organizations, but are rather to be seen as one component in a given organizational outcome. Thereby in a recursive process of emergence with the material and natural reality that surrounds any given organization, the technology present in the industry and finally the reflexivity of the actors enacting the logics, an organizational outcome is reached. Crucially, each of these parts contains their own causal potentials that must be understood individually in order to understand any social situation.

As I have already described above the actors are reflexive beyond what the institutional logics available to them entail. And with this reflexivity they interpret institutional logics and enact them into meaningful practices. My insistence on the reflexivity of actors in their institutional dealings has its roots in another core tenet of critical realism: the analytical and ontological separation of actors and structures. Actors are, as described above, not fully embedded in institutionalized contexts of meaning and practice. All societal actors are by definition embedded in more than one institutional context, each with their own logics. Furthermore actors have individual histories, biographies, socialization experiences and relationships, and finally actors have different abilities, practical dispositions and physical traits that also color their stances towards any social reality they have to perceive and act in (Margaret S Archer, 2010).

This is of course self-evident bordering on being tautological. However the implications of a separation between actors and structures in institutional theory are quite wide ranging. The theory of structuration put forward by Antony Giddens (Giddens, 1984) has been influential in the way theorizations on institutional theory

in general, and institutional logics in particular, have conceived the relationship between structure and agency as mutually constitutive and recursive (Barley & Tolbert 1997; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury 2012). Thus in many studies, actors and social structures (institutions and logics) have been conflated into analyses of enactments and instantiations of institutions in action. However these forms of theorization have a tendency toward what Archer calls "central conflation" (Margaret S Archer, 1998) which collapses structure and agency into non-separable entities of continual instantiation. In this way the individual causal potentials in both are somewhat overlooked and thereby research misses an analytical opportunity to understand how actors and structures are interdependently linked in relationships in the constitution of our social reality.

By insisting on distinctions and differences in institutional studies I do not see any social reality as being simply the result of the content of the reified attributes of institutional structures and logics, or of the purposive institutional work or entrepreneurship of actors. Nor do I only see the components of the structure that becomes resources for the actors to instantiate (Mutch, 2010), but I see them as an emergent result of the relationship between structure and agency, where both possesses causal potentials and abilities that under different circumstances could work in another way.

Critical realism is not a replacement theory for institutional theory. Instead I propose that critical realism should be seen as the overall social ontology by which we can understand the basic relationships within society (Margaret S Archer, 1998). Institutional theory and institutional logics in my view are what Archer calls 'practical social theories' (Margaret S Archer, 1998: 194), thus they are perspectives that explain how organizations and organizational actors institutionalize and renegotiate meanings and practices, and how these are embedded into fields and groups of actors with various carriers and mechanisms. However there are other interesting theories that can explain other mechanisms and processes within organizations and organizational fields. And as long as they are fully commensurable with basic principles of the social ontology of critical realism they can easily be used next to institutional explanations of organizational behavior. Categorizing institutional theory and institutional logics as practical social theories subsumed under a larger social ontology of realism does not limit them or inhibit them as theories, but on the contrary help them connect to other theories and paradigms without being bogged down in minutiae of paradigmatic wars and endless discussions on smaller epistemological points. In this way institutional theory can in such a framework exist next to paradigms as varied as contingency theory (Van de Ven, Ganco, & Hinings, 2013), performativity theory (Gond, Cabantous, Harding, & Learmonth, 2016), theory on organizational culture (Martin, 1992), theory of power relationships in organizations (Clegg, 2010), theory on organizational sensemaking (Brown, Colville, & Pye, 2014), or theory on industrial relations in society (R. Hyman, 2001). In such a way a marriage of critical realist ontology and institutional theories of explanations can help open up institutional theories toward other interesting explanations and engagements with other lively theoretical debates, and

thereby really engage in explaining organizational factors and dynamics on the micro-level.

5.2 Practical and empirical contributions

The analyses that I have presented in this dissertation are also highly relevant to organizational practioners, politicians, regulators and other work environment actors in Denmark.

The first, and maybe most important practical implication, is the fact that work environment is not a unitary concept, but rather a concept that is composed of a multitude of meanings, practices, actors and symbols that can be assembled in a number of different modes. Paper 1 highlights this fact. In the paper I use the institutional logics perspective to describe how the field of work environment management is composed of three distinct field level logics: the logic of advocacy, the logic of compliance and the logic of commitment. Each of them has a unique history of emergence within the field, and the three logics together are the preliminary result of the historical dynamics of work environment in Denmark from the passing of the work environment act of 1975 up until today. In this way the three logics also represent how larger developments in Danish society can be traced in the field. Furthermore the logics are not only historical but are all enacted within organizations by various intra-organizational work environment experts. Hereby work environment management tells the story of the Danish society, the field of work environment and the inner life of Danish organizations all at once.

The incorporation of the institutional logics perspective to explain changes in the way organizations manage their work environment is therefore a contribution that can help actors in the field understand how work environment policies and practices travel and are received by organizational actors and field actors alike. These insights can help us understand why interventions and policies in work environment are notoriously hard to implement in a functional way, and why it can be so hard to govern a complex field like this. Even though 'work environment' on the surface has a pretty clear and lucid meaning for most actors, as I have shown there are multiple means, ends, frames and values that often contradict each other, all of which are mobilized by actors when they seek to understand and interpret new legislation or prescriptions about new policies. By understanding these different logics that can be mobilized practioners in the field can design and shape policy and regulation to be understood within these frames.

My analysis of the three logics can therefore be a lense through which we can view work environment interventions and policies. How policies and interventions are rooted in widely different conceptions of means, ends, organizational design and the role of management and employees respectively. Thereby using the logics

perspective it is possible to understand how and why work environment policies sometimes fail, why multiple interventions sometimes can counteract one another in a company, and how work environment policies and interventions can lead to unintended consequences. One example of this can be seen in the handling of psycho social work environment issues. As I have described this one area where some companies and field actors employ a commitment-logic to understand the challenges and issues. This leads to a focus on 'softer' elements like culture and social capital, and efforts to strengthen individual employee resilience. However at the same time organizations are at the same time mandated to systematically do workplace assessments and often audits to provide certifying agencies and in some cases regulators with satisfying answers. Tools that treat risks as functions of systems, not people. Another example could be how the logic of advocacy prescribes participation and discretion of employees and line managers in defining their own problems and priorities work environment, and can therefore be in conflict with tools of management systems or company-wide culture changes prescribed by the logics of compliance and commitment. Therefore the study of work environment practices and policies through a logics lense can help all actors from both organizations and from the regulative and political systems understand that the prescriptions to organizational interventions often are confusing and in conflict with one another, and that they can often directly counteract one another. Therefore it is important that regulators and field level actors reflect upon if the program theories and underlying theories and logics are compatible. To think work environment interventions as 'orchestrations' as described by Hasle et.al (Hasle, Limborg, Grøn, & Refslund, 2017).

This brings me to another contribution of my study: the introduction and theorization of work environment as an organizational field. I believe that the field concept goes a long way in explaining and clarifying relationships and developments that actors of the field might take for granted, but which have not been theorized sufficiently in previous work environment research. The field concept points out that the group of actors who are active in developing work environment in Denmark are broader than just politicians, the organizations or the work environment authorities. On the contrary they all play important roles in developing policies and practices, and in their internal relationships and with the entrance of new actors onto the field such as certifying agencies or HR departments the field has kept on being a dynamic arena for work environment development. The concept of the field, I believe, can be a useful way for practioners of all backgrounds and specialties to see what space and network policies and prescriptions are both developed and released into. Furthermore my research describes how the field has both an ideational and a relational dimension and how the two are mutually constitutive and interdependent. The field of work environment is the sum of all the actors and the way they are related to each other, and the relational structures that are inscribed in the regulation and in the additional provisions. Thus the field is made up of the whole official governance structure of work environment authorities, organizations, council, sector councils, research centers as well as other important actors such as independent work environment advisors, trade unions, employers'

associations, certifying agencies, researchers from universities and last but not least intra-organizational experts. Within this relational field are also multiple 'field-configuring events' such as the annual work environment conference, workshops and meetings that gather actors from all across the field. Then of course the field is also an ideational field of institutional complexity with three different institutional logics of work environment management available for actors, all of which offer means and ends for work environment efforts. In this way the field concept, and especially the conceptualization of fields as two distinct but interdependent dynamics, can help practioners such as regulators and policymakers understand how interventions in the one will have a ripple effect on the other. Hopefully this understanding can also help them to avoid the unintended consequences that can result from interventions and implementations.

A related contribution of my dissertation is that it clarifies how the widely described tendencies towards 'mainstreaming' (Hasle, Seim, & Refslund 2016), professionalization (Seim, Limborg, & Jensen 2015; Seim, Møller, & Limborg 2016; Limborg 2001), or 'HR-fication' (Kamp & Nielsen 2013) play out on the micro-level of organizational action.

First of all it is an interesting development that the logic of advocacy is also enacted by professional intra-organizational experts within the organizations. One could have expected to this case to be a clear cut example of an issue that is professionalized and rationalized and thus an example of how the old logic of participation and democracy that developed in tandem with the development of the independent OHS, was replaced by more corporate 'slick' and professional ways of doing business. But this was not the case. Instead a number of actors put great emphasis on the logic of advocacy and enact it as part of their daily tasks as professional intra-organizational experts. Thereby values and practices that on the surface can be seen as anathemas to modern corporate cultures and systems are enacted in Danish organizations on a daily basis by people who are paid to attend to the organizations' corporate interests. This also somewhat refutes the most pessimistic predictions about how the introduction of professional work environment management inside Danish organizations by default means the transformation of work environment as a matter of workplace democracy and rights, into a cold calculative matter of CSR and bureaucracy.

However the logics of both compliance and commitment are also enacted within the organizations, and these are, as described elsewhere, both at least partly rooted in the corporate order with its related values of efficiency, corporate culture and hierarchy. In this way these two logics are related to the processes of professionalization and mainstreaming described above. These logics exactly represent how work environment management converges with organizational areas and thereby ideas that were previously unrelated. They are also the best representation of the widening of the work environment management field that I have described in Paper 1 and Paper 3. However these two logics are at the same time somewhat contradictory. As I lay out in Paper 2 the two logics are quite different in terms of theories and concepts of

organization, management and employees. The logic of compliance is a systematic approach that has its roots in rational systems approaches such as Heinrich's safety management philosophy (Heinrich, Petersen, & Roos 1980) or the DuPont systems (Wokutch & VanSandt 2000) where agents are seen as fully rational and 'purposeful' (W. Richard Scott & Davis 2007), and which emphasizes formalized systems and goal specificity. Therefore the means towards better work environment in this logic becomes hinged upon creating systems and procedures that will control the variables can generate unsafe or unhealthy situations and thereby prevent them. On the other hand the logic of commitment is rooted in various theories of the 'natural systems approach' (W. Richard Scott& Davis 2007) such as modern 'soft' HRM theories of personal development and individuality, and the preceding therapeutic management ideas of Mayo, and McGregor's Y theory. Thus this logic emphasizes the individual employee as both the main root cause of and the main solution to work environment issues.

The three institutional logics play out side by side within the organizations I have researched, and are enacted by the actors in different situations. This also means that they co-exist peacefully in some instances, and in others are enacted in a conflictual manner by actors. In this way the three logics represent a persisting tension in the field today, which is present in every enactment of work environment. When a compliance logic is enacted in the form of implementation of the OHSAS18001 certified management system then this also means that the organization must to some degree deal with an abstract average of the employees and their behavior, not with individuals with their own unique set of problems and challenges. In this way the tension between the 'system' and the 'human' or the compliance and commitment logics is evident. On the other hand the registration and data surveillance of the compliance logic can also aid the organization when discussing how work environment and sickness absence can be respectively improved and reduced, and thus the compliance logic becomes an argument for the commitment logic in this particular constellation. In the same vein the logic of compliance and advocacy can also be mutually enforcing, as when local safety employees use graphs, data and systematic thinking to convince the production engineers to pay attention to work environment, or when the OHSAS certificate becomes a reason for widening organizational discussions and increasing attention to the cause of work environment. On the other hand the logics of compliance and advocacy can also be enacted in conflict with each other, when the cost of accidents becomes the primary argument for which work environment problems should be dealt with, or when a certifying agency audits work environment processes and written records, without paying attention to the actual health and safety of the particular employees at the site.

This brings me to the final practical contribution of my study: the typology of intra-organizational actor positions in terms of both their relationship to the field and to their own organizations. During my studies I have observed how different reflexive positions are articulated by the intra-organizational actors themselves about their roles and daily tasks, as well as about their relationship to the field of work environment. Some actors are very much embedded within the field and the

structures mentioned above. They go to conferences and meetings, some worked in OHS in its time, and have educational backgrounds that point to work environment, health and safety as a specific interest of the person. Other actors are new to the field, and while they have to attend to central work environment issues such as psycho-social work environment, data management and maintenance of the certified management system, they are not particularly enthusiastic about work environment in itself. Instead work environment is just another organizational assignment that is given to them in order to be solved, along with recruiting, financial risk assessment, environmental protection and human resource strategies of productivity and performance. This diversification is related to the widening of the field, and the professionalization of work environment management within the companies. With the emergence of new logics and new demands in the field, organizations have increasingly delegated assignments to actors with the necessary experience on management systems, HR policies or risk management from other parts of the organizational hierarchies.

And this leads to my final point about work environment in Denmark. As I have described there has been a wish from core actors in the field to include and integrate work environment concerns and actors in central organizational processes such as strategy and procurement. The actors are convinced that work environment should be moved away from the 'side-car' and into the board rooms and strategy meetings. This overall aim has guided much work environment regulation in the last few decades, right up until the most recent revision of the legislation in 2010, where this integrative aim was evident. However what my dissertation clearly shows is that while work environment has indeed moved into these very central organizational spheres, this has also meant that actors and organizational sub-systems somewhat alien to the traditions and normativity that has evolved through history, have been entrusted with core responsibilities of work environment management, and thereby it will be easier to partition work environment and give psycho-social issues to the HR specialists and organizational psychologists, and the physical to the environmental or quality managers. And therefore that the special Danish tradition of work environment as a holistic and all-inclusive concept could be weakened in the future if the development and increased complexity continues.

All of this point to a discussion that is necessary to have for actors in the work environment field in Denmark. Whether the time has come to establish a proper 'work environment education' in Denmark? To secure that future work environment experts in companies keep on viewing work environment as a whole, and not just as matters of either management systems or well-being, but as a holistic concept of safety and health for all employees within the company walls. A proper work environment education could ensure that graduates had the skills necessary to talk work environment in various sub-systems where it must be talked about. That they could speak with HR policy makers about social capital, but also with quality and environmental officers about management systems implementation. That they can present to people in board rooms and to the work environment groups at the

production line, with eyes for both organizational factors of corporate growth, efficiency and profit, as well as for prescriptions from the institutional field.

5.3 Limitations and future research directions

First of all, this study is a qualitative study and thus I do not claim that the theoretical frameworks and empirical findings of the dissertation can be generalized with certainty to intra-organizational experts in all Danish organizations.

The particularities of each research site could have been utilized even more in my analyses. There are however a number of reasons why the particular organizations appear rather generic in the descriptions and analyses. First of all my research interest was focused on the intra-organizational experts and the way they relate to the institutional field around them, as well as on their roles in organizational hierarchies. Therefore the specificities and particular developments of each organization were only described as far as they were essential in granting an understanding of an account or action from the intra-organizational experts. But more importantly the choice was made to protect the anonymity of my informants. I quickly realized that in order to answer my research question thoroughly I was dependant on the informants being open and honest about their work, their interpretations, their conflicts and their opinions on management, colleagues and cooperative relationships with other organizations. To ensure this honesty and openness I had to guarantee their anonymity. And since Denmark is a small country, with a relatively small number of very large manufacturing organizations and hospitals, I could not describe production processes, products, geographical details or other recognizable features without potentially disclosing the name of the organizations and thereby compromising the anonymity of the intra-organizational experts I interviewed. This means that the organizational perspectives could have been represented more strongly in my analyses. A good example of this is the relationship between the specifics of the production technology and the intra-organizational experts' enactment of work environment policies and practices. This could be researched in a longitudinal research project in a holistic single case study within a single organization. An interesting perspective would then be to follow the implementation of a new regulation, policy or wide ranging practice in the organization, and follow this implementation process in its entirety. In such a study observation and techniques such as 'shadowing' could be utilized to record the intra-organizational experts' concrete enactment of institutional logics at meetings and interactions with other organizational actors. A study such as this would also present the opportunity to study the relationship between institutional pressures, enactments and the actual technological realities present in organizations.

Another limitation related to the methodological choices in my dissertation is the lack of interaction data within the field level of work environment management.

While the interview data on the organizational level ensures insights into the local enactments within the organizations, the data on the field level of work environment management is only historic in character (counting here the interviews with the expert practioner as well, because those interviews were only about historic events in the field). This means that I cannot describe the interactive processes that led to diffusion and changes of field level practices. The literature on institutional theory has already produced many examples and theorizations that explain these processes (some examples are the literature on institutional work (T. Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca 2011) or institutional entrepreneurship (Julie Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum 2009)). Still I believe that more data on the social interactions on the field level would have strengthened my study, and produced a more nuanced 'story' to tell. It would have been especially interesting to see how the interpreted practices on the organizational level were communicated to other field actors through practioner networks, field configuring events and through independent consultants who act as carriers between organizations. I believe that ethnographic methods of observation and shadowing could have been a major advantage, as well as qualitative text analysis (Mohr, 1998) of field level data such as manuals and presentations from e.g. the Sector Work Environment Councils or from field configuring events such as The Work Environment Conferences. This could be an avenue for future research that holds a lot of promise.

Finally a limitation of my study is that I could have used a mixed-methods approach and utilized quantitative data on organizational implementations of various practices. For example, I could have used data that could point to how widely diffused the different institutional logics and their related practices are. Furthermore we still don't have any data that shows exactly how widely present intra-organizational work environment experts are in Danish organizations. Both limitations could have been overcome by the use of a survey method.

Another limitation of the study is that I could have used insights from industrial relations theories, as well as theories on power relations within organizations, to better understand the role of intra-organizational experts in terms of their relation to the local work environment groups and organizations. This represents an interesting avenue for future research as well. This would thereby also present an opportunity to research a theoretical relationship between institutional theory and theories on power and political negotiation. The very fact that this relationship is under-researched is often a criticism fielded towards institutional theory. To research this one could conduct a study that examines how the relationship between experts, representatives and line managers is negotiated and enacted by using ethnographic data collection methods such as conversational analysis (Larsson & Lundholm 2013). Similarly, it would be interesting to research organizational negotiations and formulations of work environment strategies: how are the various institutional logics of work environment management factored into the formulations of work environment goals and visions that organizations are obliged to document? Furthermore how do the intra-organizational experts participate in these strategy formulations?

Finally an interesting research project could investigate how theories of occupational medicine, occupational psychology and ergonomics are theorized into concrete practices by field level actors. This would provide an opportunity to study the performativity of scientific knowledge (Gond et al., 2016), and the way that new results on for example psychological risk factors are performed into organizational practice by field and organizational actors.

References:

Arbejdsministeriet. (1995). *Psykosociale risikofaktorer i arbejdslivet*. København.

Archer, M. S. (1995). *Realist social theory: the morphogenetic approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. S. (1998). Introduction: Realism in the social sciences. In M. S. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, & A. Norrie (Eds.), *Critical Realism: Essential Readings* (pp. 189–205). Oxon: Routledge.

Archer, M. S. (2003). *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation*. Cambridge University Press'.

Archer, M. S. (2010). Introduction: The rerflexive re-turn. In M. S. Archer (Ed.), *Coversations About Reflexivity* (pp. 1–14). Routledge.

Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (1997). Institutionalization and Structuration: Studying the Links between Action and Institution. *Organization Studies*, *18*(1), 93–117.

Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(6), 1419–1440.

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.

Berg Johansen, C., & Boch Waldorff, S. (2015). What are Institutional Logics - and Where is the Perspective Taking Us? *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2015*(1), 14380–14380.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Anchor Books.

Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS IN ORGANIZATIONS: EXPLAINING THEIR VARIED NATURE AND IMPLICATIONS. *Academy of Management Review*, *39*(3), 364–381.

Beskæftigelsesministeriet. Bekendtgørelse af lov om arbejdsmiljø [The Danish Work Environment Consolidation act] (2010).

Bhaskar, R. (1997). *A Realist Theory of Science*. Verso.

Binder, A. (2007). For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society*, *36*(6), 547–571.

Bjørnstad, T. C., & Steen-Johnsen, K. (2012, June 1). Beyond Planning: The Implementation of a Worksite Health Promotional Scheme. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*.

Boch Waldorff, S. (2013). Accounting for organizational innovations: Mobilizing institutional logics in translation. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *29*(3), 219–234.

Boch Waldorff, S., Reay, T., & Goodrick, E. (2013). A Tale of Two Countries: How Different Constellations of Logics Impact Action. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action (Research in the Sociology of Organizations)* (Vol. 39A, pp. 99–129). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Boxenbaum, E. (2006). Lost in Translation: The Making of Danish Diversity Management. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *49*(7), 939–948.

Boxenbaum, E., & Jonsson, S. (2008). Isomorphism, diffusion and decoupling. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 78–98). Sage London.

Boxenbaum, E., & Strandgaard Pedersen, J. (2009). Scandinavian institutionalism – A case of institutional work. In T. . B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organization* (p. 178–204.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, A. D., Colville, I., & Pye, A. (2014). Making Sense of Sensemaking in Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*, *36*(2), 265–277.

Christiansen, L. H., & Lounsbury, M. (2013). Strange Brew: Bridging Logics Via Institutional Bricolage and the Reconstitution of Organizational Identity. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action (Research in the Sociology of Organizations)* (Vol. 39B, pp. 199–232). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Clegg, S. (2010). The State, Power, and Agency: Missing in Action in Institutional Theory? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *19*(1), 4–13.

Cox, T., Taris, T. W., & Nielsen, K. (2010). Organizational interventions: Issues and challenges. *Work & Stress*, *24*(3), 217–218.

Currie, G., & Spyridonidis, D. (2016). Interpretation of Multiple Institutional Logics on the Ground: Actors Position, their Agency and Situational Constraints in Professionalized Contexts. *Organization Studies*, *37*(1), 77–97.

Danermark, B., Ekström, M., Jacobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. C. (2002). *Explaining Society: Critical realism in the social sciences*. Routledge.

Daudigeos, T. (2013). In Their Profession's Service: How Staff Professionals Exert Influence in Their Organization. *Journal of Management Studies*, *50*(5), 722–749.

Daudigeos, T., Boutinot, A., & Jaumier, S. (2013). Taking Stock of Institutional Complexity: Anchoring a pool of institutional logics into the interinstitutional system. *Institutional Logics in Action*, *39*, 319–350.

Delbridge, R., & Edwards, T. (2013). Inhabiting Institutions: Critical Realist Refinements to Understanding Institutional Complexity and Change. *Organization Studies*, *34*(7), 927–947.

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147–160.

Dobbin, F. R. (2009). *Inventing Equal Opportunity*. Princeton University Press.

Dobbin, F., & Schoonhoven, C. B. (2010). An organizational sociology of Stanford's organization theory renaissance. In *Stanford's Organization Theory Renaissance, 1970?2000* (Vol. 28, pp. xvii–xli). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Due, J., & Madsen, J. S. (2008). The Danish model of industrial relations: erosion or renewal? *Journal of Industrial Relations*, *50*(3), 513–529.

Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional Logics and Institutional Pluralism: The Contestation of Care and Science Logics in Medical Education, 1967–2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *55*(1), 114–149.

Durand, R., Szostak, B., Jourdan, J., & Thornton, P. H. (2013). Institutional Logics as Strategic Resources. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action (Research in the Sociology of Organizations)* (Vol. 39A, pp. 165–201). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Dyreborg, J. (2011). "Safety Matters Have Become Too Important for Management to Leave it Up to the Workers" –The Nordic OSH Model Between Implicit and Explicit Frameworks. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *1*(1), 135–160.

Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal Ambiguity and Symbolic Structures: Organizational Mediation of Civil Rights Law. *American Journal of Sociology*, *97*(6), 1531–1576.

EU-OSHA. (2017). *Estimating the costs of work-related accidents and ill-health: An analysis of European data sources*.

Fleetwood, S. (2005). Ontology in Organization and Management Studies: A Critical Realist Perspective. *Organization*, *12*(2), 197–222.

Fligstein, N. (1990). *The Transformation of Corporate Control*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fligstein, N., & McAdams, D. (2012). *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford University Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *12*(2), 219–245.

Friedland, R. (2012). The Institutional Logics Perspective: A new approach to Culture, Structure, and Process. *M@n@gement*. Paris

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism In Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Gond, J.-P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2016). What Do We Mean by Performativity in Organizational and Management Theory? The Uses and Abuses of Performativity. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *18*(4), 440–463.

Goodrick, E., & Reay, T. (2011). Constellations of Institutional Logics: Changes in the Professional Work of Pharmacists. *Work and Occupations*, *38*(3), 372–416.

Gouldner, A. W. (1964). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. Free Press.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., & Suddaby, R. (2008). Introduction. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational institutionalism* (pp. 1–46). Sage.

Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, *5*(1), 317 LP-371.

Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. (2006). INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN MATURE FIELDS: THE BIG FIVE ACCOUNTING FIRMS. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(1), 27–48.

Guest, D. (2011). Human resource management and performance: still searching for

some answers. *Human Resource Management Journal*.

Gunningham, N. (2011). Strategizing compliance and enforcement: Responsive regulation and beyond. In C. Parker & V. L. Nielsen (Eds.), *Explaining Compliance: Business responses to regulation* (p. 385). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Haedicke, M. A., & Hallett, T. (2015). Research Strategies for Inhabited Institutionalism. In K. D. Elsbach & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Organizational Research: Innovative Pathways and Methods*. Routledge.

Hale, A. (2014). Foundations of safety science: A postscript. *Safety Science*, *67*, 64–69.

Hale, A. R., Guldenmund, F. W., van Loenhout, P. L. C. H., & Oh, J. I. H. (2010). Evaluating safety management and culture interventions to improve safety: Effective intervention strategies. *Safety Science*, *48*(8), 1026–1035.

Hallett, T., Shulman, D., & Fine, G. A. (2009). Peopling Organizations - The Promise of Classic Symbolic Interactionism for an Inhabited Institutionalism. In P. Adler (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Sociology and Organization Studies: Classical Foundations*. Oxford University Press.

Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. J. (2006). Inhabited Institutions: Social Interactions and Organizational Forms in Gouldner's Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. *Theory and Society*, *35*(2), 213–236.

Hasle, P. (2010). Certificeret arbejdsmiljøledelse i et historisk perspektive [Certified work environment management in a historical perspective]. In R. S. Rocha & P. Hohnen (Eds.), *Ledelse af Arbejdsmiljø - Certificering i praksis [Management of work environment - Certification in practice]* (pp. 27–37). København: Nyt Teknisk Forlag.

Hasle, P., Limborg, H. J., Grøn, S., & Refslund, B. (2017). Orchestration in work environment policy programs. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies (Forthcoming)*.

Hasle, P., Limborg, H. J., & Nielsen, K. T. (2014). Working environment interventions – Bridging the gap between policy instruments and practice. *Safety Science*, *68*, 73–80.

Hasle, P., Møller, N., Hvid, H., Seim, R., & Scheller Nielsen, V. (2016). *Hvidbog om arbejdsmiljørådgivning [Whitebook on work environment consultancy]*.

Hasle, P., Møller, N., Refslund, B., Limborg, H. J., Nielsen, K. T., Bramming, P., &

Seim, R. (2016). *Virkemidler i arbejdsmiljøindsatsen - Afslutningsrapport fra Center for forskning i virkemidler og arbejdsmiljøindsatser (CAVI)*

Hasle, P., & Petersen, J. (2004). The role of agreements between labour unions and employers in the regulation of the work environment. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, *2*(1), 7–23.

Hasle, P., Seim, R., & Refslund, B. (2016). From employee representation to problem-solving - Mainstreaming OHS management. *Economic and Industrial Democracy (Forthcoming)*.

Hasle, P., Starheim, L., Jensen, P. L., & Diekmann, B. J. (2016). Lean as a Tool for Systematic Employee based Improvement of Psychosocial Factors in Hospitals. *Academy of Management. Annual Meeting Proceedings*.

Hasle, P., & Sørensen, O. H. (2013). Employees as Individually and Collectively Acting Subjects—Key Contributions from Nordic Working Life Research. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *3*(3), 9.

Hasle, P., Thoft, E., & Gylling Olesen, K. (2010). *Ledelse med Social Kapital*. Lindhardt & Ringhof.

Hedegaard Riis, A., & Langaa Jensen, P. (2002). Denmark: Transforming Risk Assessment to Workplace Assessment. In D. Walters (Ed.), *Regulating Health and Safety Management in the European Union* (pp. 59–80). Brussels: P.I.E - Peter Lang.

Heinrich, H., Petersen, D., & Roos, N. (1980). *Industrial Accident Prevension: A Safety Management Approach*. *New York: McGraw-Hill*.

Hirsch, P., & Lounsbury, M. (1997). Ending the Family Quarrel. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(4), 406–418.

Hoffman, A. J. (1999). Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the U.S. Chemical Industry. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *42*(4), 351–371.

Hoffman, A. J. (2001). *From Heresy to Dogma: An Institutional History of Corporate Environmentalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hoffman, A. J., & Ventresca, M. J. (2002). Introduction. In A. J. Hoffman & M. J. Venstresca (Eds.), *Organizations, Policy, and the Natural Environment: Institutional and Strategic Perspectives* (pp. 1–40). Stanford University Press.

Hohnen, P., & Hasle, P. (2011). Making work environment auditable–A "critical case"study of certified occupational health and safety management systems in

Denmark. *Safety Science*, *49*(7), 1022–1029.

Hwang, H., & Powell, W. W. (2009). The Rationalization of Charity: The Influences of Professionalism in the Nonprofit Sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly* , *54*(2), 268–298.

Hyman, J., & Summers, J. (2007). Work and life: Can employee representation influence balance? *Employee Relations*, *29*(4), 367–384.

Hyman, R. (2001). *Understanding European Trade Unionism: Between Market, Class & Society*. London: SAGE Publications.

Jacobsen, K. (2011). *Velfærdens Pris: Arbejderbeskyttelse og Arbejdsmiljø Gennem 150 år [The Price of Welfare: Workers Protection and Work Environment Through 150 years]*. Copenhagen: Gads Forlag.

Jacobsen, K. (2016). Det psykiske arbejdsmiljø mellem lovgivning og aftalesystem [The Psychosocial work environment between law and tripartite cooperation]. In J. Gleerup (Ed.), *Bladet fra munden - mod og vilje til det gode arbejdsliv* (pp. 15–24). Copenhagen: Dansk Sygeplejeråd - DSR.

Jonsson, S., & Lounsbury, M. (2017). The Meaning of Economic Democracy: Institutional Logics, Parabiosis, and the Construction of Frames. In J. Gehman, M. Lounsbury, & R. Greenwood (Eds.), *How Institutions Matter!* (Vol. 48A, pp. 3–71). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kabel, A., Hasle, P., & Limborg, H. J. (2007). Occupational health services in Denmark – the rise and fall of a multidisciplinary and preventive approach. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, *5*(sup1), 25–38.

Kabel, A., Limborg, H. J., Møller, N., Porse Sørensen, N., & Kragh, D. (2008). *Fra Engagement Til Styring: Arbejdsmiljøarbejdets historie fra dem der var med [From Engagement to Control: History of the work environment efforts from those who were there]*. Copenhagen: Selskab for Arbejdsmiljø [Society for Work Environment].

Kamp, A. (2009). Bridging collective and individual approaches to occupational safety and health: what promises does workplace health promotion hold? *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, *(18)*(1), 85–102.

Kamp, A., & Le Blansch, K. (2000). Integrating Management of OHS and the Environment - Participation, Prevention and Control. In K. Frick, P. Langaa Jensen, M. Quinlan, & T. Wilthagen (Eds.), *Systematic Occupational Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development* (pp. 413–436). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kamp, A., & Nielsen, K. T. (2013). Management of Occupational Health and Safety. In Å. Sandberg (Ed.), *Nordic lights: Work, management and welfare in Scandinavia*. SNS Forlag.

Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 243–275).

Lampel, J., & Meyer, A. D. (2008). Guest Editors' Introduction: Field Configuring Events as Structuring Mechanisms: How Conferences, Ceremonies and Trade Shows Constitue New Technologies, Industries and Markets. *Journal of Management Studies*, *45*(6), 1025–1035.

Larsson, M., & Lundholm, S. E. (2013). Talking work in a bank: A study of organizing properties of leadership in work interactions. *Human Relations*, *66*(8), 1101–1129.

Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional Work: Refocusing Institutional Studies of Organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *20*(1), 52–58.

Leca, B., & Naccache, P. (2006). A Critical Realist Approach To Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization*, *13*(5), 627–651.

Limborg, H. J. (2001). The professional working environment consultant? A new actor in the health and safety arena. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, *11*(2), 159–172.

Limborg, H. J., Porsgaard Nielsen, M., Viskum, S., Saabye, A., Sæbye, U., & Langaa Jensen, P. (1994). *Arbejdsmiljøprofessionelle i Danmark: Kvalifikationer og Uddannelse [Work Environment Professionals in Denmark: Qualifications and Education]*.

Limborg, H. J., & Voxted, J. (2008). *Arbejdsmiljørådgivningens fremtid – set i historisk lys [The Future of Work Environment Counselling - In a historical light]*.

Lounsbury, M. (2001). Institutional sources of practice variation: Staffing college and university recycling programs. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*(1), 29–56.

Lounsbury, M. (2007). A Tale of Two Cities: Competing Logics and Practice Variation in the Professionalizing of Mutual Funds. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(2), 289–307.

Lounsbury, M., & Boxenbaum, E. (2013). Institutional Logics in Action. In M.

Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action (Research in the Sociology of Organizations)* (Vol. 39A, pp. 3–22). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Lounsbury, M., & Kaghan, W. N. (2001). Organizations, occupations and the structuration of work. In S. Vallas (Ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Work: The Transformation of Work (Vol. 10)* (Vol. 10, pp. 25–50). Emerald.

Mahoney, J. (1999). Nominal, ordinal, and narrative appraisal in macrocausal analysis 1. *American Journal of Sociology*.

Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives*. Oxford University Press, USA.

McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in Action: Managing Institutional Complexity in a Drug Court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *58*(2), 165–196.

Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. *Social Forces*, *18*(4), 560–568.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340–363.

Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1983). *Organizational environments : ritual and rationality* (3rd ed.). Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.

Meyer, R. E. (2008). New Sociology of Knowledge: Historical Legacy and Contributions to Current Debates in Institutional Research. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 519–538). SAGE Publications.

Meyer, R. E., & Höllerer, M. A. (2016). Laying a smoke screen: Ambiguity and neutralization as strategic responses to intra-institutional complexity. *Strategic Organization*, *14*(4), 373–406.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Misangyi, V. F. (2016). Institutional complexity and the meaning of loose coupling: Connecting institutional sayings and (not) doings. *Strategic Organization*, *14*(4), 407–440.

Mohr, J. W. (1998). Measuring Meaning Structures. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *24*, 345–370.

Mutch, A. (2010). Technology, Organization, and Structure: A Morphogenetic Approach. *Organization Science*, *21*(2), 507–520. Retrieved from

Møller, N., Langaa Jensen, P., & Broberg Jensen, O. (1988). *Arbejdsmåder i sikkerhedsgruppen [Practices in the safety group]*.

Møller Christiansen, J., & Limborg, H. J. (2005). *Private virksomheders håndtering af det psykiske arbejdsmiljø [Private companies handling of the psychosocial work environment]*.

Nielsen, K., Taris, T. W., & Cox, T. (2010). The future of organizational interventions: Addressing the challenges of today's organizations. *Work & Stress*, *24*(3), 219–233.

Pache, A.-C., & Santos, F. (2010). When Worlds Collide: The Internal Dynamics of Organizational Responses to Conflicting Institutional Demands. *Academy of Management Review* , *35*(3), 455–476.

Pache, A.-C., & Santos, F. (2013). Embedded in Hybrid Contexts: How Individuals in Organizations Respond to Competing Institutional Logics. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action (Research in the Sociology of Organizations)* (Vol. 39 B, pp. 3–35). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Pallas, J., Fredriksson, M., & Wedlin, L. (2016). Translating Institutional Logics: When the Media Logic Meets Professions. *Organization Studies* , *37*(11), 1661–1684.

Palmer, D., Biggart, N. W., & Dick, B. (2008). Is the New Institutionalism a Theory? In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 739–768). SAGE Publications.

Powell, W., & DiMaggio, P. (1991). *The New Institutionalism In Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional Change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an Identity Movement in French Gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, *108*(4), 795–843.

Rasmussen, M. B., Hansen, T., & Nielsen, K. T. (2011). New tools and strategies for the inspection of the psychosocial working environment: The experience of the Danish Working Environment Authority. *Safety Science*, *49*(4), 565–574.

Raynard, M. (2016). Deconstructing complexity: Configurations of institutional complexity and structural hybridity. *Strategic Organization*, *14*(4), 310–335.

Reay, T., Goodrick, E., Boch Waldorff, S., & Casebeer, A. (2016). Getting Leopards to Change their Spots: Co-Creating a New Professional Role Identity. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the Rivalry of Competing Institutional Logics. *Organization Studies*, *30*(6), 629–652.

Reay, T., & Jones, C. (2016). Qualitatively capturing institutional logics. *Strategic Organization*, *14*(4), 441–454.

Robson, L. S., Clarke, J. A., Cullen, K., Bielecky, A., Severin, C., Bigelow, P. L., … Mahood, Q. (2007). The effectiveness of occupational health and safety management system interventions: A systematic review. *Safety Science*, *45*(3), 329–353.

Rocha, R. S., & Granerud, L. (2011). The search for legitimacy and organizational change: The agency of subordinated actors. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *27*(3), 261–272.

Sahlin-Andersson, K., & Wedlin, L. (2008). Circulating Ideas: Imitation, Translation and Editing. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational institutionalism* (pp. 218–243). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Sayer, A. (1992). *Method in Social Science* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Sayer, A. (2004). Why Critical Realism. In S. Fleetwood & S. Ackroyd (Eds.), *Crirtical Realist Applications in Organisation and Management Studies* (pp. 6–20). Routledge.

Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and Organizations*. SAGE Publications.

Scott, W. R. (2008). Lords of the Dance: Professionals as Institutional Agents. *Organization Studies*, *29*(2), 219–238.

Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and Organizations* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2007). *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Seim, R., Limborg, H. J., & Jensen, P. L. (2015). Professionalization of occupational health and safety management in Danish companies and the effects on worker participation. In *Proceedings 19th Triennial Congress of the IEA* (Vol. 9, p. 14).

Seim, R., Møller, N., & Limborg, H. J. (2016). Professionelle og

medarbejderrepræsentanter - nye roller i arbejdsmiljøarbejdet [Professionals and Employee Representatives - New roles in the working environment efforts]. *Tidskrift for Arbejdsliv [Journal for Working Life]*, *18*(1), 18–33.

Selznick, P. (1953). *TVA and the grass roots : a study of politics and organization*. University of California Press.

Seo, M., & Creed, W. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *27*(2), 222–247.

Sewell, W. H. (1996). Historical Events as Transformations of Structures: Inventing Revolution at the Bastille. *Theory and Society*, *25*(6), 841–881.

Silver, C., & Lewins, A. (2014). *Using Software in Qualitative Research - a step-by-step guide*. London: SAGE Publications.

Simmons, S., & Stampe Øland, J. (1992). *Workplace Assessment*. Eurofound.

Sonne Nørgaard, A. (1997). *The Politics of INstitutional Control: Corporatism in Danish Occupational Safety and Health Regulation and Unemployment Insurance 1870-1995*. Politica.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. SAGE Publications.

Stranddorf, J., Møller, N., & Langaa Jensen, P. (1992). *Arbejdsmiljøarbejdet i udvikling [Work environment efforts in development]*.Arbejdsmiljøfondet

Suddaby, R. (2006). FROM THE EDITORS: WHAT GROUNDED THEORY IS NOT. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(4), 633–642. Arbejdsmiljøfondet

Suddaby, R., & Foster, W. M. (2016). History and Organizational Change. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 19–38.

Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2009). Methodological issues in researching institutional change. In *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods* (pp. 177–195). Sage London.

Suddaby, R., Viale, T., & Gendron, Y. (2016). Reflexivity: The role of embedded social position and entrepreneurial social skill in processes of field level change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 225–245.

Swuste, P., Gulijk, C. van, & Zwaard, W. (2010). Safety metaphors and theories, a review of the occupational safety literature of the US, UK and The Netherlands, till the first part of the 20th century. *Safety Science*, *48*(8), 1000–1018.

Swuste, P., Gulijk, C. van, Zwaard, W., & Oostendorp, Y. (2014). Occupational safety theories, models and metaphors in the three decades since World War II, in the United States, Britain and the Netherlands: A literature review. *Safety Science*, *62*, 16–27.

Thornton, P. H., Jones, C., & Kury, K. (2005). Institutional logics and institutional change in organizations: Transformation in accounting, architecture, and publishing. In C. Jones & P. H. Thornton (Eds.), *Transformation in Cultural Industries (Research In Sociology of Organizations vol. 23)* (pp. 125–170). Emerald Group Publishing.

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational institutionalism* (pp. 99–130). SAGE Publications. Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The Institutional Logics Perspective - A New Approach To Culture, Structure, And Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional Logics and the Historical Contingency of Power in Organizations: Executive Succession in the Higher Education Publishing Industry, 1958– 1990 [1]. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(3), 801–843.

Thursfield, D., & Hamblett, J. (2004). Human resource management and realism: A morphogenetic approach. In S. Fleetwood & S. Ackroyd (Eds.), *Crirtical Realist Applications in Organisation and Management Studies* (pp. 113–130). Routledge.

Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory Construction in Qualitative Research: From Grounded Theory to Abductive Analysis. *Sociological Theory*, *30*(3), 167–186.

Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22–39.

Townley, B. (1997). The Institutional Logic of Performance Appraisal. *Organization Studies*, *18*(2), 261–285.

Van de Ven, A. H., Ganco, M., & Hinings, C. R. (BOB). (2013). Returning to the Frontier of Contingency Theory of Organizational and Institutional Designs. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *7*(1), 393–440.

Westgaard, R. H., & Winkel, J. (2011). Occupational musculoskeletal and mental health: Significance of rationalization and opportunities to create sustainable production systems - A systematic review. *APPLIED ERGONOMICS*, *42*(2,

SI), 261–296.

Wokutch, R. E., & VanSandt, C. V. (2000). OHS Management in the United States and Japan: The DuPont and Toyota Models. In K. Frick, P. Langaa Jensen, M. Quinlan, & T. Wilthagen (Eds.), *Systematic Occupational Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development* (pp. 367–390). Emerald Group Publishing.

Wooten, M., & Hoffman, A. (2008). Organizational fields: Past, present and future. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin-Andersson, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational institutionalism*. SAGE Publications.

Zanko, M., & Dawson, P. (2012). Occupational health and safety management in organizations: a review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *14*(3), 328–344.

Zilber, T. B. (2002). Institutionalization as an Interplay between Actions, Meanings, and Actors: The Case of a Rape Crisis Center in Israel. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(1), 234–254.

Zucker, L. G. (1977). The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence. *American Sociological Review*, *42*(5), 726–743.

Aalders, M., & Wilthagen, T. (1997). Moving Beyond Command-and-Control: Reflexivity in the Regulation of Occupational Safety and Health and the Environment. *Law & Policy*, *19*(4), 415–443.

Paper 1: Ordering Work Environment: An integrated framework of institutional logics and critical realism*

Abstract

In this paper the authors propose a theoretical framework that integrates insights from institutional logics and critical realism as a better way to understand how institutional processes occur simultaneously on multiple analytical levels. The framework is utilized in an analysis of the empirical case of work environment management in Denmark. Through the use of historical data, and qualitative contemporary data, the study shows that the field level logics of work environment are the results of institutional orders, historic field level processes and enactment from actors on the ground. The paper contributes to the literature on institutional logics by elaborating the inter-relatedness between the levels of society, institutional field and the near-decomposable relations between institutional logics and orders.

Christian Uhrenholdt Madsen

PhD Fellow, Dept. of Materials and Production, Aalborg University

AND

Susanne Boch Waldorf

Associate Professor, Dept. of Organization, Copenhagen Business School

*Submitted

ORDERING WORK ENVIRONMENT: AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK OF INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS AND CRITICAL REALISM

Introduction

Work environment management has evolved considerably during the last 40 years. From being a matter of preventing chemical risks and workplace accidents in the early 1970s, it is now concerned with creating sustainable performance culture and dealing with a wide array of psycho-social issues. The approach has evolved from a model where the organization simply complies with an extensive list of requirements, to the integration of work environment tasks into the organization's fundamental practices and strategies. Correspondingly, work environment professionals have moved from positions outside the companies in the regulatory and wider participatory labor market structures, to positions inside the companies in professionalized staff functions, where they have gradually replaced the voluntary employee and management representatives as the main intra-organizational actors (Seim, Møller, Limborg 2015).

Researchers have long been interested in exploring the developments in work environment management as a process of rationalization (Hwang & Powell 2009) in which staff managers and experts become the main actors managing work environment efforts in larger companies as a tighter and more systematic integration of work environment tasks into operations (Hasle et al. 2016; Pawlowska & Eeckelaert 2010). This can be seen in various forms, such as in certified management systems (Frick & Kempa 2011; Hohnen et al. 2014), in efficiency optimizing systems (Hasle 2016; Hasle 2014), or in how ideas from human resource management are influencing work environment management (Kamp & Nielsen 2013; Kamp 2009).

However, work environment should not be understood as a neutral management tool. The management of workers' health and safety touches upon core values and conflicts in modern capitalist societies and is embedded in inherent contradictions between the need for efficiency versus the need for employees' wellbeing. In response to these tensions, each organization has to construct and enact their version of work environment management. This means that work environment is not only a question of managing and organizing local procedures, but also one of labor market governance and the employers' and employees' rights, responsibilities and relations.

In this study, we aim to capture the development of work environment management at the societal, field, and organizational levels. We show how the 'grand story' of the development of the industrial societies in the last half century, and the 'little story' of work environment enactment inside the organization, are closely linked. In so doing, we address recent calls for studies which seek to analytically connect institutional processes on different analytical levels (Delbridge & Edwards 2013; Martin et al. 2017; Daudigeos et al. 2013; Berg Johansen & Waldorff 2015). We develop a theoretical framework drawing upon institutional logics (Thornton et al. 2012) and critical realism (Fleetwood 2005) to capture these developments. More precisely, we integrate the theoretical concepts of 'stratified ontology' (Fleetwood 2005), 'mediating concept' (Archer 1995), and 'emergence' (Archer 1995) into the framework of institutional orders and logics (Thornton, Occasion and Lounsbury, 2012). We contribute to the literature on institutional logics by elaborating the inter-relatedness between the levels of society, institutional field, and organization. Furthermore, we contribute by revisiting and extending Thornton and colleagues' original crucial point about the near-decomposable relations between institutional logics and orders, which has been overlooked in the empirical studies that have followed their original work (Thornton et al. 2012).

The management of work environment in Danish companies is a relevant case for elaborating institutional processes spanning more analytical levels. Workers' protection and work environment have been integral parts of the so-called 'Danish model' of industrial relations and labor market regulations since the passing of the Work Environment Act of 1975 by the Danish Parliament. The law inscribed the regulation of work environment into a regulatory framework characterized by corporatism and a tri-partite system of voluntary cooperative agreements between employer and employee associations, with the state as a mediating partner in negotiations of essential issues. The uniqueness of the Danish model and the longevity of the labor market structures have led scholars to refer to Denmark as a 'negotiated economy'(Pedersen 2006), and an alternative ideal type to both the 'liberal' and the 'coordinated' models of market economies described by Hall and Soskice (2001). Even though work environment has been characterized by more and tighter legal regulation than, for example, labor market regulations on wages, which in the Danish model is completely independent of the state, the 'spirit' of participation and democracy has still been a pillar of the work environment management (Dyreborg 2011) and led to the establishment of an institutionalized field with employees, management, consultants, regulators, trade unions and employers' associations all playing their parts in managing and regulating the work environment in Danish companies.

Through the use of both historical archival data sources, as well as qualitative interviews with professional work environment actors in Danish companies, we were able to capture the interconnectedness of the societal, field, and organizational levels. We interviewed 23 professional work environment specialists from four different research sites in the spring of 2015. Furthermore, we collected historical data from reports, popular history, and research.

In the following section, we outline our integrative framework that combines concepts from critical realism and institutional logics. We then describe our methods and strategy of analysis followed by our findings. We demonstrate how the historical development of the work environment management field and the enactment of organizational actors have led to the existence of three competing institutional logics: 'advocacy', 'compliance' and 'commitment´, which, in different ways, link to two institutional orders of 'state' and 'corporation'. We end this article by discussing our findings and offering a conclusion.

Theoretical framework

In this section, we describe our theoretical framework, combining institutional logics with critical realism. We explain how this framework can advance the analysis of multiple analytical levels and the near-decomposability between orders and logics.

Institutional logics

The perspective of institutional logics is one of the most predominant and widely disseminated theoretical paradigms in current organizational science. Originally, Friedland and Alford (1991) developed the so-called 'inter-institutional system' which Thornton et al. (2012) refined and further expanded. The 'inter-institutional system' consists of seven overall ideal type orders, each with its own set of values, modes of governance, legitimacy, and authority (Thornton et al. 2012: 73). The orders in the inter-institutional system are all what can be described as cornerstone institutions in society (Friedland & Alford 1991); namely, state, corporation, market, professions, community, family, and religion.

A few researchers have applied the concept of institutional logics to the context of work environment management or related contexts (Dyreborg 2011; Daudigeos et al. 2013). In a study of the Danish construction industry, Dyreborg describes how the safety policies correspond to overarching orders of democracy, state and market (Dyreborg 2011). Similarly, Daudigeos et al. (2013), trace the evolution of institutional logics in the safety management of the French construction industry showing how every historical era has been characterized by a multiplicity of logics, and not by one dominant logic. None of these studies, however, have analyzed the historical emergence of specific field-level logics of work environment, while at the same time demonstrating how these are being enacted concretely inside companies by work environment actors.

Friedland and Alford (1991) posit that social action could be explained simultaneously on three levels: 1) At the societal level, where the seven institutional orders can be found, 2) on the organizational level where the institutional orders form the basis of institutionalized values, structures and practices (logics), and finally 3) at the level of the individual, where

logics both delimit and enable individual social action. The main argument from the perspective of institutional logics is thus one of nestedness and embedded action (Thornton et al. 2012), which is to say that the institutional logics that can be found in a specific empirical context always refer back to one or more of the institutional orders in the inter-institutional system. Therefore, while each of these orders are institutions in their own right, with distinct rules, values and practices, they will, in real-world institutional fields, appear as the institutional logic specific for the particular field, and furthermore these field-level instantiations are again translated and enacted into concrete practice by organizations and individual actors of the field. Neither of these analytical levels is to be considered more 'real' than the others when one seeks to understand developments in society (Friedland & Alford 1991: 242; Thornton et al. 2012: 13).

Within the literature on institutional logics, historically focused analyses are common and widely used as a tool to understand the dynamics and processes of emergence and evolution of institutional logics in fields (e.g Thornton et al. 1999; Daudigeos et al. 2013; Greenwood & Suddaby 2006; Rao et al. 2003; Jonsson & Lounsbury 2016). This has led to a macro-orientation in many studies, where the evolution of competing logics' development over extended historical periods is tracked and analyzed, primarily through archival research methods used on policy documents or trade journals. In recent years, we have also witnessed an increasing number of scholars carrying out studies to explain and capture logics in concrete organizational settings, and their influence on meaning, values and practices for concrete actors (e.g. Waldorff 2013; Lindberg 2014; Binder 2007; McPherson & Sauder 2013; Pallas et al. 2016). However, as has been pointed out (Delbridge & Edwards 2013), the majority of research within the logics stream has tended to be either focused on the larger developments in society (and thus focused less on the levels of organizations and individuals), or focused on how logics are enacted at the micro-level of individuals and organizations (and thus ignored connections to larger institutional orders).

While we recognize that the number of scholarly works have increased in both macro-perspectives, and in later years also in the micro-foundations of logics, there is still an apparent lack of analyses and descriptions that capture the interconnectedness between orders and the institutional logics in concrete contexts (Berg Johansen & Waldorff 2015; Delbridge & Edwards 2013). This tendency for a macro/micro split in institutional theory "runs counter" to Friedland and Alford's original intentions (Delbridge & Edwards 2013: 933), and furthermore has, in many cases, led to a conflation of what constitutes orders and what constitutes logics in many studies (Berg Johansen & Waldorff 2015). Therefore, the relationship between the higher-order institutional orders and their concrete instantiations in fields and organizations – one of the most central propositions of the perspective – has not been made clear in many empirical studies. It is therefore important to investigate the relationship between order and logics. The so called near-decomposability.

Near-decomposability of orders and logics

The 'near decomposability' of the inter-institutional system plays a prominent role in the original model (Thornton et al. 2012: 60), but has not received adequate theoretical or empirical attention in studies of logics in organizational fields. The near-decomposability of the different levels in the inter-institutional system means that the logics in a field may draw on the same higher-level orders, but they may also segregate and mix them in varied ways, thus creating a widely different enactment of practices on the organizational level. The near-decomposable nature of institutional orders and logics – as we see it – is a necessary step to clarify the links between logics and orders, and strengthen the analytical power of the perspective of institutional logics. We believe that furthering and empirically grounding this central proposition goes a long way in remedying an apparent gap in the institutional logics' stream of research.

The near-decomposability of orders and logics allows for an "analogous modularity" (Thornton et al. 2012: 60) of the system of orders and logics, which means that, while logics and orders certainly have affinities and cannot completely be separated from each other analytically, a logic cannot only be ascertained by its associated order(s). Furthermore, this modularity explains how changes in logics can take place as a result of historic contingencies or the strategic symbolic manipulation of "cultural entrepreneurs" (Thornton et al. 2012: 60). In short, this near-decomposability ensures that agency and historical specificity has a place in the theoretical model, without erasing what makes these logics 'institutional' in the first place.

The last point has, however, been criticized by, for instance, Friedland (2012). The question here is the boundaries of this modularity or decomposable character of institutional orders and logics. This question, the authors acknowledge, remains to be answered empirically (Thornton et al. 2012). The conundrum, as Friedland puts it, is: *"Institutional logics are specific constellations of practices, identities and objects. The more decomposable they are, the less they can be argued to exist"* (2012:588). Extending this point, Friedland furthermore argues that what makes orders salient analytical constructs is the very fact that they are bundles of practices, theories and values that are *"joined in the social imagination"* (2012: 588). In this argument, 'logics' stop being institutional when they cannot be clearly connected to one specific institutional order, thereby losing their explanatory power.

Friedland's critique serves as an important reminder to remain aware of what makes logics institutional in the first place. However, we believe that the modular and decomposable character of the relationship between orders and logics can help explain the institutional character of many changes, conflicts and complexities that modern organizations experience. The notion of decomposability and autonomy between the levels is important to understand concrete societal changes and developments in and around fields. First of all, this is because even institutional orders, as strongly institutionalized in our collective consciousness as they are, within themselves also encompass complex structures and forces

that can result in conflict or confusion when enacted simultaneously. One example of these intra-institutional complexities (Meyer & Höllerer 2016), can be seen where organizations experience institutional complexity from two competing logics of corporate governance linking to the market order. Another noteworthy example is found in the world of human resource management, where scholars often distinguish between the 'soft' and 'hard' versions (Legge 2005). Both are easily identified as logics within the corporate order, but at the same time these logics present divergent prescriptions to safeguard or gain performance from employees. One could also think of Weber's descriptions of the internal contradictions between different religious practices (Rosenberg 2015; Weber in Whimster 2004). Each of these examples shows us that even though orders themselves are quite firmly institutionalized in 'social imaginations' they still contain their own contradictions and inherent conflicts.

This leads to our second argument for why we believe that the inter-institutional system must be conceptualized as near-decomposable. This becomes imperative if we follow Friedland and Alford's original intention of not providing explanatory primacy to the societal level of analysis. Whenever an institutional order is found in an institutional field, it is not an exact reproduction of its root order(s). Instead, it is embedded in the institutional orders and the values and frames they provide, but at the same time a field-level logic is the result of historical field-level developments (Thornton et al. 2012). A market-inspired logic will look radically different depending on whether it appears in the field of book publishing (Thornton et al. 2012), yacht design (Delbridge & Edwards 2013) or accounting (Greenwood & Suddaby 2006). Moreover, sometimes logics at the field level are blends, which draw on more than one order, or segregated, where they only draw on parts of one order. (see Thornton et al. (2012: 164) for a list of empirical studies on transfortmations of field-level logics).

Critical realism and institutional logics

In our pursuit of understanding and clarifying the relationship between different analytical levels, we turn to critical realism and its relevance for the perspective of institutional logics. The combination of these two currents is a promising path forward, as previously noted by Leca and Naccache (2006), who described how it help explain the concepts on institutional entrepreneurship and agency, and by Delbridge and Edwards (2013), who showed how the critical realist perspective can illuminate and explain the black box of individual agency and structure without relegating one to an epiphenomenon of the other when it comes to institutional logics. In line with these thoughts, we suggest that critical realism can help explain the inter-connectedness between different analytical levels.

Critical realism is a stream of research from the philosophy of science. Theories in the stream are all concerned with staking out a middle ground between empiricism and

relativism in social science. Notable contributions have been put forward by Bhaskar (1997), Archer (1995) and Sayer (Sayer 1992) For further in-depth readings on critical realism we refer to Fleetwood's exemplary article (2005). In the following, we explain the theoretical concepts of 'stratified ontology' (Fleetwood 2005), 'mediating concept' (Archer 1995), and 'emergence' (Archer 1995), and we elaborate how we see they fit with the perspective of institutional logics.

The concept of stratified ontology is foundational in critical realist thinking, which corresponds to the ideas of multiple levels of analysis from the logics perspective (Delbridge & Edwards 2013). The stratified ontology divides social reality into three distinct but interrelated domains (Leca & Naccache 2006): The 'empirical', that is the part of social reality that actors immediately understand or can identify (e.g. the bus is not coming), the 'actual' domain, that is the part that encompasses all of social reality that could potentially be empirically identified by actors (e.g. all buses have stopped because of a strike due to salary cutbacks), and the 'real' domain, that signifies deeper hidden social structures that cannot be identified without some theorizing, but still enable and inhibit actors' relationships and actions (e.g. external institutional and technical pressures led the city council to agree to cut back on bus drivers' salaries). At this point, it is important to mention Fleetwood's notion that materials, social structures, discourses, and technology can equally be considered 'real' if they, in some way, act to generate social action or processes. It is thus not hard to see the parallels to institutional logics, where the institutional orders can be viewed as real domains signifying social structures on the deeper ontological domain.

However, institutional orders and other deep social structures do not appear as they are for actors and organizations. Instead, they appear through so-called 'mediating concepts' (Archer 1995). These exist as '*disjunctions'* (Archer 1995: 149) between the deeper social structures and the experience of actors and thus transmit from one to the other. It is the mediating concepts that are being enacted and interpreted by actors, as these appear, for example, as concrete social roles and practices available in any given social situation. These mediating concepts are, according to Archer, "*pre-existing properties…"* (Archer 1995: 151) that enable or inhibit actors' action and understanding in social interactions. These can be equated to institutional logics in particular fields. Given that they are pre-existing, this means that any mediating concept with which actors interpret and interact, has always 'emerged' as a result of historic social interaction and processes in the field (Archer 1995: 151). To put it the terms of institutional logics, the field-level logic with which actors are interacting is always: 1) related to the institutional orders of the deeper ontological domain, and 2) a result of concrete historical interpretations and interactions in the same field. Institutional logics are thus, as Delbridge and Edwards suggest, social structures with 'emergent properties' (Delbridge & Edwards 2013: 944). To clarify, we mean they are both vertically related to the deeper ontological domain as instantiation of the institutional orders, and at the same time historically related to previous field processes and interactions. What makes logics emergent is the fact that their properties are not merely the sum of their constitutive parts (orders and field events), but rather the combination of institutional order and field history gives them properties that only exist in this particular field logic.

We have incorporated the concepts of the stratified ontology, mediating concepts and emergence from critical realist philosophy into our model of institutional logics on different levels.

The model helps explain how larger historic changes in an institutionalized field are the result of interplay between higher level orders, historically contingent developments within the particular institutional field, and enacted by social actors in organizational settings. We argue that, by incorporating critical realist concepts into the theoretical framework of institutional logics, we contribute to the clarification of the relationship between orders and field-level logics in a coherent and intuitive way, and furthermore we extend and strengthen the intentions of Thornton and colleagues' work.

Methodology

Our study is a qualitative case study (Flyvbjerg 2006). To empirically capture how institutional logics simultaneously transcend multiple levels, we decided to use historical sources and contemporary accounts from organizational actors as our empirical data (Reay & Jones 2016).

Data collection

We collected a variety of documents, such as government reports, evaluations from stakeholders, and popular history tracking the overall historical development of work environment management in Danish companies, and what heuristic groupings of meanings and practices could be detected from the time of the passing of the Work Environment Act of 1975 until today (see Table 1). We used a snowballing technique to find these sources. We contacted key actors from the field of work environment, who pointed us towards reports and evaluations they deemed of importance to our research interest. Furthermore, we used the limited, but significant, academic peer-reviewed sources that have described the developments in the field to shape our initial understandings of the field's logic formations. Finally, we performed two background interviews with one key expert of the field who has extensive experience in the field, both as a practitioner and as a researcher. These two interviews were conducted to help us reflect on our initial understandings of the historical developments and to guide our further research process. All sources are listed below in Table 1.

Table 1: Historical sources

Source	Title	Year	Type
(Arbejdsministeriet 1995)	Psykosociale risikofaktorer I arbejdslivet [Psycho-social risk factors in the working life]	1995	Report
(Dyreborg 2011)	Safety Matters Have Become Too Important for Management to Leave it Up to the Workers	2011	Peer-review
(Hasle 2010)	Certificeret arbejdsmiljøledelse i et historisk perspektiv [Certified work environment management in a historical perspective]	2010	Popular history
(Hasle, Møller, et al. 2016)	Hvidbog om arbejdsmiljørådgivning [Whitebook on work environment consultancy]	2016	Report
(Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002)	Denmark: Transforming Risk Assessment to Workplace Assessment	2002	Peer-review
(Jacobsen 2016)	Det psykiske arbejdsmiljø mellem lovgivning og aftalesystem [The Psychosocial work environment between law and tripartite cooperation]	2016	Popular history
(Jacobsen 2011)	Velfærdens Pris: Arbejderbeskyttelse og Arbejdsmiljø Gennem 150 år [The Price of Welfare: Workers Protection and Work Environment Through 150 years]	2011	Popular history
(Kabel et al. 2008)	Fra Engagement Til Styring: Arbejdsmiljøarbejdets historie fra dem der var med [From Engagement to Control: History of the work environment efforts from those who were there]	2008	Popular history
(Kabel et al. 2007)	Occupational health services in Denmark – the rise and fall of a multidisciplinary and preventive approach	2007	Peer-review
(Kamp & Le Blansch 2000)	Integrating Management of OHS and the Environment - Participation, Prevention and Control	2000	Peer review
(Limborg et al. 1994)	Arbejdsmiljøprofessionelle i Danmark: Kvalifikationer og Uddannelse [Work Environment Professionals in Denmark: Qualifications and Education]	1994	Report
(Limborg 2001)	The professional working environment consultant? A new actor in the health and safety arena	2001	Peer-review
Limborg 2016/2017	Background interviews with Hans Jørgen Limborg, consultant and researcher	2016/2016	Interviews
(Limborg & Voxted 2008)	Arbejdsmiljørådgivningens fremtid – set i historisk lys [The Future of Work Environment Counselling - In a historical light]	2008	Report
(Møller et al. 1988)	Arbejdsmåder i sikkerhedsgruppen [Practices in the safety group]	1988	Report
(Møller Christiansen & Limborg 2005)	Private virksomheders håndtering af det psykiske arbejdsmiljø [Private companies handling of the psychosocial work environment]	2005	Report
(Hasle, Seim, et al. 2016)	Professionelle og medarbejderrepræsentanter - nye roller i arbejdsmiljøarbejdet [Professionals and Employee Representatives - New roles in the working environment efforts]	2016	Peer-review
(Rasmussen et al. 2011)	New tools and strategies for the inspection of the psychosocial working environment: The experience of the Danish Working Environment	2011	Peer-review
(Simmons & Stampe Øland 1992)	Workplace Assessment	1992	Report
(Stranddorf et al. 1992)	Arbejdsmiljøarbejdet i udvikling [Work environment efforts in development]	1992	Report

Furthermore, we collected data at four research sites, which were chosen based on where we believed we would find exemplary organizational dynamics that could further our understanding and knowledge of the different logics in work environment management, as suggested by Reay and Jones (2016). The four research sites were large Danish

organizations, which can be characterized as large-scale bureaucracies with multiple differing staff functions to manage external regulations and demands. To encapsulate the developments in the way the work environment is managed in Denmark we found two organizations where HR consultants have, to some extent, been integrated into the management of work environment issues, and two organizations where this was not the case. To ensure depth and width in the data, our samples were two private and two public organizations. We consulted organizational websites, CSR reports and key actors from the wider work environment organizations (unions, employers' associations and government agencies) to find appropriate research sites within the framework described above.

We conducted semi-structured interviews between November 2014 and June 2015 with 23 key informants, all working as professional specialists in the organizations, and all of whom have the work environment as either their main responsibility or as one of them (see Table 2). All interviews lasted from around 35 minutes and to almost one hour and twenty minutes. All interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Table 2: Interviewees

Informants	**Job description**	**Company**
Manager, work environment function	Managing staff work environment staff function	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 1, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 2, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 3, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 4, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 5, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Manager, HR function	Managing HR function	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 1, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 2, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 3, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 1, Risk function	Full time work environment consultant	Company 1 (C1)
Consultant 2, Risk function	Full time work environment consultant	Company 1 (C1)

Data consultant, Risk function	Data consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 1 (C1)
Manager, Management systems function	Managing the staff function responsible for all management systems (among them work environment management system)	Company 1 (C1)
Local site consultant 1	Consultant for local site with work environment as main responsibility	Company 1 (C1)
Local site consultant 2	Consultant for local site with work environment as main responsibility	Company 1 (C1)
Manager, safety, health and environment function	Managing staff function responsible for safety, health and external environment	Company 2 (C2)
Consultant 1	Full time health and safety consultant	Company 2 (C2)
Consultant 2	Full time health and safety consultant	Company 2 (C2)
Local safety consultant 1	Full time health and safety consultant at local site	Company 2 (C2)
Local safety consultant 2	Full time health and safety consultant at local site	Company 2 (C2)
HR consultant 1	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 2 (C2)
HR consultant 2	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 2 (C2)

Strategy of analysis

We proceeded with an analysis of all collected data. First, to capture the development of logics in the actual domain of the field of work environment management, we studied the historical research of work environment management (e.g. Limborg 2001; Dyreborg 2011) that has categorized institutional logics or similar bundles of practice and meaning in the field of work environment. These studies led us to three distinguishable heuristic logics of practices and corresponding social meaning that influence the way the work environment is currently managed in Danish companies. Of these logics, one centers on workplace democracy and participation, one centers on systems and risk management, and the final one centers on increased performance and employee development. We used the collected historical sources to research the history and event sequencing of each of the heuristic logics.

Following this, we then related each of the three logics to the institutional orders we find in the domain of the real. In this analytical step, we moved from the pattern-inducing analysis to a pattern-matching analysis (Reay & Jones 2016). We compared the main elements of our logics and how they *"…pertain to the higher institutional orders, as described by Thornton et al.…*"(Daudigeos et al. 2013: 333). In this manner, we ended up with three historical logics of work environment management: The logic of advocacy based in the order of the state, the logic of compliance based in both the order of the state and the corporation, and finally the logic of commitment based in the order of the corporation.

The next step was to explore if, and how, the three identified institutional logics were available and enacted in the daily tasks of work environment professionals in Danish companies, i.e. in the empirical domain. To explore the enactment of logics in our case, we used two different analytical elements. Thornton et al. (2012), suggest that the choice of analytical elements should be based on what is "*most salient"* to the research context and research question (Thornton et al. 2012: 59). As analytical elements, we chose the means and ends of work environment management in the companies including: a) the motivation for trying to improve the working environment, and b) the concrete strategies and practices to do so, e.g., the particular means-ends configurations available to the organizational actors (Boxenbaum 2006). The data was coded in an iterative coding process with both descriptive and interpretive codes (Miles & Huberman 1994). Generic descriptive codes were added ("interaction with management", "historical account of the specialist function", "concrete task"), as well as interpretive codes ("identity of the specialist function", "strategic task" "reactive task"). The software program Nvivo was used to systematize and code all transcribed material. Finally, we employed a pattern-coding process to investigate our interviews (Miles & Huberman 1994).

Table 3: Coding

		Keywords	**Examples from data**
Logic of Advocacy	**Ends**	Improving work environment for employees	*"No I try to see it this way. I don't want the employees to get hurt, and neither do they* [the employees] *and that is what I work for. And then sometimes I am after the employees because they don't use the proper safety equipment, and sometimes I am after management because they haven't provided something. This way I help employees to get some things for example, and I help management by solving problems, so I am kind of on both sides".* (Local safety consultant C2) *It is to meet our 'customers' where they are. We have a big task in finding out how to give this or that work environment group the best counselling. It can easily be that we have some strategic great intentions, intentions about health promotion, but if this work environment group doesn't know what APV means, then we have to start there. And that I think is an important role.* (Consultant 1, H1)
	Means	Coalition building	*"One of the demands to our certificate is that we as a*

			minimum comply with legislation, and that means that I often take on a 'B' role [B means the employees, while A stands for the employers] *because I will make demands about hey we have an area here and so on, and if we don't regulate it in compliance with the legislation then our certificate is in danger. Therefore there are sometimes accordance between what the employees want and what I want"* (Local site consultant 2, C1) *"I make an effort to build bridges between* [headquarters location] *and the factories"* (Consultant 2, C1)
		Lobbying	*For me, and this might sound a little ugly, but I see actually the work environment as sort of a parasite, in a good sense. We to run to where things are happening. Hygiene is important, great, we will connect with that. The Danish quality model, great we will connect with that. Because then we are successful. We should not be out there with the red flags and say work environment at all costs. Nope because we are here for the patients and therefore we can mooch of these things* (Consultant 1, H1)
Logic of compliance	**Ends**	Compliance	*"…but the whole management field is very dominated by theories, more than by regulation and evidence. And that looks very different for work environment field because it is regulated by law and there is an expectation that the initiatives we take is based on evidence to a larger extent"*(Consultant 1, H2)
	Means	Reactive datadriven approaches	*"On the basis of those* [the data on compensation costs] *we always have an overview of where the injuries and the strain happens, and then we seek them out"* (Consultant 1, C1) *"…we direct their* [the local clinics] *attention towards it, by annually to make these reports for their annual work environment meeting. In these reports we write about person lifting, accidents, sickness absence, health promotion, health control, and tries to include all the things we can get data on"* (Consultant 4, H1)
		Preventive systematic approaches	*And as managers that* [whether an audit can discover unsafe practices and processes] *we are interested in. Whether we 'walk the walk', have this or that been tightened, whether people know what to do. And that is really the value of a certified management system, it is not the paper, it is doing it in practice* (Industry 1)
Logic of commitment	**Ends**	Employee engagement	"[Engagement] *is all about being 'fired up' and engaged in the job, and really think that one is putting in an effort. It is about thinking that one's manager is really good and that the job is really good, but also about whether one is proud and shares* [brags about] *this company"* (HR Consultant 2, C2)
		Prevent sickness absence	*"Our most important job as a staff function is to create this red thread, so we don't just discuss work environment, not just wellbeing, not just sickness absence, but create these wholes so that people in the clinics don't experience these sporadic initiatives, but that they experience them as a whole"* (Consultant 4 H 2)
		Creating cooperation	*"We treat patients at this hospital, we don't produce a good work environment. So they* [the patients] *are our profit, and to make sure that everything is going accordingly we need cooperation, wellbeing, high MTU scores and high levels of social capital and what not".*(Consultant 3, H2)

			"we work with the same issues, but from two different perspectives, so we also work to ensure that people are feeling better at work, so my angle is that on should be able to work together with colleagues and with one's manager, that one can handle the assignments"(HR consultant 1, C2)
	Means	Building resilient cultures	*"…and one of the assigments that i am working on currently, is to develop a progression of workshops that i can launch in the autumn. We will have some cross-departmental workshops that will bring everyone into play, and where the theme will be how to come from one culture to another" (HR Consultant 2, C2)* *"Informant: Well when I started I had one and a half years where I travelled around with my….you know …* *Interviewer: Travelling circus?* *Yeah (laughing) Travelling circus. I was almost Mr/Mrs Social Capital and visited a whole lot of local clinics"* (Consultant 1, H2)
		Line management competence building	*"Of course there is a job to find out what it actually means when an employee has a special pattern of absence, and how to deal with that. So that is one type of effort, and then we have established these management teams where we plan on including sickness absence"* (Hospital 2)

Three logics of work environment management

In the following sections, we explain the existence of three institutional logics in the field of work environment management. First, we describe the historical development of the field and the origins of the three logics of advocacy, compliance, and commitment. Following this, we show how each logic is enacted at the organizational level in the accounts of our informants. Finally, we show how each logic is related to institutional orders.

Historical development of institutional logics in the field of work environment management

The logic of advocacy

The logic of advocacy is characterized by a motivation to improve the work environment inside the organizations as well as increasing the awareness and activity of other organizational actors. Historically speaking, this logic can be traced back to the special Danish work environment tradition of independent work environment professionals who were employed by the Occupational Health Service (OHS). OHS was an independent institution born out of tripartite negotiations between employers, trade unions and the state, that provided work environment consultancy and help for Danish organizations.

Before the Work Environment Act of 1975, work environment management was primarily characterized by complying with detailed 'command and control' regulation that regulated what was, and was not, allowed in the workplaces in terms of dangerous substances or machinery. This was heavily enforced by the regulating agency that ensured companies complied with the regulation by issuing fines (Dyreborg 2011). However, with the passing of the 1975 Act, a new logic of advocacy entered the field. The Act ensured the establishment of the mandatory 'safety organizations', i.e. the local participatory structures of both management and employee representatives who should work in cooperation to ensure a productive and healthy work environment in the workplaces (Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002). Furthermore, the law also laid the institutional groundwork for the OHS[1], which was put into practice in 1980 by an agreement between the state, the trade unions and employers associations, and which, in the following decades, developed into one of the main sources of discussions and development of tools and practices in the work environment management field (Limborg 2001).

The establishment of the OHS was a compromise between the social parties and the state, and thus constituted a prime example of the tri-partite model. The OHS was designed by the lawmakers (the social political parties) to be one of the *"load-bearing columns"* of the work environment management, and was intended to work in tandem with the local participatory safety organizations (the other column) (Jacobsen 2011: 379f)

The model was carried out by professional work environment consultants who could counsel companies in matters of health and safety. The services, of course, employed health professionals, but soon after saw an influx of other occupational groups such as physio- and occupational therapists, engineers and machinists, chemists and, to a lesser degree, academics with backgrounds in the social sciences (Limborg & Voxted 2008). With the expansion of the multi-disciplinary OHS (Kabel et al. 2007), an occupational group of professional work environment actors outside the companies gradually emerged and became a nexus around which a field of work environment characterized by multidisciplinarity, formal neutrality to both employers and employees and their respective organizations and, finally, by a main focus on improvement of the work environment as a democratic right, rather than a regulatory nuisance for the companies.

The OHS was finally dissolved in 2008 by the center-right coalition government, after considerable pressure and critique from the employers' associations. Work environment specialists hereafter instead became increasingly employed in staff functions, and as we will describe below brought the logic of advocacy within the company walls.

The logic of compliance

The logic of compliance can be traced back to three separate historical processes and developments in the regulatory frameworks from the late 1980s and onwards, in the

[1] Da. Bedriftssundhedstjenesten

organizational responses to this regulation, and finally in the preferred strategies of the professional work environment actors in the OHS system.

Through the first decades of existence, the tandem of the OHS and the internal safety organizations was increasingly criticized for being in so-called 'side-car' position (Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002) i.e. they were marginalized inside the companies without influence on the central strategic decisions and processes. The OHS was not an integral part of the companies but instead generally called upon when problems or risks were discovered, while the safety organizations did not hold the resources or the capacities to influence central processes in the management of companies. This led to an increasing interest and focus on ways of implementing preventive systems in organizations and working with the companies and safety organizations to maintain these among the OHS consultants (Limborg 2001; Limborg & Voxted 2008).

Concurrent to this, new types of regulation appeared that emphasized reflexivity and self-regulation in the work environment efforts of the organizations. The European Union passed the 'framework directive' (EU Framework Directive 89/391) that mandated all member states to implement workplace assessment schemes in their national legislations (Walters & Jensen 2000). This was formally implemented in the Danish legislation in 1992 and systematic assessments of risks, processes and challenges in relation to work environment have been a mandatory process for all Danish companies ever since (Simmons & Stampe Øland 1992).

Finally, larger manufacturing companies increasingly sought to integrate health and safety processes into the much more widespread monitoring systems and processes for external environmental issues (Kamp & Le Blansch 2000). Environmental sustainability, and thus compliance with normative societal expectations about being good corporate citizens and the regulative demands about pollution and controlling emissions, became the main part of organizational CSR strategies and policies, and the work environment became incorporated into these efforts (Dyreborg 2011). This, in turn, led to the use of international standards such as OHSAS18001 that easily could be integrated into joint management systems (JMS) in the companies (Pagell et al. 2015). This development was furthered by the political decision in 2005 to exempt all Danish companies who hold a work environment certification from labor inspections (Hohnen & Hasle 2011; Rocha & Granerud 2011), a system that an increasing number of both public and private organizations in Denmark now implement (Hohnen & Hasle 2011).

As described elsewhere (Uhrenholdt Madsen & Hasle 2016), this makes the logic of compliance an amalgam of two historically different approaches to safety management: The North American 'safety first' tradition that developed into a Tayloristic, operations-oriented and company-centered approach to managing safety and accidents in manufacturing organizations with the use of systems to avoid risks (Swuste et al. 2010), and the continental approach of heavy state involvement and detailed command-control legislations (Abrahamsson & Johansson 2013) that we briefly mentioned at the start of this section. In

this way, we see this logic as a compliance logic 2.0, where the attention has been shifted to complying with procedural rules of self-governance, rather than with checklists of prohibited machines and materials.

The logic of commitment

The logic of commitment is historically the result of three parallel developments in the Danish labor market that took place during the 1990s: 1) An emerging consciousness of psychosocial work environment issues and risks both among actors from the field of work environment and within the organizations (Limborg & Voxted 2008), 2) the insistence from employers and regulators that psycho-social issues should be treated as the prerogative of management rather than the joint safety committees, and finally 3) the emergence of human resource management as a distinct field of management in Danish companies (Holt Larsen 2009).

Even though psychosocial risk factors were formally part of the early legislative formulations regarding risks to health and safety at work, these factors were largely ignored by both regulative and organizational actors during the 1970s and 1980s (Rasmussen et al. 2011). This is due to the complex and multi-causal character of psychosocial issues, that makes them harder for the authorities to inspect and for organizations to detect (Jespersen et al. 2016). Furthermore, the scope of what legally constituted a psychosocial work environment risk was also greatly delimited because of resistance from, in particular, employers' associations, who made the case that issues around the psycho-social work environment were intimately related to the management of the companies, and therefore that detailed regulation on the issues would impinge upon the employers' right to manage work inside the companies, which is one of the foundational agreements in the Danish model of industrial relations (Rasmussen et al. 2011).

However, gradually, the issues became unavoidable for all actors in the field of work environment. This was a result of both rising pressure from within the work environment field, especially from actors in public sector (Limborg & Voxted 2008), and from companies, who increasingly saw the business value in being known in public for a good psycho-social work environment (Limborg & Voxted 2008). With the publication of a highly cited white paper regarding ways of regulating psycho social work environment from a so-called 'methods committee' commissioned by the Ministry of Work in 1995 (Arbejdsministeriet 1995), and successive amendments of the legal framework, psycho-social risks and issues took a much more central place in both regulation and company efforts (Rasmussen et al. 2011).

Simultaneously, the OHS also became aware of the need to develop tools and methods to combat psychosocial strains. This meant that they increasingly employed psychologists and other professionals who could advise organizations concerning these risks and issues (Limborg 2001; Kabel et al. 2007). These developments, together with the fact that many psycho-social issues were, in fact, issues of management, led to the entrance of a new

player in the work environment field: the human resource (HR) department in the organizations.

In a parallel development, in many companies, the traditional 'personnel departments' were transformed into HR departments. With this transformation, a new conception of employees as strategic resources to be developed and protected increasingly became dominant (Holt Larsen 2009). Furthermore, HR departments were more sensitive to companies' external reputations and legitimacy than their personnel predecessors, and therefore more attentive to issues of social sustainability and wellbeing (Ehnert 2009; Holt Larsen 2014). Therefore, the agenda of wellbeing became increasingly important to HR strategies in Danish companies, and thus to the departments in charge of carrying them out.

Issues of wellbeing and psychosocial work environment issues have always been hard to distinguish, yet closely connected (Rasmussen et al. 2011), and therefore HR departments increasingly played a role in the work environment issues in the companies from the 'wellbeing position' (Møller Christiansen & Limborg 2005).

Table 4: Historical formation of logics

	Logic of advocacy	**Logic of compliance**	**Logic of commitment**
Historical formation process	- Work Environment Act of 1976 - OHS established and expanded	- EU Framework directive - Critique of 'sidecar' position from experts - Integration into joint management systems - Exemption from labour inspections for organizations with certified work environment systems	- The report from the 'methods committee' - Demand for tools and knowledge on prevention from public organizations - Political compromise regarding management of psychosocial risks - HRM emerges in Denmark

Enactment of the institutional logics on the organizational level

In the following section, we describe how each of the institutional logics is enacted at the organizational level by work environment staff specialists.

The logic of advocacy

The logic of advocacy is characterized by the ends and means of improving the work environment inside the organizations by increasing the organizational awareness and activity.

"Well, they see me as pretty impartial. They know that I work for the management, but they come to me with special issues they want help with and so on" (Local site consultant 1, C1).

The quote above highlights how the logic of advocacy is enacted in one of the companies, and especially how this logic is rooted in the ethics of impartiality. In the same vein, another consultant explains the motivation for the informants' own daily work:

My calling in this is that I find it valuable every single day to help those employees who are working hard out there at the sites, (...) it is hard, it is raw and all that, so one needs to be able to stand up to management, to see it from all angles. (Consultant 2, C1).

Two important values of the logic of advocacy can be seen in the quote above, namely that the cause of work environment is the primary reason for the job, or a 'calling' as the informant calls it, and that the role of the work environment professionals is found relatively outside the normal organizational hierarchy, i.e. that it is the job of a staff professional to 'stand up to management'.

This logic is enacted in two specific practices around the organizations, which are intended to make sure that work environment is looked after in the company both among management as well as employees.

Coalition building relates to the efforts to create a coalition of organizational actors around the work environment cause:

"It is worth a lot to be a part of a house where, if you have a good idea, you can call lots of different friends out there and invite them to join the project (Consultant 1, H1).

This practice can be observed in many accounts across the different research settings, all of which emphasizes how they try to involve actors from all across the organization, as well as across the hierarchical divides between employees and management functions.

Another practice is lobbying. This can be seen in different accounts of local struggles to incorporate the work environment into the decisions of various organizational processes such as the machine repair, the construction of new production lines, or quality optimization processes. One consultant mentions that the informant sees the work environment as a *'parasite'* on other organizational processes.

The process of lobbying is reported by a safety professional, in this account of persuading

the local management into a new safety practice:

"So then I persuaded the local director that we should do this [safety project], *and initially the site director was a little, you know, skeptical, and you know what 'good does that do?' and like that. But my experience from previous courses was that they were much more receptive if I got some numbers and drew some graphs, and they are engineers the whole lot of them, so if I could draw a graph they understood everything perfectly"* (Local safety consultant 1, C2).

Overall, the logic of advocacy prescribes the more autonomous role of activists or advocates of the work environment, who use different strategic tools and processes to further the cause, more than the role of classic staff managers firmly rooted in the companies' hierarchical structures.

Logic of Compliance

Where the logic of advocacy presents the work environment as a political issue in the companies, the logic of compliance prescribes bureaucracy and systematic risk management means to achieve an improved work environment.

In the quote below, the informant describes the reasons for the adoption of a work environment management system based on an international standard:

"Well, it makes sure that we comply with legislation, and makes sure that we don't just react to accidents, but that we have this structured and systematic approach that makes sure we are ahead of the curve.(…) so very much to work structured and make sure that it is not this ad hoc approach we have" (Staff function manager, C2).

A safe and risk-free work environment can be achieved by the right system and bureaucratic structure, and furthermore by ensuring that compliance with the standards and commands of the law is the yardstick against which the safety performance is measured.

If we look closer, we can see how the logic of compliance is enacted into two particular means of efforts. First of all, this is by monitoring data extensively, to spot possible risks and thus prevent accidents and injuries. One example relates to the quite extensive use of statistics and data in the work environment management:

"Well, I update these statistics and send them out to the local directors all the time, and then consultant 1 gets a copy and consultant 1 is visiting all sites continuously, and then we can try with a friendly talk about the problems" (Data consultant, C1).

This account also points to the other strategy of choice in the logic of compliance: Preventive systematic efforts that guide both employees and management to safe and risk free practices at work.

All case companies either had obtained the OHSAS18001 certificate on the work environment system or were in the process of obtaining it. As described in the following quotes, the reasoning for having a standardized work environment system is closely related to the overall assumptions and beliefs of the logic of compliance. The reasons and implicit assumptions for certifying the work environment processes are outlined by the environmental manager:

"And this is what we, as management, are interested in. Whether we walk the walk, has this thing been improved, do employees know what they have to do, and so on. And that is really the value of any management system, not the paper, but that we do it in practice" (Manager, management systems function C1).

This again evidences the idea that the systematic effort is intended to offer guidelines for employee and management behavior and thereby improve the work environment through internal behavioral regulations, as described above.

The systematic prevention efforts can also be seen in the solution of single issues. In one company, they use preventive systems in the prevention efforts towards repetitive strain injuries (RSI) by implementing an ergonomic rotation design in their production facilities, and in their procurement of new machines:

"We have had this system made for mapping out repetitive work (…) we have a number of things we can measure, things like reaching distance, room for movement, and so on, and then we rate our workstations after these things, and how good workstations are in terms of repetitive work, and then we map it out systematically on all our sites…" (Consultant, C2).

Overall, the logic of compliance is principally concerned with compliance to external demands and systems. Where the logic of advocacy primarily sees the work environment as an ethical issue concerning the rights of employees, the logic of compliance perceives it as an issue of organizational compliance with the law. Therefore, the logic of compliance prescribes efforts rooted in bureaucracy and organizational hierarchy as the way to ensure the aforementioned compliance.

Logic of commitment

While the logics of advocacy and compliance have both emerged from inside the field of work environment itself, the logic of commitment has its roots in field of human resource management, i.e. its end is to create commitment and engagement towards the workplace from individual employees, and thereby enhancing organizational performance. The means in this logic are generally focused on enhancing individual and social competencies of both management and employees. This entails competencies for the former about leadership that create cooperation, social capital and job satisfaction, and competencies for the latter that increase individual resilience to the psychological pressures and physical strains of the modern working life.

As expected, the logics of commitment were especially outspoken in the organizations, where HR consultants played a role in the management of the work environment.

Many accounts from the commitment logic divide work environment issues into two different categories: one of traditional work environment issues such as toxic chemicals, physical problems or problems with the buildings or machinery, and another category of issues of wellbeing and organizational culture. Whereas the former can be solved instrumentally, then the latter category is hyper-complex and requires different strategic tools and efforts to be employed. An example is the description below from an HR manager:

"*Yes, we have the overall responsibility for* it [the physical work environment] (…) *It just has to be okay, there is a system for how we deal with these issues, and much of the issues are solved this way* (…) *The psycho-social work environment is extremely complex because there are so many factors in play (…)Then I sit there as a manager and say, 'Hmmm it is hyper-complex and there is no quick fix'*"" (Manager Staff Function, H2).

As the name, and the quote above, suggest, the logic of commitment is not merely about complying with external demands or improving the work environment for its own sake, as is the case with the two logics previously mentioned. On the contrary, it is about committing and engaging the employees through better a work environment:

"If you can lower sickness absence, there are more healthy people at work, and then you can produce more for the same amount of money" (Manager Staff Function, H2).

One company has a strategy they call sustainable performance that, according to one HR consultant, they are excited about. They are excited because it means, as she puts it, that they have to figure out how to fuse the performance culture in the company with culture of wellbeing to make the performance sustainable in the long run:

"*…because how can we have this performance culture, and at the same time make sure that it is sustainable and that one does not get sick because of it"* (HR Consultant 1, C2).

When it comes to the concrete means of making this happen, the logic of commitment prescribes two related strategies: One about developing and supporting management in their wellbeing efforts, and another concerning creating resilient employees to withstand the pressures and risks. Often in combined efforts.

In one company, this is apparent in both the policies and strategies they have in place to combat stress. The company has implemented an online toolbox to combat stress among employees. Thus managers and colleagues to stressed employees can seek the best tips and tricks to help. Furthermore, the HR department offers courses for line managers in how to spot an employee who suffers from stress, and finally they support and coach the line managers to hold continuous dialogues with employees with stress. An HR consultant sums

up the assumptions behind the organization's manager-driven approach to stress in the following quote:

"…you have to look at whether the individual is thriving or not (…) sometimes people are stressed out by having too much to do, other times by having too little. It is not always easy to know what is going on. It can be caused by many different reasons" (HR Consultant 1, C2).

The problems are individual; therefore, the solutions must also be individual. Since the root causes of work environment problems such as stress and burn-out are primarily issues between the employee and the manager, risk management systems are redundant. Instead, a considerable amount of effort is directed at creating cultures and environments that facilitate both performance and wellbeing. In one company, an organization-wide strategy based on the management concept of 'social capital' was implemented. A consultant describes the process as being:

"Well, we work a lot with brown paper, these big pieces of paper, and then you know, it leads to great discussions. Now we are talking about four-hour sessions, so one cannot necessarily build up trust in that short time, but one can feel that some seeds are planted for good cooperation"(Consultant 3, H2)

Three logics of work environment management across different levels

We have demonstrated how field-level logics are the result of the interplay between higher-level institutional orders and concrete historic developments of the particular field, and how actors in real organizations enact them. As we have already captured the two latter issues, we now move to demonstrate the former – the 'institutional' in the 'institutional logics', so to speak. In so doing, we empirically illustrate the relationship between the orders and logics characterized by near-decomposability, as Thornton et al. (2012) have posited theoretically.

We understand *the logic of advocacy* as an instantiation of the order of the state. The logic emphasizes democratic participation of different groups in the work environment process, and finds its legitimacy not in the corporate hierarchy or strategy, but rather in increasing the common good for all organizational actors. Historically, the logic has been formed as a result of the political compromises and collective bargaining results of the Danish labor relations systems. However, the logic does not put great emphasis on the bureaucratic system-thinking, which is also considered part of the state order by Thornton et al. (2012). In fact, a great many of the actors who refer to the logic of advocacy find the bureaucratic system-thinking to be a form of anathema to their mission of improvements in the working

environment. This dynamic of segregation (Thornton et al. 2012: 111) of parts of the order of the state is an example of the near-composability of the institutional orders and their instantiations on the lower levels of analysis.

The logic of compliance is according to our analysis a blend (Thornton et al. 2012) of the order of the state and the order of the corporation. The logic plays down the participatory aspects of the state logic, while playing up compliance with the work environment law as the main source of legitimation and motivation. The logic, however, also emphasizes the corporate hierarchy and the professional experts' position in said hierarchy. Furthermore, we can see strong motivations to be 'good' organizations in the logic of compliance, because it is expected of organizations from normative pressures outside the gates, but also because it benefits the organizations' reputational standing in the public and regulative eyes. In this way, it also invokes key parts of the order of the corporation.

Finally, we see that *the logic of commitment* is rooted in modern human resource management, i.e. it is focused on creating commitment and engagement towards the workplace from individual employees, and thereby enhancing organizational performance. Therefore, the logic of commitment also presents itself as a representation of the institutional order of the corporation (Thornton et al. 2012). Consequently, work environment issues in this logic become whatever is creating barriers for engagement and commitment and, by extension, for increasing performance by the employees.

What our analysis thus shows is that the institutional logics in the particular field are not copies of the higher institutional orders. They are instead the result of an interplay between historic field-level processes, the values and principles from higher institutional orders and, finally, the enactment by concrete actors in concrete organizations. In this way, an institutional order is simultaneously 'transformed' on two levels before actually becoming incarnated in organizational practice, i.e. the transformation of the institutional orders into emergent field-level logics, and the transformation by actors into concrete practice on the organizational level. As such, we see the field-level institutional logics as emergent structures (Archer 1995) where neither the historic developments or the institutional orders alone can explain the prescriptions, values and meanings that field-level logics offer organizational actors. Furthermore, a field-level logic is always enacted into a concrete historical and organizational context. The individual work environment professionals make sense of the issues and problems they face in their everyday work through the lenses of the three field-level logics. As a result, we can see the decomposable structure of the inter-institutional system, as well as the partial autonomy of the individual actors.

Most significantly, this can be seen in the logic of advocacy. The order of the state cannot, in itself, explain why this field-level logic is shaped the way it is – why its adherents in the companies pursue work environment improvements through coalition building and maintaining neutrality. Only the specific context of the Danish labor market and its traditions for tripartism and negotiation on several levels of analysis can fully explain that professional staff specialists in a large technical bureaucracies 'stand up to management' as

a part of their job motivations, or that it is an integral part of their tasks to lobby management and employees alike for more focus on the work environment.

With regards to the compliance logic, it is also the result of field-level contingencies and historical developments, even if it is not as specific to the Danish context as the logic of advocacy. The logic of compliance is an amalgam of the American company-centered 'safety management tradition', and a continental European state-centered 'command-control' approach to safety management. This blend of the state and the corporation orders has appeared because of both a more general shift in the way welfare states are governed through less state control and more self-regulation, which has been an important part of the development in western societies in recent decades (Gunningham 2011). However, the logic of compliance is also the result of criticisms from inside the field of work environment management regarding the so-called 'side-car position' of the work environment organizations in the 1980s. Therefore, the change and genesis of the compliance logic was not exclusively externally implemented, but is also the result of processes inside the field.

The logic of commitment meanwhile refers to the corporation, but only to the 'softer' side of corporate management, about creating culture, social capital and competencies among employees, and it is not in any way controversial to say that the corporation order also contains practices that can be seen as anathema to the practices and values of the logic of commitment. However, the interplay between the historic field-level processes, the context of work environment and the institutional order of the corporation shaped the logic of commitment in the concrete instantiation that we have described in this paper.

Overall, our analysis have shown that there are multiple interactive analytical levels to consider when investigating institutional logics and their concrete enactment in companies. Moreover, it has shown that a framework of both critical realism and institutional logics is highly compatible and strengthens the analytical muscle of the logics perspective.

Concluding discussion

The story we have presented here is not the simple story that the professionalization of organizational work environment management has eroded participation and workplace democracy and led to a narrower focus on performance and rationalized systems thinking. Rather, it is the insight that all of these values matter in the management of today's work environment and therefore present organizational actors with the challenging task of interpreting and enacting multiple logics into their everyday organizational practices. The field of work environment is not characterized by one dominant logic which defines the practices and values of the actors, but rather by three field logics which co-exist in the field and offer competing and sometimes contradictory prescriptions of practice to actors in the field.

This leads us to our theoretical contribution to the development of the perspective of institutional logics in organizational analyses. As described, the institutional logics concept emphasizes that societal change and action can – and should – be explained at multiple levels. However, the research has, in general, divided itself into macro- and micro-oriented studies. While both lines of research have obviously produced interesting and thought-provoking work in their own right, this division in analytical levels has resulted in some confusion regarding what constitutes logics and orders, and how the relationship between these concepts and the actors enacting them is to be conceptualized. This is evident in the fact that the concept of near-decomposability between the different levels, while theorized by Thornton and colleagues (2012) in their reformulation, has not been furthered by any subsequent studies.

Therefore, our study furthers the perspective of institutional logics by using the concept of near-decomposability analytically in our empirical setting and thereby providing an illuminating example on the nested relationship between the different levels of analysis. To clarify the understanding of near-decomposability, we draw upon the concept of the stratified ontology, which divides social reality into three distinct ontological domains (the real, the actual and the empirical) and helps us understand the differences between the different levels described by institutional logics scholars. The immediate enactments of logics by concrete actors take place in the empirical domain. Here, the actors enact and reinterpret values and practices that exist in the larger institutional field of work environment. The logics enacted will only be meaningful for both actors and observers in the concrete context of the individual organization. At this level, the logics interact with reflexive actors with their own history and agency (Delbridge & Edwards 2013) which leads to specific instantiations at organizational levels. However, these logics are situated on the deeper level of the actual in the institutional field. This field encompasses all actors who, in some way, participate and have participated in work environment management in Denmark, inside and outside the actual organizations throughout its history. These are all processes and interactions that we, in theory, have possibilities to investigate empirically. Here, the specific historical processes described in our analyses have led to the emergence of three institutional logics that are enacted by actors inside the organizations. Nonetheless, as we have shown, these are not just any logics, but rather instantiations of the institutional orders of the state and the corporation. These orders are situated at the deepest ontological domain – the domain of the real. Here, the institutional orders exist as root institutions in our collective imaginations. However, our point here is that these are too abstract and too pure to appear in real life fields or contexts. They are carried in what Archer terms mediating concepts, and these mediating concepts exist in the field as institutional logics which have emerged from the interaction between root institutions of society and the concrete historical processes in the field. They have emergent properties, by which we mean that they are not reducible to either the root orders or the historical processes in themselves. It is only in the interaction in the two that the logics make sense.

Our integrated and multilevel model of institutional logics can be seen as a response to, and clarification of, the criticisms and charges against the logics perspective of being

downwards conflationary or 'Durkheimian' (Hallett & Ventresca 2006) in the sense of presenting social reality as the result of deeper structural phenomena, without any room for actors to exercise agency. The analysis of the *"analytical history of emergence"* (Archer 1995: 91) for institutional logics in a particular field is therefore a key undertaking for academic work in the field of institutional logics. What interactions between historical interactions and institutional orders have led to a particular configuration (segregation or blend) of institutional logics that condition the social reality of contemporary actors in the field, and how does the agency exercised by these actors in translating and interpreting the different logics play out?

In this manner, we have shown how the concept of near-decomposability in the inter-institutional system is key if we are to understand how institutional logics mediate values from the abstract level of institutional orders to concrete organizations and actors. We are therefore hopeful that our contributions will lead to an increased attention paid to the multilevel character of institutional processes with regard to logics, and we believe that in order to understand the relationship between the levels, our framework of near-decomposability and critical realist concepts can be a tool.

Finally, our study has practical implications. For many years, research relating to the work environment management has pointed to the fact that knowledge on both exposure and risks, as well as knowledge on measures of improvement for said risks, has steadily increased (Hasle et al. 2014; Zanko & Dawson 2012). However, there is still a lack of knowledge that illuminates how organizations receive and implement policies and new practices. We believe that our study presents valuable knowledge as this can help explain the different lenses through which organizational staff specialists look at new policies or strategies, and thus help explain the divergence in implementation and choices when it comes to responding to new regulations and other field-level pressures that have characterized the field of work environment in Denmark (Hasle et al. 2014).

Avenues for future research

We believe that an important future extension of the theoretical model we present here is to explore how the field-level logics are affected and shaped by the interactions and agency of actors. Specifically, that agents, through their interpretations and interactions, not only shape how logics are enacted in an organizational level, but also how these enactments become part of structuring of logics in the field, a process Archer terms 'structural elaboration' (Archer 1995) to describe how structures are also elaborated by social interactions between actors, and how these elaborated structures then form the conditioning context for actors in the next round of social interaction. We believe that more research is needed to explain the processes of how local practices and interpretations are diffused in the field and modify field-level logics in interaction with institutional orders.

Institutional studies normally describe how organizations are increasingly forced to operate in complex institutional environments. They have to simultaneously satisfy various shareholders, legislators, customers and societal stakeholders. As a consequence of this,

institutional scholars have increasingly conceptualized institutional environments as consisting of multiple different fields with often contradictory institutional demands that organizations must navigate to succeed (Kraatz & Block 2008; Pache & Santos 2010; Besharov & Smith 2014). This complexity can be seen as a struggle between different groups inside companies. In recent years, many studies have highlighted the role of organizational subgroups in the translation and imposing of institutional projects from external fields into their organizations. Examples of such are manifold, and include safety managers in the French construction industry (Daudigeos 2013), HR professionals (Lindström 2016) and health care managers (Currie & Spyridonidis 2016). However, as we have shown in this paper, these fields themselves (i.e. the work environment field) are not in agreement and unison, but are often characterized by multiple actors and competing institutional logics with a multiplicity of meanings, practices and organizing principles.

Therefore, it is also clear that more research is needed that builds upon the insights we have presented in this paper. First of all, we need greater knowledge on how the three institutional logics co-exist inside the companies. Research has previously shown that institutional logics can co-exist in either competitive (conflictual) or cooperative constellations (Goodrick & Reay 2011). Therefore, does the presence of different institutional logics result in increased internal strife and conflict between actors enacting the various logics, or are different logics enacted in cooperative relationships? In relation to this, we also propose future research that investigates the internal structuring of the work environment and the staff specialists responsible. Do organizations with an increased functional specialization of work environment tasks in different staff functions experience an increased institutional complexity of logics in relation to organizations where one staff function deals with all work environment-related issues? Finally, we believe that it is necessary relating to more research into the professional roles and identities of the actual professional specialists inhabiting the specialist functions, and if these differences lead to the enactment of different logics or to different translations of said logics.

Literature:

Abrahamsson, L. & Johansson, J., 2013. One Hundred Years of Inertia: An Exposé of the

Concept of the Psychosocial Work Environment in Swedish Policy and Research. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 3(1), pp.4–30.

Arbejdsministeriet, 1995. *Psykosociale risikofaktorer i arbejdslivet*, København.

Archer, M.S., 1995. *Realist social theory: the morphogenetic approach*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Berg Johansen, C. & Waldorff, S.B., 2015. What are Institutional Logics - and Where is the Perspective Taking Us? *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2015(1), pp.14380–14380.

Besharov, M.L. & Smith, W.K., 2014. Multiple Institutional Logics in Organizations: Explaining Their Varied Nature and Implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), pp.364–381.

Bhaskar, R., 1997. *A Realist Theory of Science*, Verso.

Binder, A., 2007. For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society*, 36(6), pp.547–571.

Boch Waldorff, S., 2013. Accounting for organizational innovations: Mobilizing institutional logics in translation. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 29(3), pp.219–234.

Boxenbaum, E., 2006. Lost in Translation: The Making of Danish Diversity Management. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(7), pp.939–948.

Currie, G. & Spyridonidis, D., 2016. Interpretation of Multiple Institutional Logics on the Ground: Actors Position, their Agency and Situational Constraints in Professionalized Contexts. *Organization Studies*, 37(1), pp.77–97.

Daudigeos, T., 2013. In Their Profession's Service: How Staff Professionals Exert Influence in Their Organization. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(5), pp.722–749.

Daudigeos, T., Boutinot, A. & Jaumier, S., 2013. Taking Stock of Institutional Complexity: Anchoring a pool of institutional logics into the interinstitutional system. *Institutional Logics in Action*, 39, pp.319–350.

Delbridge, R. & Edwards, T., 2013. Inhabiting Institutions: Critical Realist Refinements to Understanding Institutional Complexity and Change. *Organization Studies*, 34(7), pp.927–947.

Dyreborg, J., 2011. "Safety Matters Have Become Too Important for Management to Leave it Up to the Workers" –The Nordic OSH Model Between Implicit and Explicit Frameworks. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 1(1), pp.135–160.

Ehnert, I., 2009. *Sustainable Human Resource Management - A conceptual and exploratory analysis from a paradox perspective*, Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.

Fleetwood, S., 2005. Ontology in Organization and Management Studies: A Critical Realist

Perspective. *Organization*, 12(2), pp.197–222.

Flyvbjerg, B., 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), pp.219–245.

Frick, K. & Kempa, V., 2011. *Occupational Health & Safety Management System: When are They Good for Your Health?*, Brussels.

Friedland, R., 2012. The Institutional Logics Perspective: A new approach to Culture, Structure, and Process. *M@n@gement*, 15(5), p.583-.

Friedland, R. & Alford, R.R., 1991. Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio, eds. *The New Institutionalism In Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.

Goodrick, E. & Reay, T., 2011. Constellations of Institutional Logics: Changes in the Professional Work of Pharmacists. *Work and Occupations*, 38(3), pp.372–416.

Greenwood, R. & Suddaby, R., 2006. Institutional Entrepeneurship in Mature Fields: The Big Five Accounting Firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), pp.27–48.

Gunningham, N., 2011. Strategizing compliance and enforcement: Responsive regulation and beyond. In C. Parker & V. L. Nielsen, eds. *Explaining Compliance: Business responses to regulation*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 385.

Hall, P. & Soskice, D., 2001. An Introduction to Varieties of Capitalism. In P. Hall & D. Soskice, eds. *Varieties of Capitalism: The INstitutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford University Press, pp. 1–70.

Hallett, T. & Ventresca, M.J., 2006. Inhabited Institutions: Social Interactions and Organizational Forms in Gouldner's Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. *Theory and Society*, 35(2), pp.213–236.

Hasle, P., 2014. Lean Production-An Evaluation of the Possibilities for an Employee Supportive Lean Practice. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, 24(1), pp.40–53.

Hasle, P., 2016. Lean as a Tool for Systematic Employee based Improvement of Psychosocial Factors in Hospitals. *Academy of Management. Annual Meeting Proceedings*.

Hasle, P., Limborg, H.J. & Nielsen, K.T., 2014. Working environment interventions – Bridging the gap between policy instruments and practice. *Safety Science*, 68, pp.73–80.

Hasle, P., Seim, R. & Refslund, B., 2016. From employee representation to problem-solving - Mainstreaming OHS management. *Economic and Industrial Democracy (Forthcoming)*.

Hedegaard Riis, A. & Langaa Jensen, P., 2002. Denmark: Transforming Risk Assessment

to Workplace Assessment. In D. Walters, ed. *Regulating Health and Safety Management in the European Union*. Brussels: P.I.E - Peter Lang, pp. 59–80.

Hohnen, P. et al., 2014. Hard Work in Soft Regulation: A Discussion of the Social Mechanisms in OHS Management Standards and Possible Dilemmas in the Regulation of Psychosocial Work Environment. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 4(3), pp.13–30.

Hohnen, P. & Hasle, P., 2011. Making work environment auditable–A "critical case"study of certified occupational health and safety management systems in Denmark. *Safety Science*, 49(7), pp.1022–1029.

Holt Larsen, H., 2009. HRM: Ledelse af virksomhedens menneskelige ressourcer [HRM: Management of the human resources of the firm]. *Ledelse og Erhvervsøkonomi [Management and Business]*, (4), pp.7–19.

Holt Larsen, H., 2014. Human Resource Management. In S. Vikkelsø & P. Kjær, eds. *Klassisk og Moderne Organisationsteori [Classical and Modern Organization Theory]*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag, pp. 589–612.

Hwang, H. & Powell, W.W., 2009. The Rationalization of Charity: The Influences of Professionalism in the Nonprofit Sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 54(2), pp.268–298.

Jacobsen, K., 2011. *Velfærdens Pris: Arbejderbeskyttelse og Arbejdsmiljø Gennem 150 år [The Price of Welfare: Workers Protection and Work Environment Through 150 years]*, Copenhagen: Gads Forlag.

Jacobsen, S. et al., 2013. Quality in Modern Nordic Working Life—Investigating Three Related Research Perspectives and Their Possible Cross-Fertilization. *Nordic journal of Working Life Studies*, 3(3).

Jespersen, A.H., Hasle, P. & Nielsen, K.T., 2016. The Wicked Character of Psychosocial Risks: Implications for Regulation. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies; Vol 6, No 3 (2016)DO - 10.19154/njwls.v6i3.5526* .

Jonsson, S. & Lounsbury, M., 2017. The Meaning of Economic Democracy: Institutional Logics, Parabiosis, and the Construction of Frames. In J. Gehman, M. Lounsbury, & R. Greenwood, eds. *How Institutions Matter!*. Research in the Sociology of Organizations. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 3–71.

Kabel, A., Hasle, P. & Limborg, H.J., 2007. Occupational health services in Denmark – the rise and fall of a multidisciplinary and preventive approach. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, 5(sup1), pp.25–38.

Kamp, A., 2009. Bridging collective and individual approaches to occupational safety and health: what promises does workplace health promotion hold? *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, (18)(1), pp.85–102.

Kamp, A. & Le Blansch, K., 2000. Integrating Management of OHS and the Environment - Participation, Prevention and Control. In K. Frick et al., eds. *Systematic Occupational*

Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 413–436.

Kamp, A. & Nielsen, K.T., 2013. Management of Occupational Health and Safety. In Å. Sandberg, ed. *Nordic lights: Work, management and welfare in Scandinavia*. SNS Forlag.

Kraatz, M.S. & Block, E., 2008. Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood et al., eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. pp. 243–275.

Leca, B. & Naccache, P., 2006. A Critical Realist Approach To Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization*, 13(5), pp.627–651.

Legge, K., 2005. *Human Resource Management: Rhetorics and Realities; Anniversary Edition*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Limborg, H.J., 2001. The professional working environment consultant? A new actor in the health and safety arena. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, 11(2), pp.159–172.

Limborg, H.J. & Voxted, J., 2008. *Arbejdsmiljørådgivningens fremtid – set i historisk lys [The Future of Work Environment Counselling - In a historical light]*,

Lindberg, K., 2014. Performing multiple logics in practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30(4), pp.485–497.

Lindström, S., 2016. "An army of our own": Legitimating the professional position of HR through well-being at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 32(4), pp.189–196.

Martin, G. et al., 2017. Institutional Complexity and Individual Responses: Delineating the Boundaries of Partial Autonomy. *Organization Studies*, 38(1), pp.103–127.

McPherson, C.M. & Sauder, M., 2013. Logics in Action: Managing Institutional Complexity in a Drug Court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2), pp.165–196.

Meyer, R.E. & Höllerer, M.A., 2016. Laying a smoke screen: Ambiguity and neutralization as strategic responses to intra-institutional complexity. *Strategic Organization*, 14(4), pp.373–406.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M., 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* 2nd ed., SAGE Publications.

Møller Christiansen, J. & Limborg, H.J., 2005. *Private virksomheders håndtering af det psykiske arbejdsmiljø [Private companies handling of the psychosocial work environment]*,

Pache, A.-C. & Santos, F., 2010. When Worlds Collide: The Internal Dynamics of Organizational Responses to Conflicting Institutional Demands. *Academy of Management Review* , 35(3), pp.455–476.

Pagell, M. et al., 2015. Are safety and operational effectiveness contradictory requirements: The roles of routines and relational coordination. *Journal of Operations Management*, 36, pp.1–14.

Pallas, J., Fredriksson, M. & Wedlin, L., 2016. Translating Institutional Logics: When the Media Logic Meets Professions. *Organization Studies* , 37(11), pp.1661–1684.

Pawlowska, Z. & Eeckelaert, L., 2010. *Mainstreaming OSH into business management*, Bruxelles.

Pedersen, O.K., 2006. Denmark's Negotiated Economy. In J. L. Campbell, J. A. Hall, & O. K. Pedersen, eds. *National Identity and the Varieties of Capitalism: The Danish Experience*. McGill University Press, p. 525.

Rao, H., Monin, P. & Durand, R., 2003. Institutional Change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an Identity Movement in French Gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(4), pp.795–843.

Rasmussen, M.B., Hansen, T. & Nielsen, K.T., 2011. New tools and strategies for the inspection of the psychosocial working environment: The experience of the Danish Working Environment Authority. *Safety Science*, 49(4), pp.565–574.

Reay, T. & Jones, C., 2016. Qualitatively capturing institutional logics. *Strategic Organization*, 14(4), pp.441–454.

Rocha, R.S. & Granerud, L., 2011. The search for legitimacy and organizational change: The agency of subordinated actors. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27(3), pp.261–272.

Rosenberg, M.M., 2015. The conceptual articulation of the reality of life: Max Weber's theoretical constitution of sociological ideal types. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 16(1), pp.84–101.

Sayer, A., 1992. *Method in Social Science* 2nd ed., Routledge.

Seim, R., Limborg, H.J. & Jensen, P.L., 2015. Professionalization of occupational health and safety management in Danish companies and the effects on worker participation. In *Proceedings 19th Triennial Congress of the IEA*. p. 14.

Simmons, S. & Stampe Øland, J., 1992. *Workplace Assessment*, Dublin.

Swuste, P., Gulijk, C. van & Zwaard, W., 2010. Safety metaphors and theories, a review of the occupational safety literature of the US, UK and The Netherlands, till the first part of the 20th century. *Safety Science*, 48(8), pp.1000–1018.

Thornton, P.H., Ocasio, W. & Lounsbury, M., 2012. *The Institutional Logics Perspective - A New Approach To Culture, Structure, And Process*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thornton, P.H., Ocasio, W. & Ocasio, W., 1999. Institutional Logics and the Historical Contingency of Power in Organizations: Executive Succession in the Higher Education Publishing Industry, 1958– 1990 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3),

pp.801–843.

Uhrenholdt Madsen, C. & Hasle, P., 2016. Commitment or Compliance?—Competing institutional logics in the field of OHS management. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, In review.

Walters, D. & Jensen, P.L., 2000. The Discourses and Purposes behind the development of the EU framework directive 89/391. In K. Frick et al., eds. *Systematic Occupational Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing, pp. 87–99.

Weber, M. & Whimster, S., 2004. *The Essential Weber: A Reader*, Psychology Press.

Zanko, M. & Dawson, P., 2012. Occupational health and safety management in organizations: a review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(3), pp.328–344.

PAPER 2: COMMITMENT OR COMPLIANCE? INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS OF WORK ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT*

Christian Uhrenholdt Madsen

PhD Fellow, Dept. of Materials and Production, Aalborg University

AND

Peter Hasle

Professor, Dept. of Materials and Productions, Aalborg University

Abstract

Scholars of the work environment have pointed out how management ideas and practices inspired by a human resource approach are influencing the work environment efforts in Nordic organizations. In this paper, we use the 'institutional logics' perspective to propose heuristic ideal types of two institutional logics of work environment management: The logic of compliance as the ideal type of the 'traditional' approach to work environment management and the logic of commitment as the human resource informed approach. Through a side-by-side comparison of key characteristics, we analyze the two ideal types as instantiations of institutional orders on the societal level with the compliance logic being rooted in the orders of the state and the corporation, and the commitment logic as based on the orders of the corporation. The paper ends with a discussion on the how the two logics can influence concrete work environment practices and approaches to management in organizations.

*Published in Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies Vol.7.Issue S2.2017
(DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18291/njwls.v7iS2.96688

Commitment or Compliance? Institutional Logics of Work Environment Management[1]

▮ **Christian Uhrenholdt Madsen**[2]
PhD Fellow, Center for Industrial Production, Aalborg University, Denmark

▮ **Peter Hasle**
Professor, Center for Industrial Production, Aalborg University, Denmark

ABSTRACT

Scholars of the work environment have pointed out how management ideas and practices inspired by a human resource approach are influencing the work environment efforts in Nordic organizations. In this paper, we use the 'institutional logics' perspective to propose heuristic ideal types of two institutional logics of work environment management: The logic of compliance as the ideal type of the 'traditional' approach to work environment management and the logic of commitment as the human resource informed approach. Through a side-by-side comparison of key characteristics, we analyze the two ideal types as instantiations of institutional orders on the societal level with the compliance logic being rooted in the orders of the state and the corporation, and the commitment logic as based on the orders of the corporation. The paper ends with a discussion on the how the two logics can influence concrete work environment practices and approaches to management in organizations.

KEY WORDS

Commitment / Compliance / HRM / Human resource management / Ideal types / Institutional logics / Institutional theory / Occupational Health and Safety / OHS / Work environment

Introduction

The organizational approaches to work environment management are undergoing considerable change in the Nordic countries in these years, which in turn have an impact on how organizations in Scandinavia develop their strategies, systems, and practices aimed at this issue. There are three major trends behind this development: 1) The movement of governmental regulation from command-control toward increased self-regulation in the last decades (Aalders & Wilthagen, 1997); 2) A growing social pressure on organizations to behave in a socially responsible manner (Dyreborg, 2011; Hart, 2009); 3) The still greater focus on psychosocial factors at work (Abrahamsson & Johansson, 2013). One important consequence of these changes is that organizations tend to change their fundamental approach to the work environment from an issue they deal with in order to satisfy external regulatory bodies or satisfy employee demands, toward considering the work environment as an issue in its own right which has to be

[1] You can find this text and its doi at https://tidsskrift.dk/njwls/index.

[2] Christian Uhrenholdt Madsen, Aalborg University, AC Meyers Vænge 15, 2450 Copenhagen SV, Denmark, E-mail: cum[a]business.aau.dk

managed in order to secure a sustainable business practice and organizational outcomes. There is, therefore, a trend toward mainstreaming of the work environment (Pawlowska & Eeckelaert, 2010) with the consequence that it is managed in the organizations like any other organizational issue such as recruiting, accounting, and quality control (Hasle et al., 2016).

As the work environment has to do with employees' health, it has a lot in common with human resource management (HRM), which deals with the employees. The rise of HRM is widely seen as an organizational response to the shift toward a knowledge and service-based production, and thus to a view of employees as valuable resources in the global competition (Holt Larsen, 2014). HRM has been expanding its field of attention from merely administration of personnel matters such as salary systems and competence development to a broader approach to well-being and psychosocial work environment issues. The reason is both due to concerns for social sustainability (Dyreborg, 2011; Ehnert, 2009) and the recognition of psychosocial work environment and well-being as crucial preconditions for employee commitment and engagement, and by extension better performance (Tzafrir et al., 2015). In the English-speaking world, the related concept of occupational health and safety (OHS) is already a component of HRM (Zanko & Dawson, 2012, p. 329), which is reflected in the fact that a chapter on OHS is a standard in books on HRM for students and practitioners (see examples in Bratton & Gold, 2012; Torrington et al., 2008).

Meanwhile, scholars of the Nordic working life studies have described how ideas and concepts from HRM increasingly have found their way into work environment management.

> What we observe is that problems regarding health at work that are considered important in modern working life are increasingly managed in the human resources (HR) rather than the OSH domain. (Kamp, 2009:86)

It is furthermore suggested as an 'HR-fication' of the work environment (Kamp & Nielsen, 2013), while other scholars also point to the same development (Abrahamsson & Johansson, 2013; Georg, 2014; Holt Larsen, 2014; Jacobsen et al., 2013; Knudsen et al., 2011).

The consequence is an ongoing integration of the two fields of work environment and HRM. This development constitutes a challenge for the previous approach to the work environment, which up until now has been focused mainly on the management of risks and compliance to external regulatory pressures. The HRM approach may, for instance, change the focus from control of risk to the individual employee's resilience, coping strategies, and a personal responsibility for staying fit. It can therefore act as a complementary perspective that can cover crucial work environment issues in the modern working life, that a 'traditional' risk-based approach might overlook (e.g., psychosocial work environment and personal health issues). But it can, on the other hand, possibly obfuscate other and more traditional industrial risks such as accidents, chemical exposure, or repetitive strain injuries.

However, the extent of this development and the consequences for the work environment efforts remains up to now under-researched (Zanko & Dawson, 2012). One challenge for this endeavor is that the key constructs—'work environment', 'occupational health and safety', and 'human resource management'—have a multitude of different meanings and

a lack of clear consensus about definitions. It is therefore necessary to conceptualize these constructs and thereby create a foundation for future theoretical discussions and empirical studies. To do this, we build on institutional theory—specifically the institutional logics approach (Thornton et al., 2012), which we use to theorize how competing institutional logics and cultural frames of the traditional work environment and HRM approaches can affect how organizations manage the issue of the work environment. The purpose of our paper is therefore to use an institutional logics framework to conceptualize developments in the management of work environment in the Nordic countries, and thereby show what logics are available to actors in the field, and finalize theorize on possible practical consequences for the work environment efforts in the Nordic organizations.

Framework

Theoretical inspirations

In a review of management of OHS (Zanko & Dawson, 2012), the authors suggest that there is a lack of research on organizational implementation and, in particular, about how organizational actors make sense of external institutional demands for OHS. While the work environment research either has been focused on exposure and health risks on the individual level or on regulatory responses on a societal or at a sectoral level, the research on the organizational level has not produced a large body of work (Zanko & Dawson, 2012). The call for more knowledge on how organizations implement and translate ideas, practices, and strategies to improve the work environment has been made by other scholars as well (Cox et al., 2010; Hasle et al., 2014; Nielsen et al., 2010).

To do just that Hasle et al. (2014) present a theoretical model of how work environment interventions function in organizational contexts. The authors use a framework partly inspired by the neo-institutionalism of DiMaggio and Powell (1983). In the paper, the authors ask, 'What makes organizations react to the application of policy instruments?' (Hasle et al., 2014), and while the use of neo-institutional analysis certainly is an innovation in the field of work environment research, we find that the model mentioned above relies too heavily on the idea of isomorphic pressures and thus could be further strengthened by incorporating some of the more recent theoretical developments in institutional theory, more specifically, the stream of theory that addresses the issues of institutional complexity and competing institutional logics (Berg Johansen & Waldorff, 2015).

The neo-institutional perspective focuses on organizational isomorphism from coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) in a top-down perspective (either through regulation or through a field's conception of legitimate choices) as the main driver behind organizational change. And, as scholars point out (Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Seo & Creed, 2002; Wooten & Hoffman, 2008), the approach to institutional fields of the early new institutionalists such as DiMaggio & Powell has significant shortcomings in explaining changes and emergence of new ideas and practices in organizational fields. W. Richard Scott describes how institutional change 'poses a problem for a lot of classical texts in institutional theory, most of which view institutions as the source of stability and order' (Scott in Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006: 27). But, as our Introduction shows, the field of work environment management is not characterized by increasing homogeneity but actually just the opposite—an increasing diversity

in organizational responses and strategies. Therefore, our proposal is to use the institutional logics perspective (Thornton et al., 2012)—an analytical framework based on the emerging 'change and complexity' theoretical perspective in institutional theory (Berg Johansen & Waldorf, 2015: 5).

We use the institutional logics perspective to better understand work environment management as a field with multiple logics available to a wide array of actors vying for power and influence (Hoffman, 1999; Scott, 2014; Wooten & Hoffman, 2008), and where different cultural frames and ideas coexist and make alternative strategies available to actors in the field (Scott, 2014; Waldorff, Reay et al., 2013).

The institutional logics perspective describes how organizations are presented with a wide array of different institutional logics containing different sources of legitimacy, identity, and organizational practices (Thornton et al., 2012). Whereas early institutionalism focuses on the processes of isomorphism and the conformity and uniformity that necessarily follow in organizational fields, institutional logics can help explain the differences that remain between related organizations and their practices and why organizational fields are changing and evolving.

The institutional logics perspective is, as mentioned above, a relative novelty when theorizing on organizational approaches to work environment management, but the analytical framework has been utilized in related research. Dyreborg (2011) used the framework to contribute to the explanations to understand shifts in the Danish regulatory framework of safety management in the construction industry. Bjørnstad and Steen-Johnsen (2012) furthermore analyzed a workplace health promotion (WHP) scheme in a logistics company in Norway, using a similar concept of 'organizational logics'.

To provide an analytical framework with greater appreciation of the organizational contexts and how they are shaped, we reconceptualize the two approaches to the work environment, as two ideal types of field level institutional logics—one of compliance and one of commitment.

Ideal types

Ideal types are widely used tools in both sociology of work (e.g., Burawoy, 1985) and organization studies (e.g., Mintzberg, 1980), and are a methodological approach of distinction to create clarity in muddled empirical areas (Swedberg, 2005). Furthermore, as we describe later in our paper (in the section 'The Commitment Logic'), scholars of HRM have used idealtypes to categorize HRM practices into respectively 'hard' and 'soft' HRM practices (Legge, 2005). As ideal types, the two logics are not empirically detectable or concrete descriptions of any one organization's management philosophy, but are rather what Weber calls 'conceptual constructs' (Swedberg, 2005: 120) where certain properties, mechanisms, and practices of the field are amplified to better distinguish contradictions in overall strategies or organizational approaches (Swedberg, 2005). Ideal types are, as Max Weber himself writes: 'a harbor until one has learned to navigate safely in the vast sea of empirical facts' (Weber in Swedberg, 2005: 120), or as Scott puts it: 'useful maps to guide analysis and increase understanding of the real world' (Scott, 2014: 15). Therefore, the two ideal types cannot be seen as real phenomena that can be found and measured one to one, but rather as means to analyze 'cultural meanings into their logically pure components' (Whimster in Swedberg, 2005: 120).

Therefore, it is also important to note that in reality, the logics developed in our paper will not be two obviously distinctive systems of meanings and practices always recognizable in organizations, but on the other hand, they will blend and mix in various competitive and cooperative constellations as we elaborate in the following section.

The two logics in the present paper are constructed from multiple different theoretical and empirical sources to illustrate these cultural meanings. The sources are chosen by the authors and used in the formulation of the two ideal types. This rather eclectic selection of sources should not be seen as an empirical proof of our model, but rather as illustrations of our points about the two emerging field-level logics. Our theoretical sources are mainly drawn from Anglo-American scholarly traditions, which in one way or another have had an impact on the management ideas in Scandinavia. Our empirical illustrations are all from Nordic labour market contexts.

Not to simply name them *the HRM logic*, *the OHS logic*, or *the work environment logic* is an analytical choice we make for a number of reasons. First, because HRM, OHS, and work environment are concepts with a multitude of meanings and definitions, and as mentioned above, we believe that these names alone would obfuscate our essential points. Second, we want to make it clear that the commitment logic in our view is not practiced solely in HR departments, while the compliance logic in a similar vein is contained not only within OHS management units. Third, institutional logics are not the same as an ideology or a management theory (Thornton et al., 2012). Institutional logics are the overall framework of identities, ideas, and practices (which also includes ideologies or management theories). Thus, we identify a set of ideas and practices, which ultimately revolves around the principle of creating committed and motivated employees—the *commitment logic*, and a set of ideas and practices that revolves around the goal of complying with external demands to maintain legitimacy and legality—the *compliance logic*.

The two ideal types illustrate the wide array of strategies, practices, frames, and norms that are available to actors in the field of OHS management. We will, after a presentation of the basic concepts in institutional logics, get back to the analysis of the two ideal types, describing the norms, beliefs, and practices that make up the organizational contexts where the two typologies are enacted, and thus show how OHS practices are culturally embedded, and thereby at the same time leaving space for agency of the actors involved in the work environment management.

Institutional Logics

The institutional logics framework is developed over the last two decades and seeks to explain how 'individual and organizational actors are influenced by their situation in multiple social locations in an inter-institutional system' (Thornton et al., 2012: 2).

Institutional Orders (Macro-level)

Institutional logics is an attempt to understand and reconcile structure and agency in organizational sociology (Thornton et al., 2012), while at the same time it attempts to provide a framework to analyze and understand the behavior of real-world organizations

and organizational actors—a level of analysis that has been somewhat forgotten in the mainstream of institutional theory in the last decades (Berg Johansen & Waldorff, 2015; Greenwood et al., 2014). The main and most simple point is that all institutions and societal actors are connected in a network of 'institutional orders' (Thornton et al., 2012), and that these can be found in instantiations at the various levels in society where they are shaped and refined into collective identities and thus provide actors with categories, organizing principles, and frames (Thornton et al., 2012). Researchers have used these broad principles of institutional logics as inspiration for analyses in various institutional and organizational settings, from the strategizing of book publishing companies (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999) over the symbolic struggles between modernizers and reactionaries in French cuisine (Rao et al., 2003), to competing logics in software development (Westenholz, 2012).

The inter-institutional system consists of seven overall ideal type orders: family, religion, state, market, profession, corporation, and community. Each of the orders consists of values, modes of governance, legitimacy, and authority (Thornton et al., 2012: 73). So, the orders in the inter-institutional system each build what can be described as 'core societal institutions' on the macro-level and the values, rules, and practices they contain (Greenwood et al., 2014: 1214). And while each of these orders are distinct systems with distinct rules, values, and practices, they will, on a meso-level of organizational fields, appear as the institutional logic specific for the particular field. The main argument in the institutional logics perspective is that a specific empirical context always refers back to one or more of the institutional orders on a macro level in society. In this way, a meso-level institutional logic in the field of work environment that places trust in systems, bureaucracy, and compliance can be seen as an instantiation of the macro-level order of the state, and another logic that values organizational performance and commitment to the values and culture of the organization can be seen as an instantiation of the corporate order.

Institutional Logics in Organizational Fields (Meso-level)

The organizational field is the meso-level social arena between the overall level of society, and the individual organization and organizational actors. It consists of groups of organizations and actors who share some common characteristics or issues. It is at this level in the institutional logics perspective, where the overall institutional orders of the state and the corporation are transformed into specific instantiations of logics work environment management. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) originally defined organizational fields in their seminal paper as groupings of organizations with commonalities in terms of products, customers, or suppliers.

Hoffmann (1999) and others later revised this conception of fields. He describes how fields can be organized around an issue (in his case, environmental management in the American chemical industry). In this way, the field becomes the arena of power struggles between actors with divergent interests, as well as an arena that presents competing institutional logics to organizations. So, whereas organizational fields were mainly seen as the medium for institutional isomorphism in organizations (Seo & Creed, 2002; Wooten & Hoffman, 2008), we see them as arenas not only causing organizations to change their practices and identities through institutionalization but also as arenas

that are themselves subject to change processes and conflicts as well (Hoffmann, 1999; Wooten & Hoffman, 2008).

Institutional Logics in Organizations (Micro-level)

Field-level logics are bridging the societal-level orders and their logics with the actions and practices of organizations and individuals in society. Field logics are both shaped by the institutional orders on a societal-level at the same time, as they are shaped by processes happening in-field (Thornton et al., 2012:148). Even formerly stable fields are subject to change given the right circumstances. So, where the organizational field can act as a medium for the institutionalization and further diffusion of already established institutional logics, it can also see the rise of new and alternative logics that challenge the current orthodoxies (Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Seo & Creed, 2002) or, in some cases, coexist with the former (Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Waldorff et al., 2013). Researchers point out that institutional logics can exist in various constellations (Goodrick & Reay, 2011)—both competitively, that is, competing for dominance in the given field or organization, in a segmented form where the competing logics exist side by side in separate spheres of the organizational life, or even in cooperative form where the existence of multiple institutional logcs can actually enhance and empower each other and the practices they entail (see Goodrick & Reay, 2011, or Lindberg, 2014; Waldorf et al., 2013).

Institutional Logics of Work Environment Management

The key constructs for the logic of our two typologies for work environment management, compliance and commitment, are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1 Institutional logics of work environment management

	Compliance	Commitment
Institutional orders	• State • Corporation	• Corporation
Key historical events	• Command-control regulation • 'Safety first' movement • Risk assessment and reflexivity	• The Hawthorne studies • Socio-technical experiments • Increasing environmental complexity • Increasing competition
Foundational theories	• 'Rational systems' approach • Scientific management • Safety management • Occupational health and safety management systems	• 'Natural systems' approach • Human resource theory • Elton Mayo's therapeutic management • McGregor's Theory Y

In the following part, we present the two logics, their relation to the inter-institutional orders, historical development and their roots in various management and organization theories and perspectives.

The Compliance Logic

In the earliest days of management of health and safety in organizations, two diverging tendencies emerged. A regulatory strand that promoted and developed governmental control and legislation emerged especially in Germany and England, also known as the command-control model, while an American 'safety management' strand chose the path of self-regulation, where businesses themselves work to combat accidents and promote safety (Abrahamsson & Johansson, 2013). The compliance logic is in many ways an amalgam of these two strands that together became the foundation of the compliance logic's combined understanding of both the work environment, and the management and regulation thereof (Abrahamsson & Johansson, 2013).

The regulatory strand has been characterized by a move from what can be described as 'command-and-control' systems to a more reflexive paradigm of OHS-management (Aalders & Wilthagen, 1997). From the 1970s and onward, it became increasingly evident that the command-and-control systems were not adequate to tackle the ever more complex health and safety problems, and the need for a move toward more reflexivity and self-regulation on a workplace level became evident (Hasle, 2010). A number of Western countries subsequently implemented new regimes of OHS legislation that were characterized by three common denominators (Frick & Wren, 2000: 22):

- Employers responsibility for OHS on a workplace level,
- Comprehensive and separate OHS-legislation,
- Workers involvement in OHS-management.

The last point especially was the result of the political strength of both trade unions and their political counterparts in center-left governments during the last half of the 20th century, and can be seen as a prime example of the way that the industrial relations of this era tried to institutionalize systems of consent between employees and employers while at the same time acknowledging the basic conflict of interest between the two parties—the so-called 'conflict-based consensus' approach (Jensen, 2012). Johnny Dyreborg describes this development in the following way: 'The command and control governance model was in this way supplemented by a decentralized participation model' (Dyreborg, 2011:142). In his institutional history of the Danish work environment, this participatory logic in turn again is supplemented by another logic, which he dubs the 'market logic' (Dyreborg, 2011).

In the management strand, on the other hand, the first programs to secure healthy and safe workplaces were rooted in the 'safety first' movement of the early 20th century (Nielsen, 2000), and eventually saw large corporations maintaining systematic registration of accidents and extensive strategies for risk prevention. This evolved further into more systematic approaches in large organizations, such as the Dupont STOP approach (Safety Training Observation Program), which emphasized behavioral regulation of employees to maintain safe procedures and to report any unnoticed risks or hazards. The STOP approach is still in place in large organizations across the globe but is, to a large extent, developed into systems of OHS management (Frick & Kempa, 2011; Hohnen & Hasle, 2011).

Safety management and the regulatory strand have in many ways merged with the introduction of the so-called 'occupational health and safety management systems',

which have become mandatory in various forms (Frick & Kempa, 2011). The 1989 Framework Directive (89/391/EEC) of the European Union is a good example of regulatory demand for an OHS-management-like mandatory system. OHS management systems ideally lead to implementation and maintenance of systematic managerial approaches to the work environment (Kaj Frick & Kempa, 2011; Hohnen & Hasle, 2011; Robson et al., 2007). But from command-control, through the legislative regulation of the 1980s, and finally in the systematic approaches of OHS management from the 1980s and onward, the main logic has been that of risk management. This is apparent in the framework directive from the European Union (Frick, 2011), in national legislations (Walters & Wadsworth, 2014), and the international standards and certificates on OHS on which voluntary OHS management systems are based (Hasle & Zwetsloot, 2011; Hohnen & Hasle, 2011; Kaj Frick & Kempa, 2011).

Institutional orders

The compliance logic is both based on the order of the state and the order of the corporation. It adheres to the corporate bureaucracy and the hierarchies embedded in this. Furthermore, the logic also has the purpose protecting the corporation from liability, from costs associated with accidents and health issues, and thus maintaining the market position of the organization. Through the years however, the main counterpart of the compliance logic has been the legal requirements and authorities with which organizations should comply—the intention of the internal compliance systems (OHS management system) is to mimic the external regulatory goals (Parker & Gilad, 2011).

Theoretical foundations

The theoretical inspirations of the compliance logic all see organizations as rational systems, a view that organizations consist of 'purposeful and coordinated agents' (Scott & Davis, 2007: 36). Therefore, goal specificity and a high degree of formalization characterize the logic, as well as the belief in systematization and thorough analysis and descriptions of all steps in all processes.

An important point of departure for the compliance logic is Taylor's scientific management (Frick & Wren, 2000: 21). The Taylorist legacy is, in terms of the compliance logic and the work environment, especially evident in the idea that knowledge and processes can be understood, rationalized, and reduced into general management systems and manuals.

The overall principles of scientific management were made specific to health and safety by Heinrich and Petersen (Heinrich et al., 1980; Nielsen, 2000). Their principles of safety illustrate the rational approach: (1) Unsafe acts, conditions, or accidents are all symptoms of failures of management and the system, (2) events and conditions that produce injuries can be predicted, identified, and thus controlled, (3) safety is a function like any other organizational function. It should be dealt with as such (like quality, production, or sales), (4) safety is achieved through fixed procedures of accountability for line management, (5) the responsibility of the specialized function of safety should deal with work environment issues by defining root causes of accidents and by maintaining the management system (as described by Nielsen, 2000:106).

The Commitment Logic

Modern HRM has two different main objectives in organizations—one transactional and the other transformational (Boglind et al., 2011; Storey et al., 2009). The former ensures that all employee-related administration is managed competently. This objective covers employment relations, legal issues, salary, union negotiations, and hiring and firing practices, to name a few. The latter, on the other hand, is concerned with change management and 'long-term strategic' work (Storey et al., 2009). It may include developing competencies, utilizing hidden human resources strategically, and developing the human capital and dynamic capabilities inside the companies. The commitment logic presented in this paper can be seen as a part of the transformational version, which in turn is partly rooted in the theories of cooperation and management developed by the human relations school.

The human relations school of management philosophy is an important theoretical inspiration to the transformational version of HRM and, therefore and by extension, also for the commitment logic. One of the most famous organizational studies is also the foundational description of the human relations school: The Hawthorne Studies that were initiated in 1927 by Elton Mayo and his team of researchers at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company (Shafritz & Ott, 2001). Without retelling this story again (see Roethlisberger, 2001), these studies directed management theorists interest toward motivation as covering other aspects than the one provided by a salary. Variables included among others personal needs, managerial feedback, and group norms (Shafritz & Ott, 2001:146). Furthermore, Mayo's own writings (2003) emphasized that good management requires understanding of the human conditions and problems that workers face to further understand the social and psychological aspects of work in order to improve productivity. Mayo and later human relations scholars' thoughts on the nature of the employment relationship, and the employees on the receiving end of these relationships, are core concepts and practices of the soft version of HRM and thus in the commitment logic (see O'Connor, 1999, for a contemporary and thororugh analysis of Mayo's philosophy).

Human relations theories and thoughts were mainly transformed into HRM in an Anglophone context and then later brought across the Atlantic to mainland Europe (Brewster, 2007). Another bundle of theories and practices inspired by the human relations paradigm came from the researchers at the Tavistock Institute and are known as the *socio-technical systems* approach (see Trist & Bamforth, 1951). They played an integral part in the development of the particular Nordic working life approach to organizational development (Hasle & Sørensen, 2013). More specifically, the human relations inspired concepts constituted the main inspiration behind the Nordic approach to working life and organizational development (Thorsrud & Emery, 1970). The ideas and aspirations of the Nordic approach were critical of Tayloristic workplace designs and emphasize 'workers' psychological needs that work should fulfill' (Hasle & Sørensen, 2013). These are needs that exceed basics such as economic security, just treatment, and time to rest, but include subjects such as autonomy, participation, and recognition as well (Hasle & Sørensen, 2013).

HRM can be seen as an answer to increasing organizational and environmental complexity. Scholars agree that the growth of HRM in the last 30 years is partly due to the macroeconomic shift from industrial production to the knowledge economy, and

partly due to the increasing complexity of both communication and manufacturing processes (Holt Larsen, 2009; Legge, 2005). Increasing competition in the global marketplace, challenges of new and better production systems from, among others, Japan, created a demand for dynamic and flexible production systems that required organizations to start managing the employee relationship strategically and with competitive advantages in sight. In this business environment, a great variety of HRM-practices such as strategic recruitment, employee competency development, and motivational tools were developed and adopted. An early distinction in different HRM approaches was made between the 'soft' commitment-based and 'hard' models based on performance, constant measurement, and a liberal use of hiring and firing to suit the strategic needs of the day. The soft were described as 'developmental-humanist' (Legge, 2005) and seek to increase performance through commitment, well-being, and motivation. This model was later implemented and further developed in, for instance, 'high commitment management' and the AMO model of modern HRM (Ability, Motivation, and Opportunity) (Guest, 2011).

Institutional orders

The logic is rooted in HRM that in turn views the organization through a managerialist lens of the organization, with respect to legitimacy and authority. In both the aforementioned transactional and the transformational aims, the corporate logic shines through. The transactional practices develop and maintain the inner workings of corporate bureaucracy and hierarchy through rewards and sanctions, while the transformational practices have the increased market position and the utilization of the human resources to achieve it, as a raison d'etre.

The question that we can ask on the commitment strategy of modern HRM is 'commitment to what?' (Legge, 2005: 209). In an economic and societal climate of fluidity, flexibility, and change, highly skilled employees do not necessarily feel a strong connection to one specific organization. Storey et al. (2009) point to this as an important reason for the commitment strategy of HRM. It is necessary to create a sense of community and commitment, because a priori commitment and solidarity of the late modernity tend to focus on groups outside the specific organization (professional associations, trade unions, educational background, etc.). So, reciprocal trust-filled relations and organizational culture become tools to create commitment and motivation.

Foundational theories

The foundational theories of the commitment logic all fall into the natural systems category as opposed to the rational systems view of the compliance logic (Scott & Davis, 2007). So, where the latter primarily sees goal specificity and formalization as the features distinguishing organizations from other kinds of social systems, the natural systems understanding, while acknowledging these two features as existing in organizations, argues that goal complexity and informal structures exist as they do in all social systems, and that these have greater significance in organizational

development (Scott & Davis, 2007: 60). This is especially apparent in two ways in the logic of commitment. Actors will not only pursue organizational output goals directly as fully rational agents (e.g., increased financial or organizational performance of the organization, more effective use of resources, etc.) instead, organizational actors pursue other less rational goals (social recognition, reward, satisfaction, self-actualization, etc.), which will divert our attention, energy, and resources from these rational goals. Organizations therefore have to align 'maintenance goals' to the output goals (Scott & Davis, 2007, p. 60). Furthermore, informal structures exist (collectivities) and often times guide organizational actors' choices as much as formalized structures and systems.

The HRM perspective is a significant theoretical inspiration for the commitment logic. Human resource theory (or, perhaps more accurately, bundle of theories) rests upon the assumption 'that organizational creativity, flexibility, and prosperity flow naturally from employee growth and development' (Shafritz & Ott, 2001: 145), and, more importantly that the people are the most important asset of any organization (Shafritz & Ott, 2001). From early descriptions (see Beer et al., 2015), HRM was characterized first and foremost by a strategic approach to people-management. That is, employees are resources to be used strategically, as well as resources that should be recruited, evaluated, rewarded, and sanctioned based on their strategic merits (Storey et al., 2009). Furthermore, another common denominator for most HRM models was that it should be both transactional and transformational at the same time, meaning that HRM manages both administrative tasks such as salary, bonus systems, and legal requirements in hiring and firing and so forth, while at the same time developing and transforming the human resources to improve performance, motivation, and corporate culture (Storey et al., 2009; Ulrich et al., 1995).

Elton Mayo's rejection of the *homo economicus* approach to employees (as seen in Taylor's writings) is another foundational theory of the commitment logic. In Mayo's theories, man was not simply reacting to incentives or sanctions, but reacting because of deeper emotional traumas and instabilities (Bruce & Nyland, 2011; O'Connor, 1999; Schneider, 1999). Furthermore, employees were seen as irrational and in need of empathy, love, and understanding from the managers. The lack of these was the real reason behind industrial unrest (Bruce & Nyland, 2011; O'Connor, 1999). Mayo's prescription for industrial captains of his time was that all administrators should be skilled listeners who could understand the social and emotional needs of their employees (Mayo, 2003).

A third theoretical inspiration comes from McGregor (2001) and his Theory Y. He advanced the points of Mayo in his Theory Y where he claims that (1) employees (in their harmonious state) do not have an inherent dislike for labor, (2) that punishment and control are not as effective motivators as rewards, and (3) that a reward that 'satisfies the ego and self-actualization needs' is more effective than an economic reward (cited from Scott & Davis, 2007: 67). McGregor furthermore described principles of management that are all foundational behind the commitment logic. Management is responsible for the organization of a productive enterprise. They cannot conjure motivation and potential in people; these are inherent properties of human nature. Management, however, has to provide people with the right opportunities to discover the motivation and potential by providing the right kind of 'organizational conditions and methods of operation' (McGregor, 2001: 183).

Possible consequence for work environment management

The two institutional logics in the field of the work environment not only differ in terms of theoretical roots, history, and foundational assumptions, but they may also have consequences for concrete environment practices in Nordic labor markets and inside organizations. Abrahamsson and Johansson (2013) sum up the development of the work environment field in Scandinavia during the last 50 years in the following way:

> The path of development has gone from noise reduction to coaching and from viewing the work environment as an area for problems to viewing it as an area for workplace learning and for strategic development from management. (p. 7)

It is this development that we suggest to utilize as the analytical lens of institutional logics. To be more specific, we have identified three key areas where the two logics differ remarkably and that can therefore help illuminate how they present different organizational practices to organizations and actors in the field.

Table II The institutional logics and their approaches to work environment management

Approaches to work environment management	Compliance logic	Commitment logic
Motivation behind efforts	• Economic and social compliance	• Work environment leads to job satisfaction that in turn leads to higher productivity
Primary agents of change	• Experts and specialists (external or internal)	• Management (line or staff)
Work environment strategies	• Risk prevention through systematization of processes at the organizational level	• Development of competencies and resilience at the individual level

Motivation behind work environment efforts

As the name of the two logics suggests, they differ fundamentally when it comes to the organizational motivation behind the work environment efforts. The most basic approach to work environment management in the compliance logic is just that—compliance with rules: rules that can take the form of both laws and of certified standards, which are becoming increasingly prevalent in the management of the work environment (Hohnen & Hasle, 2011). Motivation for this compliance takes two forms. What Nielsen and Parker (2012, p. 431) term 'economic motivation' for compliance. Here, the aim is to ensure that the work environment efforts are saving the organization money on fines from external regulators, sickness absence, and from the payment of damages to injured employees. Furthermore, we can point to social motives for compliance (Nielsen & Parker, 2012). In this form, work environment efforts are developed to maintain legitimacy and respect from competitors, customers, and regulators and can be viewed as a form of institutional isomorphism (Hasle et al., 2014). Motivation in the compliance logic can be summarized like this:

The approach of the commitment logic, on the other hand, is that well-being and job satisfaction lead to commitment that again increases organizational performance. This is the most fundamental approach that the commitment logic makes available to actors in the field of work environment management. The approach can roughly be summarized in the following formula:

In the end, this performance lens is the key behind the commitment logic's approach to the work environment. Initiatives and practices toward the work environment and well-being will necessarily be evaluated through a performance lens—are they motivating people? This could in turn mean that aspects of the work environment without a clear performance link are overlooked by work environment actors in the organization, for example, long-term exposure to chemical substances that can cause cancer.

Work environment strategies—collective risk prevention or individual resilience building?

A second area in which the two logics' prescribed approaches will differ has to do with which actual work environment practices to implement in the organizations. If one concept should encompass the compliance logic, it would be 'safety from risk' (Hohnen & Granerud, 2010). The scope and focus of the approaches to safety and health have expanded and changed through the years, as has the knowledge of risks and hazards, but the main battle cry of risk prevention has endured. Therefore, the compliance logic generally prescribes efforts on an organizational and thus collective level. Because of the focus on risks and hazards, and because of the belief in causal predictions and preventions in terms of what leads to accidents and injuries, a characteristic of the compliance logic is the overall systematic and rational approach to health and safety: the belief that accidents, injuries, or sicknesses are mainly to be considered failures in said system. This also appears in the required reflexivity of contemporary OHS management systems. Because of increasing complexity, the multi-causality of work environment issues and the idiosyncratic nature of modern organizational contexts, the need is to make them comply with procedural regulations (e.g., mandatory risk assessment, internal and external audits, reporting, running supervising processes from the top management) (Frick & Kempa, 2011; Rocha & Hohnen, 2010).

When organizational actors employ compliance approaches such as the use of certification from international standards, or simply work toward avoiding actions from the regulatory agency, research shows that they will give attention to work environment issues that can be made auditable, that is to say made into 'manageable procedures and

auditable performances' (Hohnen & Hasle, 2011) such as checklists and safety KPIs and thus fitting the basic rational understanding of the risk management approach. This will also, in most cases, give priority to aspects such as safety risks and physical exposures that can be measured and registered, over complex and possibly hidden psychosocial work environment issues (Jespersen et al., 2016).

The commitment logic, on the other hand, is rooted in the therapeutic management ideas of human relations theorists and in the view that all individuals have varying needs and sentiments. In this light, work environment problems are dealt with at the level of the individual. Some commitment-inspired work environment strategies are somewhat reactive in nature and are mainly in place to mitigate the strains that the organizational demands can put on the working life of the individual employees. One example here is work-life balance initiatives such as the possibility for flexible work arrangements in terms of both temporal and spatial flexibility and good conditions for paternity and maternity leave (Håpnes & Rasmussen, 2011; Hyman & Summers, 2007; Jacobsen et al., 2013). Another example is employee assistance programs that provide employees with free access to skilled health professionals such as physiotherapists, psychologists, masseurs, and chiropractors.

Other commitment strategies focus on the optimization of the individual employees through the development of resilience to strains and stresses from a high performance work environment. We can see these strategies of resilience in WHP schemes (WHP), which focus on improving the physical health of the employees (Bjørnstad & Steen-Johnsen, 2012; Kamp, 2009; Larsson et al., 2015), in training and fitness excersises to combat muscular-sceletal strains (Sundstrup et al., 2016), in individual stress management training to improve coping skills of the employees (Nytrø et al., 2000), and finally in the concept of 'employee development dialogues' (Triantafillou, 2003) and 'performance appraisal interviews' (Asmuss, 2013), which seek to develop competencies and strengthen the fit between individual competencies and the demands of the job.

Primary actors in work environment management

The trust in systems and formalized structures of the compliance logic is rooted in the rational systems assumption. Events, accidents, and root causes for ailments, and—more importantly—the systems that can prevent them, can be measured and mapped out in a scientifically correct manner by experts and engineers. Thus, employees and line management are the receivers of the expert knowledge and maybe somewhat responsible for maintenance and supervision of the control systems, but the main solutions and designs of the work environment management fall mainly on either staff specialists inside the organizations (Seim et al., 2016) or by external consultants (Limborg, 2001).

The commitment logic, on the other hand will, as shown above, tend to see the work environment as just another managerial task, carried out either through direct line management or possibly with support from a staff specialist. An example can be found in the study by Knudsen et al. (2011) wherein the authors show that workplaces that employ management techniques from what we have dubbed the commitment logic prioritize the work environment and well-being of the employees. These workplaces employ more direct participatory models for employee-management relations. This approach reflects human relations inspired ideas about empathetic and semi-therapeutic

roles for management. Roles that require training in well-being issues should be on the agenda for top and especially for line managers in every successful organization because they will act as the main facilitators of social cohesion and community in the workplace.

Perspectives

In this article, we have analyzed how the institutional field of the work environment in the Nordic countries in recent decades has been influenced by management approaches from HRM and how the field is thus composed of multiple and somewhat diverging approaches to the management of the work environment issues. To understand these field changes, we have constructed a typology of two institutional logics of compliance and commitment, respectively, and shown how they differ in terms of theoretical foundations, normative aspirations, and practical approaches to work environment issues.

The logics that we mapped out in this paper are ideal types, not detailed descriptions of the empirical reality. Therefore, the concrete organizational practices change from context to context and the two logics is can both interact as a competitive constellation, but just as well can interact in a complementary and thus cooperative constellation. The ideal types of commitment and compliance can help to underline which understandings and preconditions OHS actors in organizations draw upon when they translate policy, regulations, voluntary strategies, or collective bargaining agreements into concrete organizational practice and strategies.

A number of different organizational approaches can be imagined based on the two ideal types. Few approaches will lean entirely one way or the other and thus represent either a commitment-based or a compliance-based approach. In these instances, organizational strategies and practices will come close to the clear idealtypical practices of the logic of compliance and commitment, respectively, that we have outlined in the previous paragraphs. A more likely variant would be a model of constellations of logics. We can imagine an organization with a strong HR department with a commitment-based overall strategy to the work environment, but at the same time employing actors to make sure that the organization complies with basic regulations standards. In this model, the overall work environment approach and strategy mirror the commitment-based logic, but with specific compliance-based practices in place. Again, another model would be a segmented model where the two logics coexist in the organization, but in different functions and with separated responsibilities. Examples of this model would include organizations that have, on the one hand, a compliance-based department with its focus on safety, accidents, and the chemical and physical work environment and, on the other hand, a commitment-based department with its focus on well-being, psychosocial factors, and health development. Two different variants could be imagined: one of peaceful coexistence and clear demarcation of responsibilities between the two functions, and one of contestation and competition over resources and jurisdiction. The logics of compliance and commitment are thus not inherently competing or coexisting, but can interact in various constellations both competitive and cooperative based on the organizational context in which they exist.

In other words, fields do not consist of overly determining organizational ideas that actors then mindlessly carry into their organizations and start to enact (Binder, 2007). Organizational actors are real people with feelings, histories, political views, and ethical

rules for themselves. Likewise, organizations are entities with their own history, idiosyncrasies, and social systems. As Binder (2007) writes:

> 'They [organizations] are places where people and groups (agentic actors, not "institutional dopes") make sense of and interpret, institutional "vocabularies of motive" (Fligstein, 1997), and act on those interpretations'. (p. 551)

In other words, actors do not act on the prescriptions of institutional logics of the field alone, but rather on the shared interpretations of these that arise from social interactions on an organizational level. Therefore, further studies are also necessary to investigate concrete empirical settings where the competing institutional logics of the field are enacted and shaped into concrete work environment practices.

As we have made apparent earlier in this paper, there is a need for research on the linkages between values and orders from a societal macro level, how they are embedded in the meso level of organizational fields, and finally the micro level processes inside the organizations, without either giving too much explanatory power to the structural impact of societal pressures or to unbound agents inside the organizations. As such, an institutional logic perspective can be the bridge between the various analytical levels, and our paper can hopefully act as a point of departure for further empirical studies of these and their connections. It is necessary to further investigate how institutional field logics of commitment and compliance are carried into the organizations, who carries them, and how are they interpreted into concrete work environment practices by actors when the rubber hits the road. Such knowledge can help to guide practitioners in the organization in such a way that they avoid the negative side effects of the compliance logic's too strong belief in a rational system that has difficulties in approaching, among others, psychosocial factors and the commitment logic's focus on the employees' individual responsibilities with a tendency to close the eyes on the employers' responsibility.

References

Aalders, M., & Wilthagen, T. (1997). Moving Beyond Command-and-Control: Reflexivity in the Regulation of Occupational Safety and Health and the Environment. *Law & Policy*, *19*(4), 415–443. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9930.t01-1-00034.

Abrahamsson, L., & Johansson, J. (2013, January 1). One Hundred Years of Inertia: An Exposé of the Concept of the Psychosocial Work Environment in Swedish Policy and Research. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v3i1.2518.

Asmuss, B. (2013). The emergence of symmetries and asymmetries in performance appraisal interviews: An interactional perspective. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *34*(3), 553–570. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0143831x13489045.

Beer, M., Boselie, P., & Brewster, C. (2015). Back to the Future: Implications for the Field of HRM of the Multistakeholder Perspective Proposed 30 Years Ago. *Human Resource Management*, *54*(3), 427–438. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21726.

Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P., Mills, D., & Walton, R. (1984). *Managing human assets*.

Berg Johansen, C., & Waldorff, S. B. (2015). What are Institutional Logics - and Where is the Perspective Taking Us? *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2015*(1), 14380–14380. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2015.14380abstract.

Binder, A. (2007). For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society*, *36*(6), 547–571. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11186-007-9045-x.

Bjørnstad, T. C., & Steen-Johnsen, K. (2012, June 1). Beyond Planning: The Implementation of a Worksite Health Promotional Scheme. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v2i2.2357.

Boglind, A., Hällstén, F. & Thilander, P., 2011. HR transformation and shared services: Adoption and adaptation in Swedish organisations. *Personnel Review*, 40(5), pp. 570–588. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483481111154441.

Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2012). *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice* (5th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Brewster, C. (2007). A European perspective on HRM. *European Journal of International Management*, *1*(3), 239–259. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/ejim.2007.014696.

Bruce, K., & Nyland, C. (2011). Elton Mayo and the Deification of Human Relations. *Organization Studies*, *32*(3), 383–405. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0170840610397478.

Burawoy, M., 1985. *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*, Verso Books.

Cox, T., Taris, T. W., & Nielsen, K. (2010). Organizational interventions: Issues and challenges. *Work & Stress*, *24*(3), 217–218. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2010.519496.

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147–160. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2095101.

Dyreborg, J. (2011). 'Safety Matters Have Become Too Important for Management to Leave it Up to the Workers' –The Nordic OSH Model Between Implicit and Explicit Frameworks. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *1*(1), 135–160. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v1i1.2339.

Ehnert, I. (2009). *Sustainable Human Resource Management - A conceptual and exploratory analysis from a paradox perspective*. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7908-2188-8.

Frick, K., & Kempa, V. (2011). *Occupational Health & Safety Management System: When are They Good for Your Health?* Brussels.

Frick, K., & Wren, J. (2000). Reviewing occupational health and safety management: multiple roots, diverse perspectives and ambiguous outcomes. In K. Frick, M. Quinlan, P. L. Jensen, & T. Wilthagen (Eds.), *Systematic Occupational Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development* (p. 527). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism In Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.

Georg, S. (2014). Bæredygtige Organisationer [Sustainable Organizations]. In S. Vikkelsø & P. Kjær (Eds.), *Klassisk og Moderne Organisationsteori [Classical and Modern Organization Theory]* (p. 704). København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Goodrick, E. & Reay, T., 2011. Constellations of Institutional Logics: Changes in the Professional Work of Pharmacists. *Work and Occupations*, *38*(3), pp.372–416. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406824.

Greenwood, R., Hinings, C. R., & Whetten, D. (2014). Rethinking Institutions and Organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, *51*(7), 1206–1220. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/joms.12070.

Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutional Entrepreneurship in Mature Fields: the Big Five Accounting Firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(1), 27–48. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.20785498.

Guest, D. (2011). Human resource management and performance: still searching for some answers. *Human Resource Management Journal, 21(1), 3–13. doi:* http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2010.00164.x.

Hart, S. M. (2009). Self-regulation, Corporate Social Responsibility, and the Business Case: Do they Work in Achieving Workplace Equality and Safety? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *92*(4), 585–600. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0174-1.

Hasle, P., 2010. Certificeret arbejdsmiljøledelse i et historisk perspektiv [Certified work environment management in a historical perspective]. In R. S. Rocha & P. Hohnen, eds. *Ledelse af Arbejdsmiljø - Certificering i praksis [Management of working environment – Certification in practice]*. Nyt Teknisk Forlag, p. 165.

Hasle, P., Limborg, H. J., & Nielsen, K. T. (2014). Working environment interventions – Bridging the gap between policy instruments and practice. *Safety Science*, *68*, 73–80. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2014.02.014.

Hasle, P., Seim, R., & Refslund, B. (2016). From employee representation to problem-solving - Mainstreaming OHS management. *Economic and Industrial Democracy (Forthcoming)*.

Hasle, P., & Sørensen, O. H. (2013). Employees as Individually and Collectively Acting Subjects—Key Contributions from Nordic Working Life Research. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *3*(3), 9. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v3i3.3009.

Hasle, P., & Zwetsloot, G. (2011). Editorial: Occupational Health and Safety Management Systems: Issues and challenges. *Safety Science*, *49*(7), 961–963. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2011.02.013.

Heinrich, H., Petersen, D. & Roos, N., 1980. *Industrial Accident Prevension: A Safety Management Approach*, 5th ed. New York: McGraw- Hill, 1980.

Hoffman, A. J. (1999). Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the U.S. Chemical Industry. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *42*(4), 351–371. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/257008.

Hohnen, P., & Granerud, L. (2010). Forståelser af Arbejdsmiljø på Certificerede Virksomheder. In R. S. Rocha & P. Hohnen (Eds.), *Ledelse af Arbejdsmiljø - Certificering i praksis [Management of Working Environment – Certification in practice]*. Nyt Teknisk Forlag.

Hohnen, P., & Hasle, P. (2011). Making work environment auditable–A 'critical case' study of certified occupational health and safety management systems in Denmark. *Safety Science*, *49*(7), 1022–1029. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2010.12.005.

Holt Larsen, H. (2009). HRM: Ledelse af virksomhedens menneskelige ressourcer [HRM: Management of the human resources of the firm]. *Ledelse Og Erhvervsøkonomi [Management and Business]*, (4), 7–19.

Holt Larsen, H. (2014). Human Resource Management. In S. Vikkelsø & P. Kjær (Eds.), *Klassisk og Moderne Organisationsteori [Classical and Modern Organization Theory]* (pp. 589–612). København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Hyman, J., & Summers, J. (2007). Work and life: Can employee representation influence balance? *Employee Relations*, *29*(4), 367–384. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01425450710759208.

Håpnes, T., & Rasmussen, B. (2011). Policies and Practices of Family Friendliness. Time and Employment Relations in Knowledge Work. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *1*(2), 39–57. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v1i2.2344.

Jacobsen, S., Bramming, P., Holt, H., & Holt Larsen, H. (2013). Quality in Modern Nordic Working Life—Investigating Three Related Research Perspectives and Their Possible Cross-Fertilization. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *3*(3). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v3i3.3011.

Jensen, C. S. (2012). *Industrial Relations in Denmark: From Conflict-based Concensus to Consensus-based Conflict*. Djøf Publishing.

Jespersen, A. H., Hohnen, P., & Hasle, P. (2016). Internal audits of psychosocial risks at workplaces with certified OHS management systems. *Safety Science*, *84*, 201–209. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2015.12.013.

Kamp, A. (2009). Bridging collective and individual approaches to occupational safety and health: what promises does workplace health promotion hold? *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, *18*(1), 85–102. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14774003.2009.11667730.

Kamp, A., & Nielsen, K. T. (2013). Management of Occupational Health and Safety. In Å. Sandberg (Ed.), *Nordic lights: Work, management and welfare in Scandinavia*. SNS Forlag.

Knudsen, H., Busck, O., & Lind, J. (2011). Work environment quality: the role of workplace participation and democracy. *Work, Employment & Society*, *25*(3), 379–396. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0950017011407966.

Larsson, R., Stier, J., Åkerlind, I., & Sandmark, H. (2015). Implementing Health-Promoting Leadership in Municipal Organizations: Managers' Experiences with a Leadership Program. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v5i1.4767.

Legge, K. (2005). *Human Resource Management: Rhetorics and Realities; Anniversary Edition*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Limborg, H. J. (2001). The professional working environment consultant? A new actor in the health and safety arena. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, *11*(2), 159–172. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hfm.1006.

Lindberg, K., 2014. Performing multiple logics in practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30(4), pp. 485–497. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2013.12.007.

Mayo, E. (2003). The Human Problems Of An Industrial Civilization. In K. Thompson (Ed.), *The Early Sociology of Management and Organization* (p. 194). London & New York: Routledge.

McGregor, D. M. (2001). The Human Side of Enterprise. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of Organization Theory* (5th ed., pp. 179–184). Harcourt College Publishers.

Mintzberg, H., 1980. Structure in 5's: A Synthesis of the Research on Organization Design. *Management science*, 26(3), pp. 322–341.

Nielsen, K. T. (2000). Organization Theories Implicit in Various Approaches to OHS Management. In K. Frick, T. Wilthagen, M. Quinlan, & P. Langaa Jensen (Eds.), *Systematic Occupational Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development* (p. 515). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Nielsen, K., Taris, T. W., & Cox, T. (2010). The future of organizational interventions: Addressing the challenges of today's organizations. *Work & Stress*, *24*(3), 219–233. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2010.519176.

Nielsen, V. L., & Parker, C. (2012). Mixed Motives: Economic, Social, and Normative Motivations in Business Compliance. *Law & Policy*, *34*(4), 428–462. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9930.2012.00369.x.

Nytrø, K., Saksvik, P. Ø., Mikkelsen, A., Bohle, P., & Quinlan, M. (2000). An appraisal of key factors in the implementation of occupational stress interventions. *Work & Stress*, *14*(3), 213–225. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678370010024749.

O'Connor, E. (1999). Minding the Workers: The Meaning of Human' and Human Relations' in Elton Mayo. *Organization*, *6*(2), 223–243. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/135050849962004.

Parker, C., & Gilad, S. (2011). Internal corporate compliance management systems: structure, culture and agency. In C. Parker & V. L. Nielsen (Eds.), *Explaining Compliance: Business responses to regulation* (p. 386). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pawlowska, Z., & Eeckelaert, L. (2010). *Mainstreaming OSH into business management*. Bruxelles. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional Change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an Identity Movement in French Gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, *108*(4), 795–843. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/367917.

Robson, L. S., Clarke, J. A., Cullen, K., Bielecky, A., Severin, C., Bigelow, P. L., … Mahood, Q. (2007). The effectiveness of occupational health and safety management system interventions: A systematic review. *Safety Science*, *45*(3), 329–353. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2006.07.003.

Rocha, R. S., & Hohnen, P. (2010). *Ledelse af arbejdsmiljø: certificering i praksis [Management of Working Environment – Certification in practice]*. Nyt Teknisk Forlag.

Roethlisberger, F. J. (2001). The Hawthorne Experiment. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of Organization Theory* (5th ed., pp. 158–166). Harcourt College Publishers.

Schneider, S. C. (1999). Human and Inhuman Resource Management: Sense and Nonsense. *Organization* , *6* (2), 277–284. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/135050849962007.

Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and Organizations* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2007). *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Seim, R., Møller, N., & Limborg, H. J. (2016). Professionelle og medarbejderrepræsentanter - nye roller i arbejdsmiljøarbejdet [Professionals and Employee Representatives - New roles in the working environment efforts]. *Tidskrift for Arbejdsliv [Journal for Working Life]*, *18*(1), 18–33.

Seo, M., & Creed, W. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *27*(2), 222–247. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.6588004.

Shafritz, J. M., & Ott, J. S. (2001). *Classics of Organization Theory* (5th ed.). Harcourt College Publishers.

Storey, J., Ulrich, D., & Wright, P. M. (2009). Introduction. In J. Storey, D. Ulrich, & P. M. Wright (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Strategic Human Resource Management* (p. 528). Routledge.

Sundstrup, E., Jakobsen, M. D., Petersen, M. B., Jay, K., & Andersen, L. L. (2016). *Styrketræning mindsker kroniske smerter og forebygger tab af arbejdsevne hos slagteriarbejdere [Training reduces chronical pain and prevents loss of fitness for work for slaughterhouse workers]*. Copenhagen. National Research Centre for the Working Environment.

Swedberg, R. (2005). *The Max Weber Dictionary: Key Words and Central Concepts*. Stanford University Press.

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. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/210361.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The Institutional Logics Perspective - A New Approach To Culture, Structure, And Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thorsrud, E. & Emery, F.E., 1970. Industrial Democracy in Norway. *Industrial relations*, *9*(2), pp. 187–196. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-232X.1970.tb00505.x.

Torrington, D., Hall, L., & Taylor, S. (2008). *Human Resource Management*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the Longwall method. *Human Relations*, *4*(3), 3–38. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872675100400101.

Tzafrir, S. S., Gur, A. B.-A., & Blumen, O. (2015). Employee social environment (ESE) as a tool to decrease intention to leave. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *31*(1), 136–146. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2014.08.004.

Ulrich, D., Brockbank, W., Yeung, A. K., & Lake, D. G. (1995). Human resource competencies: An empirical assessment. *Human Resource Management*, *34*(4), 473–495. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930340402.

Waldorff, S. B., Reay, T., & Goodrick, E. (2013). A Tale of Two Countries: How Different Constellations of Logics Impact Action. In *Institutional Logics in Action, Part A* (Vol. 39 Part A, pp. 99–129). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X(2013)0039AB008.

Walters, D., & Wadsworth, E. (2014). Contexts and determinants of the management of occupational safety and health in European workplaces. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, *12*(2), 109–130. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14774003.2014.11667806.

Westenholz, A. (2012). *The Janus Face of Commercial Open Source Software Communities: An Investigation Into Institutional (non)work by Interacting Institutional Actors*. Copenhagen Business School Press DK.

Wooten, M., & Hoffman, A. (2008). Organizational fields: Past, present and future. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin-Andersson, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational institutionalism*. SAGE Publications.

Zanko, M., & Dawson, P. (2012). Occupational health and safety management in organizations: a review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *14*(3), 328–344. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00319.x.

PAPER 3: INSTITUTIONAL ACTORHOOD INSIDE ORGANIZATIONS: INTERNAL EXPERTS IN THE FACE OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLEXITY*

Christian Uhrenholdt Madsen

PhD Fellow, Dept. of Materials and Production, Aalborg University

Abstract:

The paper researches how intra-organizational experts of work environment in Danish organization

In this paper I investigate the relationship between individual intra-organizational actors in organizations and the institutional structures they have to implement. Thereby I engage in the discussion on the role of individual agency in institutional theory, and the reflexivity of the actors interacting with institutional pressures and prescriptions. My study therefore also contributes to discussions on micro-foundations of institutional theory (Zilber 2016; Hallett et al. 2009). I investigate this through a qualitative analysis of what I call the reflexive positions of intra-organizational experts within Danish organizations who are responsible for the efforts to comply with the Danish work environment regulation, and what these different reflexive positions afford actors in terms of 'the reflexive potential' (Delbridge & Edwards 2013: p. 932) of actors in engaging with institutional logics in the field. Thereby the study also contributes with perspectives on modern organizational governance and the growing tendencies toward self-regulation and so-called meta-governance that are increasingly characterizing the regulative frameworks of modern welfare states (Gunningham 2011; Aalders & Wilthagen 1997; Frick & Wren 2000).

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 33rd EGOS Colloquium, Copenhagen 2017 (Sub-theme 19: Organizations and Organizing in a Welfare State Context)

INSTITUTIONAL ACTORHOOD: INTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERTS IN THE FACE OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLEXITY

Introduction

Organizational fields are increasingly described by scholars as being characterized by institutional complexity and thus composed of multiple and often competing institutional logics (e.g. Caronna, Pollack & Scott 2009; Daudigeos, Boutinot & Jaumier 2013; R. Greenwood & Suddaby 2006; van Gestel & Hillebrand 2011). This has, as noted elsewhere, led to a resurgence of questions about the relationship between structure and agency in institutional theory (Delbridge & Edwards 2013; Greenwood et al. 2011).

Complexity means that organizational fields consist of multiple institutional logics, meaning they consist of ideas, values and practices which are often at odds with one another. Organizations and actors participating in the field must recognize and make sense of this conflict in their responses to institutional demands and prescriptions. In this way the 'change and complexity' view of fields (Berg Johansen & Boch Waldorff 2015) represents a move away from earlier organizational field conceptions of fields as mediums of isomorphic and homogenizing pressures on partaking organizations.

This understanding of complexity makes the question of agency in organizations unavoidable. If fields are not mediums of isomorphism and stability, but are instead fields of diversity and change, then the organizations and individual actors themselves are the ones who enact this institutional diversity into some form of coherent practice within the organizations, and in doing so they draw upon previous experiences, identities, local contexts and hierarchical positions – or in short their own reflexive actorhood.

Institutional studies have highlighted the role of organizational subgroups of 'experts' and staff functions in processes of institutionalization and have described how various expert functions engage in the importation of values and practices from their own 'home-fields' and into their organizations. Examples are manifold and include safety managers in the French construction industry (Daudigeos 2013), HR professionals (Lindström 2016; Sandholtz & Burrows 2016), managers in health care (Currie & Spyridonidis 2016; Reay et al. 2016), CSR professionals (Risi 2014; Boxenbaum 2006), diversity managers (Dobbin 2009) and legal compliance professionals (Edelman 1992). In these studies the internal experts and specialists act as internal agents of their particular fields, and try to influence their respective

organizations with values and practices of their fields. This view of institutions and actors collapses the actors into the ideational structures they are trying to import, and thus the actors become one with their institutional projects. In this way, actors are seen as 'cultural dopes' (Binder 2007) who are fully embedded in the institutional contexts of interest, and who do not have any agency themselves when it comes to pressures and prescriptions from the institutional logics of their fields. However, this presupposes the fields that the intra-organizational experts are parts of are not characterized by complexity but by uniformity and sameness in means and ends. Yet this is often not the case, as many studies show (Lounsbury 2001; Lounsbury & Kaghan 2001; Pache & Santos 2010).

This is not only an issue with theoretical significance. The role of intra-organizational actors in institutional processes is becoming increasingly important as a matter of the governance and democratic control of corporations and organizations in modern welfare states. In the last decades, regulatory frameworks and modes of governance have increasingly been characterized by reflexivity and 'meta-governance' and therefore by demands for internal governance and monitoring systems instead of tight governmental 'command and control' (Gunningham 2011). This means, as Gray & Silbey (2011) write, that: 'Compliance to regulations is very rarely carried out in the presence of regulatory agents' (p. 125). Instead organizations themselves carry out the task of maintaining and developing systems and guidelines to ensure compliance. As a consequence of this increased regulatory reflexivity organizational demand and use for internal specialized experts such as HR consultants, environmental protection officers or safety professionals also increase (Reed 1996; Fincham 2012). These experts act as mediators between the organization and the demands from the institutional environment, and are responsible for transforming abstract regulatory demands into functional systems and policies for their specific organization, and furthermore for maintaining these systems in the absence of external regulators. As such this group of intra-organizational experts play a crucial role in many regulatory frameworks of modern welfare states such as workplace health and safety law, collective bargaining implementation or environmental protection regulation (Parker & Gilad 2011).

A good example of this development can be found in the field of work environment in Danish companies.

Since the first Danish comprehensive law of work environment was passed in 1976 an organizational field composed of multiple organizations and actor groups emerged. A field mostly composed of professional actors outside the regulated organizations with numerous institutionalized arenas for interaction, tight relationships between the different actor groups and with its own overall conceptions of work environment issues and their solutions, this were transmitted to companies and organizations through regulation and collective bargaining.

The law has encouraged the decrease of direct regulatory demands on organizations, and the increase of meta-governance demands, that emphasize integrating work

environment processes such as frameworks, participatory structures and the following of standards into the organizational strategies and core processes (Rocha & Granerud 2011; Hohnen & Hasle 2011). These tendencies toward integration and 'mainstreaming' (Hasle et al. 2016) have among other things led to more and more organizations increasing the resources they use on internal work environment management, and correspondingly the manpower assigned to these matters (Seim et al. 2016). These internal work environment experts represent an emergent group of actors in the field of the work environment. A group not only composed of long time 'believers' in the cause, but also of people with no prior experience in either the work environment field or its relationships, but with backgrounds in previously unrelated fields, which again contributes to increasing variations in organizational responses and interpretations of the fields' prescriptions.

Through a qualitative analysis I investigate how intra-organizational experts relate to their tasks and the organizational field, and thereby identify four ideal typical reflexive positions that they can occupy in these efforts. Then it discusses what these reflexive positions mean for the enactment of institutional logics and their associated practices.

Theoretical context

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is a concept with a wide array of meanings in the social sciences, and it has been used in numerous ways and in many different theoretical discussions. Sociologists such as Bourdieu, Giddens and Beck have all used the concept in various works (see eg. Archer 2010a for an overview). In this paper however I employ a concept of reflexivity that is close to Archer's conception of reflexivity that in its simplest form is defined as '…the action of a subject towards an object…' (Archer 2010a: 2). In short, reflexivity describes how actors relate themselves to the structures around them in terms of physical material structures, but importantly also to the social structures such as institutional logics, social positions and relationships (Archer 2010a). This 'reflexive engagement' and the process through which it is achieved is described as the 'internal conversation' of the actors (Archer 2013; Archer 2003). In this definition it is also clear that the concept of reflexivity separates actors from social structures, in the sense that actors are something separate from the institutional logics they interact with. In this way the concept of reflexivity takes the focus of institutional theory away from 'instantiations' and 'structuration' (Thornton et al. 2012; Vican & Pernell-Gallagher 2013; Barley & Tolbert 1997) in which structure and agency are inseparable, and toward a critical realist conception where both are treated as distinct, but interdependent concepts in processes of institutionalization (Leca & Naccache 2006; Delbridge & Edwards

2013). A large stream of research has further embraced a similar stance by referring to institutions and institutional logics as being 'inhabited' by real human actors with backgrounds, feelings, and biographical notions that influence their way of enacting institutional structures (Hallett & Ventresca 2006; Hallett et al. 2009; Binder 2007; Haedicke & Hallett 2015).

To employ the notion of reflexivity in an institutional theoretical context I lean on other scholarly works in this area, especially works by Delbridge & Edwards (2013) and by Suddaby et al. (2016). In a short but concise summation Suddaby et.al (2016) describe reflexivity as: 'awareness of the cognitive limits imposed on an individual because of the taken-for-granted assumptions that are generated by one's institutional life-history' (p. 227). Simply put, reflexivity describes how aware an actor is of the constraints and possibilities that are embedded in the cognitive (institutional) structures that surround her/him. A similar concept of reflexivity is put forward by Delbridge & Edwards (2013) who describe different types of reflexivity as being determined by the social positions and spaces in which actors conduct their 'internal conversations' that lead them to act and 'engage' with the institutional surroundings in a certain way. In both frameworks the various types of reflexivity offer the actors different outlooks on the world surrounding them. The aim of this study therefore is to identify what reflexive positions are available to intra-organizational experts inside organizations, and how different reflexive positions also give actors different cognitive bases from which to engage with the institutional logics of the field. Thereby the reflexivity of actors is a crucial factor in explaining the enactment of institutional logics on an organizational level.

It is clear that sources of reflexivity can be almost anything and therefore are impossible to capture comprehensively. As individual actors with personal lives lived, biographies, experiences and peculiarities it is of course impossible to identify all the reasons why the individual experts in my study reflect and enact institutional prescriptions as they do. Or put more plainly it would be impossible to understand every single event, experience or emotion that has shaped the way the experts understand work environment efforts. However what they all have in common are two things. They are all employed in large and bureaucratic organizations, and thus have to engage with the organizational structures and hierarchies to perform their tasks as experts. Furthermore they all in one way or another have to engage with the field of work environment management, and all the institutional pressures and logics that the field contains.

In the following sections I describe the literature regarding intra-organizational experts as both organizational and institutional actors, to determine the space that defines the actors' reflexive possibilities.

Actors and organizations

All intra-organizational experts are a part of an organization, and therefore both the formal and informal structures and hierarchies of these organizations.

Historically in industrial sociology tensions emanating from organizational hierarchy have always characterized staff functions and the role of intra-organizational experts (Dalton 1950; Child 1973; Gouldner 1964). Typically the tension has been between the experts' administrative or strategic interests, and the more technical and operational concerns of the line (Scott & Davis 2007). This tension is evident in Dalton's description of the conflicts and contradictions in the identities and backgrounds of the white collar staff professionals, and the blue collar line managers (Dalton 1950), as well as in the Gypsum company described by Gouldner (Gouldner 1964; Hallett & Ventresca 2006) where the staff professionals that were hired in to change routines and systems quickly clashed with the institutionalized practices of the line. The tension is also evident in Mintzberg's model of organizational sub-parts (Mintzberg 1980) where staff functions of experts are part of the 'techno-structure' 'out of the formal "line" structure' (p. 323).

The main tension described in this strand of the literature is that intra-organizational experts are in opposition to the formal line and the productive cores of the organizations, and that their primary project becomes one of political machination (e.g. Dalton 1950), doing top-management's bidding against the managers and employees of the line (e.g. Gouldner 1964), or simply as actors in 'other' and alien sub-systems with entirely different types of skills and knowledge to those of the line organization.

Intra-organizational experts can also be described as boundary spanners (Aldrich & Herker 1977; Tushman & Scanlan 1981) who engage in various translator practices in order to get various types of knowledge-based (Yanow 2004), technical (Barley 1996) or regulatory systems implemented into the rest of the operational line organization.

However this difference between strategic and operational outlook can also be found within groups of intra-organizational experts. Sandholtz and Burrows (2016) describe how HR managers can be close to the strategic circles of the organization, or closer to the line. This difference also means that their approach to their work and its practices can differ quite a lot. Another example of this difference is also found in the literature on HRM specialists caught between being strategists and day to day operators (Boglind et al. 2011; Storey et al. 2009; Guest & King 2004).

This divide can also be seen within the field of safety management. In his paper from 2013, Daudigeos describes how local safety professionals engage in preventing accidents on local construction sites, and thereby try to implement safety management projects in very local contexts i.e. close to the operations (Daudigeos 2013). Limborg (2011) and Brun and Loiselle (2002) also describe how safety management has both a strategic and an operational dimension.

Thus the roles and formal positions of the experts within the organizations become an important basis for reflexivity. It is self-evident that there will be differences in the resources and the outlooks on implementation and strategies that depend on

whether the place of the expert is on the hardwood floors in corporate headquarters, or closer to the employees on the operating line.

Actors and institutions

Traditional institutional theory maintains that the experts in functions responsible for maintaining organizational relationships with organizational fields surrounding them tend to exist as formal structures decoupled from the technical core. In this view these structures are mainly created to confer legitimacy on the organization in the eyes of regulators and others, but do not have any real influence over production and strategic decisions (Meyer & Rowan 1977; Boxenbaum & Jonsson 2008).

However, as Scott puts it, '…these structures have a life of their own…' (Scott 2014: p. 186) and the experts inhabiting them do not tend to see themselves as "ceremonial props" (Boxenbaum & Jonsson 2008: p. 88) in such Potemkin departments, but tend to be engaged about the particular institutional projects that their particular structure deals with such as diversity, HRM or environmental protection. Over time the intra-organizational experts and their specialized departments and units have ended up having a great importance for the institutionalization of practices in their organizations, even though initially they were merely intended as smoke screens in the eyes of external regulators. One example comes from Edelman (1992). She describes how the lawyers employed in the equal opportunity department ended up defining what compliance meant for the organization, and thus what practices should be implemented. In a similar vein Dobbin (2009) describes how institutional pressures for equal hiring practices in the United States increasingly led companies to hire diversity managers to manage these issues; these actors ended up playing major roles in shaping and more importantly expanding the scope of both regulation and organizational practices.

Finally Hoffman (1999; 2001) describes how mounting institutional pressures from stakeholders and regulators lead companies to form independent organizational units dealing with environmental issues. The scope and responsibilities of these units increasingly expands from being ceremonial smoke screens with no independent budgets, through existing as compliance departments, to being strategic partners with a wide array of organizational responsibilities and systems in place.

Therefore a new concept of the intra-organizational expert can be distinguished from the 'experts-as-ceremonial-props'-view mentioned at the start of this section (Boxenbaum & Jonsson 2008). This new concept is the 'experts-as-institutional-carriers'-view. In this view intra-organizational experts are seen as 'carriers of institutional meaning' (Zilber 2002: p. 235). These carriers are connected to organizational fields through ties such as belonging to occupational communities (Delmas & Toffel 2008), education and professional accreditation (Scott 2008), participation in field-level events (Lampel & Meyer 2008), and participation in trade

associations and professional peer groups (Edelman 1992; Dobbin 2009). These groups of actors will therefore 'give voice to institutional logics' inside the organizations (Greenwood et al. 2011: p. 342).

Daudigeos (2013) describes how safety managers in French construction companies use institutional work to exert influence and make safety a larger concern at the building sites of the company. Lindström (2016) also describes how HR-managers in Swedish public sector organizations try to promote field-level practices and policies of well-being and employee development within the organizations they are employed by. This view of intra-organizational experts being carriers is so entrenched that it is not even questioned empirically in most studies. In Risi's work on CSR managers in multinational companies (2014), it is for example the foundational assumption that the CSR managers in question work to 'develop and implement CSR as a taken-for-granted way of doing business' (p. 279), and Boxenbaum (2006) similarly describes how dedicated CSR managers work to import CSR practices into Danish organizations as well.

Two main assumptions thus define this view. In the 'experts-as-carrier' view organizational fields present a clearly defined set of practices and meanings for the experts to implement in their respective organizations. Furthermore the 'expert-as-carrier' view presupposes that organizational staffing also exclusively happens within clearly defined occupational communities or professions such as the medical professions (Scott 2008).

However, both of these assumptions can be challenged.

First of all, regarding fields' isomorphic tendencies. From the descriptions of institutional complexity and multiplicity of logics and frames within fields, it follows that this complexity can also be the case within the 'home' fields of intra-organizational experts such as the HR field, work environment management field, or the CSR field. Therefore these fields do not necessarily present a single institutional logic to implement, but multiple competing logics that experts must sample and choose between, all providing structures of meaning and practice that actors can understand the fields' core issues through (e.g. Uhrenholdt Madsen & Hasle 2017). This paradox shows us that organizational fields have two interdependent but distinct components. An ideational component and a relational component (Meyer 2008; Hoffman & Ventresca 2002). The ideational content is made up of meanings, values and practices – the institutional logics, which change and evolve over time. Multiple competing logics often exist side-by-side within fields, resulting in institutional complexity. However fields have a relational component as well: networks and relationships between actors in the form of conferences, meetings, boards and councils, vocational training, courses, regulators, the state, trade unions and employers' associations. All of these define a relational network of shifting composition, but put simply actors can have closer or more distant relationships with work environment in the form of formal training, informal relationships, codified knowledge or practices.

And this leads to the assumption of staffing; that intra-organizational experts are always recruited from occupational communities or professions with a close institutional relationship with the particular relational network that defines the field (Scott 2008). Lounsbury (2001) and Lounsbury & Kaghan (2001) do however show that reality is often more complex than this. They describe how some organizational recycling managers on US campuses are environmentalists and therefore strongly identify with values of conservation and recycling from the external organizational field. However others are distant from these values and the norms of the field, and do not feel a strong sense of belonging to an environmentalist group. Therefore, institutional experts can have a close relationship or a more distanced relationship to the organizational field. Lounsbury (2001) refers to this distanced relationship as the consequence of 'social accretion' where an institutional pressure is dealt with by a pre-existing organizational function, and is added to the employee's already existing portfolio of other assignments. These 'social accretion' employees tend not to be actively involved in the field and not to feel strongly for the cause of environmentalism, for example. On the other hand he describes another group of recycling managers with a close relationship to the field of environmental management. They participate in working groups, internet discussions and conferences and typically have a background in recycling. Usually they can be found in organizations where the recycling management function is created as a new and independent function ('status creation'). Gondo & Amis (2013) reach a similar conclusion as they describe how internal change agents in organizations can be more or less reflexive and accepting of the field-level practices they have to implement into their organization, and that these differences lead to variations in practice adaptations within organizations.

As shown by Fligstein & McAdams (2012) and Suddaby et al. (2016), the relational closeness to the central networks in a field provides individual actors with reflexivity that differs from the reflexivity of peripheral actors.

Research context

The field of work environment in Denmark is a fitting research context in which to investigate institutional complexity and the roles of intra-organizational experts.

Work environment in Denmark is regulated by a comprehensive legal framework first passed in 1975, which standardizes organizational behavior in terms of securing health, safety and well-being for employees. Since the initial passing of the law, a field with multiple actors, organizations and governance mechanisms has emerged around the legal framework. At the most basic level the law mandates that organizations themselves have the ultimate responsibility for the health and safety of all its employees while at work. This means that the organizations have to be

proactive and engage in various activities to prevent any risks to health or safety. In this way the law moved beyond the 'command-control' legislation that was previously in place in Denmark and in most other European countries (Aalders & Wilthagen 1997), where the responsibilities of organizations were only to comply with what was explicitly prohibited by regulation. In this way the new law inscribed organizational self-regulation as a demand, i.e. that organizations themselves must have processes and systems in place to actively engage in preventive efforts. The law also inscribed the core relationships between various field level actors that were to form the field of work environment management in Denmark. First of all, the work environment legislation mandates that employers' associations and trade unions participate in various tripartite counselling bodies regarding work environment – both at societal and sectoral levels; furthermore the Work Environment Authority and the National Research Center for Work Environment are also actors inscribed in the legal framework with important roles in the counselling of regulators. Besides these institutionally defined actors, a large group of work environment advisors also populate the field. Historically this occupational community emerged from the Occupational Health Services (OHS), a counselling service which was mandatory for organizations in selected large sectors, and which was established in 1980 as the result of a compromise between the state, employers and the trade unions. As the sectors for which membership to the service was mandatory multiplied, and the OHS increased its number of employees during the 1980s, the health services became the main arena for the professional development of something resembling a Danish safety profession (Limborg 2001; Kabel et al. 2007). The OHS was multidisciplinary and politically independent from the organizations they counseled. Because of the existence of the OHS, no Danish intra-organizational safety manager profession emerged as it did in the US and other European countries (Limborg 2001; Daudigeos 2013; Hale 2014; Swuste et al. 2014), despite the legal requirements for organizations to appoint safety-responsible managers at workplaces. These positions were mostly added to the responsibility of line managers, rather than becoming a distinct profession (Limborg 2001). The field of work environment management was mainly defined by actors positioned outside the companies with diverse backgrounds, especially from health sciences but also from social and technical backgrounds. The annual OHS conferences emerged as an arena of professional development for the emerging occupational community (Limborg 2001), but also through multidisciplinary fora such as the so-called 'Society for Work Environment', supported by the Engineering Trade Association.[1]

However, when the OHS was disbanded in 2008 by the Danish government the occupational community of work environment advisors mainly migrated to either one of the many private sector consultancies that set up work environment consultancy as part of their portfolio after the closure of OHS, or into one of the internal work environment expert functions that larger organizations increasingly set up. The former are organized by the trade association, The Work Environment Consultants,[2] which also arranges the largest field-configuring event, the annual

[1] Da. Selskab for Arbejdsmiljø (SAM)
[2] Da. Arbejdsmiljørådgiverne

Work Environment Conference, with participation from intra-organizational experts, external consultants, researchers within the field, employees in employers' associations and trade unions, occupational medicine practitioners and many more.[3]

The field of work environment, while quite structured with institutionalized and mature bonds between organizations, regulators and actors (Greenwood et al. 2011), is at the same time an example of a field characterized by increasing institutional complexity (Uhrenholdt Madsen & Hasle 2017; Uhrenholdt Madsen & Waldorff 2017). Three logics have emerged as the result of the developments within the field; these logics are available to actors and organizations when deciding on the most effective preventive strategies and efforts. These logics are: *The logic of commitment,* focused on creating commitment and engagement toward the workplace from individual employees, and is rooted in HRM thinking on engagement and commitment (Guest 2002). *The logic of compliance* is characterized by rational and systematic approaches to work environment management where compliance with external institutional demands is the guiding principle, and is rooted in a rational systems approach to organizations and employees (Scott & Davis 2007; Nielsen 2000). Finally *the logic of advocacy* is characterized by a motivation to improve work environment within the organizations as well as increasing work environment awareness and activity by other organizational actors.[4]

The increasing complexity can first of all be explained by the very nature and jurisdiction of work environment regulation. Work environment is embedded in various organizational and societal systems, and the diverging logics reflect this. First of all work environment is a matter of democratic rights for employees and the relationship between the state and the organizations within it. This led to organizations, actors from within the field, and researchers and politicians all voicing increasing concern that work environment was being decoupled from the operating systems inside organizations, and being downgraded into 'side-car' departments (Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002; Hasle et al. 2016). This has led to a tendency toward the 'mainstreaming' of work environment in the last decades (Hasle et al. 2016; Pawlowska & Eeckelaert 2010), with more and more of the regulating, developing and improving happening within the company walls. Thus work environment now also increasingly relates to both the technical cores and the social systems inside the regulated organizations. New materials, machinery or production system are part of the work environment 'sphere', but so is the relationship between line management and the line, between the manager and her employee, and the organizational culture (Uhrenholdt Madsen & Hasle 2017). Finally work environment management increasingly plays a part in CSR efforts and communicative strategies. Work environment is a part of being a good corporate citizen (Dyreborg 2011), and it is important to signal compliance and proactivity to customers and stakeholders alike. Mainstreaming efforts have further been helped

[3] http://www.bamr.dk/am2017/om-konferencen/

[4] An analysis from Uhrenholdt Madsen & Waldorf, 2017. This work is an unpublished manuscript. The paper triangulates historical and contemporary qualitative interviews to find three logics in the field of work environment, their historical origins and their respective enactments in Danish organizations today.

along by political wishes to internalize regulatory efforts, in line with overall tendencies towards reflexive meta-governance systems (a work environment example of this is the framework directive 89/391 from the European Union), and by the critique from work environment researchers and experts that the efforts inside the companies had to move away from the so-called 'side-car' position and into central managerial decision bodies in order to be effective (Hedegaard Riis & Langaa Jensen 2002). Institutional complexity has thus emerged as the result of both extra and intra-field occurrences and developments over the last thirty years (Uhrenholdt Madsen & Waldorff 2017).

Methodology

Research sites

My overall approach to my research was iterative and exploratory, as I was interested in identifying reflexive positions of work environment experts within large companies from the experts' own accounts. Furthermore a qualitative multi-sited case study helped me understand the contexts of the intra-organizational experts, and illuminate the accounts of daily tasks from multiple angles. Therefore I chose research sites where the phenomenon I was interested in could be studied in intense form (Reay & Jones 2016). The sites are four large Danish organizations with tightly coupled technical production systems with strong demands of productivity, quality and costs. All four research settings contain different systems, technologies and work cultures. In this way I sought to ensure that a wide array of various work environment issues was present for the intra-organizational experts to deal with within the organizations. Furthermore two of the organizations are public and two are private to better illuminate the work of experts in different institutional settings. Lastly, as I wanted to capture how organizations' diverging structural arrangements delegated various work environment tasks to different staff functions, I chose two organizations where the HR department was integrated into the work environment management and two where all work environment management was done without HR involvement. With these criteria in mind I used a snowball method where I interviewed key actors from the field of work environment, consulted organizational webpages, CSR reports and publically available work environment strategies and documents to find four companies that suited these profiles (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Case selection

	Public	**Private**
No HR involvement	Hospital 1	Company 1
HR involvement	Hospital 2	Company 2

I conducted semi-structured interviews with 23 institutional intra-organizational experts (Table 1) who had work environment issues in the company as one of the main parts of their job description. The interviews focused on their professional backgrounds, their everyday job tasks, their interpretations of and conceptions about work environment, and their relationships with other organizational actors. The interviews were designed to explore the different and varying dimensions of the experts' tasks, their backgrounds and their opinions and accounts of work environment management, the field and other organizational actors.

Table 2: Informants

Informants	**Job description**	**Company**
Manager, work environment function	Managing work environment function	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 1, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 2, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 3, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 4, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Consultant 5, work environment function	Full time work environment consultant	Hospital 1 (H1)
Manager, HR function	Managing HR function	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 1, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 2, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 3, HR Function	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Hospital 2 (H2)
Consultant 1, Risk function	Full time work environment consultant	Company

		1 (C1)
Consultant 2, Risk function	Full time work environment consultant	Company 1 (C1)
Data consultant, Risk function	Data consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 1 (C1)
Manager, Management systems function	Managing the staff function responsible for all management systems (among them work environment management system)	Company 1 (C1)
Local site consultant 1	Consultant for local site with work environment as main responsibility	Company 1 (C1)
Local site consultant 2	Consultant for local site with work environment as main responsibility	Company 1 (C1)
Manager, safety, health and environment function	Managing function for safety, health and external environment	Company 2 (C2)
Consultant 1, safety, health and environment function	Full time health and safety consultant	Company 2 (C2)
Consultant 2 safety, health and environment function	Full time health and safety consultant	Company 2 (C2)
Local safety consultant 1, Local site	Full time health and safety consultant at local site	Company 2 (C2)
Local safety consultant 2, Local site	Full time health and safety consultant at local site	Company 2 (C2)
HR consultant 1, Local site	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 2 (C2)
HR consultant 2, Local site	HR consultant with work environment as one of various responsibilities	Company 2 (C2)

All interviews were transcribed and coded with NVIVO and analyzed using an iterative bottom-up coding process (described below). All interviews were done in Danish. The empirical examples used in this paper have been translated by me. To ensure anonymity for all participating experts I have omitted personal information from the empirical examples used in this paper. I have indicated this by using [ ] within the text.

Coding and analysis

I coded all my data in a stepwise coding process, as described by Miles and Huberman (Miles & Huberman 1994) with both generic descriptive codes (e.g. 'mentions management', 'mentions external partners', 'task description') as well as more basic interpretive codes (e.g. 'role identity', 'operational task', 'strategic task'). Lastly I used a pattern coding based on a pattern of categories that I developed in iterations between the data and the literature and its theoretical concepts as described by Miles and Huberman (1994).

The outcome of this process was a coding pattern that incorporated both organizational and institutional dimensions of the accounts of the experts. The organizational and institutional accounts described both the formal belonging and more subjective accounts of identity and preferences from the experts. The formal accounts describe the formal belonging to the organizational hierarchy and to the

relational network within the field of work environment. In these accounts the experts describe formal tasks and hierarchical place with the organizations, and institutional biographical information (Lawrence et al. 2011; Bertels & Lawrence 2016) about belonging to the field of work environment management such as educational background, previous employment, and membership in trade associations etc. Next to these formal accounts, the experts also describe their organizational and institutional orientations in more subjective terms; whether they prefer operational tasks or strategic tasks, what they describe as valuable and important work in their everyday jobs and so on to account for organizational orientation, and their thoughts, feelings, valuations and knowledge about the field of work environment and work environment as a 'cause'. Finally I coded each of the abovementioned accounts with either 'close' or 'distant' in the case of the institutional accounts, and 'strategic' or 'operational' in terms of organizational accounts. The pattern coding as well as empirical examples can be seen in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Pattern coding and examples

Attribute	Dimension	Place	Example
Institutional orientation	Institutional biography	Close to field	*I worked at* [name of company] *which is a work environment consultancy firm, and was with them for multiple years. I worked mostly with ergonomics and health promotion because I have a degree in* [health science]… (Consultant 2, Risk function, C1
		Distant from field	*I have worked with HR for 20 years. Originally I have a degree in* [mercantile background] *and was afterwards hired into* [large corporation] *in a traineeship where I worked with recruitment* (HR Consultant 1, C2)
	Subjective institutional accounts	Close to field	*There is no doubt that I am fired up about improving the work environment. And that there are areas where we can do better, for example when it comes to health promotion* (Consultant 2, H1)
		Distant from field	*No when I think about a management system, I think of just one. I don't think you should have more than one, and a work environment system in itself I have never understood. Because I think you should have a system that creates flow in our processes, and we treat patients at this hospital, we don't produce good work environments, they are our earnings. And then to do that you need cooperation, well-being, high*

			satisfaction…. (HR Consultant 3, H2)
Organizational orientation	Formal position	Strategic	*…with global responsibility therein lie systems, guidelines, our direction, policies, our entire management system, but also of course some tasks where we help single units.* (Manager, safety, health and environment function, C2)
		Operational	*…here I am as said before employed as an environmental employee; that means that day to day I am responsible for the environment and I am the management representative in relation to the regulators, and I am responsible for our management system where we have certificates for the environment and the work environment* (Local site consultant 2, C1)
	Subjective organizational accounts	Strategic	*The educational background of me and my staff is much more academic and structured; in the work we are prone to documenting, structuring, and working systematically…* (Manager, Management systems function, C1)
		Operational	*I am all about getting out to the 'customers', out and cooperating and speaking with them, finding the good solutions, putting things into motion, coming back after some time and following up. I am not very strategic. I want to be out there and finding the good solutions…* (Consultant 1, H1)

Findings

In the following section I describe the tensions and contradictions that are present in the accounts of my informants. First I start by describing the organizational orientation, and then follow this by describing the institutional orientation.

Organizational orientation

The organizational orientation is, as described above, an aggregate category that encompasses both the formal place within the organizational hierarchies, as well as the experts' own subjective accounts of their roles and preferences when it comes to the operational/strategic tension and their role in it.

The tension between experts who do a lot of *'…legwork, out and feel and talk and get input on what to be aware of*' (HR consultant 2, C2) and those who: '*wear the*

blue shirt from the technical department, [or sometimes] wear the white shirt if it is an issue on the production floor' (Local site consultant 1, C1)

And between the experts who:

'send my emails directly to the overall directors with 'now this site is out of control' and of course I then suggest that they have a conversation on how to solve it. Then [name of colleague] *takes my statistic and goes to the local site manager and has a conversation as well, and the overall directors also have that conversation probably.'* (Data consultant, Risk function, C1)

Formal organizational roles

When it comes to the formal roles of each of the intra-organizational experts, I have tried to interview representatives from all organizational subsystems that have work environment as a primary work task. Therefore my investigation also encompasses both experts who are employed in centralized staff functions, and experts who are employed locally on local sites.

At the two hospitals there is no distinction. All work environment experts are employed in central staff functions subordinated only to the overall management of the hospitals.

The work environment efforts in H1 are managed by a central work environment function. The experts employed here counsel the various hospital units in their day to day work environment issues. They are also responsible for educational courses on various work environment related themes (e.g. patient moving). The specialist function is also responsible for data registration and surveillance, as well as maintaining the management systems related to work environment.

At H2 this is also the case. Their work environment is managed by a central HR department with a number of consultants. They are responsible for every work environment related issue at the hospital. One consultant holds a special responsibility for maintaining systems and the day to day work environment management while the whole function shares responsibility for sickness absence and psycho-social work environment issues. They are also responsible for the management systems regarding work environment.

In the two private companies the complexity of their work environment structure and the division of labor between various functions and actors are higher than in the hospitals.

In C1 multiple actors are involved with managing the work environment efforts. At HQ three different functions have roles in work environment management. First of all they have a rather small staff function of specialized work environment consultants. The consultancy function works with the local sites and provides help

and counseling regarding concrete work environment challenges. This function is part of a larger risk management group which handles financial, legal and production risks. Regarding work environment they are primarily responsible for registration and surveillance of the company-wide data on accidents, sick days and compensations. Furthermore the company employs a certified management system (CMS) and holds the OHSAS18001 certificate in regards to their work environment efforts (see e.g. Rocha & Granerud 2011). The responsibility for all types of CMS, among them OHSAS18001, however is located in a third staff function – the environmental function. Finally C1 employs local safety employees on all sites, who report directly to the local managers and manage the day to day work environment tasks at the shop floor level. They have no formal ties to the central work environment function.

In C2 the work environment efforts are handled by three distinct organizational functions. Consultants who work in a combined environment and work environment function at the corporate headquarters. Their overall responsibility is to develop and maintain overall systems, the CMS and work environment data management in C2. Besides that they provide expertise for the local manufacturing sites on challenging and complex safety issues (e.g. safety implications of new procurement, chemical risks). At the individual local production sites two different groups are responsible for the day-to-day work environment efforts. A group of local work environment employees assesses risks and works with both line managers and employee representatives at the sites. They are formally employed by the local management on the individual sites, but maintain a close relationship with the central work environment consultants. Finally all responsibility for psycho-social work environment issues and issues of well-being is held by locally employed HR consultants. Even though they are employed locally, they maintain relations with other HR consultants in C2. Work environment is just one out of a multitude of traditional HR tasks (i.e. recruitment etc.) that is a part of the HR consultants' job description.

Subjective organizational accounts

However the formal roles and the place of employment are not the only important factor in the data that shows whether experts have a strategic or a more operational reflexive position. Repeatedly the experts also highlight the tension between the strategic and the operational as a subjective issue of where one's main interest lies.

Many experts display an organizational orientation that is in accordance with their formal places within the organization.

One local safety employee in C2 describes her/his own job as dealing in '*the concrete'* and the efforts from the central staff function as '*the overall stuff*' (Local safety consultant 2, C2). This is also the case when an HR consultant from C2 complains how systems '*take time away from focusing on whether people feel good or bad at work'* and that this poses a great '*dilemma'* in the day-to-day work (HR consultant 1, C2).

There is also concordance the other way around i.e. that people employed in strategic functions also display subjective preferences for strategic solutions illustrated by the following quote from an HR consultant from H2:

'One of the things that I liked about this job was that there was a coupling, or more than that, that it was placed within the HR department. Because my experience from almost twenty years in the business is that if work environment becomes a column on its own, then it is really hard to get an ear from the more strategic levels and decisions. (…) Then you can just stand on the sideline and register and document that we have a problem, so that was one of the reasons that I wanted to come here' (Consultant 1, HR function, H2)

What shines through in the quote above, and in many other empirical accounts, is a skepticism about 'ad hoc' solutions to work environment in a local manner, or work environment management through 'yellow post-it's, as one expert from C2 puts it.

This point is also made clear from this quote from the manager of the work environment function in H1:

'…the developmental task for many years now has been to make all the surrounding factors, like the bureaucracy and all those surrounding things manageable, and these are not exactly tasks that my consultants are particularly fired up about. But we agree that it is necessary, so now we all help each other' (Manager, work environment function H1)

That the systematic and bureaucratic efforts are important is the main point of this quote. The quote shows that the view of this manager is in accordance with her/his formal place in the organization. However the quote also points to another interesting finding. This concordance between formal role and subjective feelings is not a given thing in organizations.

A consultant from the central staff unit at H1 makes this clear in the following quote:

'I like that we go out and put our lab coats on and participate in the work and help with the people moving[5] *(…) it takes time and resources to be 'out there' but in the end that is what moves the work environment forward; that we have that close insight into [the issues]'* (Consultant 2, work environment function, H1).

So "out there" with concrete assignments are more valuable than the strategic systems and procedures and their implementations. One of her/his colleagues puts it, the difference between "*being in the field"* on one hand and *"those things behind the desk"* on the other (Consultant 3, work environment function, H1).

The same point is also made by the leading consultant in the central function in C1:

[5] The moving of patients in a hospital.

'It is symptomatic for my way of work, and the way that I have made our function work, that we are out there talking to the work environment groups, and the local consultants. We are always out on the sites, not here [in their office at headquarters], not on the parquet floors' (Consultant 1, Risk function, C1)

Institutional orientation

The institutional orientation of the experts is also evident in two different types of account: the institutional biography of the experts, and the more subjective institutional orientation that characterizes accounts in which the feelings, opinions or identities of the experts in relation to the field of work environment management are stated.

Institutional biography

Institutional biography as a concept describes individual actors' '…relations to the institutions that structure their lives…' (Lawrence et al. 2010: p. 55). The concept therefore situates the actors and their history in relation to the organizational field and its relational components. Thus it can help researchers determine how individuals' biographies enable individual action e.g. by adding resources through education and previous experiences, but also at the same time condition individual responses to institutional logics.

When it comes to the institutional biography the experts fall into two groups. First of all there are the experts with a 'close' biography to the field i.e. through educational background, vocational training, previous employment or membership in trade associations and field level organizations.

The account below from the staff function manager in C2 is an example of a 'close' institutional biography.

'Well already while I was studying [natural science] I knew that environmental and work environment subjects were what I wanted to pursue (…) that was why I studied [natural science] I never wanted to be an analyst, but it was more like if you wanted to do something about it [work environment], you had to understand it first' (Manager, safety, health and environment function, C2)

Other examples include educational backgrounds in engineering but with work environment and safety as an integral part, in public health and sports, in health professions such as physio- and occupational therapists, and one with a social science background in planning and development.

Previous employment in work environment positions is also a prevalent institutional biographical factor that many experts have. There are examples of experts who have been employed as work environment experts in other companies, have worked in the

OHS before the disbandment of the service, or in private work environment consultancies as evident in the account below:

'I worked at [name of company] *which is a work environment consultancy firm, and was with them for multiple years. I worked mostly with ergonomics and health promotion because I have a degree in* [health science]…' (Consultant 2, Risk function, C1).

Other experts have a background in the field of work environment management, but not as advisors or counsellors. Two were trade union representatives in the participatory 'work environment organization' in the organization and were recruited from there to be professional experts for the organizations instead. And one expert has a background in one of the wider field level organizations:

'…I have been a [job title for a position within one of the central organizations within the field of work environment] *for seven years, got the training and certification as a* [jobtitle] *there, and got so to speak a wider work environment background, and that was really what qualified me to work in* [C2] *because I had worked with it for many years. So that is probably seventeen or eighteen years of hardcore work environment'* (Local safety consultant 1, C2)

Lastly a biographical factor that characterize many experts, and that can be marked as 'close' to the field is their membership and participation in various field-configuring events in the field of work environment such as the annual work environment conferences or courses and arrangements through peer networks, and the 'Society for Work Environment'.

The second group of experts' institutional biographies was marked as 'distant' from the field. The backgrounds of the experts in this group are varied, as are their formal organizational places. They come from backgrounds in HR and people management, in corporate risk management or in environmental protection regulation; one is a technician who has worked with the implementation of various kinds of management systems in manufacturing companies, one has used a mercantile degree in working with recruitment of personnel, and one moved from their original job as a technician in C2 to a job in HR working with the hiring of employees with special needs. What is significant about all these biographical details is that work environment has not been a part of them, as exemplified in the quote below.

'*My background is that I have* [university title in economic subject]*, I have worked with* [financial services] *for some years in* [company], *and then for some years in the same* [company] *with developing business concepts, and then in* [company] *as HR*…' (Manager, HR function, H2)

Institutional subjective orientation

When it comes to the subjective dimension of the institutional orientation the same difference between close and distant relationships can also be observed in the accounts of the experts. Accounts that are deemed as close, all share the fact that work environment as a subject is an important reason of why they hold the job in the first place. It is not just any other organizational topic for them. Instead they are: *'fired up about improving the work environment'* (Consultant 2, H1) as one consultant puts it, or they want to be *'a part of seeing things through, to fight for this work environment development in the same organization'* (Consultant 2, Risk function, C1).

The same kind of affection for work environment as a cause also shines through in the following quote from the staff function manager in C2 about how her/his position is perceived by regular line employees:

'When it's mentioned that I work with safety (…) there are these dialogues with the local safety employees where they say, 'why don't you fight more for this or that' and then I say, 'well we can do that but there could be a boomerang effect where management at the end says 'we don't want to follow up and use all this time on this cause or that cause'. And that is the political game one has to play about what to fight for, and what not to' (Manager, safety, health and environment function, C2).

Regardless of the political and processual strategies and the discordance between the different types of safety employees, it is clear that their main concern is improving the work environment.

In many cases the same people who have a 'close' institutional biography also express 'close' subjective orientations. However there are examples of experts with no prior biographical connections to work environment who still consider it a special issue that one has to fight for. One example is the manager of the staff function at H1 who confesses that she/he couldn't even spell 'workplace assessment' before starting the job. However, now she/he considers it *'the most important task'*, and she/he accounts the institutional work and strategies she/he employs in the organization to further the cause.

Another way that close subjective institutional orientation shows itself is in the question of whether work environment is something special or just another managerial task so to speak. A number of accounts point to the former. As illustrated by the following quote about the difference between normal management and work environment:

'…the whole field of management is very dominated by theories, more than by regulation and evidence and that is very different for work environment because it is regulated by law, and there is an expectation that the interventions we implement to a large extent are based on evidence…' (Consultant 1, HR Function, H2).

On the other hand it is visible from 'distant' accounts that they do not see work environment as something special.

As a consequence of this distance from the field the accounts in this category all see work environment as merely one part of the job, and not necessarily something of particular importance. On contrary it is seen as just another managerial task, as seen in this quote from an HR consultant from H2:

'I've never been able to understand why work environment was its own separate field, because I think that when an employee steps into a workplace then it is work environment, no matter where (…) *so I have never been able to see that there is this one little part we should work with. I think it is the task of management that employees thrive in their workplaces'* (HR Consultant 3, H2).

This also means that work environment is subject to the same decisions and economic cost calculations as any other business area. The HR manager from H2 states that while compliance with legal demands is non-negotiable, not every work environment solution should be 'Rolls Royce model' as she/he puts it, and this point is even more evident in the following quote from a consultant in C1:

'…and this should not sound all 'Lomborgian'[6] *but you know* [names of two colleagues] *they look at it with this view that says well everybody has to come to work, and come home from work. And my perception of that is well that would be very nice if we could do everything* [names of two colleagues] *say we should do, but we have limited resources'* (Data consultant, Risk function, C1).

Furthermore some accounts also explicitly distinguish between the informant and work environment. As an example one actually explicitly mentions that she/he does not see herself/himself as a '*work environment person'* (HR consultant 1, C2). Another HR consultant from C2 distinguishes between her/his job as having to do with well-being issues and the issues of '*safety shoes and gloves'* (HR consultant 2, C2).

Discussion

Typology of reflexive positions

As I show in the findings above the accounts of the intra-organizational experts are split along two separate dimensions of orientation: between operational and strategic organizational orientation, and between the close and distant institutional orientation. I identify four ideal types (Swedberg 2005) of reflexive positions from which intra-

[6] A reference to Bjørn Lomborg, a Danish researcher and debater known for his 'cost-benefit'-like approach to grand societal challenges such as climate change.

organizational experts can engage with the world around them (see Table 4 below). The framework is thereby not a typology of the experts themselves, but a representation of the idealized reflexive positions that can influence their daily work. That I use empirical examples from my data to describe the reflexive positions does not mean that the experts behind the accounts are this or that type, but merely that the thinking evident in the account resonates with the reflexivity in the ideal typical position in question.

In the following section I will illustrate each reflexive position with accounts of enactments of an institutionalized field level practice that all four organizations either already had in place (C1,C2) or were in the process of implementing (H1, H2) at the time of the interviews. This practice is management systems certified with the OHSAS18001 standard as a way of managing the work environment in large complex organizations. Both in the program theories behind it (Hohnen et al. 2014; Hohnen & Hasle 2011), and the practices embedded in it, the use of OHSAS18001 certified systems represents the epitome of the 'compliance logic' of work environment management. By using it here I want to illustrate how the different reflexive positions make interpretation of a field level logic differ.

Table 4: Reflexive positions and CMS implementation

	'Close' institutional orientation	**'Distant' institutional orientation**
'Strategic' orientation	CMS-as-progress	CMS-as-necessity
'Operational' orientation	CMS-as-wedge	CMS-as-fact

CMS-as-progress

The reflexive position in the upper left corner is close to the organizational field, as well as strategic in orientation. The position and the engagement it leads to can in some ways be compared to the description of 'tempered radicals' by Meyerson and Scully (1995) i.e. intra-organizational actors who are both committed to their organizations and the systems they are a part of, but also committed to a cause,

working to further this within the organizations, and more importantly, the individual does not see a contradiction between these two positions.

Using CMS in work environment management fits into this reflexive position perfectly as the CMS emphasizes company-wide processual structures that seek to align work environment efforts and standardize organizational detection and responses to risks. In this way the position here emphasizes universal generalizable principles, instead of going into the particulars of every case as the most viable way to further the cause of work environment. The position is summed up in the following quote on the benefits of CMS implementation:

'*…And then to minimize workplace accidents, to be able to use time in a more optimal way instead of making all these quick fix solutions, instead of rushing around after people, we get it into a structure and a system and make sure that it functions'* (Manager, safety, health and environment function, C2).

CMS-as-necessity

On the other side of the institutional axis in the upper right corner we find a position that shares the strategic outlook of the 'CMS-as-progress' position, but is rather distant to the organizational field. The work environment efforts that the position inspires will thus be characterized by an attempt to integrate work environment concerns and compliance demands into already existing systems and policies, risk management control, management systems or HR policies. The position does not inspire people to be 'believers' in the same way that the 'CMS-as-progress' position does, and thus work environment practices and policies become the subject of negotiations and interpretations to fit them into company policies and interests. In the words of the manager of the HR function in H2, work environment is something *'that just has to be in order, and we have a system for it, and it works pretty well over time'* (Manager, HR function, H2).

Therefore the CMS implementation is not treated as a step forward for work environment efforts, but as a way of dealing with external pressure from the field. This is illustrated in the following quote from the environmental manager in C1 when she/he talks about the CMS implementation, and how it could be fitted into already existing work environment systems.

'*Then we made a little task force with me, our production director and our technical director where we discussed if we wanted this refund* [refund of a 'work environment fee' that all companies had to pay in a short period of time]. *And I, with all my experience within management systems, could say "it won't be hard to add work environment to our existing systems" so that was what we did'* (Manager, Environmental function, C1).

CMS-as-wedge

In the lower left corner the reflexive position is close in institutional orientation and operational in organizational. What characterizes this position is a focus on local efforts and concrete practices, not grand strategies and schemes.

Furthermore the position inspires an approach where experts are somewhat skeptical of the idea of organizational systems and bureaucracies, and furthers a belief that these in themselves are not effective as means to implement field level values about work environment and safety.

This position is illustrated by accounts from experts that describe the primary gains from implementing CMS as part of work environment to increase awareness and get the discussion going within the lower levels of the organization. As described in this account from H2:

'We are running a process where we reach an agreement with the coordinator and the work environment group, and then they talk about it at their staff meetings. And that is one of the good things about the certification process ;that it is now a task that local leaders have to acknowledge, where some of them might have tended to treat it a little casually…' (Consultant 2, H1).

CMS-as-fact

Finally in the lower right corner the reflexive position is operational in organizational orientation and distant when it comes to institutional orientation. Thereby the position inspires local processes at specific locations. But opposite the 'CMS-as-wedge' position this position does not inspire people towards an inherent 'mission' to succeed with the work environment, but simply pushes them to make sure that the rules and regulations of society and what higher-ups demand in relation to work environment efforts are seen through.

Therefore the CMS becomes matter-of-fact. Something solid and unchangeable in the context of the work environment efforts, and not something to question, sample or criticize. To follow the regulations and processes becomes just a part of the job. The following quote is an example of this.

'…one of the demands of our certification is that we comply with the law, and that means that I often take the 'B-role' [B meaning employee side. In Denmark, 'A-side normally' refers to employer side of the labor market] in the discussions because I make demands about 'hey we have an area here, and if we don't regulate it our certification might be in danger' (Local Safety Employee 2, C1).

The reasoning behind the quote is the opposite of the reasoning behind what the 'CMS-as-wedge' inspires. In the latter the CMS is a tool to engage in work environment efforts locally, but from the interviewee's position the CMS becomes the reason behind this engagement. Or put in another way it becomes an unavoidable structural premise of work environment work.

Contributions

Recently numerous calls have been put forward for more theoretical focus on the individual actors within organizations and thus on the micro-processes of institutionalization within organizations (Delbridge & Edwards 2013; Zilber 2016). This paper is a response to these calls. By investigating the reflexive positions available to intra-organizational experts, and their position in the organizational field the paper illuminates tensions and contradictions experienced in organizational work environment efforts, and thereby in processes of institutionalization inside organizations.

As described, reflexive positions of the intra-organizational work environment experts can be plotted into four ideal typical positions based on organizational and institutional orientation. From these positions a certain kind of 'engagement' with the field and the work is possible. The 'local activist' practices of the 'CMS-as-wedge', or the integrative 'work environment-is-just-another-managerial-task' practices that are put forward in the 'CMS-as-necessity' position are two contradictory examples of this. And this leads to the first contribution of this paper. That the intra-organizational experts are not a uniform or homogenous group of institutional actors that work as internal agents of an organizational field's values and prescriptions, as has been the dominant idea in most work on institutionalization and intra-organizational experts (e.g. Scott 2008; Dobbin 2009; Edelman 1992; Lindström 2016; Risi 2014; Daudigeos 2013). Instead tensions and complexity exist within this group. As such the paper furthers our understanding of the internal conflicts and ambiguities in which regulation and prescriptions are interpreted and enacted.

The paper tells the story of the developments within the field of work environment and its increasing complexity, and how this complexity again seems to dissolve the relational structures within the very same field. At the same time it also tells the story of how values and concepts from an organizational field that was once considered a merely external disturbance to be overcome by organizations, increasingly becomes integrated into central organizational processes. As such the story of the intra-organizational experts in work environment can be said to represent both an institutionalization of work environment and a de-institutionalization as well.

In this way a second contribution of the paper furthers research on institutional complexity and especially illuminates the interdependencies between the ideational and the relational components of organizational fields. Fields are composed of ideas; various and often competing bundles of means-and-ends that all make sense of the fields' core issues and problems. But fields are also relationships, networks and bonds forged in classrooms, conferences and councils between real people and organizations. The dynamics between these two aspects of fields are interdependent.

On the one hand ideational complexity in logics will have profound effects on central structures and organizing principles in the field (Greenwood et al. 2011). Logics with roots in the corporate order increasingly emerged within the field of work environment during the last twenty years and can be seen in the development of governance principles and regulatory frameworks. The result of this ideational complexity has been that new organizational actors play a more prominent role in the management of the fields' core issues. Thus actors with weak ties to the field and its institutionalized social arenas now increasingly have to make sense of the legal and normative prescriptions that are transmitted from the field to the organizations.

Importantly the paper contributes to the development of institutional theory in showing that actors are not fully embedded in institutional logics that are present in a field. Actors are not conflated with social structures in the field, but are reflexive subjects that interpret the ideational prescriptions of any field. Actors are embedded in relations and networks with other actors; and through these the ideational content of a given field is filtered. Actors will thus draw inspiration from available logics without necessarily being fully embedded in said logics which in turn are not the sole explanation for social action. As shown in my analysis the so-called logic of compliance and the associated practice of CMS is an example of this. Because institutional logics are naturally generalizable and somewhat abstract logics are suitable across the field, intra-organizational actors engage reflexively with these field-level structures in order to implement them into their particular organizational contexts. Thereby we see how the logic of compliance is used and enacted in different ways in the four reflexive positions, with different reasons for doing so, which will have ramifications for the actual implementation. The theoretical point that I am making with this example is simply that field level logics are not totalizing concepts that fully embed and explain everything about and every micro-action in a given social context. To be considered field-level logics they will have to be somewhat abstract, as they have to be applicable in more than one context, for more than one actor. Thus actors have to interpret these available field level logics for themselves. And while some are more commensurable with reflexive positions than other (for example, the logic of advocacy would be somewhat incommensurable with the reflexive position located in the upper right corner that is both strategic and distant), it is important in institutional theorizing to distinguish analytically between actors (experts) and structures (logics) (Delbridge & Edwards 2013; Sayer 2010). Actors display something other than the logics of a given field – a reflexivity about the social world and structures that they inhabit and interpret in their daily work lives (Delbridge & Edwards 2013; Suddaby et al. 2016). This reflexivity and the character of the 'internal conversation' (Archer 2010b; Delbridge & Edwards 2013) that characterizes actors' interpretation of the social structures are reflected in my typology. While the structural embeddedness of the individual actors is reflected in the institutional biographies, as well as the formal organizational position, I have also tried to incorporate the individual actors' own subjective accounts based on feelings, identities and opinions in the analytical framework. By also using accounts of institutional identity and organizational identity my typology reflects both the structural 'habitus'-like positions, but also the actors' internal conversations about

their own positions. In this way my study gives a nuanced theoretical perspective on actors' relationship to social structures, without falling into an upwards, downwards or central conflation of structure and agency (Archer 1995; Sayer 2010).

References:

Aldrich, H. & Herker, D., 1977. Boundary Spanning Roles and Organization Structure. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2(2), pp.217–230.

Archer, M.S., 2010a. Introduction: The rerflexive re-turn. In M. S. Archer, ed. *Coversations About Reflexivity*. Routledge, pp. 1–14.

Archer, M.S., 1995. *Realist social theory: the morphogenetic approach*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M.S., 2013. Reconceptualizing socialization as reflexive engagement. In M. S. Archer & A. M. Maccarini, eds. *Engaging with the world; Agency, institutions, historical formations*. Routledge, pp. 103–129.

Archer, M.S., 2010b. Routine, Reflexivity, and Realism. *Sociological Theory*, 28(3), pp.272–303.

Archer, M.S., 2003. *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation*, Cambridge University Press'.

Barley, S.R., 1996. Technicians in the Workplace: Ethnographic Evidence for Bringing Work into Organizational Studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3), pp.404–441.

Barley, S.R. & Tolbert, P.S., 1997. Institutionalization and Structuration: Studying the Links between Action and Institution. *Organization Studies*, 18(1), pp.93–117.

Berg Johansen, C. & Boch Waldorff, S., 2015. What are Institutional Logics - and Where is the Perspective Taking Us? *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2015(1), pp.14380–14380.

Bertels, S. & Lawrence, T.B., 2016. Organizational responses to institutional complexity stemming from emerging logics: The role of individuals. *Strategic Organization*, 14(4), pp.336–372.

Binder, A., 2007. For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory and Society*, 36(6), pp.547–571.

Boglind, A., Hällstén, F. & Thilander, P., 2011. HR transformation and shared services: Adoption and adaptation in Swedish organisations. *Personnel Review*, 40(5), pp.570–588

Boxenbaum, E., 2006. Lost in Translation: The Making of Danish Diversity Management. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(7), pp.939–948.

Boxenbaum, E. & Jonsson, S., 2008. Isomorphism, diffusion and decoupling. In R. Greenwood et al., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Sage London, pp. 78–98.

Brun, J.-P. & Loiselle, C.D., 2002. The roles, functions and activities of safety practitioners: the current situation in Québec. *Safety Science*, 40(6), pp.519–536.

Caronna, C.A., Pollack, S.S. & Scott, W.R., 2009. Organizations, populations, and fields: Investigating organizational heterogeneity through a multilevel case study design. In B. G. King, T. Felin, & D. A. Whetten, eds. *Studying Differences between Organizations: Comparative Approaches to Organizational Research*. Research in the Sociology of Organizations. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 249–270.

Child, J., 1973. Parkinson's Progress: Accounting for the Number of Specialists in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18(3), pp.328–348.

Currie, G. & Spyridonidis, D., 2016. Interpretation of Multiple Institutional Logics on the Ground: Actors Position, their Agency and Situational Constraints in Professionalized Contexts. *Organization Studies*, 37(1), pp.77–97.

Dalton, M., 1950. Conflicts Between Staff and Line Managerial Officers. *American Sociological Review*, 15(3), pp.342–351.

Daudigeos, T., 2013. In Their Profession's Service: How Staff Professionals Exert Influence in Their Organization. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(5), pp.722–749.

Daudigeos, T., Boutinot, A. & Jaumier, S., 2013. Taking Stock of Institutional Complexity: Anchoring a pool of institutional logics into the interinstitutional system. *Institutional Logics in Action*, 39, pp.319–350.

Delbridge, R. & Edwards, T., 2013. Inhabiting Institutions: Critical Realist Refinements to Understanding Institutional Complexity and Change. *Organization Studies*, 34(7), pp.927–947.

Delmas, M.A. & Toffel, M.W., 2008. Organizational responses to environmental demands: opening the black box. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(10), pp.1027–1055.

Dobbin, F.R., 2009. *Inventing Equal Opportunity*, Princeton University Press.

Dyreborg, J., 2011. "Safety Matters Have Become Too Important for Management to Leave it Up to the Workers" –The Nordic OSH Model Between Implicit and Explicit Frameworks. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 1(1), pp.135–160.

Edelman, L.B., 1992. Legal Ambiguity and Symbolic Structures: Organizational Mediation of Civil Rights Law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6), pp.1531–1576.

Fincham, R., 2012. Expert labour as a differentiated category: power, knowledge and organisation. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 27(3), pp.208–223.

Fligstein, N. & McAdams, D., 2012. *A Theory of Fields*, Oxford University Press.

Frick, K. & Wren, J., 2000. Reviewing occupational health and safety management: multiple roots, diverse perspectives and ambiguous outcomes. In K. Frick et al., eds. *Systematic Occupational Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, p. 527.

van Gestel, N. & Hillebrand, B., 2011. Explaining Stability and Change: The Rise and Fall of Logics in Pluralistic Fields. *Organization Studies*, 32(2), pp.231–252.

Gondo, M.B. & Amis, J.M., 2013. Variations in Practice Adoptions : The Roles of Counscious Reflection and Discourse. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2), pp.229–247.

Gouldner, A.W., 1964. *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*, Free Press.

Gray, G.C. & Silbey, S.S., 2011. The Other Side of the Compliance Relationship. In C. Parker & V. L. Nielsen, eds. *Explaining Compliance: Business responses to regulation*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 385.

Greenwood, R. et al., 2011. Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), p.317 LP-371.

Greenwood, R. & Suddaby, R., 2006. INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN MATURE FIELDS: THE BIG FIVE ACCOUNTING FIRMS. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), pp.27–48.

Guest, D., 2002. Human resource management, corporate performance and employee wellbeing: Building the worker into HRM. *Journal of Industrial relations*.

Guest, D. & King, Z., 2004. Power, Innovation and Problem-Solving: The Personnel Managers' Three Steps to Heaven? *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(3), pp.401–423.

Gunningham, N., 2011. Strategizing compliance and enforcement: Responsive regulation and beyond. In C. Parker & V. L. Nielsen, eds. *Explaining Compliance: Business responses to regulation*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 385.

Haedicke, M.A. & Hallett, T., 2015. Research Strategies for Inhabited Institutionalism. In K. D. Elsbach & R. M. Kramer, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Organizational Research: Innovative Pathways and Methods*. Routledge.

Hale, A., 2014. Foundations of safety science: A postscript. *Safety Science*, 67, pp.64–69.

Hallett, T., Shulman, D. & Fine, G.A., 2009. Peopling Organizations - The Promise of Classic Symbolic Interactionism for an Inhabited Institutionalism. In P. Adler, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Sociology and Organization Studies: Classical Foundations*. Oxford University Press.

Hallett, T. & Ventresca, M.J., 2006. Inhabited Institutions: Social Interactions and Organizational Forms in Gouldner's Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. *Theory and Society*, 35(2), pp.213–236.

Hasle, P., Seim, R. & Refslund, B., 2016. From employee representation to problem-solving - Mainstreaming OHS management. *Economic and Industrial Democracy (Forthcoming)*.

Hedegaard Riis, A. & Langaa Jensen, P., 2002. Denmark: Transforming Risk Assessment to Workplace Assessment. In D. Walters, ed. *Regulating Health and Safety Management in the European Union*. Brussels: P.I.E - Peter Lang, pp. 59–80.

Hoffman, A.J., 2001. *From Heresy to Dogma: An Institutional History of Corporate Environmentalism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hoffman, A.J., 1999. Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the U.S. Chemical Industry. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), pp.351–371.

Hoffman, A.J. & Ventresca, M.J., 2002. Introduction. In A. J. Hoffman & M. J. Venstresca, eds. *Organizations, Policy, and the Natural Environment: Institutional and Strategic Perspectives*. Stanford University Press, pp. 1–40.

Hohnen, P. et al., 2014. Hard Work in Soft Regulation: A Discussion of the Social Mechanisms in OHS Management Standards and Possible Dilemmas in the Regulation of Psychosocial Work Environment. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 4(3), pp.13–30.

Hohnen, P. & Hasle, P., 2011. Making work environment auditable–A "critical case"study of certified occupational health and safety management systems in Denmark. *Safety Science*, 49(7), pp.1022–1029.

Kabel, A., Hasle, P. & Limborg, H.J., 2007. Occupational health services in Denmark – the rise and fall of a multidisciplinary and preventive approach. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety*, 5(sup1), pp.25–38.

Lampel, J. & Meyer, A.D., 2008. Guest Editors' Introduction: Field Configuring Events as Structuring Mechanisms: How Conferences, Ceremonies and Trade Shows Constitue New Technologies, Industries and Markets. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(6), pp.1025–1035.

Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R. & Leca, B., 2011. Institutional Work: Refocusing Institutional Studies of Organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1), pp.52–58.

Leca, B. & Naccache, P., 2006. A Critical Realist Approach To Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization*, 13(5), pp.627–651.

Limborg, H.J., 2001. The professional working environment consultant? A new actor in the health and safety arena. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, 11(2), pp.159–172.

Lindström, S., 2016. "An army of our own": Legitimating the professional position

of HR through well-being at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 32(4), pp.189–196.

Lounsbury, M., 2001. Institutional sources of practice variation: Staffing college and university recycling programs. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(1), pp.29–56.

Lounsbury, M. & Kaghan, W.N., 2001. Organizations, occupations and the structuration of work. In S. Vallas, ed. *Research in the Sociology of Work: The Transformation of Work (Vol. 10)*. Emerald, pp. 25–50.

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B., 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), pp.340–363.

Meyer, R.E., 2008. New Sociology of Knowledge: Historical Legacy and Contributions to Current Debates in Institutional Research. In R. Greenwood et al., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. SAGE Publications, pp. 519–538.

Meyerson, D.E. & Scully, M.A., 1995. Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change. *Organization Science*, 6(5), pp.585–600.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M., 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* 2nd ed., SAGE Publications.

Mintzberg, H., 1980. Structure in 5's: A Synthesis of the Research on Organization Design. *Management science*, 26(3), pp.322–341.

Nielsen, K.T., 2000. Organization Theories Implicit in Various Approaches to OHS Management. In K. Frick et al., eds. *Systematic Occupational Health and Safety Management - Perspectives On An International Development*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, p. 515.

Pache, A.-C. & Santos, F., 2010. When Worlds Collide: The Internal Dynamics of Organizational Responses to Conflicting Institutional Demands. *Academy of Management Review* , 35(3), pp.455–476.

Parker, C. & Gilad, S., 2011. Internal corporate compliance management systems: structure, culture and agency. In C. Parker & V. L. Nielsen, eds. *Explaining Compliance: Business responses to regulation*. Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 386.

Pawlowska, Z. & Eeckelaert, L., 2010. *Mainstreaming OSH into business management*, Bruxelles.

Reay, T. et al., 2016. Getting Leopards to Change their Spots: Co-Creating a New Professional Role Identity. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Reay, T. & Jones, C., 2016. Qualitatively capturing institutional logics. *Strategic Organization*, 14(4), pp.441–454.

Reed, M.I., 1996. Expert Power and Control in Late Modernity: An Empirical Review and Theoretical Synthesis. *Organization Studies*, 17(4), pp.573–597.

Risi, D., 2014. Corporate Social Responsibility Professionals and Institutional Work:

An Institutional Perspective on a Developing Profession in Multinational Corporations. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Unternehmensethik*, 15(2).

Ritti, R.R. & Goldner, F.H., 1969. PROFESSIONAL PLURALISM IN AN INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION. *Management Science*, 16(4), p.B-233-B-246.

Rocha, R.S. & Granerud, L., 2011. The search for legitimacy and organizational change: The agency of subordinated actors. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27(3), pp.261–272.

Sandholtz, K.W. & Burrows, T.N., 2016. Compliance Police or Business Partner? Institutional Complexity and Occupational Tensions in Human Resource Management. In L. E. Cohen, M. D. Burton, & M. Lounsbury, eds. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Volume 47 - The Structuring of Work in Organizations*. Emerald Insight, pp. 161–191.

Sayer, A., 2010. Reflexivity and the habitus. In M. Archer, ed. *Coversations About Reflexivity*. Routledge, pp. 109–122.

Scott, W.R., 2014. *Institutions and Organizations* 4th ed., SAGE Publications.

Scott, W.R., 2008. Lords of the Dance: Professionals as Institutional Agents. *Organization Studies*, 29(2), pp.219–238.

Scott, W.R. & Davis, G.F., 2007. *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives* 1st ed., Routledge.

Seim, R., Møller, N. & Limborg, H.J., 2016. Professionelle og medarbejderrepræsentanter - nye roller i arbejdsmiljøarbejdet [Professionals and Employee Representatives - New roles in the working environment efforts]. *Tidskrift for Arbejdsliv [Journal for Working Life]*, 18(1), pp.18–33.

Storey, J., Ulrich, D. & Wright, P.M., 2009. Introduction. In J. Storey, D. Ulrich, & P. M. Wright, eds. *The Routledge Companion to Strategic Human Resource Management*. Routledge, p. 528.

Suddaby, R., Viale, T. & Gendron, Y., 2016. Reflexivity: The role of embedded social position and entrepreneurial social skill in processes of field level change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, pp.225–245.

Swedberg, R., 2005. *The Max Weber Dictionary: Key Words and Central Concepts*, Stanford University Press.

Swuste, P. et al., 2014. Occupational safety theories, models and metaphors in the three decades since World War II, in the United States, Britain and the Netherlands: A literature review. *Safety Science*, 62, pp.16–27.

Thornton, P.H., Ocasio, W. & Lounsbury, M., 2012. *The Institutional Logics Perspective - A New Approach To Culture, Structure, And Process*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tushman, M.L. & Scanlan, T.J., 1981. Boundary Spanning Individuals: Their Role in Information Transfer and Their Antecedents. *Academy of Management*

Journal, 24(2), pp.289–305.

Uhrenholdt Madsen, C. & Hasle, P., 2017. Commitment or Compliance?—Competing institutional logics in the field of OHS management. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 7(S2).

Uhrenholdt Madsen, C. & Waldorff, S.B., 2017. Ordering Work Environment: An integrated framework of institutional logics and critical realism. *Unpublished Manuscript*.

Vican, S. & Pernell-Gallagher, K., 2013. Instantiation of Institutional Logics: The "Business Case" for Diversity and the Prevalence of Diversity Mentoring Practices. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum, eds. *Institutional Logics in Action (Research in the Sociology of Organizations)*. Research in the Sociology of Organizations. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 233–273.

Yanow, D., 2004. Translating Local Knowledge at Organizational Peripheries*. *British Journal of Management*, 15(S1), pp.S9–S25.

Zilber, T.B., 2016. How Institutional Logics Matter: A Bottom-Up Exploration. In J. Gehman, M. Lounsbury, & R. Greenwood, eds. *How Institutions Matter!*. Research in the Sociology of Organizations. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 137-155–5.

Zilber, T.B., 2002. Institutionalization as an Interplay between Actions, Meanings, and Actors: The Case of a Rape Crisis Center in Israel. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), pp.234–254.

Aalders, M. & Wilthagen, T., 1997. Moving Beyond Command-and-Control: Reflexivity in the Regulation of Occupational Safety and Health and the Environment. *Law & Policy*, 19(4), pp.415–443.

ISSN (online): 2446-1636
ISBN (online): 978-87-7210-048-7

AALBORG UNIVERSITY PRESS