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Abstract

Abstract: Prisons are a specific type of organization with distinct challenges for their management. Most importantly, prisons – as well as understandings of how to 'successfully' manage them – are embedded in a pluralistic environment that consists of a variety of stakeholders with different ideas and expectations with regard to role and governance of prisons. This study addresses the question of which different understandings of 'good' prison management can be found in the Austrian discourse and how the expected complexity constituted by contradictory expectations is manifested in the shared narratives of prison managers. I draw on an institutional theory perspective in order to reconstruct the distinct constellation of institutional logics at the field level as well as at the individual level. Empirically, the study has four central elements: First, I identify the institutional logics at the field level as well as the relevant actors in the field. Second, I reconstruct the prevalent institutional logics as well as the metaphors in use at the individual level. Third, I compare field level and individual level. Finally, I am particularly interested in whether and how metaphors are used by prison managers to enact institutional logics and establish relationships between them. To answer the questions concerning the field level, I focused on articles in five Austrian newspapers from 1970 to 2015. Regarding the individual level, I conducted eight narrative interviews with (former) Austrian prisons managers. Methodologically, I combine a variety of different analytical approaches, namely content analysis, metaphor analysis, and objective hermeneutic analyses. The findings reveal two different 'types' of logics, namely governance and purpose logics. These logics differ in their content (what they claim jurisdiction over), their structure (their relationships within and across types), and in the metaphors used (purpose logics have a more restricted set of metaphors, while governance logics have a more differentiated set). Further, the empirical analyses show that metaphors play a variety of roles with regard to logics. They may either specify individual logics, set up competing logics against each other, stress complementarities between logics, or create relationships between otherwise unrelated logics. Summing up, this dissertation contributes, first, to literature on cross-level relationships of institutional logics by linking field-level results with individual-level results. Second, it extends literature on institutional pluralism and institutional complexity by arguing that constellations of logics do not only exist at different levels but there may also be different types of logics within a constellation. Third, I contribute to rhetorical approaches in institutional theory by showing how metaphors are a way of manifesting institutional pluralism. Fourth, for the practice of prison management, the study has implications for the planning and realization of change management efforts.

Keywords: institutional logics, institutional complexity, 'types' of logics, prison management, metaphors, cross level analysis, Austria
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I Introduction

“It would be nice to live in a world where there were no prisons or jails, a world of perfect justice and harmony. But despite our best efforts, crime persists, and persons who would do harm to others have to be separated from the rest of society.” (Horn, 2008: 524)

Flipping through newspapers shows that prisons have frequently made headlines in the last few years. Honduras (Latin America), for instance, made the front pages when 355 prison inmates died in a fire in February 2012. One of the main points of criticism was the prison officers' slow reaction in unlocking the barracks. Additionally, the prison was severely overcrowded, having twice as many inmates as permitted (Die Presse, 2012). More recently, there was a riot in an US prison this year. Inmates took other inmates and prison officers hostage, and several people were badly hurt. The reason for the riot was that inmates were not satisfied with prison conditions, education opportunities, and the despotic behavior against them (Der Standard, 2017a). Brazilian prisons also made headlines several times this year. Newspapers reported a number of riots between drug gangs in prisons, which even led to a massacre of almost 30 people (Die Presse, 2017a). In Europe, the situation – though not as dramatic as the examples from the Americas – was also characterized by rising tensions and problems. In the UK, for instance, prison management faced violent riots, an increasing number of suicides, and issues of drug abuse and overcrowding (Borger, 2017).

In Austria, prisons gained media attention for different reasons. One of the main issues centered on the increasing number of inmates and a corresponding decreasing in the availability of resources (e.g., Gratz, 2008). That is why the Austrian government has planned to send a certain number of non-domestic inmates back to their home countries (Aichinger, 2011). Austrian newspapers also reported on violent incidences between inmates. For example, in the Prison Hirtenberg, one inmate badly injured a fellow inmate by stabbing him in the back. In response, the staff council demanded more prison officers be hired, arguing that violence in prisons needs to be directly addressed (e.g., Die Presse, 2017b). Recently, the staff council also demanded more rights for prison officers when handling more challenging inmates, who posed a threat to the safety and security in the prison. For example, the staff council argued that prison officers should have the

---

1 In this thesis, I use exclusively ‘prison officers’ for reason of clarity. Existing literature also uses the term ‘prison guards’.
right to shackle aggressive inmates in cases of emergencies, to lock them away, or surveil them on video cameras – instead of giving them German classes and social counseling. The Austrian Ombudsman Board (‘Volksanwaltschaft’) immediately countered this proposal, arguing that prison staff might treat foreign inmates in a discriminatory manner (N.N. 2017; see also Der Standard, 2017b, 2017c). Another issue related to security was the highly publicized escape at Prison Klagenfurt – where an inmate escaped in a garbage truck when working in the prison kitchen (Die Presse, 2017c).

From these numerous examples, it is readily apparent that prison managers\(^2\) face a wide range of issues, including the limited availability of (monetary) resources and various cultural factors such as the social construction of crime and the culturally dominant view of the raison d’être of prisons (punishment vs. reintegration), among others. Even though extant literature underscores the importance of having “a clear understanding of [...] objectives, mission and values” (Coyle, 2002: 97) in prison management, it is not obvious what these visions and objectives should be. Should they mainly focus on security issues such as preventing escapes and riots or should they be measured in terms of the level of human dignity, health care, personal safety, and number of prison activities? How important are factors such as legal representation and respecting the need for special types of imprisonment for different categories of inmates (e.g., women, adolescents, etc.) (e.g., Coyle, 2002)? In light of the plurality of potential goals, the aim of this dissertation is to investigate competing social constructions of ‘good’ and ‘successful’ prison management in the Austrian discourse and to show how this complexity is manifested in the shared narratives of prison managers. Accordingly, it is important not only to focus on the (public) administration’s point of view, but to also consider different political, social, and cultural perspectives. This, consequently, leads to questions concerning consensus around what ‘good’ management means within the Austrian penal system.

1.1 Focus and research questions

In my dissertation, I adopt an institutional perspective in order to address the question of how the understanding of ‘good’ or ‘successful’ prison management is constructed and contested between different actors in the Austrian penal system. From the perspective of prisons’ stakeholders, there are divergent opinions and understandings of ‘good’ prison management – and, therefore, different demands on prisons. Institutional theory is a suitable conceptual lens for such questions,
since it builds on a phenomenological take on social construction (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Meyer, 2006) and argues that understandings of ‘good’ and ‘appropriate’ action are based on established rationalized myths that pervade a society (e.g., Meyer & Rowan, 1977). According to this perspective, prison managers face divergent social expectations of how the prisons should be managed. Drawing on more recent literature in institutional theory, I further argue that these demands represent potentially conflicting positions within institutional fields and/or different institutional logics (e.g., Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thonton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012; see also for similar arguments, e.g., McPherson & Sauder, 2013). My overarching research questions are:

_Which competing understandings of ‘good’ prison management can be found in the Austrian discourse? How does this complexity manifest in the shared narratives of prison managers?_

By focusing on the cross-level relationships between field- and individual-level institutional logics3, I contribute to recent developments in institutional theory. In recent years, a considerable amount of research has acknowledged that (constellations of) institutional logics exist on different levels (macro, meso, and micro), and that these levels are somewhat interdependent (e.g., Thornton et al., 2012). Such studies have provided substantial insights on the effects and dynamics of single or multiple institutional logics at various levels of analysis (e.g., Lounsbury, 2007; McPherson & Sauder, 2013; Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a). However, few have focused on the relationship between the field level and individual level. The purpose of this dissertation is, first, to reconstruct distinct actor positions and their enacted logics at the field level in order to gain a systematic understanding of the constellation (Goodrick & Reay, 2011) of institutional logics in the Austrian penal system and the actors making up the issue field. I will focus on the Austrian media discourse and illustrate how the constellation of logics has shifted over the years. Second, I reconstruct the constellation of logics at the level of prison managers (individual level) and take a detailed look at how prison managers perceive this institutional pluralism (i.e., how field-level logics manifest at the individual level), and how this plurality of logics and their interrelationships are manifested and enacted in the shared narratives of prison managers. In doing so, I extend existing literature in institutional theory with a systematic assessment of the cross-level relations between constellations of institutional logics. More specifically, I examine these issues in terms of the following sub-questions:

3 In this dissertation, I use the term ‘individual level’ for a specific group of actors, namely prison managers. Therefore, I use ‘individual level’ and ‘manager level’ as synonyms.
(1) Who are the relevant actors in the field?

This sub-question aims to identify the relevant actors as well as their needs and claims. It is important to illustrate the different notions of ‘good’ prison management in the Austrian discourse and their underpinning logics. I focus on the speakers as well as the actors mentioned in media discourse in order to reconstruct the “totality of relevant actors” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983: 148).

(2) Which logics can be found at the manager level? What is their relationship to field-level logics? What is the degree of overlap, and how do they differ?

In this sub-question, I shift my focus to the individual level. As a first step, I reconstruct the institutional logics found at this level of analysis. Then, I link the field level and individual level in order to provide insights about the relationship between these two levels. In particular, I am interested in whether the logics at the field level are mirrored at the individual level, or whether they differ in their main characteristics. This provides insights on whether prison managers perceive and enact the whole constellation of logics existing in their relevant field, or whether their own perceptions and relevance structure act as ‘filters’.

(3) How is the relationship between logics experienced at the manager level? Do these logics peacefully co-exist or can tensions be identified?

The third sub-question sheds light on how the constellation of logics is experienced by prison managers. For this question, I focus primarily on the individual level. Specifically, I am interested in assessing the relationships between manager-level logics – for instance, are logics contradictory? Do they co-exist peacefully, complement each other, or exist in a state of (temporary) truce (e.g., Besharov & Smith, 2014; Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a; Raynard, 2016)?

Finally, I go into more depth, by examining the role of language, particularly the use of metaphors, in enacting the relationships between logics at the manager level. Going back to Berger and Luckmann’s (1967) foundational work, language is commonly understood as the most important ‘tool’ for the social construction of reality. In his later work, Luckmann (2006) coined the phrase ‘communicative’ construction of social reality. Institutional theory has always drawn substantially on actors’ externalizations in its examination of institutions, for instance the use of frames (e.g., Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a) or vocabularies (e.g., Loewenstein, Ocasio, & Jones, 2012). More recently, such ideas have gained momentum. Cornelissen, Durand, Fiss, Lammers, and Vaara
(2015; see also Ocasio, Loewenstein, & Nigam, 2015), for instance, argue that actors use communication and shape discourse in order to make sense of institutional logics in their ongoing interaction.

In this dissertation, I contribute to this stream of research by taking a less explored path to investigate the central role of metaphors in the enactment of institutional logics. Powell and Colyvas (2008) stress that actors in the field use metaphors to reduce complexity and also to make sense of the particular challenges they are confronted with in their everyday organization life. However, to date, few studies have examined the role of metaphors in the enactment of logics, and, specifically, the rhetorical construction of relationships between multiple logics. Here, I develop the argument that metaphors – or ‘socially shared images’ – support the enactment of one specific logic, but, due to their inherent transfer of meaning from one domain to another, also enable actors to bridge multiple logics in innovative ways. This leads me to my final sub-question:

(4) What is the relationship between logics that are invoked and the metaphors used? Which metaphors are used to simply enact specific logics, and which metaphors help manage institutional pluralism?

I draw on metaphorical analysis (Kruse, Biesel, & Schmieder, 2011) to investigate whether metaphors are a way in which prison managers enact – and react to – the institutional pluralism they experience. According to extant literature (see chapter 3.2.3), metaphors are a way of reducing complexity by taking established and familiar understandings (source domain) and transferring them to new and potentially problematic target domains. My interest is to understand whether metaphors have the potential to build ‘links’ between two logics and, thus whether they can reduce contradictions between two conflicting logics.

As outlined in the rationale behind my research questions, my aim is to contribute to institutional theory by advancing research on the micro-foundations of institutions and their logics, as well as by identifying cross-level relations between whole constellations of logics. Prisons are a particularly interesting field of study for such questions, because they come close to what Goffman (1961) refers to as "total institutions". Following Toubiana (2014), I conceive the penal system as being characterized as a context pervaded by multiple logics. To date, there has been little research on how multiple logics play out in the everyday life of prison managers (for an exception, see McPherson and Sauder’s [2013] study on pluralistic rationalities in courts), and how prison managers deal with multiple logics. A dual focus at field-level logics and actors’ active engagement with complexity on the individual level will provide more detailed insights about the interrelationship between those levels. Building on recent literature (e.g., Thornton et al., 2012)
suggesting that logics at any particular level of analysis draw from logics at higher level(s), I expect that the logics I identify at the field level are manifested at the manager level – however they may have a different character, focus, and relevance.

Furthermore, my investigation of how prison managers apply metaphorical thinking to resolve field-level institutional complexity at the individual level contributes to the literature on the constitutive role of language regarding institutions. Although metaphors have garnered considerable interest in organization research in the last few years (e.g., Cornelissen, 2004, 2006a), they are largely absent in the literature on the linguistic and rhetorical enactment of institutional logics, and, in particular, institutional pluralism. To address this gap, I analyze the metaphors prison managers use when they talk about their daily work and, in so doing, I contribute to the ongoing research on communication in institutional theory – linking a metaphorical approach to the institutional logics approach.

1.2 Outline of the study

In the next chapter (chapter 2), I provide a literature review on prison management. I first sketch the roots of research on prisons within the social sciences. Then I shift my focus to prisons as organizations and discuss their purposes and functions (including punishment, justice, rehabilitation and resocialization, protection of society, and isolation), and conclude with an overview of types of prison systems. In this review, I highlight different aspects of ‘good’ prison management, drawing attention to the tasks and challenges faced by prison managers, the changing models of prison management, the internal and external stakeholders of prisons, as well as the administrative reforms that have had an impact on prison management. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the increasing expectations that prison managers become ‘jacks of all trades’.

The demands on prison managers to simultaneously satisfy multiple constituencies and divergent expectations motivates my turn to the institutional logics literature as well as the literature on tropes and metaphors (chapter 3). First, I focus on the institutional logics perspective by highlighting why this approach matters and the influences that institutional logics have on collective as well as individual actors. I then turn to the literature on institutional pluralism and complexity. I discuss institutional complexity as a specific form of pluralism and provide an overview of the existing literature on managing institutional complexity, before summarizing the relevance of an institutional perspective on the penal system. Next, I shift my focus to the importance of communication in institutional theory. I start by giving an overview on rhetorical figures, such as metaphors, analogies, similes, metonyms, synecdoche, anomaly, irony, and idioms. Given my interest in the role of metaphors, I narrow my focus and illustrate the function and
purpose of metaphors, providing an overview of different types of metaphors within the literature. Here, I highlight some relevant work on metaphors within organizational theory, especially Morgan's 'Images of Organization', before I conclude the chapter by linking institutional logics with the metaphorical approach.

In *chapter 4, 'Methodology*', I introduce my empirical context, namely the Austrian penal system and its management. I give a brief historical overview of legal milestones within the last century before explaining the structure, tasks and duties, and some key facts about the Austrian penal system. I also highlight some particularly important penal reforms, such as New Public Management (NPM), and how they have affected the Austrian penal system. I conclude this section by discussing the challenges and criticisms of the penal system. Once I have outlined the empirical context, I provide a detailed overview of my methodology and research strategy. I present my data, the methods I used to answer my research questions, and explain the analytical procedures of each step.

To present my findings (*chapter 5*), I divided the section into two parts. First, I reconstruct the prison world from the media perspective (field level). I use articles from 1970 to 2015 drawn from five Austrian newspapers. Second, I describe the prison world from a prison manager's perspective by analyzing the shared narratives, taken from interviews with (former) prison managers (manager level). For both levels of analysis, I reconstruct building blocks from my data in order to identify the prevalent logics. As I observed a time span of more than 40 years, my data allowed me to show the development of the constellation of logics at the field level across four decades. In addition, I analyzed the speakers as well as actors mentioned in the media in order to identify the relevant actors in the field. After describing findings at both levels, I compare the constellations of logics and their characteristics across levels. I then go deeper into my data at the manager level and show how prison managers experience the relationships between logics – i.e., the manager-level constellation. Finally, I show which metaphors are connected to particular logics, and how this accentuates specific relationships.

Finally, in *chapter 6*, I discuss my results in more detail and show how my findings contribute to ongoing literature on cross-level relationships of institutional logics and the communicative construction of institutions. I conclude this chapter by identifying the limitations of the study and finish with general concluding remarks.
II Prison Management

"Prisons will continue to be 'complex institutions, difficult to manage' (Simon 1999: 218) and managing them will continue to be 'an exceptionally complex task' (Faulkner 2001: 301)." (Bryans, 2007: 190)

The modern prison "is a part of civil society and its management is an important element of public service" (Coyle, 2002: 40). Several scholars have conducted research on the organization and management of prisons. For the most part, they broadly address questions concerning the adequate management of inmates and prison staff (e.g., Carlson & Garrett, 2008; Jewkes, 2007a). In the German-speaking world, for instance, Preusker, Maelicke, and Flügge (2010) provide an overview of contemporary developments within the German prison system – highlighting, in particular, emerging risks and threats in this area. In the English-speaking world like the UK, Australia, and the USA, scholars have focused more on the differences between public and private prisons and the benefits and drawbacks of each form of governance (e.g., Lukemeyer & McCorkle, 2006; Mehigan & Rowe, 2007).

In this chapter, I first provide a brief overview of the roots of prison management research in the social sciences and the literature on prisons as an organization. After introducing prisons as a specific type of organization, I present existing insights on the purposes and functions of imprisonment and different types of prison systems. Subsequently, I focus on prison management in general and discuss tasks and challenges of prisons, prison management models, internal and external stakeholders, as well as administrative reforms, in particular NPM. I conclude this chapter by summarizing the extensive demands on prison managers.

2.1 Sketching the roots of research on prisons in the social sciences

Although scientific research on penal institutions has a long and established history in disciplines such as law, criminology, and sociology and also in the humanities, particularly in history and philosophy, questions of how to adequately manage prisons continue to challenge researchers and practitioners alike. According to Roth (2006), the first references to these ‘ancient’ institutions date back to the so-called ‘Great Prison’ of ancient Egypt in 1900 B.C. Two of the most influential studies on prisons and imprisonment within the social sciences were conducted by Foucault (1995) and Goffman (1961). Whereas Foucault (1995) dealt with the emergence and development of the penal system by explaining the shift from physical punishment (i.e., torture
and execution) to the punishment of the soul (i.e., false imprisonment), Goffman (1961) focused on structural and control aspects – coining the term “total institution” to describe prisons:

“First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member’s daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day’s activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution” (Goffman, 1961: 6).

According to Goffman (1961), five groups of people typically populate various types of “total institutions”: (1) the incapable and harmless (e.g., the blind, the aged, the orphaned, etc.), (2) people with mental disabilities who pose a threat to themselves or to the community (e.g., patients of mental hospitals), (3) people who are dangerous and therefore need to be separated from the general public (e.g., inmates in jails, camps, etc.), (4) people who are dedicated to the same work-like task (e.g., army barracks), and (5) people who seek to retreat from the world (e.g., abbeys, monasteries, etc.). Giddens (1984: 157) describes such contexts as a “stringently disciplined carceral organization”, whereas Foucault (1995: 231) refers to them as “complete and austere institutions”. In a nutshell, “total institutions” are “a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life” (Goffman, 1961: xxi).

Despite radical changes in the penal system since the times of Goffman, prisons are still largely understood as “total institutions”. For instance, Boin, James, and Lodge (2006) comment that the ‘total’ character of prisons extends to inherent information asymmetries which lead to ongoing control issues, like challenges for street-level bureaucrats of how to interpret rules and government objectives. Still, prisons nowadays are not the strictly isolated institutions they were in the past. Indeed, within the last 30 years, most western European countries have engaged in a series of prison reforms designed to ‘open up’ the penal system. The objective has been to shed the image of a “total institution” and improve the resocialization process of inmates. Inmates, for example, are granted visitation rights, allowed to write letters, and now have access to media outlets (TV, newspapers, etc.). Recently, such reforms (so-called ‘relaxed regime detention’ [‘Vollzugslockerungen’]) have also been initiated in Eastern European countries (Dünkel, 2010). Nevertheless, an inmate’s life is still highly regulated and the suspension of certain liberties is still a central characteristic of incarceration (Gratz & Pilgram, 2007). Accordingly, a prison is still strongly related to ‘punishment’. It has simply been adapted for the 20th and, with the introduction of electronic tagging, the 21st century. This change process, which started in Austria with the introduction of a new law in the 1970s, opens prisons to a broader environment and, consequently, to more stakeholders. Such broader change efforts have created a variety of new
challenges for the management of prisons, which makes them an interesting research area for studying different perceptions of ‘good’ management and governance.

2.2 The prison as an organization

Like schools, hospitals, and the armed forces, prisons are organizations that many believe should be run by the government – not only because they are meant to serve the broader public, but also because one of the primary tasks of the state is to protect society against delinquents and crime (Coyle, 2009; Logan & Rausch, 1985). Prisons are, at their most basic level, organizations which take on the societal function of separating those that the state’s public justice apparatus deems to be ‘criminal’ from the rest of the population (Andrew, 2007; Brakel, 1988). In most Western countries, the deprivation of freedom and liberties is considered to be one of the harshest penalties people can undergo – and, as such, it is widely believed that responsibility over such an issue should be assumed by a democratically-elected government and not a private organization (e.g., Brakel, 1988).

Prisons are different from other organizations in four key ways – making them and their management particularly illuminating and intriguing contexts for research. First, in contrast to most organizations that are engaged in the provision of some kind of service, prisons ‘provide’ punishment (Schneider, 1999), which is not commonly seen as a good to be ‘consumed’ (e.g., Mennicken, 2014). While other policy areas, like taxation, are perceived by members of a society with similar ambivalence, the penal system still stands out with its unique ‘product’ (Schneider, 1999). Second, prisons face the challenging task of managing and overseeing a group of people that are not ‘members’ of their own-free will or volition (Colvin, 2007). As Schneider (1991: 192) puts it, “prisoners are not free, they do not make choices about most events in their daily life, they have virtually no political power, and they are socially constructed as deviant or violent by most of the population”. Inmates do not have a choice over their incarceration, and prisons cannot choose which inmates they wish to house (Mennicken, 2014). These factors notwithstanding, it is the duty of prison officers and management to adequately deal with inmates and treat them as human beings regardless of the crimes they committed (e.g., Coyle, 2009). Third, prisons differ with respect to how they are organized – they usually constitute rather steep and formal hierarchies (Cressey, 1968). However, by being highly bureaucratic organizations, they exhibit some similarities to other hierarchical types of organizations with regard to their bureaucratic rules and procedures (Colvin, 2007). Finally, prisons operate at the intersection of many societal spheres – making them the object of divergent opinions about how they should be managed. Prisons face intense pressures and scrutiny both from inside (e.g., inmates, prison staff, etc.) and outside (e.g., the public, government, etc.).
In the last decades, prisons have undergone a number of important changes not only in terms of their size, but also in terms of the underlying understandings about what constitutes ‘good penology’ and ‘good prison management’ (Cressey, 1968). Such changes have had a fundamental impact on the aims, functions, and management of prisons. For example, besides punishment, the idea of rehabilitation has gained increasing support over the years. Likewise, the practice of isolating people in special holding cells has appeared – and then disappeared again. In terms of management, public private partnerships (PPPs) and privatizations have become increasingly prevalent (Resodihardjo, 2009 quoted in Mennicken, 2014), particularly in Anglo-Saxon governance traditions. As a consequence, new services and roles have emerged for prisons to enact (Cressey, 1968). Prisons have started hiring new professions, such as social workers or other civil staff in order to fulfil the requirements of modern prison management.

In most Western countries, prisons are the dominant form of incarceration. Most prison systems tend to combine different forms of imprisonment, including administrative forms of confinement, political detention, confinement of illegal immigrants, and the mentally ill. All of them become increasingly regulated (Faugeron, 1996). In Austria, for example, two different levels of imprisonment can be distinguished. These two types differ in two main respects: in terms of the responsible authority and their legal basis. The first type is the so-called ‘police detention’ and encompasses the sub-types: preliminary detention (‘Verwahrungshaft’), administrative detention (‘Verwaltungshaft’), and pre-expulsion detention (‘Asyl/Schubhaft’). The Federal Ministry of Internal Affairs is responsible for all three. Primary legal bases are the Administrative Penal Act (‘Verwaltungsstrafgesetz’), Aliens’ Police Act (‘Fremdenpolizeigesetz’), Asylum Act (‘Asylgesetz’), and Code of Criminal Procedures (‘Strafprozeßordnung’). The second type, ‘judicial detention’, includes measures of involuntary forensic placement (‘Maßnahmenvollzug’), pretrial imprisonment (‘Untersuchungschaft’), and custodial sanctions (‘Strafvollzug’); and it is under the rule of the Federal Ministry of Justice. As mentioned in chapter 4.1.1, the most important legal bases are the Correctional Service Act (‘Strafvollzugsgesetz’) and the Criminal Code (‘Strafgesetzbuch’). In this thesis, I focus on the management of ‘judicial detention’. The two forms of imprisonment imply different challenges for management since they deal with specific types of inmates (e.g., mentally ill inmates need to be treated differently from high security offenders).

Given the fact that prisons are often considered to be “total institutions”, it could be expected that they follow one dominant rationality or logic with respect to how they are managed and what their purpose is. At first blush, it seems that they have a very precise structure (i.e., how things are organized and how things are managed) and that they are guided by clear and specific objectives regarding punishment and custody. In earlier periods, this characterization may have been correct, as prisons were grounded in punishment-enforced rules. The whole organization, in other words, was bureaucratically managed, such that the discipline of inmates and the
management of employees were taken as a given. Prison officers were expected to treat “inmates without favoritism and without giving special consideration to the problems of individual prisoners” (Cressey, 1959: 2). A prison was considered to be ‘well managed’ as long as prison officers followed the rules (Cressey, 1959). Since the Second World War, however, such views of prisons and their management have changed dramatically (Faugeron, 1996). Of particular importance for this thesis is the fact that they have become much more complex organizations, faced with increasingly challenging and internally contradictory objectives (Bryans, 2007). To complicate matters, prison managers are increasingly held accountable for everything that happens inside a prison – even though they can never have full control over all situations and events (Bryans, 2007).

Consequently, prisons have changed from rather static to more dynamic organizations. Traditionally, the prison system and its organizations have been described as static and hierarchical – with little change in, or debate over, their objectives. For years, the main focus of the penal system was restricted to the administration and execution of prison sentences, i.e., the deprivation of an inmate’s liberty, which was expected to be conducted in a humane way. Orders were passed down from higher levels of the hierarchy, and it was the responsibility of staff at lower levels “simply to obey these orders” (Coyle, 2002: 11). Likewise, inmates were expected to “obey instructions from staff without question” (Colye, 2002: 11). For the most part, there was no two-way communication, as everything went from the top to the bottom, and not the other way round (Colye, 2002). Thus, prisons have traditionally been bureaucratic organizations. Over the course of several reforms, however, prisons have become increasingly dynamic, and more recently, they have become regarded as requiring development and change. A critical transformation has been that the staff is now being encouraged to act autonomously and to drive change. But “this will only be possible if there is a change in both the traditional culture and the organizational structure of the prison and the prison system” (Coyle, 2002: 13). Therefore, managerial spirit and action can only take place within the spaces provided, and it requires the will to adapt structures, cultures, and systems.

2.2.1 Purposes and functions of imprisonment
Despite considerable discussions on how punishment should be meted out (e.g., Foucault, 1995 – punishment of the soul instead of the body; or ever more recently the discussions about electronic tagging) over the years, there have been very few debates over the general functions of prisons. Although the terminology and number of functions mentioned vary slightly within the literature, these can be summarized in three main sets of tasks: punishment, retribution, and justice; rehabilitation and resocialization; as well as protection of society and isolation (e.g., Cressey, 1968). This three-dimensional understanding of prison functions fits well with three
imprisonment ‘credos’ by which the penal reform in Western countries has been shaped (see the discussion of Rutherford, 1993 and Liebling, 2004 in English, 2013). These include the ‘punishment credo’, ‘care credo’, and ‘management credo’. Whereas the first two focus more on the question of ‘what’ prisons are for, the third relates to questions about ‘how’ prisons should fulfill their goals. Accordingly, English (2013) sees the punishment and care credos as manifestations of particular values guiding responses to the question of what matters, while the managerialism credo is without any particular value base and responds to the challenge of how to achieve it.

2.2.1.1 Punishment, retribution, and justice

The objective most broadly and commonly associated with prisons is the administration of punishment which serves the achievement of justice. Low (2003), for example, points out that the aims of imprisonment are, besides rehabilitation, also incapacitation, deterrence, and retribution. Incapacitation is often associated with punishment, whereas deterrence has a more ‘preemptive’ character. To give an example, a lot of decisions people make in their daily lives are influenced by the expected consequences of their choices. Decision making requires weighing the pros and cons of potential outcomes. When the likely negative outcomes clearly outweigh potential benefits, rational actors decide against what they planned to do. For instance, we may decide to buy a ticket for only one bus stop because we are afraid to get caught fare-dodging, which would carry a substantial financial penalty (Coyle, 2005). The thought of getting fined, let alone going to prison, can prevent people from violating laws. Nevertheless, because not all people can be deterred from illegal activities, there is a need for ‘punishment’. Therefore, institutionalized punishment can be understood as an instrument of public justice (e.g., Cressey, 1968) which, however, is never a purely rational act but carries multiple meaning potentials and may lead to both intended and unintended consequences (e.g., Andrew, 2007).

While the underlying – and largely taken-for granted – idea behind the penal system is the punishment of people breaking the law (e.g., illegal actions, violations, and criminal behavior), the form and degree of punishment varies widely. For instance, punishment does not require that the execution of justice has to be conducted in a physical way (Coyle, 2005; Cressey, 1968). The ‘best’ form of punishment has been a constant object of expert discussions. In general, “punishment can be deprivation of anything that members of society cherish, such as money or liberty” (Cressey, 1968: 1026; see also Coyle, 2005). So far, no clear consensus about the optimal forms of punishment has been reached. “While there is growing empirical evidence concerning which model is more effective in reducing crime, the evidence is not yet strong enough to convince people who are philosophically predisposed toward one position” (Low, 2003: 8). Despite the introduction of several alternatives to imprisonment, the number of people in prisons has not
declined as expected, and, paradoxically, in some cases, the prison population has even increased (Faugeron, 1996). This makes it even more challenging to introduce alternative imprisonment systems. However, there is a clear trend away from forms of punishment that are applied directly upon the body. At least in many Western countries, corporal punishment and the death penalty have been abolished – leading to an increase in the length of sentences for serious crimes. In most countries, imprisonment is the highest penalty that can be forced upon a citizen – such that “the prison has become the sole means of punishment which reflects the states coercive authority” (Faugeron, 1996: 124).

2.2.1.2 Rehabilitation and resocialization

The second main function of a prison is the facilitation of rehabilitation. Except for countries where the death penalty still exists, the rehabilitation of inmates and their eventual reintegration into society is a paramount objective of the penal system. Advocates of the rehabilitation perspective argue that crime rates can be reduced by ‘changing’ criminals (Cressey, 1968). Faugeron (1996), for example, argues for the restorative function of a prison, which requires, at the very least, offering opportunities for rehabilitation. Over the years, it has become increasingly apparent that most of the prison population is comprised of people from lower-income segments of society. They are often less educated, socially and economically disadvantaged, and are commonly enmeshed in complex and seemingly insurmountable combinations of issues and problems. They are also very likely to suffer from addictions to drugs or alcohol. Without external professional help, it is very hard for them to break the vicious cycle. As an organization aiming at betterment, it is therefore crucially important for prisons to establish guidelines and plans for the effective treatment and rehabilitation of inmates (Faugeron, 1996), as well as help them to reintegrate into society after discharge. Such practices and programs are meant to help reduce crime rates over time by potentially breaking the vicious cycle perpetuated by leaving prison without any opportunity or resources to re-enter society.

2.2.1.3 Protection of society and isolation

The third main function of prisons focuses on the protection of society. Its aim is to put people away who break the law – isolating them in order to reduce their potential threat to society or to themselves. Generally speaking, it is the responsibility of the prison manager to ensure safety (e.g., prevention of escapes) and security (e.g., prevent of riots) in prisons (Mennicken, 2014). Consequently, it is paramount to keep things ‘under control’ (Mennicken, 2014). Colye (1992) points out “that allowing an escape is the most serious professional mistake that prison staff can make” (Colye, 1992 quoted in Faugeron, 1996: 126). This implies a certain tension between the aims of reintegration and protection, particularly with regard to finding a balance in terms of how
much to restrain the prison population in order to retain control, and how much freedom to allow inmates in order to facilitate their transition back into society. It is a question of autonomy and trust and, ultimately, a fine line: How much is too much? The ability to draw such lines endows the state with a substantial amount of power (Faugeron, 1996).

In sum, all three functions of prisons involve challenges related to designing processes and controlling inmates (e.g., Craig, 2004) – that is, dealing with how to effectively manage a prison. Several authors define ‘control’ in a very broad way: “encompassing guidance, co-ordination and evaluation of multiple units, usually in terms of whether organizations are achieving outcomes that are in the set of desired states of the world” (Boin et al., 2006: 82). Control is an important feature of prisons – as it necessary to ensure order and safety of both the inmates and staff. Control is not only about observing people, it also includes issues of ‘treatment’. According to Faugeron (1996: 127) it is important to “understand something of the rules which regulate the staff as well as the relations between staff”. This is necessary because it helps to comprehend how order with the prison is accomplished.

Molleman and van der Heijden (2013: 6) stress that factors like “individual characteristics of inmates (e.g., age, sex, sentence length, and criminal history), staff-inmate ratio, cell sharing, prison capacity, building (architectural design) and; regime” are all relevant factors to ensure safety. But all these parameters cannot be directly managed or controlled by prison managers. That being said, awareness of these factors provides an opportunity to consider key structural aspects of prisons – which centrally concerns management issues, but is also important for more ‘material’ aspects such as the architecture and design of a new prison. Hancock and Jewkes (2011), for instance, stress that building new prisons often leads to the fallacy that modern is often (wrongly) associated with better (for more information about prison architecture see, e.g., George, 2008; Jewkes & Johnston, 2007). Furthermore, over the years there has been increased emphasis on the need to provide decent and humane conditions within prisons – leading to the introduction of welfare services and leisure activities. Such services have had a positive impact on management and control of the prison population (Faugeron, 1996).

“Noting that prisons have multiple tasks (i.e., ensuring custody, maintaining decent conditions, economic production, maintaining internal order, and rehabilitation)”, the challenge is to handle all these goals and try to balance them (Craig, 2004: 96). Coyle (2009) notes that the assumption that treating inmates as human beings – i.e., with respect and fairness – would have a negative impact on security or control issues is mistaken. Instead, he argues that a safe environment (for inmates as well as staff) is a necessary requirement for preventing escapes and riots, and ensuring control. This includes interactions between all kinds of people within a prison where inmates get support for their release and prison managers try their best to manage and balance all these tasks.
2.2.2 Types of prison systems

In most countries, prisons are the responsibility of the government, and, consequently, managing them is in the responsibility of the state. The costs for running a prison are often underestimated, as they not only include construction but also operating costs (e.g., salary, infrastructure, etc.) (e.g., Logan & Rausch, 1985). One way to reduce these costs in the national budget is to involve private or non-profit organizations. In the following sub-sections, two types of governance models that deviate from the ‘standard’ model of state-run prisons are discussed. The main focus lies of research on prisons has centered on private prisons. As the definitions and boundaries of concepts like outsourcing, contracting out, and privatization are often vague, only a broad and somewhat ‘fuzzy’ classification is provided.

Privatization

During the 1980s, a substantial number of traditional public service sectors, like telecommunications, water, gas, and electricity, were privatized within the UK (Farnham, Horton, & White, 2005). This wave of privatization was echoed in other countries, including the USA and Australia (Thompson, 2000; see also Price & Riccucci, 2005). However, this idea only really succeeded in England, Wales, and the USA (Mehigan & Rowe, 2007). The wave of privatization also affected the prison system as the cost for running a prison was extremely high (e.g., Logan & Rausch, 1985; see also McDonald, 2008 for an overview of the growth of the private sector). Several experts, who had experience in the governmental prison system, had “come to believe that they can build and run prisons at least as effectively, safely, and humanely as the state, but with greater efficiency” (Logan & Rausch, 1985: 307). Their aim was to reduce expenditure and save taxpayers’ money on the one hand and; and to create profits for themselves on the other (Logan & Rausch, 1985).

The prison service market, however, is highly regulated by the state. “The goods traded are not private goods: they are public services aimed at the delivery of public security, punishment and rehabilitation at a reasonable cost” (Mennicken, 2014: 28). As private prisons are acting in the interest of the state, they need to be accountable to and supervised by the government. They have to follow the same rules and regulations as public prisons (Mennicken, 2014). But private prisons also face external pressure to meet their financial goals. This can create conflicts between the general purpose of a prison, as the main focus may shift to keeping costs low instead of providing safety, security, and order. As a consequence, this might also lead to additional problems with staff. For example, private prisons cannot pay enough, so the average salary is lower, therefore they might have to hire staff with less work experience, and the turnover rate becomes higher (Useem & Goldstone, 2002).
The privatization of prisons can be divided into two forms: The first is contracting out all management operations to either commercial or non-profit organizations. This means that the prison is still owned by the government, but all management tasks are outsourced (Thompson, 2000; Coyle, 2005). A second variant is more substantial, with a private company taking responsibility for the prison from its inception up to its ongoing operation, effectively including design, construction, as well as issues of management and finance (Coyle, 2005). The wave of privatizations has led to several heated debates with advocates and detractors discussing the pros and cons of privatization. In the following section, the pros and cons of prison privation are discussed in detail. One of the main arguments for prison privatization is that it reduces costs in the public sector. Advocates claim that private prisons can operate more effectively than public prisons because privatization creates competition and furthers a focus on efficiency (Nash & Ryan, 2003; see also Thompson, 2000; Zager, McGaha, & Garcia, 2001). Studies suggest that privately-run prisons not only achieve better performance in terms of lower costs, but they are also superior in terms of reduced numbers of escapes, riots, suicide, etc. (Cabral & Azevedo, 2008). Cabral and Azevedo (2008: 64-65) found three main reasons behind such findings: “a) the lower level of administrative controls; b) stronger incentives of the private operator to monitor employees, to bypass local judiciary constraints, and to fulfill contractual obligations; c) the separation of decision rights within the privately operated prison, which restricts the warden’s discretion and the private use of his/her information advantage”.

Lukemeyer and McCorkle (2006), similarly, show that private prisons perform better than public ones at least in some quality aspects:

“[I]n terms of the proportion of inmates in educational programs and that private facilities outperform both state and federal facilities in terms of the proportion of institutions that are able to avoid inmate assaults (either on staff or on other inmates) entirely. It is surprising that even when we controlled for other potentially causal variables, private prisons remained significantly less likely than federal prisons to experience any violence” (Lukemeyer & McCorkle, 2006: 202).

According to inmate surveys, private prisons also receive higher evaluations on items like “respectful treatment of inmates” (vgl. NAO 2007 quoted in Edel & Grüb, 2010: 46).

Lukemeyer and McCorkle (2006) highlight two studies (Hatry et al., 1993; Logan, 1991) which show that the less hierarchical and more flexible nature of private prisons enables them to test and implement innovative incarceration philosophies more easily compared to public prisons. In addition, because private prisons are accountable for how they spend public money, their staffing costs and construction costs are often lower than those of public prisons (Antonuccio, 2008).

Whereas “Charles Logan has argued that there is nothing inherently wrong with delegating prison management functions to non-state agencies or actors” (Brakel, 1988: 7), there are several counterarguments. One of the main critiques from the opposing side is that the
deprivation of liberty is a harsh penalty and one of the most powerful sanctioning tools a state can use; and, therefore should not be connected with profit making. Such arguments are supported, for instance, by the fact that even though the crime rate in the USA has decreased, the number of people imprisoned has risen to fill empty spaces and increase revenue (Antonuccio, 2008: 581). These trends led to several moral and ethical objections over why prisons should stay in public hands (Thompson, 2000; see also Anderson, 2009). Brakel (1988), for example, points out that because people who violate the law are convicted by public courts, prisons – which are responsible to keep and punish those people – should also be run by public officials.

Another argument in the literature is that private prisons are less secure than public ones (Edel & Grüb, 2010). According to Greene (2001 quoted in Useem & Goldstone, 2002), the rates of riots and escapes in privately-operated prisons are unusually high. Furthermore, opponents are concerned that the focus on achieving efficiency might have a negative impact on the quality of services for inmates (Thompson, 2000). However, it is not easy to compare prisons. In terms of quality, the result of comparisons depends on the criteria for the evaluation. Very often private prisons focus more on questions concerning economic efficiency (Mehigan & Rowe, 2007). Alonso and Andrews (2016) came to the conclusion that private prisons (in their case, in England and Wales between 1998 and 2012) tend to use easy-to-measure dimensions.

Despite a considerable number of empirical studies outlining the advantages and problems of privatized prisons, Perrone and Pratt (2003) claim that it is uncertain whether private prisons are indeed cheaper, more effective, or offer a higher quality of confinement than public prisons: “There were few patterns or consistent findings across the studies, with the exception of the safety, order, and care domains. In the domain of safety, private prisons performed equally as well or worse, whereas they performed equally well or better in the order and care domains” (Perrone & Pratt 2003, 309-310). Cost comparisons are difficult to conduct because there are often many ‘hidden’ costs, such as contract fees, monitoring, etc. Additionally, different accounting practices prescribe different rules for what should or should not be included in cost analyses and how costs should be calculated in general (Perrone & Pratt 2003; Zager et al., 2001). For example, private sector organizations might include depreciation in their calculations, whereas public companies might not (Mehigan & Rowe, 2007). To complicate matters, costs also differ depending on the type of prison (which influences the facilities needed) and the number of inmates they house (Perrone & Pratt 2003). Two prisons can never be fully comparable, because they are never the same (Mehigan & Rowe, 2007). Even if they have groups of inmates requiring the same security level, the inmates cannot be compared (Gaes et al., 2004 quoted in Molleman & van der Heijden 2013). Zager and colleagues (2001) came to the same conclusion. In their study, they analyzed articles between 1983 and 1998. Most of the empirical papers emphasized difficulties of comparing prisons.
In sum, it is difficult to say conclusively whether private prisons are really better or more efficiently managed. James Spalding commented in an interview that the focus should not be on the question of “whether the private sector can do the job better or not”, but whether privatization actually reduces costs. For him it is an issue of whether “[p]rison administrators have to learn how to effectively monitor the private operations and learn how to make it work” (James Spalding, Interview in Riveland, 1999: 197). Tom Coughling argues that “anything that the private sector can do government can do and at the same cost. The public sector simply has to manage as wisely as the private sector” (Tom Coughlin, Interview in Riveland, 1999: 196). In light of all the pros and cons it remains unclear why private prisons sometimes perform better. Maybe it is simply the fact that those prisons are new, having new employees, new buildings and facilities with new technologies; as well as having the opportunity to deviate from standards and to implement innovations (Mehigan & Rowe, 2007). Saving costs, however, is not the only reason why prisons were increasingly privatized. Besides budgetary constraints, it seems that political and ideological factors also have an impact. In any case, privatization continues to be a controversial topic (Price & Riccucci, 2005).

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs)

PPPs are an alternative means by which a government can, despite few available public funds, run prisons. In essence, PPPs are a form of hybrid organization (Edel & Grüb, 2010) – however, identities and responsibilities are still separated (Budäus & Grünig, 1996 quoted in Schedler & Proeller, 2011). PPPs are a collaboration between public entities and private ones. Typical characteristics of PPPs include: (1) fulfillment of a public task; (2) cooperation between a public as well as a private entity; (3) long-term cooperation; (4) product and/or services provided under economic aspects; and (5) shared responsibilities (Bolz, 2005; Wissenschaftlicher Beirat der Gesellschaft für öffentliche Wirtschaft, 2004 quoted in Schedler & Proeller, 2011). “In short, PPPs involve the use of private funds, risk-taking and management skills to provide public infrastructure and related services” (English & Braxter, 2010: 290).

Proponents argue that PPPs are more efficient, flexible, and less expensive than conventional public sector organizations. Manpower costs, for example, can be reduced through a more effective management (e.g., James et al., 1997 quoted in Edel & Grüb, 2010), which is supposed to be facilitated by involving of private sector corporations. Literature generally assumes that staff in private sector organizations are better motivated through financial incentives than public sector staff, and therefore suffer from lower levels of absenteeism. It is also argued that costs are handled more transparently in private organizations (Wohlgemut, 2001 quoted in Edel & Grüb, 2010). Furthermore, arguments for PPPs rely on the assumption that competition between private companies managing a prison, and between prisons and private
partners, increases efficiency in the sense of pushing them to balance performance and costs (Edel & Grüb, 2010).

Opponents of PPPs, in contrast, argue that these partnerships are plagued by conflicting goals and communication problems. Further, it is argued that transaction costs are not fully accounted for (Edel & Grüb, 2010). In general, it is criticized that there is no clear differentiation from other tools and forms, such as contracting out or partial privatization (Schedler & Proeller, 2011).

Each of these different types of prisons has pros and cons. What should be kept in mind is that “prisons are institutions that cannot be managed as effectively as expected by the media, political elites, or the general public regardless of whether they are entirely under government control or whether they involve extensive privatization” (Schneider, 1999: 206). An organization that is tasked with ensuring public safety faces a number of challenging issues and requirements – such that it may not be able to deliver a level of performance that fully meets the expectations of all of its various constituents. Indeed, such an endeavor may be a mission without any chances of success because – as previously mentioned – a multiplicity of impact factors pervade a prison’s environment that are outside the direct control of any individual actor.

2.3 Aspects of ‘good’ prison management

The penal system is “one of the largest growth industries4 of the 1990s” (Zager et al., 2001: 222). Whereas government funding for public services like health care, education, and welfare have been on the decline, correctional system budgets continue to rise quickly (Zager et al., 2001). The reasons for this trend are not only the growing prison population, but also the increase in “staffing costs, health-care costs, and goods and service costs” (Riveland, 1999: 194). Accordingly, the management of prisons is steadily becoming a major factor for success. In the following section, I focus on prisons from a management perspective. I provide insights into the tasks and challenges of prison management, the change in prison management models over time, the typical internal and external stakeholders of prisons, and important administrative reforms, such as NPM. All of these aspects are crucial for understanding the shifting and complex requirements for ‘good’ prison management.

---

4 For instance, in the U.S.A. expenditure for corrections increased by 255% between 1982 and 2002 (Kyckelhahn, 2011).
2.3.1 Tasks of prison managers

The occupational role of a ‘prison manager’ has changed a lot during the last decades (e.g., Bryans, 2007). “In the early 1990s Governors had limited developed power over areas such as finance and personnel. Governors were unable, for example, to move resources from one area to another” (Bryans, 2007: 76). In a somewhat extreme assessment, Dilulio (1989: 29) states that “prison managers can do virtually nothing to improve conditions behind bars”. Over the years, however, management became increasingly professionalized, and the powers of a prison manager increased. Consequently, the demands, responsibilities, and expectations of the occupation have risen accordingly. As Dilulio (1987, quoted in Caeti, Hemmens, Cullen, & Burton, 2003) points out, the administrator’s managerial style has a great impact on the institution and its organizational philosophy. “His or her method of directing can determine whether or not the prison is a place of decency, humanity and justice” (Coyle, 2009: 21). In a study of juvenile facilities, Caeti and colleagues (2003) find that prison managers also influence which functions and objectives are emphasized over others: “The directors of juvenile facilities are in a unique position to affect the goals and objectives of the institution. Their correctional orientation can directly affect whether the institution manifests a punitive or rehabilitative atmosphere” (Caeti et al., 2003: 385). The rise of NPM, in particular, has had a considerable impact on the operation of prisons. The idea of ‘managerialism’, for example, has changed “the work they [prison managers] undertake; the way they are managed; and the level of discretion they can exercise” (Bryans, 2007: 75). Importantly, prison managers have been granted more financial as well as personnel power (Bryans, 2007).

Nowadays, the responsibilities and duties of prison managers encompass a broad range of tasks. In a study examining 98 job descriptions of prison managers within public prisons and 42 interviews with prison managers, four main functions of prison managers were identified: (1) ‘Prison Management’ includes managing relationships with politicians and government officials, protecting society, and providing a safe environment in which order and discipline are preserved, and inmates are treated in a fair, just, and humane way; (2) ‘General Management’ involves the attainment of key performance targets; (3) ‘Leadership’ means strategic vision and effective public relations, while (4) ‘command’, in contrast, is more narrowly understood as the successful resolution of incidents. These results showed that the term ‘prison management’ in a more narrow sense summarizes the purpose and the function of imprisonment, but performance management and strategic management are also important tasks of prison managers. Therefore, metaphorically speaking, a prison manager is much like a steersman – as he or she has to deal with strategic questions, like ‘where to go in the next five years or the next twenty years’. At the same time, he/she is responsible for the daily operations of the organization, although operative tasks are often performed by prison staff (Bryans, 2007).
2.3.2 Challenges for prison managers

Prison managers have to deal with various challenges – such as “complex personnel systems, overcrowded institutions, and technological advances in a context of increased public and political scrutiny” (Riveland, 1999: 163). Prisons and prison systems have grown substantially since the 1970s (Riveland, 1999), and the prison population has also changed a lot (e.g., increases in mental problems, drug abuse, as well as on an increase in the age of inmates).

Prison managers are confronted with such challenges, which considerably impact their managerial work on a daily basis. One main problem facing prison managers is the fact that prisons, while commonly seen as necessary, are not an attractive field to be associated with. The penal system and the rehabilitation of inmates is not a particularly promising area for politicians to stake their political capital – yet without their support, resocialization efforts have limited chances of succeeding. However, quick political gains and public attention can easily be gained by pointing at flaws in the penal system, its organization, and its management – which jeopardizes public trust in the penal system (Preusker, 2010).

Another pressing problem within prisons is the issue of mental illnesses – which are on the rise (Müller, 2010). Oftentimes, inmates with mental illnesses pose a significant threat to themselves and to others. Those posing a high level of threat must be kept under strict surveillance, generally for the entire course of their sentences (Coyle, 2002). Moreover, many of these inmates require special (therapeutic or psychological) treatment – which begs the question: what is the maximum amount of money the government should pay for each inmate?

Health-related costs within prisons are also rising because of poor hygiene and drug addiction (see also Riveland, 1999), as well as general sickness. In some cases, inmates are sick even before they enter a prison – with some suffering from serious diseases such as HIV or cancer (Müller, 2010). Additionally, inmates with special needs often require single cells. The problem of increasing overall operating costs is further exacerbated by the fact that the duration of imprisonment is getting longer and the general population (and, therefore, also prison inmates) is getting older (see also for ‘imprisonment in old age’, Crawley, 2007). Accordingly, the penal system has to deal with an aging population, making special innovations like ‘retirement homes for inmates’ necessary.

Another critical problem is overcrowding – which can be assessed by the amount of living space for each inmate. A benchmark is provided by The European Committee for the Prevention
of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT): each inmate should have at least 4 square meters of space for themselves. If prisons are overcrowded and under-resourced, it becomes a challenge for prison management to provide basic essentials, such as ensuring that inmates “have sufficient food and clean water, have a bed to sleep on and access to fresh air” (Coyle, 2002: 14). One way to solve the issue of overcrowding would be to establish more ‘release residential groups’ where inmates can prepare for the world outside. Basically, people should not remain imprisoned longer than absolutely necessary. Additionally, in order to prepare inmates for reintegration, jobs and employment opportunities during their incarceration must be provided (Müller, 2010).

In order to improve their balance sheets, some prisons (for instance, in the UK, Wales, Austria, Switzerland, Germany) try to increase their income by selling products produced by inmates. However, prison administrations struggle with improving the efficiency and productivity of prison firms (Dünkel, 2010) and becoming stable business partners for other companies. A central problem is that prisons cannot guarantee the delivery of products on time. In case of emergencies – or if too many prison officers are on sick leave – prison firms need to be closed down temporarily, since compliance with the control and safety function has the highest priority.

2.3.3 Changing models of prison management
The existing literature offers various approaches for clustering different models of prison management. Barak-Glantz (1981), for example, categorizes the American penal system according to four different types. He distinguishes between “the Authoritarian Model, the Bureaucratic Lawful Model, the Shared-Powers Model, and the Inmate Control Model” (Barak-Glantz, 1981: 42), whereby the ‘authoritarian Model’ and the ‘inmate control model’ are the two extremes. It is important to be aware, however, that the majority of prison management systems cannot be explained completely with any one of these ideal-types. In practice there are substantial overlaps (Barak-Glantz, 1981).

The authoritarian model, which was common until the middle of the twentieth century (and still exists in some prisons), is characterized by the idea that power should be centralized in the hands of the prison manager, who operates at his/her own discretion, often through

---

5 The European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) was founded in 1989. Its mandate was to supervise and control organizations such as prisons, police detention facilities, and psychiatric hospitals – where inhabitants are confined with restricted liberties and freedoms. The CPT has to report if minimum standards of prisons facilities are not achieved and if inhuman treatment is occurring. Those reports have had and great impact on prison reform in many European countries (Dünkel, 2010; see also Flügge, 2010).
repressive social control. Given the power and discretion of the prison manager, the environment within such prisons is dominated by fear and uncertainty. The rights of the inmates are limited to 'physical survival', and corporal punishment and terror are the general means by which prison staff fulfil their daily duties. Consequently, the authoritarian model is often characterized by a misuse of power, authority and privilege to the disadvantage of the inmates (Barak-Glantz, 1981).

In the bureaucratic lawful model, rules, values, principles, and regulations are clearly formulated and rationalized. All practices follow a certain structure. Professionals, for example, are brought into prisons, and a formal bookkeeping system is often put in place. The role of the prison manager is not one of an autocratic ruler but, instead, a “prison bureaucrat” (Barak-Glantz, 1981: 46). Such a bureaucratic model strongly corresponds to Weber’s ideal bureaucracy and places a high value on rational organization and conduct.

Within the shared powers model, inmates are granted more voice and power, which affects the operation of the organization. Whereas in the previous two systems, inmates had no, or very limited rights, this model shifts the balance of power more in favor of the inmates – such that prison managers and prison officers face increased challenges in ensuring control. Such challenges increase with the acknowledgement of inmates as a collective stakeholder group in the prison – because it is much harder to control organized groups instead of single persons that can easily be isolated and subdued. At the same time, “the inmate has become greatly politicized and ‘recitizenized’” (Barak-Glantz, 1981: 51), which means considerable personal empowerment.

In stark contrast to the authoritarian model is the inmate control model. In this model the power shifts considerably from the managers to the inmates. Formal and informal group associations act on behalf of the inmates and have the opportunity to regulate and control prison policy. Barak-Glantz (1981: 52) points out: “Although controlled by walls, gates, cells, guards and rules, the convicts exercise real control over the prison community”. However, he also stresses that this system is hardly ever found in (US) prisons.

Dilulio (1987, quoted in Craig, 2004) outlines a very similar typology of prison models. He distinguishes between three different types. The control model, like the authoritarian model, puts authority and power in the hands of the prison administration. The emphasis is on strict control and clear regulations. “This perspective is recognizable as the total institution model described by Goffman (1961) and that was seen by Sykes (1958) as the ideal, if not the reality, of the typical prison administration” (Craig, 2004: 100). The responsibility model, in contrast, devolves some aspects of control to the inmates themselves, while the consensual model can be defined as “a hybrid in which some aspects of the other two models are present. The differences among the approaches were seen by Dilulio as reflective of assumptions prison administrators make about the appropriate use of power to control inmates and to encourage cooperation among prison staff and inmates” (Craig, 2004: 100).
Craig (2004) distinguishes between the rehabilitation and the control-oriented model, which aligns with Cressey’s (1959) classification of custodially-oriented prisons versus treatment-oriented prisons. It has been argued that control-oriented model is the most effective, particularly when effectiveness was measured in terms of control, rather than rehabilitation and treatment (Craig, 2004). “The prison as it has been known in the United States was originally conceived as a more humane alternative to other punishments such as flogging, public humiliation, exile, and torture, all of which were considered by early reformers to be cruel and unusual punishments unworthy of a republic” (Sykes, 1958 quoted in Craig, 2004: 93). However, concerns for security and logistical challenges regarding the incarceration of large numbers of inmates were a side-effect of abolishing execution and exile. As a consequence, rehabilitation had to be subordinated to security issues (Sykes, 1958 quoted in Craig, 2004). Nowadays, studies show that well-run prisons are not “total institutions” in the Goffmanian sense. Instead, prisons attempt to keep inmates occupied and productive, e.g., they offer education programs, work places, and so forth (Craig, 2004).

The custodially-oriented prison is grounded in the idea of maintaining discipline and order by preventing riots and reducing friction between inmates as well as between employees and inmates (Cressey, 1959). Prison officers are expected to treat inmates without favoritism and to refrain from getting involved in inmates’ problems. Staff are to follow the (punishment-enforced) rules. Generally, the whole system is strongly bureaucratic and hierarchical (Cressey, 1959). Over the years, there have been changes in the objectives of prisons. They have “shifted from mere custody to humanitarian custody or productive custody” (Cressey, 1959: 2). In a treatment-oriented prison, however, the role of the staff is – besides ensuring order and discipline by keeping inmates occupied – to support inmates in their rehabilitation process. In this model, staff have to care about the personal problems of inmates (Cressey, 1959).

Comparing all four different classifications shows that they range from a control and authority-driven model to a treatment- and custody-oriented model. The first one is defined by clear rules and a single source of authority relegated to prison managers, whereas the other entities inmates to more power and shifts the focus to rehabilitation and treatment.

2.3.4 The prison and its internal stakeholders
Within prisons, two main stakeholder groups can be distinguished, namely prison officers and inmates.
Prison officers

By the end of the 20th century, it became widely accepted that the penal system needed people with professional skills in order to facilitate and ensure ‘modern prison management’ (Colye, 2005). Prison managers must be aware that their jobs, and the jobs of their prison officers, are getting more complex and demanding. ‘Good’ management is supposed to achieve high degrees of safety, justice, and order, while also encouraging staff to treat inmates in a humane and decent way. Conversely, poor management is said to lead to states of dismay, where inmates are encouraged to engage in delinquent behavior (Dunbar & Langdon, 1998 quoted in Bryans, 2007). Prison managers increasingly require leadership skills and knowledge of modern human resource management – along with the courage and power to implement new strategies. For example, in 2000, the Prison Service in the UK established a new human resource strategy. This strategy focused on three main objectives: good and outstanding performance should be rewarded, all staff should be more valued, and staff should be guaranteed an agreeable and safe working environment (Prison Service, 2002, quoted in Farnham et al., 2005). Such innovations were considered crucial for managing prisons in a modern way. Additionally, it was also important to implement a functional communication and feedback system between prison administration and staff. This also helped prison administrations ensure that they hired the right staff with the best skills (Farnham et al., 2005).

Whereas the prison manager oversees all operations in a prison, prison officers work at the operational level. They are the ones dealing with inmates on a day-to-day basis (Coyle, 2005). Prison officers are expected to treat all inmates justly and in a humane way. In addition, they are responsible for ensuring a safe and orderly environment for the inmates, and to support inmates’ resocialization and reintegration into society (Coyle, 2009). Therefore, prison officers are expected to offer inmates opportunities to develop their personalities, talents and skills and to support them in recognizing the harm they have caused – all with the aim of reducing the likelihood that they will act in a similar way in the future (Coyle, 2005). It is, therefore, important to have a sufficient number of prison staff, but also to ensure that prison staff are well trained to fulfill these various tasks (Gratz, 2008).

Inmates

The second major stakeholder group in a prison is its inhabitants – the inmates. Imprisonment affects a person in many ways. The loss of freedom and separation from the rest of society can be particularly difficult. Moreover, the lack of privacy and the prevalence of violence, mistrust, and drugs can trigger feelings of loneliness and powerlessness. Even after an inmate is released, his/her life is forever changed – as incarceration typically leads to a disruption in a person’s life.
or career path, as well as some degree of alienation from friends and family (Andrew, 2007). One of the biggest threats for inmates is uncertainty. "They like to know what the rules are; what they may do, what they should not do and what the consequences are if they break the rules" (Coyle, 2005: 140). Generally speaking, as long as inmates know the rules of the game, they can cope with the very hierarchical and regime-driven management system. It is much harder if there is inconsistency, and if there are no clear rules to follow (Coyle, 2005).

Recent studies show that some policy makers like "to hold inmates more accountable for their actions" (Gendreau, Listwan, Kuhns, & Exum, 2014: 1079). The argument is that if inmates experience more autonomy and more responsibility over their actions, it will have a positive impact on their daily activities. This autonomy requires more discipline and, thus, provides inmates with more structure that can prove helpful as they prepare for life outside the prison (Gendreau et al., 2014). This approach, however, requires prison authorities to provide opportunities for more inmate autonomy, and to provide inmates with encouragement and incentives. Gendreau and colleagues (2014) point out that "[i]nmates, not the system, must take on the major part of the responsibility to improve their lot by submitting to highly structured reward and disciplinary systems that provide immediate consequences for behavior" (Gendreau et al., 2014: 1081). Such incentives could include better salaries for inmates, more frequent visitation rights, opportunities for parole, and even better accommodation and living conditions (Bottom, 2003 quoted in Gendreau et al., 2014). This type of system can facilitate the achievement of important objectives of prisons – as it is likely to increase the motivation and satisfaction levels of inmates.

Inmates, have very specific ideas about what constitutes 'good' prison management. According to Coyle (2002), inmates often demand the following requirements are met: First, human dignity needs to be maintained, which, at the very least, means freedom from torture and inhuman, cruel, or degrading treatment. Further, this includes proper accommodation, hygiene, and sufficient food and water, as well as exercise and fresh air. Second, proper and adequate health care should be provided. Third, the level of security in the prison should also ensure the safety of inmates and protect them from physical, sexual, as well as mental abuse. Fourth, contact with the world outside of the prison – particularly friends and family – should be guaranteed. Fifth, opportunities to engage in meaningful activities, such as work, education, cultural activities, physical exercise, as well as religious and spiritual activities. Sixth, prisons should enable access to legal representation, including the opportunity to complain about their treatment. Finally, the special needs of particular categories of inmates, such as women, juveniles, and other minority groups should be respected.
2.3.5 The prison and its external stakeholders

Despite being surrounded by "high walls and fences" (Coyle, 2002: 40), prisons are not isolated organizations. Even if the world is clearly regulated and structured for inmates, like in a "total institution", the organization itself is, instead, embedded in a multifaceted environment that has a great impact on its management. Prison managers are not only faced with challenges inside prisons (e.g., prison staff, inmates, etc.) but also outside (e.g., politics, media, etc.). Accordingly, the decisions that prison managers make are often of great interest to many other people (Coyle, 2002). It is not only crucial to manage a prison in an efficient and effective way. Prison managers also have "to meet the legitimate expectations of governments, of civil society, of victims and of staff, prisoners and their families" (Coyle, 2005: 98).

The environment within which prisons are embedded can be described as complex and challenging. Prison managers have to deal with different external stakeholders and their potentially competing interests, including the general public, politicians, the Ministry of Justice and its courts, the media, inmates’ families, and various advocacy groups (e.g., associations for human rights or victims), unions, as well as organizations responsible for probationary services. The complex interrelationships between prisons and their external environment have critical implications for the management of prisons – as changes in the external environment affect the managers’ work and how they can, and are expected, to operate (Bryans, 2007). Existing literature suggests that successful prison managers are aware of these influences and are responsive to external pressures and demands (Carlson & Dilulio, 2008).

Often, both media and politics work according to a logic of blame, which implies the need to hold somebody accountable for mistakes and negative incidents. In the worst case, deferring blame exclusively to prison management may deteriorate the social acceptance and legitimacy of the penal system, which may also create negative consequences for inmates over time (Preusker, 2010). I define the two main stakeholder groups with the strongest impact on the penal system as the media and the general public. Existing literature has focused on the media, and to a lesser degree, on the general public. More information on other external stakeholder groups will be provided as part of my empirical findings.

The media and their impact on prison management should not be underestimated. News media focus on stories that are considered ‘newsworthy’ (e.g., Cook, 1998). In the context of the penal system, this generally means that prisons appear in the media when things go wrong – for example, if there are escapes, riots, or other major incidents that might have a (negative) impact on society (Coyle, 2002; see also Müller, 2010). Solomon (2006: 61), for example, explores “why the media concentrate on bad news about crime, why they are sensationalists and why they misrepresent and misinform the public”. He stresses that prison managers must be aware of the specific role of the media which, according to him, is not the provision of information on penal
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issues to the broader public – he claims that this is the responsibility of the government (Solomon, 2006 – for more information prison and media, see Jewkes, 2007b; Mason 2006). Additionally, the direction of impact and influence is sometimes unclear. Does media influence what the general public thinks, or does the general public get the media to write what they think is true? In any case, stakeholder relations are highly complex and ambiguous.

This leads to the second major external stakeholder group, the general public. As Coyle (2002: 44) points out, prison systems are “influenced by the general management structures and styles that are prevalent in a particular country. If civil society at large has little concern in matters of good government, it will be unlikely that this will be a matter of concern within the prison system”. This quote illustrates that the general public has a lot of influence on prison management, and also how imprisonment is organized and conducted. For the public, it is important to feel safe and to see justice prevail, meaning that people who break the law should be punished. Furthermore they want inmates to work during their time in prison, but without taking jobs away from them. They demand proper and secure incarceration with enough space for inmates, but not at the expense of tax payer money (DiIulio, 1986 quoted in Zager et al., 2001). The relationship between the general public and inmates is a complicated one. Müller (2010), for instance, points out that society needs to be aware that prison inmates are also citizens and need to be reintegrated into society after having served their sentences. Consequently, the general public has a vested interest in successful rehabilitation. On the other hand, since public opinion is strongly based on media coverage, the interest of the public on matters of prisons is rather episodic – it rises and falls with media attention; and is primarily elicited by larger events and incidents, which mostly revolve around issues of punishment and security rather than reintegration.

2.3.6 Prison management and administrative reforms

As part of the public sector, prisons are subjected to broader reforms within this field. Several noteworthy reform efforts have been introduced in the public sector in the last decades, which have had a substantial impact on prison management. Some have been more successful than others.

The call for reforms in the penal system is as old as modern government. Since the 17th century, the penal system has pretty much remained the same as what we see today. Several attempts to implement reforms failed. Gratz (2008; 2010) describes the historical evolution of the penal system as a sequence of reform movements that unfold in a futile and fruitless cycle. The first step of these movements is generally to shift the penal system towards a more humane- and treatment-oriented way. In the second phase, the relevant actors come to realize that such reform cannot be implemented as easily and substantially as expected. This leads, in the third phase, (for the most part) to a failure of the reform movement due to scarce resources and changes or even...
catastrophes within society. Consequently, in the last phase, there are negative consequences on
the conditions in prisons (measured against the living standard of an unskilled worker outside
prison) and also an increase in repression, which then initiates a new cycle of reform.

Overall, these empirical dynamics trigger questions about the requirements of a reform
process to become fully established. Cap Gemini Consulting (see Gratz, 2010) came to the
conclusion that three critical success factors should be considered in order to stabilize change
processes in the long term: credibility and commitment of management, mobilization and
commitment of employees, and clear and realistic visions and goals (see also Coyle, 2002), as well
as a suitable communication strategy (Gratz, 2010). In short, it is crucially important that goals,
norms, and visions are shared from the top of an organization (management) down to all
employees and backwards.

But it is not only about highly sophisticated management tools, like mission statements,
controlling tools, or quality management aspects. Penal systems need to have ambitious
objectives which are, at the same time, realistic. In Austria, for example, previous experience has
shown that even when political vision or strategic management in the penal system are
insufficient, prison managers can constructively use such a vacuum to provide room to maneuver
and implement innovations themselves (Gratz, 2010).

A reform movement which had – and still has – a substantial impact on the penal system
is NPM. In the 1990s, ideas associated with NPM became increasingly popular – leading to the
introduction of "market-oriented, private sector-based management and accounting frameworks
into the public sector" (Mennicken, 2014: 22). With most prisons being part of public
administration, prison management has been deeply affected by this trend. Broadly speaking, the
primary aim of NPM initiatives is to solve the central problems of managing public sector
organizations – notably, reducing public expenditures through such means as decentralization,
downsizing, privatization, and increasing performance (e.g., Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitzgerald, &
Pettigrew, 1996; Hood, 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004). To give an example, the introduction of
public-private organization models have placed new emphasis on using financial and human
resources in a more efficient way (Mennicken, 2014).

Although there are divergent views within the NPM literature regarding the optimal
management tools and procedures, there is a general consensus that “public management
matters” (Dilulio, 1989: 127) as “the overall impact of NPM on the prison service is undeniable”
(Nash & Ryan, 2003: 160). Researchers have found, for example, that there is a significant
relationship between the management of public organizations and their performance, and,
between prison management and the quality of prison life (Dilulio, 1989).
NPM also had a significant impact on how prisons are operated and governed (Bryans, 2007). By opening the field to the private sector, inmates’ lives are not governed exclusively by public organizations anymore. Instead, intrusion by the private sector has led to competition within the prison system (Nash & Ryan, 2003). One goal of NPM, as well as of the German variant of ‘wirkungsorientierte Verwaltungsführung’, is to maximize societal outcomes with the available pool of resources. Generally, there has been a shift from input-oriented management to output-oriented management (focusing on performance). Nowadays the focus lies on ‘outcome orientation’ (Thaller & Geppl, 2010). Government should only invest money in organizations or projects which can provide evidence of the positive and substantial achievement of desirable outcomes (e.g., Schedler & Proeller, 2011).

According to NPM, a modern administration is task-driven. The aim is to achieve objectives with the lowest possible resource input (e.g., Gratz, 2010). If goals cannot be achieved with an acceptable level of efficiency and effectiveness, the government should not focus on them. To give an example, prison space is a very expensive commodity. In Austria, the establishment of one additional space for an inmate generates costs of about 100,000 euros. Additionally, the ongoing costs are estimated to be around 31,500 euros per year (Gratz, 2010). Consequently, it is important to assess in detail whether imprisonment is a necessity for the majority of criminal cases, or whether there are alternative forms (electronic tagging, community work, etc.) that would obtain the same or even better results in rehabilitation.

Ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of prison management requires the systematic assessment and comparison of costs and performance, as well as ways of improving their balance. Besides different forms and variations of privatizing the prison system, like contracting out or establishing quasi-markets where consumer choices have been simulated in order to reduce expenditure, (for more details, see chapter 2.2.2) the second main element of NPM involves introducing performance measurement systems (Nash & Ryan, 2003). One of the main aims is to measure cost and efficiency, as well as the success of rehabilitation efforts (Mennicken, 2014). Therefore, key performance indicators (KPIs), like the number of escapes, riots, recidivism rates, etc., have been introduced to audit the prison system (Nash & Ryan, 2003; see also Thompson, 2000). The U.S. Department of Justice came up with eight main objectives (security, justice, safety, conditions, order, management, health, and activity) for performance-based management. Each of these objectives has its own indicators. For example, ‘security’ deals with drug use, ‘conditions’ is about space, facilities, etc. (Carlson & Dilulio, 2008). In the following, I provide more insights into performance management, but also accountability. Both of these aspects have had an impact on prison management.
Performance Management

In the UK, the first standardized KPIs and targets were implemented in prisons in 1992 and 1993 (Mennicken, 2014). Over the years, KPIs have become quite popular. They were used to measure high and low performance in terms of cost, but also with regard to safety, security, effectiveness as well as economy (Liebling, 2004 quoted in Mennicken, 2014).

Later, a wider range of performance measures, known as key performance targets (KPTs), were introduced to not only measure output, but also “to incentivize, monitor, sanction and report on outcome achievement” (English, 2013: 533). As a consequence of these changes, prisons shifted from very bureaucratic institutions to more flexible, economically and efficiency-minded organizations: “Prisons have become managerialized, and prison managers and prison officers preoccupied with the documentation of calculable outputs” (Mennicken, 2014: 36-37). Additionally, “Liebling and her team developed new performance measures along two dimensions: relationship (respect, humanity, trust, staff-prisoner relationships and support) and regimes (fairness, order, safety, well-being, personal development, family contact and decency)” (Liebling, 2004 quoted in Mennicken, 2014: 36). Other private sector-oriented accounting tools, like prison ratings or benchmarking have helped (in addition to performance measurement) to identify under-performing or even failing prisons (Home Office, 2000 quoted in Mennicken, 2013). Through such tools, prison managers are provided with better information to help them govern prisons in a more efficient way. Likewise, such information helps policy makers not only decide between different providers, but also gain a better understanding of how resources and outputs are linked – thereby improving the general transparency of the prison system (Mennicken, 2013).

“[T]his transparency is crucial. Without it, the state would be unwilling to let go, to distance itself from the day-to-day running of the service; it would simply have no means of evaluating how efficient any agency was in meeting the strategic objectives that governments had devised for it. Therefore, mechanisms to ensure greater transparency through audit are constantly being refined and improved” (Nash & Ryan, 2003: 160).

Summing up, Pidd (2013 quoted in Molleman & van der Heijden 2013: 1) classifies the objectives of performance measurement in six categories: “planning and improvement, monitoring and control, evaluation and comparison, accountability, financial budgeting and planning, and individual performance management”.

Despite the advantages provided by performance measurements, many prison managers have been overwhelmed with performance-based information – which makes it harder to prioritize targets (Mennicken, 2013). Exclusive reliance on the numbers provided by KPIs and similar indicators bears the risk of misrepresentation and misinterpretation, as well as a too narrow focus on specific goals – which leads to counterproductive ‘narrowing of accountability’
(Kurunmäki, 1999 quoted in Mennicken, 2014), “for example, by promoting a focus on managing the numbers rather than wider processes, issues and social relations. As many previous performance measurement studies have shown, performance measurement often yields only very limited insight into ‘what’s going on’ in the entity they seek to measure and represent” (Mennicken, 2014: 22). Echoing similar criticisms of traditional performance measurement initiatives, Müller (2010) points out that while several management and leadership tools that have been successful in the private sector have been established in the penal system, not everything can be counted and measured. Success depends not only on hard facts; but soft facts also play an important role, especially with regard to social issues. To give an example, to ensure safety and security it is crucial that prison officers spend time with inmates and listen to them and their problems. This can reduce aggression and prevent riots. However, such factors are hard to measure and therefore often underestimated (Müller, 2010). Even if measures are applied and understood, it remains unclear whether their measurement has any substantial impact on actual practice. Gratz (2010), for instance, argues that despite having much more information about the reasons why people engage in criminal activities, and why recidivism rates are increasing or decreasing, this knowledge has had little impact on how prisons are managed.

Accountability

A critical aspect of NPM is its emphasis on accountability, with the consequence that audits have become rather common in the public sector. In the model of contemporary performance management systems, Laming (2000 quoted in Bennett, 2007: 525) shows "the inter-relationship between methods of measuring prison performance", like output (KPIs, KPTs, weighted scorecard), quality inspection, an independent monitoring board (IMB), measuring the quality of prison life (MQPL), and process (audit). The aim of the model was not only to improve performance and obtain information about priorities within the organization, but also to enhance accountability (Wheatley, 2005 quoted in Bennett, 2007).

According to Carlson and Dilulio (2008), (management) accountability is a particularly important factor to ensure successful operations. As prisons are organizations that deprive citizens of certain liberties, it is important that they be held accountable for “the quality and timeliness of program performance, control costs, and mitigate adverse aspects of agency operations” (Carlson & Dilulio, 2008: 206). Over the last years, “accountability within the prison system has become much more detailed and business oriented, concentrating as much on processes as on outcomes. This raises fundamental questions about the nature of accountability within prisons, to whom it is due, from whom and on what basis” (Colye, 2007: 496). Although there is no single agreed-upon method to ensure accountability, several important tools have been proposed for enhancing accountability – e.g., written policies and procedures, training regarding
processes, programs, or procedures, regular compliance audits, benchmarking, accreditation, monitoring of corruption, and strict planning (Carlson & Dilulio, 2008).

The rise of privatization in the field of prisons has also raised additional questions about accountability (Andrew, 2007). For example, Weller's (1998) examination of prison privatization in Australia revealed that although the government can delegate management processes and power to private companies, it cannot transfer basic responsibilities to private partners. The public interest does not change depending on whether a prison is governed by the state or a private organization, or whether prisons make profit or not. It is the central responsibility of public authorities to ensure that the system works as required – i.e., that prisons fulfil their societal mandate and inmates are kept within the prison walls and away from the general populace. So no matter if the prison is a private or a public one, "the public still – and properly – will hold the government responsible" (Weller, 1998: 116), because accountability has to remain with the public sector.

These reforms under the broad label of NPM have, in general, not enjoyed great popularity in prisons so far – or even in the public sector, more broadly. Studies point out that performance measures are difficult to define because stakeholders have different priorities, priorities can change very quickly in a political system, and the administrative burden on managers has often been increased by these measures (Bennett, 2007). Consequently, several tools and concepts stemming from NPM have eventually failed.

2.4 The prison manager as 'jack of all trades'?

After reviewing existing literature on prisons from a management perspective, it is now possible to reflect briefly about the emerging image of ‘good’ prison management. Prisons are complex organizations that differ from other organizations, as they do not provide ‘services’ in the traditional understanding of the term. In addition, they deal with ‘involuntary membership’, are highly hierarchical and bureaucratic, and exist in differentiated and complex environments. They have gradually changed from being static organizations to becoming increasingly dynamic, and have been subject to change because of different prison management models, as well as because of reform initiatives, specifically NPM. All these aspects have had an influence on the understanding and requirements of ‘good’ prison management. Below, I will elaborate some of these points in more detail.

The first crucial impact on the understanding of ‘good’ prison management is the organization. On the one hand, the organization shifted from being static to becoming more dynamic. On the other hand, there was also a change in the management models of prisons, and expectations of what prison management should look like. In former times, as Cressey (1959)
stresses, 'good' management was aligned with an authoritarian approach (e.g., prison managers provided clear structures and gave detailed instructions to prisons officers, who fulfilled, their duties without question. Everything was organized in a very bureaucratic and hierarchical way, and communication was top down). Nowadays, however, a well-managed prison also requires that inmates are kept occupied and are prepared for their release (e.g., Craig, 2004). The focus shifted from a more punishment-oriented to a rehabilitation- and resocialization-oriented understanding. This is also related to the functions of a prison. 'Good' prison managers have to fulfill several tasks at the same time. They should ensure custody, safety, and security, maintain humane and decent prison conditions, guarantee justice so that people are punished for their misbehavior, but also try to resocialize inmates. Balancing all these tasks without neglecting any aspect is almost impossible and a very challenging task for prison managers. Furthermore, there are several conditions which prison managers cannot even influence. On the one hand, organizational aspects such as the size of a prison, ratio of staff to inmates, architecture of prisons (which would be necessary to achieve a 'modern' way of punishment), and issues of overcrowding and cell sharing. On the other hand, characteristics of inmates, e.g., whether they have a problematic background, a criminal history, whether they suffer from mental illness, drug abuse, or specific requirements regarding their age, sex, etc. However, even if prison managers cannot control those aspects, it is important to be aware of them.

According to Coyle (2002), prisons are well-managed if they provide a decent and humane environment, and have clear objectives, missions, and values. Therefore, a good communication system is necessary, "which goes up and down and across the organisation. Staff at all levels have to be aware of, and subscribe to, the mission and values of the organization" (Coyle, 2002: 98). Furthermore, he identifies three important processes, each of them linking to the others: system issues, structural issues, and people issues. System issues stress the importance of “links with other parts of the criminal justice process and public sector agencies” (Coyle, 2002: 97). This point is also stressed by Gratz (2010) who pleads to combine, for example, NPM aspects with findings in (criminological) research in order to improve the penal system in a broader way. Instead of only comparing costs of imprisonment with treatment cost, the general effects on the social and health systems should be included. Structural issues comprise how tasks and duties are conducted and organized. People issues, in contrast, encompass leadership skills, and “the management of all those involved in the system, particularly staff and prisoners” (Coyle, 2002: 97).

Second, since prisons, like any organization, are embedded within socio-demographic, political, and cultural contexts, they – and their objectives and tools – need to remain legitimized and accounted for (e.g., Meyer & Höllerer, 2010b). Prisons operate in differentiated social environments in which different perspectives are bound to clash and arguments might become normative and emotional, such as, for instance, the tensions between economic and humanistic
perspectives regarding how much money it should cost society to ensure that criminals are treated in a humane way and that their reintegration following release is effectively managed (e.g., Gratz & Pilgram, 2007). Thus, ideas about what constitutes ‘good’ prison management (what it looks like, and what a ‘good’ manager needs to do) also differ from stakeholder to stakeholder, as they all have different understandings, interests, and points of view. External stakeholders, such as the general public and politicians put pressure on the management how they should do their job (e.g., justice should be served at minimum cost). But also internal stakeholders have their own understandings of what ‘good’ prison management should look like. Inmates, for example, consider a prison as well-managed if they are treated in a humane way or if proper health care is provided (Coyle, 2002). In contrast, for most prison managers, effective prison management can be measured by means of escape rates, number of riots or other serious events, and/or suicide rates (e.g., Coyle, 2005). Thereby, performance measurement tools, such as key performance indicators, have been introduced. Coyle (2005) suggests that this definition is pejorative, as the focus lies only on avoiding mistakes, and prison staff should avoid wrongdoing. Yet, such a perspective which emphasize only avoiding mistakes, neglects how things could be done better.

Third, prison managers with strong leadership abilities are needed for two reasons. On the one hand, they should try to endow their staff “with a sense of belief in their own ability” (Coyle, 2005: 99). This means that it is important that they trust their prison staff. Prisons should not only have a humane atmosphere, but also a positive organizational culture where people like to work. On the other hand, he or she should also bring in innovative processes, new ideas, and the passion to change old traditions within the prison system, even though this might be risky. Strong leadership skills can also facilitate more “efficient security systems and a safe environment” (Coyle, 2002: 72).

It is the job of prison managers and their staff to deal with these contradicting perspectives and values in their day-to-day management of prisons. Even if the prioritization or constellation of these values and goals shift over time (e.g., from a punishment to a more rehabilitation stance), the tensions and complexities of navigating competing demands still exist (e.g., Mennicken, 2014). Coyle (2002) points out that if all these conditions are satisfied, there is a high probability that prisons will be managed in a good manner. However, since the totality of these demands is fraught with internal tensions, and their fulfilment is hampered by resource constraints, it is obvious that managing prisons will continue to be a complex and challenging task – if not a ‘mission impossible’. In order to be a ‘good’ prison manager, they are expected to be true ‘jacks of all trades’, able to align and resolve incommensurable and contradictory demands.
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“It is important to bear in mind that most modern societies are pluralistic. This means that they have a shared core universe, taken for granted as such, and different partial universes coexisting in a state of mutual accommodation. The latter probably have some ideological functions, but outright conflict between ideologies has been replaced by varying degrees of tolerance or even cooperation.” (Berger & Luckmann, 1967: 125)

In the previous chapter, I detailed how the environment of prisons as organizations is far from monolithic and unchangeable, but rather consists of a variety of stakeholders – each with their own specific values, interests, and demands. Moreover, it is a field that has seen considerable change during the last decades. In this dissertation, I argue that this multifaceted environment constitutes considerable challenges for prisons in terms of managing cultural and institutional expectations (e.g., Meyer & Rowan, 1977). In the following chapter, I will first develop an argument for why an institutional theory lens – particularly research understanding multiple institutional logics as potentially contradictory prescriptions – is a suitable and generative way of understanding current challenges in the penal system. Then, I employ a communicative (e.g., Luckmann, 2006) perspective on institutions and outline in more detail how a pluralistic institutional environment manifests in organizations, thereby shaping communication and rhetoric. Specifically, I argue that metaphors and other tropes are helpful ways to express – and potentially ‘temper’ – complexities and contradictions by linking previously unrelated domains of meaning in novel yet meaningful ways. The aim of this chapter is to develop a conceptual lens through which to better understand the challenges of modern prison management, and opportunities to navigate them in everyday organizational life. By combining literature on metaphors and the institutional logics perspective, I contribute to the literature linking field-level institutional structures to their linguistic and communicative enactment at the individual level.

3.1 Institutional logics

Organizational institutionalism provides a conceptual framework allowing for a deeper understanding of knowledge and meaning – and, thus, culture – in the organizational and social world (e.g., Friedland & Alford, 1991; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Strands of organizational institutionalism that are strongly linked to a phenomenological sociology of knowledge perspective (Meyer, 2006, 2008) emphasize the seminal role of social stocks of knowledge that contain institutionalized meanings and ready-made interpretations, accounts, and ‘recipes’ for social action (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Schütz & Luckmann, 1973).
To date, there is a paucity of research from such a point of view in the field of penal systems and prison management (for exceptions see Mohr & Neely, 2009; Toubiana, 2014). In this dissertation, I argue that an institutional approach with a focus on meaning and meaning construction enables a better understanding of the specific challenges of contemporary prison management. The penal system, in particular, is a part of social life that has always been characterized by reforms and changes (see chapter 2.3.6). In order to bring about such changes – but also to be able to understand what drives them in particular directions – it is essential to understand the existing meaning structures and premises that relevant actors in the field draw upon. On the one hand, such an approach to the study of prison management enables researchers to critically assess the degree to which regulative and formal changes have actually led to change at the level of meaning structures (and to what degree practice is decoupled from such deeper levels of meaning). On the other hand, a thorough understanding of the potentially contradicting and competing systems of meaning or institutional orders (e.g., Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011; Reay & Hinings, 2009; Thornton et al., 2012) governing the penal system is a necessary condition for successful change management. Accordingly, I believe this stream of research to be especially fruitful for analyzing management of the prison system.

In this chapter, I lay the groundwork for an institutional theory perspective on ‘good’ prison management. I start by outlining the definitions of core conceptual constructs, and highlight a selection of core work. Afterwards, I zoom into the most prolific domains that have been scrutinized from an institutional logics perspective. I start with discussions on institutional logics and their effect on the characteristics and behavior of organizational and individual actors, and summarize work on the antecedents and consequences of changing institutional logics. Although my empirical study is not primarily concerned with institutional change, literature on changing institutional logics provides crucial insights into the ways in which logics manifest in and around organizations. In a next sub-chapter, I move on to the large research area of institutional pluralism and complexity, and close the section with a discussion of how institutional complexity can be managed at the organizational as well as the individual levels. This literature constitutes the main foundation for my empirical study, since I expect multiple, potentially overlapping logics to be relevant in the Austrian penal system (both at the field and at the manager levels). Consequently, I also expect that prison managers are confronted with multiple and often conflicting logics. Finally, I link institutional complexity to the penal system and extend and refine my initial arguments on why the institutional logics perspective is a fruitful tool to study prisons.
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3.1.1 Characterizing the institutional logics perspective

The foundation of the institutional logics perspective dates back to the seminal work of Friedland and Alford’s 1991 chapter, ‘Bringing Society Back in: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions’. Despite recent critiques (e.g., Berg Johansen & Boch Waldorff, forthcoming; Meyer & Höllerer, 2014) pointing out that organizational theory has become “anachronistic, overly theoretical, or lacking the right kind of theory” (Lounsbury & Beckman, 2015: 288), Lounsbury and Beckman (2015) show that organizational theory is still an expanding research area, having novel insights stemming from research on institutional logics. According to them, new institutional theory has developed a lot since the 1970s/1980s. They ground their argument in the fact that studies on institutional logics have grown exponentially and have become an important domain in organizational theory (Lounsbury & Boxenbaum, 2013).

Institutional logics can be defined as “a set of rules and conventions” (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008: 114) that help to define the content and meaning of institutions “by providing relevance structures and frames to construct issues, problems, and solutions as well as script actions” (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a: 1000-1001). According to Thrnton and Ocasio (2008), logics are historical and socially constructed patterns that guide individuals’ behaviors. Such patterns encompass material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules. They suggest meanings for individuals to understand their social reality, organize time and space, and produce and reproduce their material subsistence. Therefore, logics provide frames that individuals use to make sense of the world and decide how to act (Cloutier & Langley, 2013). Yet, institutional logics are not only strategies or logics of action. They can also be seen as a source of legitimacy providing order and security in an ontological context (Giddens, 1984; Seo & Creed, 2002).

Friedland and Alford (1991) build on Meyer and Rowan (1977), DiMaggio and Powell (1983), and Zucker (1977) and acknowledge that organizational structures are shaped by cultural rules and cognitive structures. The institutional logics approach builds on, and extends, these early neo-institutional ideas in several ways.

“...the focus is no longer on isomorphism, whether in the world system, society, or organizational fields, but on the effects of differentiated institutional logics on individuals and organizations in a larger variety of contexts, including markets, industries, and populations of organizational forms. Institutional logics shape rational, mindful behavior, and individual and organizational actors have some hand in shaping and changing institutional logics (Thornton, 2004). By providing a link between institutions and action, the institutional logics approach provides a bridge between the macro, structural perspective of Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983) and Zucker’s more micro, process approaches. Situated forms of organizing are linked with beliefs and practices in wider institutional environments in ways that address the critique of isomorphism and diffusion studies (Hasselbladh and Kallinkikos, 2000)” (Thornton Ocasio, 2008: 100).

The most commonly referenced systematization of Friedland and Alford’s (1991) seminal idea is found in Thornton and Ocasio’s (2008) work (see also Thornton et al., 2012). Their aim was to clarify the distinct potential of an institutional logics perspective which draws, to a large extent,
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on existing insights in institutional theory, but also extends these ideas and suggests a distinct focus on the multiplicity of cultural domains and rationalities. The first pillar of the institutional logics perspective is ‘embedded agency’. This argument highlights that “the interests, identities, values, and assumptions of individuals and organizations are embedded within prevailing institutional logics” (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008: 103) and emphasizes the dialectical relationship between structure and action. Second, Friedland and Alford (1991) argue that society is an inter-institutional system of societal sectors: “[E]ach sector represents a different set of expectations for social relations and human and organizational behavior” (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008: 104). Research on institutional logics emphasizes that institutions are patterned collections of practices and identities that are grounded in the idea “that institutions themselves are organized by what Friedland and Alford (1991) call an ‘institutional order’. Friedland and Alford (1991: 248) further suggest that “each of the most important institutional orders of contemporary Western societies has a central logic”. Initially, they describe five institutional orders: the capitalist market, family, the bureaucratic state, democracy, and religion (Christianity). More recently, Thornton et al. (2012) extend this list to seven orders, which are slightly different: family, community, religion, state, market, professions, and corporation. This approach “allows culture to not be homogenous – but to vary because culture is shaped by very different institutional orders” (Thornton et al., 2012: 44). The third main assumption is that each of the institutional orders is dually constituted by both material and symbolic elements (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Material aspects of institutions include “structures and practices”, whereas symbolic aspects “refer to ideation and meaning” (Thornton et al., 2012: 10). Both material as well as symbolic aspects are interwoven and co-constitute each other (Thornton et al., 2012). Fourth, the institutional logics approach emphasizes not only an inter-institutional system, but also that institutional logics manifest on multiple levels of analysis. Whereas Friedland and Alford’s (1991) work illustrates societal-level logics and their impact on organizations as well as individuals, more recent research focuses on field-level or organizational-level logics and also on (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Since levels are interconnected, a central question is how broader institutional contexts affect organizations and individuals. Empirical work also shows that logics differ in their importance over time (e.g., Lounsbury, 2002; Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008 – for, more recent developments of the institutional logics perspective see Lounsbury & Boxenbaum, 2013 and Thornton et al., 2012).

3.1.2 The influence of institutional logics on collective and individual actors

The institutional logics perspective suggests that logics are instantiated in structures, practices, and identities (e.g., Thornton et al., 2012; see also Friedland, 2009). Logics are not directly observable themselves, but are made visible through their manifestations which revolve around,
and constantly reproduce, a logic’s ‘substance’ (Friedland, 2009). This essentially means that research needs to capture institutional logics on the level of manifestations such as structures, practices, and identities. A common way of observing the effects of logics on individuals and collective actors is to study the consequences of institutional change, i.e., a change in the dominant logic within a particular society or field. Research on institutional dynamics shows that that the prevalent logics in any field are not necessarily stable but may change over time. On the one hand, the displacement of a dominant institutional logic impacts organizations and individual actors; on the other hand, actors may collectively act to change institutional logics. Thornton and Ocasio (2008) highlight three mechanisms of change: institutional entrepreneurship (see also Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009), structural overlaps between logics (e.g., in the case of mergers and acquisitions), and event sequences. Furthermore, they point out that competing institutional logics can either be a precursor or consequence of institutional change (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). I start by discussing literature which shows that a change in the dominant logic affects a myriad of organizational- and field-level elements. Then, I explain how research has considered embedded agency and shown how collective action is able to influence the dominant logics within a field.

3.1.2.1 The consequences of changes in institutional logics

As suggested above, the consequences of being subjected to a particular institutional logic become most visible when such a logic is being superseded by a new one. In such cases, literature suggests that actors need to change accordingly in order to remain legitimated in the novel institutional regime. Greenwood and colleagues stress that “[i]t is the incompatibility of logics that provides the dynamic for potential change” (Greenwood, Oliver, Suddaby, & Sahlin, 2008: 21). Empirical work shows that, on the one hand, different elements – such as structures (e.g., Thornton, 2002), practices, (e.g., Lounsbury, 2002), and identities (e.g., Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a) – can be influenced by changes in intuitional logics. On the other hand, changes can take place at different levels (e.g., field, organization, or individual level). In the following section, I outline central studies researching the effects of such institutional change.

Earlier studies focused on how change in institutional logics affects organizational elements. Thornton and Ocasio’s (1999: 803) article, for example, investigates the influence of institutional logics on “executive power and succession”, and empirically demonstrates this relationship in the higher education publishing industry. They identify two institutional logics and show how the industry shifts from being dominated by an editorial logic to a market one. Using a quantitative approach, they conclude,

*that a shift in logics led to different determinants of executive succession. Under an editorial logic, executive attention is directed to author-editor relationships and internal growth, and executive succession is determined by organization size and structure. Under a market logic, executive attention is
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directed to issues of resource competition and acquisition growth, and executive succession is
determined by the product market and the market for corporate control” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999: 801).

Later, Thornton (2002) developed these insights further by examining how the displacement of
the dominant editorial logic affected organizations’ strategies and structures. In a historical study,
spanning from 1958 to 1990, Thornton “show[s] how a historical shift in the prevailing
institutional logic in higher education publishing led to an increase in the importance of market
determinants of organization structure and a decline in the salience of professional sources of
organization structure” (Thornton, 2002: 82). Her study concludes that conflicting logics may
engender institutional change by re-focusing the attention of decision makers. When a new logic
becomes dominant, structures and strategies of firms within the field have to re-focus accordingly,
moving towards convergence with the new logic and away from the old one.

on a historical analysis to investigate the financial market in the United States from 1945 through
to 1993. Until World War II, the field of finance was classified as highly regulated. However,
afterwards, it became more market oriented. With this shift, financial occupations started to
become more professionalized (Bernstein, 1992 quoted in Lounsbury, 2002). Lounsbury (2002)
shows how the succession of different institutional logics guiding the field may involve removing
the old logic (regulatory logic) and building up a new one (market logic). Consequently, he points
out, such periods of transformation “are an important focal point for analysis because they are
characterized by conditions of heightened uncertainty, under which novel practices can emerge,
actors can make new kinds of claims, organizational forms can emerge and die, status orders can
be restructured, and rules of engagement can be redefined” (Lounsbury, 2002: 263).

Lounsbury’s (2002) article highlights not only how changes in institutional logics affect
organizational practices, but also the entire field of investment banking. Many studies that
followed also examined the influence of changing logics on a whole field. For instance, Reay and
Hinings (2005: 351), “develop a theoretical model that helps to understand change in mature
organizational fields by emphasizing the role of competing institutional logics as part of a radical
change process”. Investigating the health care system in Alberta, Canada, they show how the field
shifted from one dominant institutional logic (medical professionalism) to a new one (business‐
like health care). However, despite the change in dominant logics at the field level, the ‘old’ logic
of medical professionalism remained well established for the profession of physicians. This study
shows that although “the government was able to implement structural changes relatively easily,
[...] it took time and continual effort to move the field toward acceptance of a new institutional
logic” (Reay & Hinings, 2005: 378). Another example is the study by Meyer and Höllerer (2010a)
who investigated the meaning and relevance of shareholder value in Austria.
In another study, Marquis and Lounsbury (2007) examine the banking sector in the USA. They show "how the growing dominance of nationally oriented banks has been resisted in some U.S. communities" (Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007: 813). In particular, they aim to understand the practice variation enabled through competing institutional logics. As an extension of DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983) propositions about isomorphism, they show that practices and behaviors may diverge between organizations in a field if understandings are guided by different institutional logics. In their case, such divergence was enabled by dynamics pitting national bank expansion against the countermovement of new community bank creation. In contrast to literature that has claimed how competing logics may facilitate change, they show "how competing logics facilitate resistance to institutional change" (Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007: 799).

Similarly, Lounsbury (2007: 290) shows "how the spread of a new practice is shaped by competing logics that generate variation in organizational adoption behavior and practice". Again, this study reinforces and refines ideas about practice diffusion in environments characterized by competing institutional logics. The study investigates mutual funds in two different locations (Boston and New York) and how they operate in a different way depending on the distinct community logic. More specifically, he shows how trustee and performance logics "led to variation in how mutual funds established contracts with independent professional money management firms" (Lounsbury, 2007: 289). He comes to the conclusion that mutual funds in Boston followed a more conservative investment strategy related to a trustee logic, whereas in New York mutual funds highlighted more speculation and growth aspects. This study emphasize that different institutional logics not only influence the way in which organizations are designed and structured, but also which practices are developed and prevail at the field level.

Finally, changes in the dominant institutional logic also affect individuals, especially their social identities. Rao, Monin, and Durand (2003: 795), for instance, focus on identity movements “that strive to expand individual autonomy as motors of institutional change”. They analyze “how existing institutional logics and role identities are replaced by new logics and role identities”. Empirically, they investigate these dynamics in a study on how the nouvelle cuisine movement in France eventually took over classical cuisine between 1970 and 1997, which led to novel resources for identity construction for chefs. Similarly, but in a vastly different empirical context, Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006b) investigate the Austrian public sector and show how a traditional administrative logic has been replaced by a managerial logic. With regard to the identity dynamics initiated by such change, they point out that they “do not find any strong evidence of a new managerial logic but rather modifications, local translations and the emergence of a hybrid identity" (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006b: 99). Like Rao et al. (2003), Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006a) argue that in cases of competing institutional logics, actors respond by mixing the new orientation with more orthodox beliefs, thus creating hybrid versions. However,
they stress that actors play an active role in such transformations, since new models or logics are not always imposed but actively drawn on or avoided by the actors involved. Extending their insights on logics and social identities, Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006a) investigate, in a related study, the role of social identities in the transformation of institutional logics. They point out “that shifts in institutional logics can be tracked by the extent to which actors draw on the social identities derived from the competing logics” (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a: 1012). They conclude that within the Austrian public sector no complete takeover by the new logic could be found. Instead, actors picked elements from different logics and thereby they contributed to the emergence of hybrid logics and identities.

More recently, Meyer and colleagues (2013) extended these insights to research on public service motivation (PSM) by investigating public sector employees in the City of Vienna. To do so, they used data from a survey of executives. They arrive at the conclusion “that a Weberian legalistic-bureaucratic logic supports neither a high attraction to policy-making nor a high level of compassion. A managerial orientation, on the other hand, entails significantly higher scores on these two dimensions, as well as on overall PSM” (Meyer, Egger-Peritler, Höllerer, & Hammerschmid, 2013: 1). Furthermore, they point out that in transformations from a traditional Weberian model of public administration to a more managerial administration “bases of legitimacy are brought about by changes in the institutional logics in place, which not only provide frames of reference but also social identities and vocabularies of motive for the actors in the field” (Meyer et al., 2013: 1).

In yet another empirical context closer to the phenomenon under study in this thesis, Toubiana (2014) focuses on institutional logics, identity, and identity work (for an overview about institutional work see, e.g., Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). She investigates the Canadian correction system and explores how institutional logics have enduring effects on the identities of a variety of actors. Specifically, she points out that even when the identities prescribed by the logic are not useful for individuals, and even worse, when these identities are harmful, individuals still stick to that particular logic. She further shows that reflexive identity work may, however, enable individuals to de-identify with the harmful identity.

These examples show the broad variety of studies and the plurality of different research areas examining to the effects of multiple logics, many of which focus on the dynamics of change in the prevalent logics within a particular organization or field. Institutional logics can affect different levels of analysis as well as structures, practices, and identities. Change processes can be triggered, for example, by radical changes initiated by important actors. However, as Reay and Hining’s (2005) study shows, despite a shift in a dominant logic, old logics may still survive and even remain relevant for particular stakeholder groups. Finally, historical contexts matter as change processes need time to unfold.
3.1.2.2 The role of agency in changing institutional logics

The effect of logics on elements of organizations and individuals is not necessarily a ‘one-way street’. Research has examined how dynamics of dominant logics may be initiated by the behavior of particular individuals and collective actors. Such literature builds, for instance, on insights from social movement research in order to understand how actors implement new logics in a field (e.g., Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008). For instance, Glynn and Lounsbury’s (2005) investigation of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra studies how critics’ reviews of performances were shaped by broader shifts in institutional logics. However, they also argue that actors’ communications are not only guided by institutional logics, they also contribute to the dynamics of logics: “Hence, critics can resist changes in logics, act as carriers of new logics, or act in accordance with dominant logics under conditions of field stability” (Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005: 1033). In a similar vein, Rao and colleagues (2003) show that identity movements can also lead to a change in dominant logics. Studying the nouvelle cuisine movement, they found that actors classified themselves as members of a certain social category and consequently identified themselves with this category. Eventually, the creation of a novel category by certain ‘defectors’ led to other actors voluntarily joining the category which increased the reputational gains implied by membership. Such dynamics, they claim, are important mechanisms to eliminate old logics and role identities, and create and establish a new logic and identity (Rao et al., 2003).

Seo and Creed (2002: 223) provide a useful framework for understanding institutional change “that depicts the historical development of institutional contradictions and human praxis as the key mediating mechanisms linking institutional embeddedness and institutional change”. Their central argument is that institutional contradictions between prevalent logics in a field create spaces for agency which constitute seeds for eventual institutional change. Such a dialectical approach understands praxis as agency embedded in “a totality of multiple levels of interpenetrating, incompatible institutional arrangements” (Seo & Creed, 2002: 222). Finally, Sonpar and colleagues (2009) study a rural health organization in Canada, where a conflict between advocates of radical change (including senior manager and physicians) and opponents (nurses and support staff) played out. Opponents resisted the change effort and questioned its ethical appropriateness in a public system because it was driven by a market institutional logic. This paper highlights the “the role of agency despite institutional pressures. Specifically, change implementers not only face the burden of justifying ethical appropriateness of institutional logics, but also are required to engage in persuasive discourse that these institutional logics protect the interests of the members” (Sonpar, Hendelman, & Dastmalchain, 2009: 345).

To conclude, studies of how dominant logics shift over time provide important insights into organizational behavior by demonstrating the nestedness of organizational actions. While the previous studies focused on how individual and collective actors are affected by – but may also
influence – the dominant logic in a field, another stream of research has examined how competing institutional logics may exist permanently, or at least for extended periods of time. Such literature draws attention to the fact that multiple – potentially contradictory – logics may permanently co-exist within an organization or field instead of neatly succeeding each other in processes of institutional change.

3.1.3 Institutional pluralism and complexity
If logics guide and shape the characteristics and behaviors of organizations and individuals, then it becomes necessary to look more closely at situations in which actors may be under the influence of multiple logics simultaneously. Studies on institutional change have mostly understood such situations as temporary states that may happen while multiple logics vie for dominance in any field. Such temporary logic multiplicity will eventually disappear once the field returns to a novel equilibrium, i.e., when an intruding logic is either repelled, or when it manages to push the incumbent logic out. During such times, organizations may be in turmoil, as proponents of the challenger and incumbent logic throw their weight in order to bring about an outcome favorable to their interests. More recent studies, however, have increasingly begun to show that multiple logics may co-exist within a field over longer periods of time – with several studies examining more than one or two logics in a field.

3.1.3.1 Differentiated social environments as constellations of institutional logics
The simultaneous existence of multiple logics points to the prevalence of differentiated societies (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1969) in which meaning spheres – encompassing stocks of knowledge and their legitimation – are unevenly distributed among actors and actor groups. Essentially, this shows that the existence of more than one logic does not necessarily mean that a field is in a state of transition, but such multiplicity may rather be an ongoing affair. Kraatz and Block (2008: 243) coin the term "institutional pluralism" to describe a "situation faced by an organization that operates within multiple institutional spheres". Several papers started to investigate institutional pluralism or institutional multiplicity. Zilber (2011: 1539), for instance, observed “the routine, ongoing practices that sustain institutional multiplicity” at two Israeli high-tech conferences in 2002. Van Gestel and Hillebrand (2011: 232) aimed to uncover “the factors behind the process of temporary stability and change in pluralistic fields”. They investigated the evolution of the field of public employment services in the Netherlands from 1980 to 2002. Their findings provide a more dynamic image of fields pervaded by multiple logics. In particular, they show how multiple logics may co-exist even after a dominant logic is established. They conclude that, under certain conditions, institutional pluralism in a field may be characterized by ongoing change, interrupted by periods of temporary stability.
Goodrick and Reay (2011: 399) coined the term “constellation of logics” to describe the combination of institutional logics guiding behavior at any one point of time. Examining U.S. pharmacists from 1852 to 2011, they observed the co-existence of multiple logics, which collectively influenced professional work. Goodrick and Reay (2011: 403) identified three different types of constellations: (a) a constellation where one logic is dominant over the others, (b) a constellation where two logics exercise relatively equal and significant influence on behavior, and (c) a constellation where one logic exercises moderate influence and others show some, but less influence. They advance theory by highlighting the second and third types of constellations, in which logics are competing as well as cooperating. They conclude that “it is important to focus attention not only on apparently dominant logics but also on the full set of relevant institutional logics” (Goodrick & Reay, 2011: 403).

Building on these initial findings, Waldorff, Reay, and Goodrick (2013) investigated the ‘primary health care initiatives’ in Canada and Denmark in order to deepen their understanding of connections between multiple institutional logics and action. They highlight how different constellations of logics affect the primary health care initiative in different ways in both countries. Examining micro- and macro-level data they show how “actors at the micro-level interpreted the initiative and took action differently” in Denmark and Canada (Waldorff et al., 2013: 101). They point out that their two cases showed aspects of both stability and change which differs from many other studies (e.g., Smets, Morris, & Greenwood, 2012). Furthermore, Waldorff and colleagues (2013) identify five mechanisms through which logics may both constrain and enable action and propose that all five of them may occur simultaneously.

Other studies, in contrast, focus more on “mechanisms that enable the maintenance of multiple (and often contradictory) logics within a field” (Cloutier & Langley, 2013: 362). Reay and Hinings (2009), for example, show that competing or contradictory institutional logics existed for a certain period of time in the health care system in Alberta between 1994 and 2008. They suggest that institutional change is not only related to one new logic eventually superseding an old one, but may rather occur when actors attempt to support multiple logics at the same time. Reay and Hinings (2009) identify four mechanisms through which actors handle the competition of co-existing and rivaling institutional logics which affects the work they have to accomplish on a daily basis. The authors’ main interest is to understand how competing logics may co-exist and rivalry between logics can be managed through the development of collaborative relationships” (Reay & Hinings, 2009: 647). In contrast to other studies dealing with institutional logics and change, they show that “competing logics can co-exist and rivalry between logics can be managed through the development of collaborative relationships” (Reay & Hinings, 2009: 629). Similar to Reay and Hinings (2009), Purdy and Gray (2009) identify four mechanisms, namely ‘transformation,
grafting, bridging, and exit' which enabled multiple logics to co-exist within the field of alternative dispute resolution. The authors examine the emergence and development of a new population of organizations – the state offices of dispute resolution – in this new institutional field. They focus “on how actions at multiple levels interact recursively to enable multiple logics to diffuse” (Purdy & Gray, 2009: 355). Finally, Meyer and Höllerer’s (2010a) study of shareholder value in Austria shows how co-existing logics may go through periods of contestation and temporary 'truces', thereby illustrating that there is a fine line between direct conflict and peaceful co-existence. They conclude that: “rather than a hybridization of logics or the victory of one over the other, we are observing a ceasefire, a suspended contestation ready to erupt again with critical events” (Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a: 1259).

Dunn and Jones (2010) also stress that while some professions may be guided by one single logic, professions cutting across multiple institutional spheres are commonly influenced by multiple logics. In their study of medical education in the U.S.A., Dunn and Jones highlight the challenges of operating at the interface of academia and healthcare. They draw on a historical case using archival data from 1910 to 2005 and identify 'care' and 'science' as the two central logics that persisted in the profession. Their interest was to detail how these plural logics were maintained within the profession and to identify the factors which influenced the relative balance between the two logics. In brief, they found that the two logics of science and care were supported by different actor groups, represented different interests, and fluctuated over time. The interrelationship of the logics created dynamic tensions in the field of professional education.

3.1.3.2 Institutional complexity as a specific form of pluralism

Related to the idea of institutional pluralism, institutional complexity describes situations wherein organizations and fields face not only multiple institutional pressures, but pressures that are contradictory. The simultaneous existence of multiple logics implying contradictory implications for action is known as 'institutional complexity' (Greenwood et al., 2011). In their literature review, they focus, on the one hand, on studies examining how organizations experience the plurality of institutional logics. On the other hand, they also discuss research on how organizations respond to the experienced complexity. Greenwood et al. (2011) point out that organizations experience institutional complexity in different ways and also to varying degrees. Such experience may depend on the position of the organization, i.e., if an organization is embedded in the center or periphery of a field, but also its characteristics such as its ownership, structure and governance. Such factors, the authors argue, also have an important impact on how an organization might respond to institutional complexity.

Following Greenwood and colleagues (2011) seminal paper, there was a proliferation of literature on institutional complexity. On a theoretical front, Besharov and Smith (2014), for
example, stress that we still know little about why multiple logics affect fields and organizations in different ways. For instance, sometimes the multiplicity of logics leads to internal conflict, yet at other times they are blended in synergistic ways. In some cases, multiplicity causes growth in organizations, in others they barely survive. Furthermore, it is unclear why multiple logics support change within some organizations, but in others lead to stability (Besharov & Smith, 2014). Recently, Raynard (2016: 2) published an article on institutional complexity arguing that “reducing the challenge of institutional complexity solely to the presence of incompatible logics is an oversimplification. Instead, a fuller understanding of institutional complexity requires systematic appreciation of how logics variously converge—in both conflicting and synergistic ways—to shape institutional and organizational landscapes”. She identifies three factors having an impact on the experience of complexity, namely the degree of the incompatibility of logics, the extent of prioritization of logics within the field, and the extent to which the jurisdictions of the logics overlap. These three components combine to create four different configurations of complexity (segregated complexity, restrained complexity, aligned complexity, and volatile complexity). Each configuration has “differing implications for the challenges organizations face and for how they might respond” (Raynard, 2016: 1).

On an empirical front, Daudigeos and colleagues (2013) argue that extant literature on institutional complexity is often reduced to only two dominant logics, and exclusively focuses on their interactions in terms of competition. In contrast, their study focuses on multiple institutional logics and their change over time. They claim that it is important to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which logics interact. Empirically, they analyze “articles published in a leading French trade journal over more than 100 years to study logics related to workplace in the construction industry” (Daudigeos, Boutinot, & Jaumier, 2013: 320). They are able to identify six institutional logics at work in the period of one century. In a next step, they “reveal the composite nature of institutional logics” through connecting the logics with institutional orders (e.g., Thornton et al., 2012). By doing so, the authors are able to show that most institutional logics identified in their data are a combination of several institutional orders. For example, the managerial logic in their paper links to corporation, professional, and market orders. Furthermore, they identified two ‘combination’ mechanisms which help to explain the composition of institutional logics.

A specific body of literature – which, however, is only of marginal relevance for the topic of this thesis and shall therefore only be mentioned briefly – is dedicated to the study of how institutional complexity manifests in organizations which, of necessity, combine objectives and tools stemming from multiple, potentially contradictory institutional orders. Such organizations, for which complexity is often a constitutive feature, are commonly called ‘hybrid’ organizations (e.g., Battilana, Besharov, & Mitzinneck, 2017; Battilana & Lee, 2014). Focusing on the
manifestation of two distinct logics in organizations, Battilana and Dorado (2010) conducted one of the most influential studies on institutional hybridity. They show how organizations may combine logics in novel ways, and especially how they can handle the tensions between the logics they combine. They investigate new types of hybrid organizations – in this case two pioneering commercial microfinance organizations – to see how they expand and maintain their “hybrid nature”. In the literature it is generally argued that this type of organization needs to combine two distinctive logics: a development logic and a banking logic. The former guides action toward fulfilling the mission of helping poor people, whilst the latter centers on the goal of fulfilling financial obligations. The main challenge for microfinance organizations is not only to survive and become established as a new entity, but also to maintain the balance between the logics in order to avoid mission drift. Battilana and Dorado (2010: 1419) conclude that a key aspect for sustaining such new types of hybrid organizations is the creation of “a common organizational identity that strikes a balance between the logics they combine”. Their paper was a starting point for more research on mission drift (e.g., Cornforth, 2014; Doherty, Haugh, & Lyon, 2014; Ebrahim, Battilana, & Mair, 2014; Serrano-Cinca & Gutierrez-Nieto, 2014) and again a deeper focus on hybridity (for an general overview see Battilana & Lee, 2014; Pache & Santos, 2013a, for a more recent study on hybridity in the public sector, see Polzer, Meyer, Höllerer, & Seiwald, 2017).

3.1.3.3 Intra-institutional complexity as a special form of institutional complexity
In an effort to map the relationships between logics and institutional orders, Meyer and Höllerer (2014) argue that research needs to distinguish between conflicting pressures that stem from different institutional orders (like profession, state, market, etc.) and those that conflict at the intra-institutional level (meaning within one institutional order across different contexts). For the most part, studies focusing on interinstitutional orders emphasize how one logic e.g., that of the market, is in conflict or incompatible with another one (e.g., Reay & Hinings, 2005; Thornton, 2002). In contrast, intra-institutional research investigate how many logics can co-exist within an institutional order, for example, within one profession (e.g., Dunn & Jones, 2010) or within the same industry (e.g., Lounsbury, 2007). For example, if within the institutional order of religion, actors are confronted with two or more different religious beliefs that are incompatible with each other, intra-institutional complexity may arise. Another example is different models of market economies, such as the liberal market economy within the Anglo-American context versus the coordinated market economy model of continental Europe (e.g., Meyer & Höllerer, 2016). Both of them compromise different governance models as well as institutional infrastructures. Meyer and Höllerer (2014) relate this distinction to Thornton and colleagues’ (2012) clustering of institutional orders on an X-axis and Y-axis. The horizontal X-axis presents all seven institutional orders defined by Friedland and Alford (1991) and extended by Thornton et al. (2012). On the
vertical Y-axis, all the elements that serve as building blocks for each logic, for example source of legitimacy, authority, and identity. Interinstitutional research is located on the X-axis, whereas intra-institutional research focuses more on the Y-axis (Meyer & Höllerer, 2014).

Meyer and Höllerer (2016: 1) provide a concrete empirical example of how ”conflicting institutional demands that arise within the same institutional order” may play out at the field level. They label such conflicts “intra-institutional” complexity and aim to understand “how organizations deal with situations where some audiences demand adherence to one specific model, while others push for the other” (Meyer & Höllerer, 2016: 2). Empirically, they investigate the ‘careers’ of two management concepts, namely shareholder value and corporate social responsibility, among Austrian publicly listed corporations. Building on Shipilov et al. (2010), Meyer and Höllerer (2016: 4) ”argue that diffusion patterns of concepts are interlocked not only in case of logic extension but also in situations where organizations need to neutralize prior adoption decisions in light of intra-institutional complexity. Consequently, [...] [they] suggest calling such second-wave concepts ‘complexity-neutralizing’. In situations in which organizations attempt to neutralize conflicting institutional demands because compartmentalization is not possible, they send ambiguous signals. Meyer and Höllerer (2016) argue that in such cases organizations may balance conflicts created by intra-institutional complexity by setting up a ‘smokescreen’ making it difficult for audiences to categorize their behavior and practice adoption.

3.1.3.4 Managing institutional complexity

Empirical studies have shown that multiple logics are often the norm rather than the exception, and that they are often in conflict with each other. A substantial corpus of research focuses on understanding how organizations – but also individuals in organizations – respond to institutional complexity in an attempt to resolve or avoid incompatible prescriptions.

Responses to institutional complexity at the organizational level

Although the term ‘institutional complexity’ only became firmly established in 2011, studies have long recognized the possibility of multiple and simultaneous institutional pressures. One classic piece on strategic responses to institutional pressure was written by Oliver in 1991. In this article, she identifies five strategic responses: acquiesce, compromise, avoid, defy, and manipulate. Each type of response consists of different tactics. For example typical tactics for compromise are balancing, pacifying or bargaining. The aim of the paper was to gain a deeper ”understanding of the behavior of organizations in institutional contexts and the conditions under which organizations will resist institutionalization” (Oliver, 1991: 145). Organizations may,
consequently, respond to institutional complexity by adapting their strategies and structures (Greenwood et al., 2011). The specific characteristics of the individual response, however, are determined by a variety of factors that existing literature has studied in detail. For instance, interactions between logics within the field (Greenwood, Diaz, Li, & Lorente, 2010), types of events that surface complexity (Chandler, 2014), and the nature of conflict between logics and stakeholder relations (Pache & Santos, 2010) may all affect how organizations respond. Finally, recent research (Schneider, Wickert, & Marti, 2016) suggests that organizations may match the complexity found at the field level in their structures and alliances.

An example and a direct pre-cursor of the broad expansion of the institutional complexity literature is the study by Greenwood and colleagues (2010). In the paper, they stress that there is a lack of knowledge of how organizations respond to multiple logics. Their article addresses the fact that organizations in market settings may face complex institutional environments and need to respond to these challenges in specific ways. In particular, they show how the state and family logics influence how organizations respond to the prescriptions of a dominant market logic.

Chandler (2014) builds on Pache and Santos (2010) as well as on Greenwood et al. (2011) in order to understand how organizations interact with the institutionally complex environment in which they operate. He argues that the relationship between the firm and its environment is dynamic and iterative. Organizations must "respond every day in ways that satisfy the interests of multiple constituents who, at least in terms of ethics, continue to demand ever-exacting behavior" (Chandler, 2014: 1740). Chandler (2014: 1722) chose to focus on specific events: "Some of these critical events are broad and affect many firms, whereas others are narrow and affect individual firms". His study shows that both cases lead to different kinds of response behavior. He identifies different types of critical events which, in combination, may reinforce societal norms. The pressures thereby created – which may increase and decrease over time – explain when and how firms adopt novel practices and structures.

Lee and Lounsbury (2015: 848) "develop a theory to understand how organizations differentially prioritize and react to field-level institutional logics based on the saliency of community logics where they are geographically situated". They focus on the interaction of the community logic with the state logic as well as the market logics in the area of toxic pollution reduction. Empirically, they draw on panel data of 118 petroleum and chemical facilities across 34 communities in Texas and Louisiana. Lee and Lounsbury's (2015) study shows how the relevance of different forms of the community logic effect the way in which environmental practices are designed and implemented. They conclude that community logics may 'filter' organizational responses to broader field-level institutional logics. Højgaard Christiansen and Lounsbury (2013) combine existing research on organizational responses to institutional complexity with literature on institutional bricolage. They observe "how intraorganizational
problems related to multiple logics may be addressed via the mechanism of institutional bricolage – where actors inside an organization act as ‘bricoleurs’ to creatively combine elements from different logics into newly designed artifacts” (Højgaard Christiansen & Lounsbury, 2013: 199). Institutional bricolage is a way to handle institutional complexity inside an organization as it allows for reconstructing an organization’s identity. In their empirical case of the Carlsberg Brewery in Denmark, they show that growing pressures to be more ‘responsible’ prompted organizational actors to creatively combine elements from social responsibility and market logics by drawing on existing institutional resources to ‘revise’ their collective identity.

Pache and Santos (2010) also build on Oliver’s (1991) work. They argue that “[n]ot all organizations experience conflicting institutional demands in a given field in a similar way, since field-level institutional processes are filtered and enacted differently by different organizations” (Pache & Santos, 2010: 458). Consequently, organizations may respond distinctly “depending on what the conflict is about and on the motivation of organizational groups to see one of the competing demands prevail” (Pache & Santos, 2010: 459). Conflicting institutional pressures mostly affect fields with a variety of stakeholders (displaying a high level of fragmentation), but also where organizations are reliant on a few resource providers. This is very common in public services, such as health care, education, and social services.

While research has acknowledged that organizations create internal complexity, such as increasing internal structures and processes, in order to address environmental complexity (e.g., Greenwood et al., 2011), Schneider et al. (2016) go one step further and study how organizations may also deliberately build up collaborative complexity, e.g. by developing common standards or establishing alliances. They observe under which conditions organizations create either internal complexity, collaborative complexity, or both to respond to environmental complexity. Drawing from social systems theory, they illustrate their conceptual model based on the case of corporate social responsibility.

**Responses to institutional complexity at the individual level**

Similar to the organizational level, literature has outlined how, and under which conditions, individuals react to institutional complexity in specific ways. Pache and Santos (2013b), for instance, suggest that individuals ignore, comply with, resist, combine, or compartmentalize logics depending on logics’ availability, accessibility, and activation. Further, individuals may activate scripts that allow for the enactment of multiple logics (Voronov, De Clercq, & Hinings, 2013), creatively combine elements drawn from multiple logics (e.g., Binder, 2007; Smets, Jarzabkowski, Burke, & Spee, 2015), reconfigure constellations of logics in their practices (Smets & Jarzabkowski, 2013), exploit positions in the social space to blend and combine logics (e.g.,
Pache and Santos (2013b) focus on individuals within organizations and how they experience and respond to competing institutional logics. This study contributes to calls for more research on the individual level of analysis. They argue that “depending on the degree of availability, accessibility, and activation of a given logic, individuals may relate to it in three different ways” (Pache & Santos, 2013b: 8). They can either be novices, familiar, or identified with a given logic. Novice means that an individual has no or only very little knowledge and/or information about a logic. This, for example, was the case in Lounsbury’s (2001) paper, where he investigated university recycling programs. Some of the staff had knowledge about recycling, but for others it was completely unfamiliar and they were consequently not interested in it. The second option is to be familiar with a given logic. This is the case where an individual has knowledge about it, but it does not mean that he/she has access to it – which would require strong ties to this logic. Consequently, this allows an individual to distance herself from this particular logic (e.g., Pache and Santos [2013a] in their study of work integration within social enterprises in France). Finally, an individual is identified with a given logic if the logic is easily accessible and can therefore be activated anytime. Consequently, the individual is highly committed to this logic, emotionally as well as ideologically. This was, for example, the case in Glynn’s (2000) paper about the Atlanta symphony Orchestra where she observed the main groups of the orchestra, the musicians and the administrators. Each group strongly identified with their given logics, either the artistic logic or the managerial logic. Those three levels of adherence are important drivers for how individuals respond to complexity. Typical types of responses are ignorance, compliance, resistance, combination, or compartmentalization. Pache and Santos (2013b) develop a model that shows which response strategy an organizational member is likely to activate when facing competing logics. Furthermore, they “outline the roles individuals may play when they are embedded in competing logics, ranging from rather passive roles (follower, disengaged coalition member) to more proactive roles (intermediary, resistor, infiltrator, hybridizer)” (Pache & Santos, 2013b: 27).

Voronov and colleagues (2013) also focus on how actors interpret institutional logics. They point out that there is a “need to understand how actors engage with institutional logics and the creativity that such engagement implies” (Voronov et al., 2013: 1). In their study, they investigated the Ontario wine industry in Canada by using an inductive case study. More specifically, they use the notion of scripts to illuminate “how actors [but also the specific audiences] engage with the aesthetic and the market logics that are entrenched in their field” (Voronov et al., 2013: 1). The notion of scripts is used as a way to highlight how actors are able to manage incompatible and contradictory expectations on an ongoing basis. The study focuses on
how actors engage with multiple logics in their everyday work. Voronov and colleagues (2013) identified two scripts that relate to the aesthetic logic (farmer and artist) and one that relates to the market logic (business professional). However, there is no clear or exclusive link between one specific logic and one particular audience, but instead the two logics are important in interactions with all audience groups, though with differing degrees of relevance. The study shows that “logics might provide multiple rather than singular cues that actors use for making sense of their reality and determining what actions are appropriate, thereby emphasizing flexibility in how they adhere to logics” (Voronov et al., 2013: 2).

In order to show how individuals balance conflicting and complementary logics in practice, Smets et al. (2015) examine reinsurance trading in Lloyd’s of London through a year-long ethnographic study. Conceptually, the authors follow a ‘practice lens’ (e.g., Jarzabkowski, 2004) which focuses on “everyday practices by which reinsurance underwriters assess risks, place capital, and, in doing so, balance the seemingly irreconcilable demands of the financial market and their Lloyd’s community” (Smets et al., 2015: 933). The authors identify three mechanisms, namely segmenting, bridging, and demarcating, which allow individuals to balance and manage competing logics in their daily work. In a second step, these mechanisms are integrated in a theoretical model. This model “explains how individual practitioners on the frontline can balance competing logics in a state of dynamic tension, reap complementarities from their interplay, and institutionalize complexity as a natural part of their everyday work” (Smets et al., 2015: 966). The authors argue that, in contrast to most studies focusing on hybrids and/or novel complexity, managing institutional complexity may be resolved in routine patterns of daily practices. They argue that such response may de-problematize institutional complexity by institutionalizing pluralism as part of everyday reality (see also, e.g., Kraatz & Block’s [2008] reading of Selznick).

Smets and Jarzabkowski (2013: 1280) advance research on institutional complexity and institutional work by studying English and German banking lawyers in a global law firm. In particular, they are interested what individuals do in their daily work as these practices “construct and resolve institutional complexity”. In the paper, they develop a relational model. This model provides “a relational and dynamic perspective on institutional complexity that explains how individuals construct the relationality of logics in practice” (Smets & Jarzabkowski, 2013: 1303). According to the authors, ‘constellations’ of logics (Goodrick & Reay, 2011) with their internal conflicts and contradictions are constructed rather than given (see also Kodeih & Greenwood, 2014). Additionally, this model also contributes to current discussions on agency by showing “how different dimensions of agency interact dynamically in the institutional work of reconstructing institutional complexity” (Smets & Jarzabkowski, 2013: 1279). In essence, they
suggest that such agency does not make them 'grand entrepreneurs', but rather involves "practical people doing practical work to get a job done" (Smets & Jarzabkowski, 2013: 1304).

Currie and Spyridonidis (2015) investigate how actors interpret the co-existence of a professional logic and a policy-driven logic within a professionalized context. By focusing on the micro level they are particularly interested in the recursive relationship between the role of social positions in how actors interpret multiple institutional logics, and how this interpretation and enactment of multiple logics, in turn, affects social positions. The empirical context is two hospitals within the English National Health Service. Like Reay and Hinings (2005, 2009), they see the healthcare setting as a good example of a well-established organizational field. They arrive at the conclusion that logics are ambiguous and multifaceted, "so policymakers and organizational managers cannot assume that they are easily blended" (Currie & Spyridonidis, 2015: 1). Furthermore, they show hybrid nurse managers demonstrate their agency in "blending these two logics in pursuit of positional gain in professional and managerial organization" (Currie & Spyridonidis, 2015: 1). This is enabled by their social position and their level of status: compared to other nurses, their status is very high, but in contrast to doctors, it is not.

Following the call that more work is needed to unpack how actors experience and manage multiple demands, McPherson and Sauder (2013) aim to provide more insight into how institutional complexity is managed in actors' daily practices. In particular, they are interested in "how social actors translate logics into action as they engage in everyday organizational activities or how these micro-level activities help reproduce or transform organizational structures" (McPherson & Sauder, 2013: 166). They build on a 15-month ethnographic study of a drug court. By analyzing court negotiations, they identify four different logics available to the actors in the field and that are used to negotiate decisions in a drug court: the logics of criminal punishment, rehabilitation, community accountability, and efficiency. While previous research show that professionals normally stick closely to the logic of their professional group, McPherson and Sauder (2013) show that actors "stray from their 'home' logics and 'hijack' the logics of other court actors" (McPherson & Sauder, 2013: 165). Like Currie and Spyridonidis (2015), they find that one determinant of switching logics is the structural position of actors within the system. This strategy helped actors not only to manage and balance institutional complexity but also to "reach consensus, and get the work of the court done" (McPherson & Sauder, 2013: 165).

Raaijmakers and colleagues (2015) examine how decision makers interpret and respond to institutional complexity by focusing on coercive institutional demands. They "experimentally manipulated institutional complexity and gauged the time to compliance of 100 childcare managers in the Netherlands, and then asked them to describe and explain their anticipated responses to multiple pressures" (Raaijmakers et al., 2015: 85). Raaijmakers et al. (2015) extend existing theory by showing how decision makers utilized time as a resource and deliberately
delayed action in order to find a clearer path to legitimacy, weigh demands and interests, and deliberate their responses to the complex situation. They further suggest that the choice of response was influenced by how institutional complexity was interpreted by the decision maker and their personal beliefs in terms of the practice. They demonstrate the crucial importance of time and delay for decision makers faced with coercive institutional pressure to adopt a new practice.

Finally, Binder (2007) studies three service departments at a transitional housing organization. Similar to other organizations, the organization under scrutiny is dependent on federal money. She points out that existing studies predominantly argue that government money has an impact on the organization as it has to conform to more bureaucratic processes and values. The challenge thereby created is that people are not only confronted with one or two prevailing logics, "but with multiple logics ('casehood,' 'bureaucracy,' 'children's welfare' informal and ad hoc rule of themes), and with multiple ways of encountering those logics, on a continuum of almost purely universalistic to almost purely institutional" (Binder, 2007: 567-568). However, Binder finds that the members of the three departments respond to these external demands in several different ways. In fact, department members creatively use institutional logics and local meanings drawn from their professional commitments, personal interests, and interactional decision making. Accordingly, she understands her findings in terms of Mary Douglas’ idea of bricolage, which involves combining and recombining existing institutional resources, and argues that logics are not working top-down. Instead, individuals utilize their own past experiences to ‘play’ with institutional logics, question them, and combine them with institutional resources from other domains, which enables them to fit logics to their needs.

3.1.4 The relevance of an institutional perspective on the penal system

In this chapter, I highlighted that institutions can be modeled on three different but interdependent levels – individuals, organizations, and society – and all of them are important to gain better insight into how they shape everyday social reality in and around organizations. The institutional logics approach (e.g., Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton et al., 2012) constitutes a meta-theoretical framework to analyze the relationship between these three levels (Thornton et al., 2012). "By providing a link between institutions and action, the institutional logics approach provides a bridge between the macro, structural perspectives of Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983) and Zucker’s more micro, process approaches" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008: 100). Within the institutional logics literature, some studies are focusing more on the societal level (Friedland & Alford, 1999), and others more on the field level (Greenwood et al., 2011). Thornton and Ocasio (2008: 120) point out that “[w]e need more work on the microfoundations of institutional logics”. Zilber (2008: 165) also mentioned the necessity to
"analyze more the core meanings of organizations and organizing: How goals are set, strategic plans defined, and resourced depicted. How evaluation and control systems are formalized and how decisions are taken to make sense – and how these intense processes of meaning-making are embedded within wider, institutional dynamics of meaning”. But there is also a need of linking key micro-concepts with field-level-processes of institutionalization for a better understanding of institutional dynamics. And, furthermore, "future research should delve deeper into the dynamic patterns of complexity that confront organizations, arising from the multiplicity of logics to which organizations must respond, and the degree of incompatibility between those logics" (Greenwood et al., 2011: 334).

As the penal system is characterized by a multitude of different stakeholders with various interests and needs, I argue that this constitutes institutional pluralism (Kraatz & Block, 2008) or even institutional complexity (Greenwood et al., 2011) for the organization. However, as mentioned before, the co-existence of several logics within a field per se does not have to lead to complexity. Goodrick and Reay (2011: 399) "use the term constellation to describe the combination of institutional logics guiding behavior at any one point of time" and stress that such a constellation can be characterized by either conflict or peaceful co-existence. Complexity arises if two or more logics relevant to an actor are in competition with each other. Such complexity can be found between two or more logics (inter-institutional, e.g., market and bureaucracy) or within one logic (intra-institutional, e.g., different variants of the market logic) (Meyer & Höllerer, 2016). Therefore, in this dissertation, I aim to understand whether prisons and their managers are embedded in an environment in which either institutional pluralism or even institutional complexity exists. I am particularly interested in how the constellation of logics found at the field level ‘translates’ to the individual level (i.e., the experience of prison managers). As outlined in chapter 2, prisons are subjected to a variety of societal pressures stemming from a multitude of different stakeholders. I have therefore suggested that prison managers are increasingly expected to become ‘jacks of all trades’. What is needed in order to better understand their situation is, first, a systematic appreciation of the constellation of logics in the field of the Austrian penal system and, second, an investigation into the overlap between such a field-level constellation and the set of logics perceived as salient by prison managers. With such design I address the lack of cross-level studies in literature on institutional logics and take the institutional embeddedness of prison managers seriously.

Since institutions are enacted communicatively in the social sphere (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1967), I expect that the institutional pluralism experienced by prison managers will manifest in the way they talk about their work. As I will outline in more detail in the following section, I draw on metaphorical expression as a rhetorical tool that is particularly well suited to address pluralistic meanings and their interrelationships. Approaches building on the
The performative power of linguistic tropes have a long tradition in organizational theory and have constantly been further developed (e.g., Cornelissen, 2005). Metaphors provide schemata that facilitate and guide recognition and action (Fuchs & Huber, 2011), enable understanding, but also the ongoing construction of social reality. That is why they are considered a fundamental tool for mapping and understanding particularly complex organizational phenomena in a more adequate way (Cornelissen, 2005). Furthermore, they provide daily activities with meaning (Powell & Colyvas, 2008). Such ideas have some tradition in management research (e.g., Cummings & Wilson, 2003; Morgan, 1986). However, literature in the institutional logics tradition has, as yet, not systematically theorized the role of metaphors in dealing with institutional pluralism and complexity. So far, we do not know whether – and how – metaphors reduce ambiguity or even complexity between different institutional logics within a constellation. I am particularly interested in whether the metaphors employed by prison managers only serve to enact one particular logic or whether they have a bridging function between logics and might even help to reduce complexity between two or more logics. In the following chapter, accordingly, I will provide an overview of research on tropes and metaphors, and discuss in greater detail how they might serve to enact and manage institutional pluralism.

3.2 Rhetorical figures

3.2.1 Communication and institutional theory

The central role of language and communication for the construction and maintenance of institutions has been recognized from the very beginning of new institutional theory. In fact, Berger and Luckmann (1967) – who are often understood as one of the most important bases of modern institutionalism (e.g., Meyer, 2006) – have already claimed that language is the most important sign system for processes of institutionalization and legitimation. Accordingly, in his later work, Luckmann (2006) claimed that the social construction of reality is actually a ‘communicative’ construction of reality. Accordingly, research on institutions has commonly focused on the linguistic edifices on which institutions are built, such as, for instance, framings (e.g., Fiss & Zajac, 2006; Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a), claims and accounts (e.g., Creed, Scully, & Austin, 2002), vocabularies (e.g., Loewenstein et al., 2012), and narratives (e.g., Zilber, 2009).

More recently, there has been renewed interest in connecting such focus on language and communication to concepts and theories from linguistics. A central topic in this strand of research is how individuals, in their interactions, build upon speech, gestures, texts, and discourse in order to sustain or challenge institutions (Cornelissen et al., 2015). Such a rhetorical strand in institutional theory can be defined as the deployment of linguistic approaches and rhetorical insights to explain, as well as dynamically construct, institutions (Green & Li, 2011). This approach
includes research on tropes (Etzion & Ferraro, 2010; Silince & Barker, 2012), discourse (Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004), rhetoric (Green, 2004; Green, Li, & Nohria, 2009), and semiotics (e.g., Li, 2016) within institutional settings and fields. Research from this tradition conceives institutions as any collective cognition or joint understanding – that is, institutions are “constantly produced, or reproduced, in the use and exchange of language” (Cornelissen et al., 2015: 13).

This perspective, which has called for integrating research on communication more substantially within organization studies (see, e.g., special issue on ‘Communication, Cognition, and Institutions’ in the Academy of Management Review), has put the spotlight on the different forms and tools of linguistic expression which may influence institution, and therefore focuses largely on the micro level of institutional dynamics. Cornelissen et al. (2015), for example, recently reminded institutionalists that taking a communicative construction of reality seriously “puts communication at the heart of theories of institutions, institutional maintenance, and change” (Cornelissen et al., 2015: 10). For them, communication is a dynamic and ongoing process through which institutions, or other collective forms, are created or co-produced (Ashcraft, Kuhn, & Cooren, 2009; Cornelissen et al., 2015).

If institutions are a communicative accomplishment, then responses to institutional complexity can be assumed to also be communicative as well as material. At the very least, efforts at legitimation centrally build on language as its main edifice (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Bricolage, as the creative re-combination of existing institutional resources, is a useful communicative strategy of combining seemingly incompatible elements into something new (Boxenbaum & Rouleau, 2011). In this chapter, I outline an argument for the use of tropes, and metaphors specifically, as one possible strategy of dealing with prescriptions from multiple, potentially contradictory logics. Figurative linguistic tools like tropes have not always been popular within organization research. Pinder and Bourgeois (1982 quoted in Morgan, 1983: 601), for example, argued that “the use of tropes may be misleading and impede the development of administrative science and a body of knowledge useful to practitioners”. Instead of ‘borrowing’ from other fields of inquiry, they advocated the use of analytic taxonomy and other techniques, which, in their opinion, were better suited to the field of administrative science and the study of organizations. However, in the wake of the ‘revival’ of communicative approaches to institutions, the study of tropes has gained momentum (e.g., Etzion & Ferraro, 2010; Silince & Barker, 2012).

In this section, I begin with a general overview about the most common tropes used within institutional theory, including metaphors, analogies, idioms, metonymy, synecdoche, irony, and anomaly. I then focus on metaphors, as the primary trope by which disparate domains of meaning can be linked (e.g., Etzion & Ferraro, 2010). In more detail, I provide insights how metaphors work, what their functions and purposes are, and which different types and/or categorization can
be found in the existing literature. Finally, I give an overview about research including metaphors, and finish this chapter with focusing on metaphors in research on organizations and institutions.

3.2.2 Tropes
Tropes are figures of speech that shape our thinking (e.g., Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Manning, 1979) and are inseparably connected with cognition (Manning, 1979; Morgan, 1986). Examining institutions from a linguistic perspective, studies have investigated how tropes produce meaning and how they impact organizational reality (Green & Li, 2011). Tropes, in this respect, are an important form of linguistic resource as they are not ‘empty’ words; but, instead, a means for making sense of organizational life and phenomena (Schmieder, 2007). “[W]ithout them the transmission of meaning would be extremely difficult, if not impossible” (Oswick, Keenoy, & Grant, 2002: 295).

For the most part, tropes do not only function as methodological ‘access’ to actors’ constructions, but also as theory: “Trope as theory shapes knowledge because it ‘turns’ imagination and understanding, constructing parts of world as meaningful and other parts as insignificant” (Green, Alpaslan, & Mitroff, 2010: 48). Scholars from diverse research fields attribute different theoretical explanations to different tropes, depending on the lens through which they apply the trope. Green et al. (2010: 48) refer to Astley and Zammuto (1992) and note that “a strategic choice theorist might view a corporate merger as an organization adapting to and shaping the environment, whereas a population ecologist might view the same corporate merger as organizational death through environmental selection”. Thus, depending on the researcher’s theoretical grounding, different tropes and interpretations may be emphasized.

Alternatively, from a methodological perspective, tropes can also be understood as ways of knowing and as tools to investigate the social world (Green et al., 2010). Depending on which trope is used, a different set of rules is applied to make sense of a phenomenon or to create meaning. To illustrate, in narrative analysis, tropes are used to indicate a plausible understanding of a particular phenomenon (e.g., Cornelissen, 2012). Green et al. (2010), similarly, underscore the relationship between trope as theory and as method – arguing that tropes which are embedded in organizational theories have an influence on the use of organizational methods and vice versa.

Tropes are initially generative in that they help to make unfamiliar things familiar (Sillince & Barker, 2012; Tsoukas 1991). Over time, however, they become taken-for-granted and lose their generative power, because their novel interpretations become institutionalized and taken as literal meanings (Nietzsche, 1990 quoted in Green et al., 2010; see also Li, 2016 on the institutionalization of connotative meanings). Consequently, research on tropes has
demonstrated how “the language of theories and methods used within a particular paradigm move from figurative to literal and back to figurative, following a distinctive topological sequence from metaphor to metonymy to synecdoche to irony” (Green et al., 2010: 46).

As a research approach, tropological analysis draws upon tropes as crucial rhetorical constructs “which at the micro level involves how individual actors make sense of local interactions and at the macro level represents a community’s world view” (Green & Li, 2011: 1683). In general, this view takes a structural approach to language by focusing on structural similarities between the source domain and its target domain. In this way, tropes are used to understand how social structures and institutions are stabilized (Green & Li, 2011).

“Whereas prior research has focused on how tropes function to increase the taken-for-grantedness of social structure, recent research has shifted focus to studying agency: how actors employ tropes as symbolic action to disrupt motion and gain advantages” (Green & Li, 2011: 1683). In this context, Green and Li (2011) build upon Cornelissen and Clarke (2010) and emphasize the relevance of tropes at the very beginning of the institutional process. In particular, they investigate how entrepreneurs use analogies and metaphors “to imagine and make sense of novel ventures”. These metaphors and analogies not only make sense of unfamiliar situations, but also reduce uncertainty and support and strengthen acceptance – notably, because they help to draw similarities between new ventures and previous experiences. In so doing, they argue “that tropological analysis contributes to our understanding of institutionally embedded agency by specifying tropes as a set of powerful rhetorical mechanisms that help to embed actors in institutions” (Green & Li, 2011: 1684).

**Master Tropes**

Although there is a wide array of tropes, the literature generally distinguishes between four ‘master tropes’, namely metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony (Manning, 1979; White, 1973). Sillince and Barker (2012) draw upon all four types to build a tropological model of institutionalization that integrates both symbolic-linguistic and practice-material elements. The model delineates the process of institutionalization as unfolding in four stages. First, members initiate institutional change through the use of metaphors. Next, members draw upon metonymy to operationalize the growing institution – illustrating how it can become expected practice. In the third stage, synecdoche is used as a strategy to enable diffusion and standardization of the institution across time and space. Finally, irony is argued to be conducive to initiate de-institutionalization and, at the same time, suggest a novel metaphor. They show that institutions are not only material but also symbolic, as “language and material practices co-evolve during institutionalization through an interplay of tropes and ritual” (Sillince & Barker, 2012: 31).
Most of the research on tropes within organizational theory focuses primarily on metaphors (e.g., work by Cornelissen 2004, 2005, 2006a, 2006b). Within existing literature, the term metaphor is generally not used in a strict sense. Instead, it takes on the characteristics of an umbrella term, applied to metonymy and synecdoche (Manning, 1979) as well as similes, analogies (e.g., Morgan, 1983), and idioms. According to Manning (1979), metonymy and synecdoche can be seen as secondary forms within the metaphorical context "which further specify the differences between elements said to compose the whole (metonymy) or to expand the similarities within the context (synecdoche). In the latter case, the part, by extension, becomes increasingly encompassing, integrative, and consuming" (Manning, 1979: 661). Musson and Tietze (2004), however, contend that it is not appropriate to subsume these tropes 'under' the broader metaphorical trope.

In the next section, I take a more differentiated approach and provide a brief overview of the four master tropes (metaphors, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony) and, additionally, similes, analogies, and idioms. Following Oswick and colleagues (2002), I discuss the master tropes according whether they emphasize similarities or dissimilarities. In addition, I include idioms, which create completing novel meaning through bricolage of existing terminology. In my empirical investigation (see chapter 4.2.2.1), I follow Schmieder (2007) who includes metonymy, synecdoche, similarities, comparison, antonomasia, and personification into metaphor analysis.

**Metaphors:** "The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 5). Manning (1979: 661) describes metaphors as "ways of seeing things as if they were something else". Used as a tool, metaphors provide an 'explanatory impact' (Boxenbaum & Rouleau, 2011) by combining at least two domains (a source domain and a target domain) to create new meaning (Cornelissen 2004; see also Black, 1962). The language used is typically not associated with the target domain (e.g., Cornelissen, 2005; Morgan, 1983; Tsoukas, 1991). To give an example, Vaara, Tienari, and Säntti (2003) used the metaphor 'ship' to describe two merging companies looking for new directions. The purpose of the metaphor is to help handle the new situation of change by using a language which is commonly comprehensible and reduces the complexity of organizational reality. Metaphors show the
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6 Within the cognitive theory, such as Lakoff and Johnson distinguishes between target and source domain, whereas the interaction theory, e.g. Richards, 1936 call them tenor and vehicle, or Black (1977) calls them primary subject or secondary subject (see Jäkel, 1997). Genter and Bowdle (2002:18) follow Richards and talk about 'topic' and the 'vehicle', like for example "Time [topic] is like a river [vehicle]".
equivalence between distinct elements of experience and help us to understand what they have in common.

**Similes:** Similes are closely related to metaphors (Gentner & Bowdle, 2002). Like metaphors, similes compare two things (e.g., 'an organization is like a house'), and also transfer information from a source domain to the target domain. However, similes differ from metaphors because they comprise “explicit comparisons and assert directly the similarities between the compared items” (Tsoukas, 1991: 569). A metaphor presumes a simile – and in cases where the source domain and target domain are different, a simile can be transformed into a metaphor. “Literal similarity comparisons differ from metaphors in that, in literal similarity, many or most properties match, whereas in metaphor only a few properties match” (Gentner & Bowdle, 2002: 19). Therefore, from a cognitive perspective, metaphors and similes can been seen as identical, although there is an analytical difference (Ortony, 1975 quoted in Tsoukas, 1991). In most cases similes are subsumed under metaphors (e.g., Tsoukas, 1991).

**Analogies:** “An analogy ‘operationalizes’ a metaphor or a simile by focusing on relationships between items” (Tsoukas, 1991: 569). For instance, one might claim that ‘a prison manager is to an inmate as a parent is to a child’. In contrast to metaphors where domain incongruence is essential, analogies can be derived from either a similar domain (‘within-domain’) or a different domain (‘between-domain’) (Tsoukas, 1991) – the above mentioned example clearly constitutes a ‘between-domain’ analogy. Gentner (1983) points out that as most metaphors are predominantly relational comparisons, they are more or less analogies. More recently, Gentner and Bowdle (2002) suggest that metaphors and analogies use the same structure-mapping processes. “Analogies are often used to explain or predict the behavior of an unfamiliar complex or abstract system by comparing it to another, better understood system” (Gentner & Bowdle, 2002: 19). As an illustration, they state that ‘electricity is like water flow’ – using the comparison to describe how an electric current through a wire is like the flow of water through a pipe. In this sense, information is conveyed in a relational form, not a literal one (Gentner & Bowdle, 2002).

**Idioms:** Idioms are generally comprised of two or more words, wherein “the overall meaning of these words is unpredictable from the meanings of the constituent words” (Kovecses & Szabo, 1996: 328). They are linguistic expressions often integrating other tropes such as metaphors, metonymies, similes, common sayings, phrasal verbs, and specific grammatical constructions (Kovecses & Szabo, 1996). An example is the common saying ‘Has the cat got your tongue?’ which makes no sense outside of its conventionalized meaning (‘Don’t you have anything to say about
In this example, the idiom also includes ‘tongue’ as a metonymy which stands for ‘language’ or ‘speech’. Metaphors can turn into idioms over time – as demonstrated by Billig and MacMillian’s (2005) examination of the ‘smoking gun’ idiom which was used extensively in the controversial debates surrounding the search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in January 2003. They show how this phrase was initially used, and detail how the metaphor transformed into an idiom.

“The passage, by which ‘smoking gun’ has become an idiom to be used in particular political contexts, has not been effected by processes of habituation which wear down visual images or the cognitive associations of the original metaphor” (Billig & MacMillan, 2005: 477). They further highlight how metaphors are often used in political language for two different purposes. Either politicians use metaphors “in rhetorically effective ways to create new meanings and to challenge previously established ways of understanding [or] metaphors can function as routine idioms in political discourse in ways that deaden political awareness” (Billig & MacMillan, 2005: 459).

**Metonymy:** The second master trope are metonymies. “Unlike metaphors which involve a comparison between two concepts or terms from domains that are (at least initially) seen as distant from one another, metonymy and synecdoche both rely upon an exchange between parts within the same domain of language use and knowledge” (Cornelissen, 2008: 82). Metonymy takes a whole and reduces it to constitutive parts (Manning, 1979; see also Oswick et al., 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Whereas a metonymy is a part-whole substitution which works through a reduction mechanism, a synecdoche is the opposite, i.e., a whole-part substitution. Manning (1979) uses the organization as an example, because the whole can be indicated by its parts – that is, the number of levels in the organization. Consequently, it can be argued that the whole is “represented by the parts [and] the essential features of a whole are reduced to indices” (Manning, 1979: 662). Following Manning (1979), Sillince and Barker (2012) argue that a metonymy enables complex cognitive, behavioral, and emotive matters to be reduced to measurable spatial and temporal relationships (Manning, 1979) – and, in so doing, provides a means to operationalize any institutionalization process. Cornelissen (2008) investigates the use of metonymies in how people talk about organizations, and how they understand organizations. He highlights that “scholars and practitioners alike frequently use creative and figurative forms of language to produce new, coherent representations of organizations and organizational life” (Cornelissen, 2008: 79). Musson and Tietze (2004) similarly, draw upon metonymy to investigate organizational talk about physical places and spaces in an organization. Building on the assumption that statements which are taken for granted and embedded in organizational talk can be studied by the use of metonymy, they document “how cultural norms and meanings are reflected, maintained, and potentially changed in these figures of speech” (Musson & Tietze, 2004: 1301).
Snyecdoche: Snyecdoche, a third master trope, is a way to use one part for seeing the whole picture – like, for example, ‘the crown’ to stand in for the regent or the monarchy as a whole, or to refer to a company by way of the CEO (Sillince & Barker, 2012). Thus, one single example is enough to evoke a bigger picture. Snyecdoche “works through the principle of the expansion of meaning from part to a larger whole about which the reader is meant to be concerned” (Manning, 1979: 661). Sillince and Barker (2012: 11) argue that “[a] snyecdoche crystallizes an idea into a vivid and memorable image. [...] The meaning of any institutionalization process is reduced to its bare essentials by a snyecdoche and this facilitates widespread diffusion”.

Irony: Irony, in general, refers to “the humorous or mildly sarcastic use of words to imply the opposite of what they actually mean” (The Collins English Dictionary, 1995 quoted in Oswick et al., 2002: 296). It deliberately utilizes inappropriate expressions to refer to a topic in a paradoxical and contradictory way (Cornelissen, 2008). Insofar, as it is a linguistic tool which replaces apparently actualized parts of reality with signifiers that are obviously ‘false’, it nevertheless seems to correspond more to an ‘appropriate’ description of lived experience (White, 1973 quoted in Manning, 1979). In general, irony focuses more on differences than on similarities – in other words, the “sameness in difference” (Oswick et al., 2002: 296). Manning argues that irony is used in virtually all social sciences. It is about “making the apparent no longer apparent” (Manning, 1979: 662).

Anomaly: Like irony, an anomaly is a rhetorical figure that highlights dissimilarity (Oswick et al., 2002). The underlying argument is that A is unlike B, and the assumed dissimilarity between the target and the source domain provides insights for the target domain. Although it seems strange to compare a computer to a coffee (Tsoukas, 1993 quoted in Oswick et al., 2002), Oswick and colleagues refer to Galileo’s example comparing the world to a sphere as a similarly ‘bizarre’ comparison that led to novel insights. “In this respect, in contrast to the orthodox usage of metaphor, which, in our view, merely makes the ‘familiar more familiar,’ anomaly is a process that offers a means of exploring previously unthought, overshadowed, or marginalized possibilities by ‘decentering the subject’ (Lemert, 1979) and ‘making the familiar strange’ (Foucault, 1977)” (Oswick et al., 2002: 295).
Figure 1 summarizes the above mentioned tropes. The first group focus on similarities. Whereas metaphors and similes compare across domains, metonyms and synecdoche stay in one domain. Analogies, which are similar to metaphors, however, can either be derived from a similar or a different domain. In contrast, the second group emphasizes dissimilarities. Examples are anomaly and irony. Finally, idioms have a ‘bricolage’ function, as they combine several words which would not make sense outside of conventional usage. Since metaphors and their relationship to institutional logics are the main focus of my thesis, I will discuss this master trope in more detail in the next section.

3.2.3 Metaphors

The importance of metaphors in our daily life as well as in organizational discourse has increased over the past few years (Boxenbaum & Rouleau, 2011). Metaphors are not only common in our daily discourse and conversations but also in literary and poetic contexts (Gentner & Bowdle, 2002). They are considered to be the most salient type of figurative language (Pinder & Bourgeois, 1982) and, consequently, an essential part of our language as “we regularly express ourselves in terms of metaphors” (Pablo & Hardy, 2009: 821). Not only are metaphors predominant in our daily language, they also inform our thoughts and action (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; see also Dunn, 1990). Dunn (1990: 1) argues that the influence of metaphors on “knowledge, memory, conceptualization and communication is [...] far more pervasive and complex than most of us
imagine”. Lakoff and Johnson (2003), similarly, argue that metaphors cannot be avoided – people think they can do without metaphors, but that is not true.

Simple metaphors follow the principle ‘A is B’ – where one term is used to understand the other. Typically, we use what we already know to understand or gain more insight into something we do not know. For example ‘the man is a lion’, or ‘the organization is a machine’ (Morgan, 2011). The comparison is not meant to be taken literally, but to be used to identify a partial ‘truth’ – in other words, to give “insights that may resonate and produce genuine understanding”8 (Morgan, 2011: 463). A metaphor can be classified as ‘good’ or successful if its interpretation highlights something interesting for both domains (Genter & Bowdle, 2002). As Alvesson (1993: 116) puts it, metaphors need “the right mix of similarity and difference between the transferred word and the focal one. Too much or too little similarity means that the point might not be understood and no successful metaphor will have been created”.

3.2.3.1 Functions and purposes of metaphors

Metaphors have several functions. First “metaphors are said to aid communication, helping to transfer ideas from one domain to another: from the known to unknown, from the concrete to the abstract, and from the material to the immaterial” (Ortony, 1975 quoted in Pablo & Hardy, 2009: 823). Therefore, metaphors can be used to describe unfamiliar or abstract situations and topics (Gentner & Bowdle, 2002). Hofbauer (1995) argues that as a ‘product of the construction of reality’, metaphors are more than just ornamental phrases. Instead, they are fundamental for our experiences, perception, and ways of thinking.

Second, metaphors help people understand complex phenomena (Pablo & Hardy, 2009). By using clear and demonstrative images, metaphors can express situations that are difficult to describe; and also make information more memorable (Pablo & Hardy, 2009). Because of their illustrative capacity, metaphors can reduce complexity. Take for example, the abstract term ‘theory’. Talking about theory by using terminology borrowed from architecture makes the term ‘theory’ more real and less complex (Schmieder, 2007). In this way, metaphors are a useful tool to manage complex and/or unknown terms, situations, etc. (Bucher, 2014).

Third, metaphors are central cognitive tools, not merely communication devices. Building on Lakoff and Johnson (1999), Marshak (2003: 9) argues that abstract reasoning occurs through the “application of conceptual metaphors that are located in the cognitive unconscious and that
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8 This is what Morgan (2011) calls the ‘paradox of metaphor’.
help ‘frame’ reality”. Genter and Bowdle (2002: 18), similarly, highlight the cognitive and communicative functions of metaphors – arguing that metaphors “can provide a compact and memorable way of expressing ideas that would be difficult to convey with literal language”.

3.2.3.2 Types of metaphors

Within the literature, different ways of clustering metaphors into types and categories can be found. I start with a discussion of root metaphors, then I give an overview of hierarchical and non-hierarchical metaphors. Hierarchical approaches to metaphors include the distinction between ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ metaphors, ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ metaphors, as well as ‘superficial’, ‘intermediate’, and ‘meaningful’ metaphors. Non-hierarchical metaphors can be differentiated into ‘deductive’ and ‘inductive’ metaphors as well as between ‘live’, ‘dead’, ‘dormant’, and ‘conventional’ metaphors. Finally, I provide an overview of the literature on primary and secondary metaphors.

Root metaphors

Early research on metaphors from a theory building perspective focuses on root metaphors. Root metaphors “provide rich summaries of the world and reveal dominant and powerful ways of seeing” (Tourish & Hargie, 2012: 1050; see also Inns, 2002). As Smith and Eisenberg (1987: 369) describe, these metaphors “capture a fundamental, underlying world view, but are often unobtrusive with regard to their frequency of usage in ordinary discourse”. This conceptualization is echoed by Alvesson (1993: 116), who describes metaphors as “a fundamental image of the world on which one is focusing”. To give an example, “a root metaphor of evolution highlights that organizations must adapt to their environment in order to survive, whereas a computational root metaphor casts organizations as consisting of interdependent and interconnected parts” (Boxenbaum & Rouleau, 2011: 276).

Smith and Eisenberg (1987) use root metaphors to examine conflicts at Disneyland. In their study, they identify two root metaphors that held particular significance. The first one was ‘The Disney experience as drama’. Although interviewees rarely used the word ‘drama’, they talked about ‘costuming’, ‘all part of the show’, and ‘script’. The second was ‘The Disney experience as family’, which subsumed quotes that referred to seeing colleagues as family members. Their findings revealed that a change in the emphasis of root metaphors from drama to family was accompanied by parallel changes in the way management and employees interpreted their work experiences.

More recently, Tourish and Hargie (2012) drew upon root metaphors to examine statements made by four banking CEOs to the Banking Crisis Inquiry of the Treasury Committee
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of the UK House of Commons in 2009. Specifically, they identify four root metaphors that the CEOs used to explain the banking failures: the ‘the wisdom of the crowd’, meaning that bankers "were influenced by the behaviour of significant others" (Tourish & Hargie, 2012: 1045); ‘bankers forced to be passive observers when confronted by market forces beyond human agency'; ‘bankers as victims’ of the crisis; and ‘bankers as penitent learners, rather than pedagogues’, meaning that they are willing to improve. Their analysis showed that metaphors can fail in their function as an explanatory trope or as a support for organizational learning. Accordingly, they suggest that metaphors not only compare two discreet domains, “they also can exclude categories of meaning from consideration” (Tourish & Hargie, 2012: 1045).

Root metaphors play a central role in the institutional logics perspective in that they are used to provide the ‘fundamental image’ behind each logic. Consequently, Thornton et al. (2012) define root metaphors as one of their categories on the Y-Axis – in order to specify institutional orders. They build on Thornton (2004), who called root metaphors a 'natural effect of symbolic analogy'. To give an example, for the institutional order of family the root metaphor is "family as firm"; for religion the root metaphor is “temple as a bank” (see for an overview Thornton et al., 2012: 56 as well as Thornton, 2004: 44). Again, these examples illustrate that root metaphors are used in a more holistic way, meaning that such metaphors can transfer a bigger picture. However, it is important not to confuse the root metaphor that captures the bigger symbolic character of each logic with the more specialized metaphors that actors use in order to invoke and enact, but also combine logics.

Hierarchical and non-hierarchical typologies

Grant and Oswick (1996) cluster types of metaphors into hierarchical typologies and non-hierarchical ones. “Hierarchical typologies of metaphors start with those which most influence our ways of thinking and seeing the world and work down to those which are of minor or peripheral significance” (Grant & Oswick, 1996: 6). They build upon Schön’s (1993) work, which distinguishes between ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ metaphors; as well as Black’s (1993) work, which clusters metaphors into ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ categories (Grant & Oswick, 1996). Also Pablo and Hardy (2009: 824) refer to Black (1993), stressing that while "strong metaphors cannot be substituted without altering the meaning that the speaker intends to convey; weak metaphors can be replaced with ease, without any significant loss of meaning”. In a similar vein, Oswick and Grant (1996 quoted in Pablo & Hardy, 2009) distinguish between ‘superficial’, ‘intermediate’, and ‘meaningful’ metaphors. Superficial metaphors "simplify or embellish phenomena without resulting in deeper understanding; intermediate metaphors, which allow for surface comparisons broad enough to generate some deeper insights; and meaningful metaphors, which shape complex phenomena".
"Non-hierarchical typologies of metaphor do not seek to assign relative values to the different types of metaphor they identify. Instead, they focus on understanding how each type of metaphor works and when and where each type is used" (Grant & Oswick, 1996: 9). Within the non-hierarchical typology two sub-categorizations are common. The first can be described as a ‘deductive’ versus ‘inductive’ approaches. “The deductive approach involves taking a metaphor, imposing it on a particular organizational phenomenon and then seeing if it offers something of value. [...] In contrast, the inductive approach seeks to discover those underlying metaphors that are already in use and which influence our ways of thinking and seeing” (Grant & Oswick, 1996: 10). The second, and more common approach, is to distinguish between 'live' (or 'novel'), 'dead', and 'dormant' metaphors (e.g., Grant & Oswick, 1996) as well as 'conventional' ones (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Live metaphors have no socially, predefined meaning – which is common for conventional and for dead metaphors. “Thus, when two terms are combined metaphorically for the first time, an individual must seek to understand the presuppositions embedded in the extralinguistic context that helps to establish a meaning” (Cornelissen & Kafouros, 2008: 959). Live metaphors have the ability for ‘conceptual development’ (Tsoukas, 1991; see also Fraser, 1993), as Morgan (1986) showed in his book "Images of organization”. “[M]etaphors are a ‘driver’ used to generate innovation and change by stimulating different ways of thinking and acting” (Pablo & Hardy, 2009: 824) and they may also generate novelty. Live metaphors are “imaginative and creative. [...] Thus, they can give new meaning to our pasts, or our daily activity, and to what we know and believe” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 139). Lakoff and Johnson (2003), point out that new metaphors have the potential to create new realities, meanings, and similarities. They argue that new metaphors can alter the conceptual system including perceptions and actions in such a system. For instance, cultural changes result from introducing a new metaphorical concept or removing an old one.

Conventional metaphors are “metaphors that structure the ordinary conceptual system of our culture, which is reflected in our everyday language” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 139). Gentner and Bowdle (2002) point out that metaphors introducing a new source domain are interpreted as comparison. In contrast, “conventional metaphors are processed as categorizations” (Gentner & Bowdle, 2002: 20; see also Bowdle & Gentner, 1999). This is the case when novel source domains become conventionalized over time. Eventually, this can lead to a state in which metaphors completely lose their connection to their original literal meaning and become genuine and taken-for-granted terms in the target domain. Genter and Bowdle (2002: 21) provide an illustrative example:

"the term 'deadline' in the American Civil War meant a line around a prison camp; any prisoner crossing the line was shot. It was then metaphorically extended to a game of marbles, and then further extended from space to time: in newspaper parlance, it meant a time limit after which an article was unacceptable. Eventually, the literal meaning disappeared. The word 'deadline' now retains only its originally metaphorical sense of a time limit. In this way, metaphors can create new meanings".
Dead or frozen metaphors are those that “have become so familiar and so habitual that we have ceased to be aware of their metaphorical nature and use them as literal terms” (Tsoukas, 1991: 568; see also Grant & Oswick, 1996; Pablo & Hardy, 2009). As such, they cannot provide any useful novel insights into the phenomena they describe. "Through constant use, the live metaphor is killed" (Billig & MacMillan, 2005: 460) – particularly when they start to become part of everyday language. Many rhetorical theorists point out that our language is full of 'dead' metaphors (Richards, 1965 quoted in Billig & MacMillan, 2005). Typical examples are the 'legs' of a chair and the 'teeth' of a saw (Grant & Oswick, 1996), or ‘bottleneck’, ‘balance of power’, or ‘branches of government’ (Bucher, 2014). Within organizational science, Tsoukas (1991) refers to the concepts of 'strategy' ('general' in Greek) or ‘organization’ ('tool’ in Greek) as dead metaphors (Tsoukas, 1991). Recent terminology also calls such metaphors 'lexicalized'. For example, the metaphor 'argument as war', does not automatically trigger an image of the military, particularly as it became increasingly used (Billig & MacMillan, 2005). According to Lakoff and Johnson (2003), many concepts in language which are derived from the human 'body', especially referring to spatial impressions and properties (e.g., ‘moving up’, ‘falling behind’, etc.), are seen as being literal and non-metaphorical. "This occurs because human bodily experiences can be understood directly and unmetaphorically, and 'we conceptualise the less clearly delineated in terms of the more clearly delineated’" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980 quoted in Billig & Macmillan, 2005: 461). Furthermore, Billig and MacMillan (2005) argue that the transition from metaphor to idiom is often described as a movement from a 'living' metaphor to a 'dead' metaphor.

Finally, dormant metaphors describe quasi-literal terms, which constrain how we see the world. They can either become dead or live metaphors. Although the metaphorical basis of such terms is not automatically obvious, it can be easily identified ex-post. Typical examples within organization science include ‘organizational behavior’ and ‘organization structure’ (Tsoukas, 1991; see also Grant & Oswick, 1996). Dormant metaphors can still be used as a way to solve problems in a creative way “because by using them individuals can be encouraged to conceive of the topic through a different vehicle” (Tsoukas, 1991: 569).

Primary and secondary metaphors

A final categorization is the difference between primary and secondary (e.g., Alvesson, 1993) or primary and complex (e.g., Cornelissen & Kafouros, 2008) metaphors. Researchers have argued that organizational theories consist of two different types of metaphors. Secondary metaphors have an impact on the meaning of primary metaphors, as they can modify them. They are often deep and therefore implicit. Alvesson (1993) gives the example of 'organization as a culture'. If the understanding of the culture is described metaphorically as a 'holy cow', then 'organizational culture' can be identified as the first-level metaphor, and 'holy cow' as the second-level metaphor.
In order to get an adequate understanding of the cultural view on organizations, the ‘holo cow’ aspect must also be involved.

“A primary metaphor is the most basic metaphorical description of a target domain and has a minimal structure. Complex metaphors are formed from primary ones through further conceptual blending and elaboration, that is, the fitting together of smaller metaphorical ‘pieces’ into larger wholes” (Cornelissen & Kafouros, 2008: 961). Cornelissen and Kafouros (2008) use examples from organization theory to show that complex metaphors have primary metaphors at their core. Primary metaphors are often based “in our embodied experiences as human beings” (Cornelissen & Kafouros, 2008: 970). Furthermore, complex metaphors are somewhat amorphous, meaning that actors can elaborate, extend, and reinterpret them in order to fit their communicative needs. This creates a more dynamic understanding of metaphorical thought, since processes of social construction can start with primary metaphors, but evolve over time to include more complex metaphorical configurations. Such an approach, consequently, challenges the traditional view of root metaphors which are commonly considered to be rather stable. Consequently, complex metaphors have the ability to support continuity as well as change processes at the conceptual level.

According to this particular understanding of metaphors, Cornelissen and Kafouros (2008) explain the proliferation of different metaphors of an organization (e.g., as machine, as computational system, as designed object, as organizational mind). As constituting a particular continuity in theorizing about organizations that revolves around the same primary metaphors, but includes a variety of ways in which these are extended, revised, or challenged. New complex metaphors, therefore, often emerge through the innovative combination of primary ones, which means that they are not entirely novel. Since they are fundamentally grounded in shared and established primary metaphors, their meaning is innovative, but, at the same time, “in many ways already deeply familiar” (Cornelissen & Kafouros, 2008: 971).

In this section, I have tried to show that there has been a variety of attempts to cluster and categorize metaphors. Furthermore, there are also several different theoretical approaches (like linguistics and communication sciences) which also differ in their approach and terminology. However, despite all the differences and complexities in the scientific engagement with metaphors, there is little doubt about the general functions of metaphors (linking A with B).

3.2.3.3 Metaphors and research on institutions and organizations
As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, communication has always been a central pillar of institutional theory. More recently metaphors have become a focus of attention. For example, Cornelissen and colleagues (2008) review how previous work has explored the use of metaphor
Theoretical approach: Institutional logics and metaphors

in organization research. They find that this has happened in different ways, depending on the discipline metaphors are used in. For example, work within organization theory and organizational communication focuses on "metaphors that aid the practice of theorizing and research", whereas studies in organizational development use metaphors to analyze decision making processes by individuals or within groups. Studies within organizational behavior, in contrast, "emphasize the metaphors-in-use within individuals' sensemaking accounts of critical events within their organization" (Cornelissen, Oswick, Christensen, & Phillips, 2008: 7). Beyond identifying these differences in focus, Cornelissen et al. (2008) also highlight the variety of metaphor analyses, "ranging from text- and discourse-based analysis to the analysis of non-linguistic modalities such as pictorial signs, gestures and artefacts" (Cornelissen et al., 2008: 7). Jermier and Forbes (2011: 448) categorize the literature into two themes: "(a) studies examining metaphors in specific organizational settings and (b) studies detailing how metaphor works and exploring the role of metaphor in the construction of organizational theories".

As an example of the first category, Gibson and Zellmer-Bruhn (2001), for instance, investigate different understandings of ‘teamwork’ across national as well as organizational cultures. They analyze metaphors which are used to describe teams to identify underlying distinctions in the definition. The authors identify important variations in the use of teamwork metaphors across four different geographic locations in which six multinational corporations operate. In total, they find five metaphors for teamwork – namely military (including words such as battle, manpower, alliances, survive), family (including brother, families, mother, clannish), sport (including game, home run, players, coach), associates (including circle, council, crews), and community (including friend, neighborhood, buddies). These assumptions are transferred to the expectations of each team member, such as the scope, their roles, membership, etc. Insights from the study show that "[i]f the national context is individualistic, for example, then sports or associates metaphors are likely to resonate. If the organization emphasizes tight control, then a military or family metaphor is likely to resonate. [...] For example, employees who use the military metaphor are likely to have strong expectations about clarity of objectives and performance indicators" (Gibson & Zellmer-Bruhn, 2001: 296-297).

Apart from providing a useful theoretical lens to study the communicative construction of organizations and institutions, metaphors are also a helpful way to construct novel organizational theory. More recently, "work on metaphors in theory building suggests an even higher level of complexity in the metaphorical composition of organizational theories" (Boxenbaum & Rouleau, 2011: 277). Research has shown organizational theories to be composed of multiple metaphors that are combined into fairly complex metaphorical constructs (Boxenbaum & Rouleau, 2011). For example, Andriessen and Gubbins (2009) focus on the often controversial debate about key theoretical concepts and their definitions and meanings within the management and
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organizational literature. They use a systematic metaphorical analysis to study underlying conceptualizations. "It can help identify the different ways a theoretical concept is structured and given meaning, provide insight into the way these different conceptualizations relate to each other, and show how these conceptualizations impact further theorization about the concept" (Andriessen & Gubbins, 2009: 845). The study examines the concept of 'relationship' in organizations. Examining three fundamental articles, Andriessen and Gubbins (2009) identify seven metaphorical concepts for 'relationship'. Those metaphors add specific meaning as they provide particular images, for example relationships as 'contacts', 'networks', 'channels', etc.

Cornelissen (2004, 2005) introduces the 'domains-interaction-model' to complement the so-called 'comparison model' – which suggests "that the basic mechanism involved in the production and comprehension of metaphors is not the selection of pre-existing attributes of the conjoined terms" (Cornelissen, 2005: 751). Instead, Cornelissen argues that metaphors are a way to produce new meanings that go beyond existing similarity and, therefore, the resulting meaning is creative. He points out that "when theorists and researchers think about an abstract or complex idea concerning organizational life, they can use metaphor to transfer a more concrete concept to understand and relate to the idea" (Cornelissen, 2005: 753). Metaphors can therefore be used as heuristic tools "in opening up new and multiple ways of seeing, conceptualizing, and understanding organizational phenomena" (Cornelissen, 2005: 753). Like Cornelissen (2004), Jermier and Forbes (2011) provide insights into the interrelation between metaphors and their power to generate new theory. Their findings reveal that most organizational studies scholars follow Morgan's (2011: 463 quoted in Jermier & Forbes, 2011: 446) premise that "metaphor is the process that drives theory construction and science" and, as such, scholars should pay "attention to exploring the role metaphor can play in generating new theory" (Jermier & Forbes, 2011: 449).

Cornelissen's (2006a) conceptualization of metaphors stresses, on the one hand, their malleability; and, on the other, their generativity. He uses these two characteristics to differentiate his 'image-schematic' model of metaphor from the prevalent 'reductionist comparison model' – which views metaphors as rather stable in meaning and effect. Malleability connotes the "abstract, imaginative structures" (Cornelissen, 2006a: 683) that are triggered by metaphorical comparisons of concepts, which may differ across individuals and social groups. This implies that a particular metaphor (Cornelissen uses the example of 'organizational identity') may take on very different meanings between communities when it diffuses across them, because it is embedded in divergent theoretical traditions and frameworks. Generativity, according to Cornelissen (2006a), characterizes metaphors as fundamentally structuring our understanding of particular issues, rather than simply providing a comparison between two domains. The usage of metaphors, therefore, creates additional meaning through the juxtaposition of concepts that are not usually
related to each other. In other words, the meaning created by metaphor use is greater than that of its two component parts.

3.2.3.4 Metaphors and Morgan’s Images of Organization
Within organizational studies, Morgan’s fundamental book “Images of Organization” has spawned an entire research tradition in which organizations are illuminated through a metaphorical lens. A wide variety of different metaphors for organizations exist – for example organization as a machine (Morgan, 1986), as a cinema (Wood, 2002), as a theatre (Cornelissen, 2004) or as military (Mutch, 2006). In the wake of Morgan’s work (1980, 1986), several studies have subsequently focused on metaphors and organization (Grant & Oswick, 1996; Cornelissen 2005; see also Pablo & Hardy, 2009). Morgan describes organizations by using eight generative metaphors, namely organizations as machines, as organisms, as brains, as cultures, as political systems, as psychic prisons, as processes of change and transformation, and as instruments of domination.

“The aim was to present a treatise on ‘theory as metaphor’ that shows the inherent incompleteness of any particular point of view. Every metaphor is presented as a framework that generates both strengths and limitations, with the juxtaposition of different metaphors being used to show how the limitations of one particular metaphor may be addressed by the strengths of others” (Morgan, 2011: 463).

Each of these metaphors is grounded in a particular organizational theory approach. The machine metaphor covers theories focusing on efficiency and mechanical skills such as Taylor’s scientific management or Weber’s bureaucracy approach. The organism metaphor includes human relations and contingency theories by portraying organizations as open systems. The brain metaphor encompasses learning theories and cybernetics and highlights cognitive aspects of organizations. The culture metaphor "emphasizes symbolic and informal aspects of organizations as well as the creation of shared meanings among actors." Under the political system metaphor conflict and power aspects, stakeholder theories as well as variety of interests are subsumed. The psychic prison metaphor builds on psychoanalytical theories analyzing the psyche, the unconscious etc. The flux and transformation metaphor "emphasizes processes, self-reference and unpredictability through embracing theories of auto poiesis, chaos and complexity in organizations." And finally, the instrument of domination metaphor "draws from Marxist and critical theories to highlight exploitation, control and unequal distribution of power performed in and by organizations" (Örtenblad, Putnam, & Trehan, 2016: 877). Building on Morgan’s eight metaphors, Örtenblad and colleagues (2016: 875) published a special issue in Human Relations with the aim to "rethink or add to Morgan’s metaphors and to generate new organizational images. In general, the articles in this issue offer new metaphors and sub-metaphors and enrich specifications for two of Morgan’s images".
More recently, Morgan (2016) highlighted the relationship between metaphor and metonymy within organization theory. He suggests that metaphors are both a way of being and a way of thinking. Like Cornelissen (2006b), he bemoans the fact that metaphors are too often only understood as abstract epistemological constructs – particularly as they shape the very way in which we experience the social world. He therefore advocates a more flexible use of metaphor that aims at understanding the multidimensional and often paradoxical nature of social reality. From his point of view, understanding metaphors only as abstracted metonymical constructs is insufficient to understand and deal with the complexity faced by organizations. Instead, he argues that metaphors should be recognized as pervading thoughts, experiences and acts within the social realm – making it more amenable to understanding and managing such complexity.

### 3.2.4 Relationship between institutional logics and metaphors

Over the years research has examined traces of discourse and communication as micro-foundations of institution logics. Especially vocabulary approaches (e.g., Hyndman, Liguori, Meyer, Polzer, Rota, & Seiwald, 2014; Jones & Livne-Tarandach, 2008; Ocasio et al., 2015; Weber, 2005; see also Mills, 1940) have gained increasing popularity. Such studies focus on multilevel phenomena where field and individual levels are combined. Discourse and rhetoric may be understood as ways in which institutional logics are used and mobilized in concrete actions (McPherson & Sauder, 2013).

Actors communicate and shape discourse in order to make sense of institutional logics in their ongoing interactions. Cornelissen and colleagues (2015: 22) argue that:

"[f]rom the communicative perspective on institutions, it would be important to emphasize that these discourses may be used in various manners and situations, thus paving the way for resolving or exacerbating ambiguity and contradiction between logics, and for giving birth to replacement, transference, or hybridity across logics, the analysis of which may in fact help to understand institutional complexity in a novel way".

I build on Cornelissen et al. (2015) and link insights on the metaphorical aspects of organizational life (or, more broadly, the tropological side of management, encompassing a vast variety of figures of speech and rhetorical tools; see, e.g., Sillince & Barker, 2012; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005) to recent developments in the institutional logics perspective (e.g., Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton et al., 2012). I argue that metaphors are suitable tools to ‘visualize’ and ‘simplify’ institutions in general, and, in particular, constitute micro-level strategies to deal with institutional plurality and institutional complexity. As prior research has shown, management practices, decisions, and reforms are often guided by a multiplicity of institutional orders and their underlying logics (e.g., Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a). These logics, however, cannot be observed directly; rather, they are manifested at the micro level in different forms and ways (e.g., Meyer et al., 2013; see also, Powell & Colyvas, 2008). Metaphors may be a useful way
to put the guiding principles of divergent logics ‘into shape’ and reduce institutional complexity, thus making competing logics manageable (e.g., Powell & Colyvas, 2008). A metaphorical perspective, consequently, allows for identifying different conceptualizations of prison management and, finally, the field-level rationalities and logics underlying such understandings.

As stressed before, root metaphors play an important role within the institutional logic approach, as they are one of the key characteristics of an institutional order (Thornton et al., 2012). Thornton et al. (2012) use such root metaphors conceptually, meaning that each of their institutional orders are clearly separated and defined and therefore also draw from one explicit and distinct root metaphor. The role of metaphors in my dissertation differs from their approach in two ways. First, I use an inductive empirical approach to examine the relationship of multiple logics within one particular context, and therefore institutional complexity may exist – which raises the question of what function metaphors serve in such situations. Second, I do not focus on root metaphors, instead I use metaphors as a rhetorical figure (tropes) employed in concrete communicative acts. Therefore, I am not aiming to identify one constitutive metaphor for each of my logics; instead I am more interested in empirically exploring which metaphors link to one or more logics, and what this means for the enactment of institutional pluralism at the individual level.
IV Methodology

"Language, which may be defined here as a system of vocal signs, is the most important sign system of human society. [...] An understanding of language is thus essential for any understanding of the reality of everyday life.”

(Berger & Luckmann, 1967: 36-37)

4.1 Empirical Case: The Austrian penal system

In this dissertation, I aim to show that the Austrian penal system is a field fraught with various challenges and constant debate – particularly in the last few decades. Still, to date, systematic studies focusing on challenges of prison management in the Austrian context do not exist. A noteworthy exception is the work of Gratz on managing issues inside prisons9. In this chapter I draw heavily on his work, in addition to official governmental documents, and the various relevant texts of law.

In order to understand the Austrian penal system10, it is important to first provide some background information about the specifics of Austrian public administration. First, the public sector is perpetually short of resources. Whereas in the private sector it is common to invest money in human resources, new markets, products, or promising ventures, requests for additional funding in the public sector (especially for employees) are generally met with reluctance and criticism. Another problematic issue is that there is little cooperation between different ministries. Because of a high degree of bureaucracy and a generally 'closed' corporate culture, it often takes years to 'know the games and unofficial rules' of the administration system. Consequently, nepotism and favoritism are still substantial problems (e.g., in getting a job or getting specific information). Furthermore, the fact that the law is the only real control mechanism in this setting also generates criticism, since the relevant law is often old-fashioned and not easily changed. As challenges arise, new norms and regulations are developed by the government. These solutions may solve problems momentarily, but, they do not constitute sustainable solutions for issues coming up in the near future. Another issue is that legislature is highly politicized.

---

9 The term ‘prisons’ in this context always includes institutions for penal service, as well as court prisons, unless they are explicitly labeled ‘involuntary forensic placement’, ‘correctional facilities’, or ‘regional court prisons’.
10 Gratz (2011) conducted several interview about the Federal Austrian Administration and its appreciated development. The main comments are summarized here.
Politicians often suggest utopic ideas for changes which they cannot realize most of the time because of strong resistance from the opposition. Before any substantial and enduring changes can be introduced, elections often get in the way. Politicization also has a negative impact on human resource management, because it may lead to dissatisfaction. Consequently, a lot of highly qualified people quit due to politicization (Gratz, 2011). As prisons are part of Austrian public administration, these issues are also true for prisons and are, consequently, major issues for its management.

4.1.1 Historical overview and legal milestones

The start of a ‘modern’ understanding of prisons and punishment can be traced back to 1776, when the use of torture was abolished in Austria under the reign of Maria Theresia. Still, the practice of corporal punishment continued for almost a century until 1867. Although the Austrian penal system has regularly been criticized for being outdated and in need of major reforms, such reforms have been implemented later in the 19th century, although they were already common in many other countries. For example, the suspended sentence (‘bedingte Strafe’) was not established until 1920 and the Juvenile Law (’Jugendstrafrecht’) was not ratified until 1928 (cf. Gratz, Held, & Pilgram, 2001). The last public execution in Austria was carried out in 1868; and, while the death penalty was abolished in 1919, it was reinstated in 1933. Indeed, during the period of National Socialist rule between 1938 and 1945, more than 1,200 people were beheaded. By 1950, the death penalty was abolished again by the National Assembly – and then formally outlawed in the Austrian constitution of 1968 (Forsthuber, 2015).

Like many other “total institutions”, prisons were widely criticized in the 1970s, and calls for reform became increasingly prevalent. Christian Broda, Austria’s Federal Minister of Justice for 19 years (1960-1966 and 1970-1983), gained prominence for his radical reforms of the penal system as well as his vision of a ‘society without any prisons’ (’gefängnislose Gesellschaft’). Broda established a modernized penal system by building a few new prisons and modernizing existing ones (Gratz, 2010).

To provide an historical overview of developments in the penal system according to changes in relevant laws, I focus on the two most important legislative texts which are commonly considered as the fundaments of the Austrian penal system: the Criminal Code and the Correctional Services Act – as well as their amendments. Additionally, the Juvenile Court Law (‘Jugendgerichtsgesetz’) of 1988 – which regulates the imprisonment of juveniles below the age of 18 years – the Code of Criminal Procedure which regulates, for example, issues of custody, the Financial Crime Act (‘Finanzstrafgesetz’), and the Administrative Penal Act have also had some impact on the penal system (see Drexler, 2010).
Currently, the main regulatory text within the penal system is still the Correctional Services Act from 1969. Despite several amendments, it has been criticized for being archaic and outdated. For example, guidelines regulating opportunities for inmates to be better connected with the outside world through the use of modern communication media is still completely nonexistent (Drexler, 2014). Over the years, however, there have been several important revisions to the Austrian Criminal Law Amendment (‘Strafrechtsänderungsgesetze’) (e.g., 1975 or 1987), which have also had a substantial impact on the Correctional Services Act.

The most important regulations before and after the fundamental reform of the Austrian Correctional Services Act 1969 are summarized in Table 1. These regulations constitute the main resources, restrictions, and ‘tools’ for prison managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920/1928</td>
<td>First-time introduction of probation, suspended sentences, and Juvenile Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 (taking effect in 1970)</td>
<td>Initial version of a complete Correctional Services Act (‘Strafvollzugsgesetz'; StVG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Amendments to the Correctional Services Act: alignment of the Correctional Services Act with the new criminal code; abolishment of particularly severe forms of incarceration; introduction of a universal form of imprisonment – the prison sentence (‘Freiheitsstrafe’); conversion of work camps (‘Arbeitshaus’) into establishments for dangerous reoffenders (‘Anstalt für gefährliche Rückfalltäter’); introduction of a novel section on preventive measures; additional provisions concerning suspended sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Reform of the Criminal Code – supplementation of prison sentences with preventive forms of imprisonment (‘vorbeugende freiheitsentziehende Maßnahmen’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic and extensive reform and modernization of the Austrian criminal code; emphasis on the principle of fault (‘Schuldprinzip’) and the preventive purpose of the Criminal Code; redefinition of both offences and sanctions (e.g., Miklau, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Adaptation of remuneration for the work of inmates (§52); amendment of both Correctional Services Act and Criminal Code; introduction of parole (‘bedingte Entlassung’) with simultaneous reduction of the minimum penalty from six to three months; adaptation of several other provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Further reform of the Criminal Code, particularly the Juvenile Court Law (‘Jugendgerichtsgesetz'; JGG); acknowledgement of recent insights from developmental psychology; introduction of out-of-court settlements (‘außergerichtlicher Tatausgleich’) for minor crimes (Miklau, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/1990/1991</td>
<td>Ongoing amendments regarding remuneration of work, and the right of prisons to withhold parts of inmates’ remuneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Substantial amendments to the Correctional Services Act: e.g., provisions concerning temporary absences from prison, facilitation of exchange with the outside world, unemployment insurance, work remuneration, regulations concerning foreign inmates, establishments of commissions in the provinces (‘Bundesländer’) for the supervision of the penal system, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amendments to the Strafprozessänderungsgesetz: reform of pre-trial detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Introduction of alternatives to imprisonment, such as compensatory work (‘Ersatzleistungsstrafe’) and community work (‘gemeinnützige Arbeit’) as a way of reducing the number of inmates; extension of release on parole; organizational changes concerning the responsibilities of specialist teams and directorate for penal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Introduction of electronic tagging (§156); novel provisions concerning withholding of remuneration and alimentation after release</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Important modifications to Austrian law
4.1.2 The current state and central characteristics of the Austrian penal system

4.1.2.1 Structure of the penal system

In terms of its organizational and political embeddedness, the penal system is part of the judiciary, which is – according to the trias political principle in a country under the rule of law (‘Rechtsstaat’) – the third pillar of the state, besides legislature and executive. It is important to note that “the judicial system is separate on all levels from the administrative system” (FMJ, 2014: 7).

The Austrian penal system comprises 27 prisons. Most of them are regional court prisons (‘Gerichtliche Gefangenenhäuser’) connected to regional courts and accommodate people in pre-trial detention and those with a maximum sentence of 18 months. Some are correctional facilities (‘Strafvollzugsanstalten’) dedicated to the incarceration of male inmates with prison sentences of 18 months to life. Involuntary forensic placement facilities (‘Maßnahmenvollzug’) houses psychologically disturbed inmates. There is also one prison that exclusively houses juveniles; and one prison for female inmates. In addition, there are 13 small outposts (‘Außenstellen’) attached to individual prisons (FMJ, 2016).

Each of the nine Austrian provinces (‘Bundesländer’) operates at least one prison (e.g., Vorarlberg and Tyrol), with a maximum of ten prisons in Lower Austria. Prisons are only part of the Austrian penal system. Another critical component is the Austrian judicial system, which consists of public prosecution offices (representing the public interest), courts of law, probationary service (in the Austrian case this task has been devolved to the private non-profit organization ‘Verein Neustart’ (‘A New Start – Probationary Services, Conflict Solution and Social Work’), but is still under the supervision of the Federal Ministry of Justice (FMJ, 2014)), the Federal Cartel Prosecutor (‘Bundeskartellanwalt’), and the Supervisory Authority for Collecting Societies (‘Aufsichtsbehörde für Verwertungsgesellschaften’) (FMJ, 2014)\(^\text{11}\). Whereas “prisons are responsible for enforcing penal sentences [...] [the probationary facility] takes care of persons with conditional sentences and prisoners released on probation” (FMJ, 2014:7). However, ‘Verein Neustart’ provides not only probationary service, “they also offer services in connection with out-of-court settlement of offences, assistance to persons released from prison, and they provide housing facilities” (FMJ, 2014: 17). Figure 2 summarizes the Austrian justice and penal system.

---

\(^\text{11}\) The final two are only listed for the sake of completeness. For the objective of this thesis, their role in the penal system is insubstantial.
In July 2015, a Directorate General for the Administration of Custodial Sentences and Measures involving Deprivation of Liberty (‘Generaldirektion für den Strafvollzug und den Vollzug freiheitsentziehender Maßnahmen’), in short Directorate General12, was established and replaced the Directorate for Penal Services (‘Vollzugsdirektion’) in order to support and counsel the Federal Minister of Justice (see Figure 3 below). “It is the highest operational authority of the Austrian penal system, exercises strategic management functions and serves as prison staff and technical supervision body in the enforcement of penal services and involuntary forensic placements” (FMJ, 2014: 17). This restructuring led to substantial media attention and controversial discussions within the penal system.

12 „The Directorate General also covers medical superintendence and the assessment and evaluation office for violent and sex offenders” [FMJ, 2016: 9].

---

**Figure 2: The Austrian justice and penal system**

**Figure 3: Directorate for Penal Services vs. Directorate General (adapted from FMJ)**
4.1.2.2 Tasks and duties of the Austrian penal system

The duties and purposes of prisons are regulated in § 20 of the Correctional Services Act. The three main functions are (very similar to the general purposes of prisons) safety, punishment, and rehabilitation – which are often contradictory and conflicting. This inherent paradoxical nature is often called the antinomy of imprisonment purposes (‘Antinomie der Strafzwecke’) within the literature (Gratz, 2014). The Austrian penal system focuses on crime prevention and resocialization of delinquent persons instead of retributive justice (but of course also has to ensure safety and control). According to this mandate, it is believed that inmates should not be ‘locked up’ in their cells – instead, they should be given adequate support, fair treatment, and occupational training. This means, for instance, that they should have a workplace, an opportunity for education, and access to therapy and even sports facilities. In addition, it is believed that inmates’ lives should be structured with daily routines and that they should spend as much time as possible outside their cells – with a minimum of one hour a day by law (FMJ, 2016).

The aim is to provide inmates with the care and treatment necessary to be successfully rehabilitated – in order to avoid repeat offences. For inmates with a prison sentence of more than two years, prison managers develop individual correctional implementation plans to help and prepare them for their release. In addition, prisons are required by law to have an ‘educational mission’, which stipulates that inmates be provided with opportunities for education and professional skills training. They are also expected to provide inmates with visitation rights (i.e., with family and friends) and to support them in realizing their wrongdoing; and, if necessary, offer therapeutically treatment (for drug abuse, etc.) (FMJ, 2016).

4.1.2.3 Some key facts about the Austrian penal system

Prison population: Austrian prisons houses approximately 8,800 inmates (approx. 0.1% of Austria’s total population of 8.66 million). About 6,000 are serving a prison sentences (67.6%), 1,800 are pre-trial detainees (20.4%), and 800 are detained in involuntary forensic placement (9.0%). On average, 300 inmates are electronically tagged (3.5%)\textsuperscript{13}. About half of them (52.8%) are not Austrian citizens (27.1% EU citizens, 30.3% non-EU citizens, and 0.8% unknown citizenship); about 5.8% of inmates are female; less than 2.00% are juveniles (1.4%)\textsuperscript{14} (FMJ, 2016); and approximately five per cent are young adults (between 18 and 21 years) (FMJ, 2014).

\textsuperscript{13}Prison population as of 1 June 2016
\textsuperscript{14}Prison population and citizenship 2015
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For all able-bodied inmates (with the exception of those in pre-trial detention), work is compulsory. "For their work, prisoners earn remuneration which they may use to buy basic daily necessities, but also to build up reserves, which are to help them to return to an orderly life after serving their prison term" (FMJ, 2014:17). Most prisons have a variety of workshops, including kitchens, laundry services, carpentry workshops, and car repair shops. However, there are also opportunities for inmates to work in companies outside of the prison during the day (FMJ, 2014). This latter option has the advantage of enabling inmates to keep the job after their release.

Prison Staff: The Austrian penal service employs about 3,900 prison staff, which can be broken down into three groups. The first group is prison officers. Approximately 3,100 (80%) are prison officers whose job is not only to supervise inmates, but also to work in workshops and enterprises. This dual role means that prison officers serve as formal vocational trainers. The second group is the support or professional service staff ('Betreuungs-o der Fachdienste') (11%), which includes psychologists, physicians, caregivers, social workers, pedagogues, and teachers. "Their mission is to provide professional care for prisoners from a medical, psychological, social worker and educational perspective" (FMJ, 2016: 40). Additionally, about 300 professionals (58 are doctors, 101 are nursing staff, 38 are psychologists, and the others are social workers, occupational therapists, etc.) are employed by a judicial support agency ('Justizbetreuungsargen tur'). Finally, the third group is administrative service staff (8%) (FMJ, 2016).

Human resources comprise the largest expense item in the penal budget. In 2015, almost half of the budget (206 million euros out of 444 million euros) was spent on staffing. By comparison, prisons have very little revenues with about 56 million euros. About 60% of the so-called ‘correctional service contributions’ are deducted from the work remuneration of inmates which they have to pay as contribution towards the cost of correctional services. On average, an inmate in custody or in forensic placement costs about 123 euros per day (FMJ, 2016).

4.1.3 The Austrian penal system and its reforms: Trials and errors

In 1999, there was an attempt to reform the Austrian penal system in order to improve administrative processes. A strategy project was introduced to define general missions and functions between the different departments involved in the penal system. Although several ideas for improvement were suggested, very few of them were eventually implemented (Gratz, 2011). The fact that each prison manager has to cooperate with a considerable number (between eight to ten) of different directorates in three different departments within the Federal Ministry makes decision making and the implementation of projects very difficult. The aim of the reform was to reduce the challenges of coordination and collaboration. It was suggested to either establish a
Directorate General within the Federal Ministry of Justice, or create an intermediate agency, the Directorate for Penal Services. Despite a number of counter arguments, the decision was made to create a Directorate for Penal Services for two reasons: first, it was argued that the new management unit should be governed by a mixture of different professionals, like lawyers, psychologists, business economists as well as high-ranking prison officers; second, prison officers anticipated better career options in the Directorate for Penal Services than in the Directorate General (Gratz, 2011).

In 2007, the Directorate for Penal Services was established. The director and the vice-director at the top of the organization were supported by five departments (support, security, human resources, business and economic agendas, and projects). Although prison managers had demanded clear structures and responsibilities (e.g., to be assigned a specific contact person, have a clear division of tasks, etc.) this was never realized. Overall, the Directorate for Penal Services was not as effective as expected. Even the organizational culture did not improve substantially. There are still conflicts between prison managers and staff council regarding staff recruitment (Gratz, 2011). Finally, on July 1st, 2015, the Directorate for Penal Services was replaced by the new Directorate General.

Apart from the Directorate General, several other projects have been planned but never implemented. To give two examples: The first project mainly focused on a less bureaucratic human resource management. The aim was to cut out one hierarchical operative level, and establish a staff pool in order to use staff in a more flexible way (wherever they are needed). Also, a new model of duty hours should have been implemented. Although the project enjoyed popularity within the Federal Ministry of Justice, it was never implemented (see also, Gratz, 2014).

The second project, preparation for release, was also never realized. This project aimed to achieve better cooperation between prisons and probationary services, in order to create an integration plan for each inmate (Gratz, 2011). These examples show that despite several innovative ideas the penal system was hard to reform.

### 4.1.3.1 New public management (NPM) in the Austrian penal system

One of the main reforms implemented in the Austrian penal system was influenced by the NPM movement. The idea was to implement management instruments from the private sector to increase efficiency. The implementation of ‘*Flexi-Einheiten*’ (‘flexible units’), in particular, was an innovative step which gained a lot of positive feedback (Gratz, 2011). In 1999, Austria introduced the so-called ‘*Flexibilisierungsklausel*’ (for a general overview of budget reform in Austria see, e.g., Seiwald, Meyer, Hammerschmid, Egger-Peitler, & Höllerer, 2013) which allowed public departments to use their resources in a more flexible and efficient way. These Flexi-Einheiten
were characterized, for instance, by introducing concepts of performance, allowing public sector organizations to use their income and reserves at their own discretion (Promberger, Greil, & Nadeje, 2008), and, consequently, assigning them more responsibility overall (Hammerschmid, Egger-Peitler, & Höllerer, 2008). Having created a framework of limited autonomy, the ‘Flexibilisierungsklausel’ facilitated the introduction of performance-oriented management. Instead of the traditional input-management system (management by resources) as represented by the bureaucracy model of Max Weber, the focus of management was shifted to outputs (products and services like, for instance, security measures, quality of counseling) and outcomes (impact and values like, for instance, number of successful resocializations, decrease in crime) (e.g., Nullmeier, 2005; Promberger, Greil, & Simon, 2005). This idea is fully incorporated, for instance, in the so-called ‘3-E-Concept’: economy (control of costs), efficiency (evaluation of productivity by comparing input with output), and effectiveness (evaluation of achieving objectives by comparing planned with actual outcome) (Budäus, 2002). According to Schilhan (2010), organizations using the Flexibilisierungsklausel have had extremely positive effects as well as shown improved results (e.g., higher employee motivation or higher achievement and performance orientation) (see also, Gratz, 2011). Four out of the 27 prisons in Austria were organized as Flexi-Einheiten (Sankt Pölten, Sonnberg, Leoben, and Graz-Jakomini) by the end of 2012. Beginning in 2013, the second stage of the recent federal budgetary reform was initiated. There, the ideas of the ‘Flexibilisierungsklausel’ were incorporated into the new ‘Haushaltsgrundsätze’ to develop a uniform system (Schilhan, 2010).

In the wake of NPM, several attempts at reform have directly targeted cost effectiveness. Nevertheless, this development cannot be observed in any substantial extent in countries with a strong ‘Rechtsstaat’ tradition (e.g., Hammerschmid & Meyer, 2005; Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a) – including Germany and Austria. In the latter, the management of prisons ranks among the core tasks of the government and, consequently, privatization in this area does not correspond with the traditional understanding of the role of the state and the specific legal system (Gratz, Held, & Pilgram, 2001). In many cases, privatization merely covers areas like catering, medical treatment, laundry service, and cleaning (Dünkel, 2010). As mentioned before, apart from contextual factors, several studies support the view that private prisons are not managed significantly better (cheaper) than public ones (McDonald, 2008). Furthermore, the idea of integrating financial profit goals with the fulfillment of governmental core tasks is difficult to carry out (Sandmann, 2010).

4.1.3.2 Challenges and critics of the Austrian penal system
Compared to the courts and prosecution offices, prisons have – throughout their history – received a lot of criticism and are commonly described as insufficient and deficient organizations
In the following, I highlight four main challenges and weaknesses of the penal system. According to Gratz (2014) the difficulty of prison management lies in the combination and handling of a wide array of different service provisions and processes. Prison managers have to manage different departments, workshops, and care and treatment services – while also ensuring that tasks are adequately carried out by prison officers.

Since 2013, the principle of an ‘outcome orientation’ for governmental agencies has been enshrined in the federal budget law. The aim of this aspect of reform is to negotiate objectives and performance agreements with the ministry which requires outputs and outcomes to be achieved. However, adequate controlling tools to measure the degree to which prisons achieve their core task (imprisonment) are still missing within the penal system. Therefore, an outcome orientation is not yet a substantial issue or central focus in the prison system. Also, no quality measurement and assurance tools have been systematically implemented so far. Moreover, prison units are hard to compare. Not only do they differ substantially with regard to the different types of prisons and inmates, each prison manager may govern and manage his/her prison in a different way. Therefore, a great deal of variation exists with regard to, for instance, electronic tagging and relaxed regime detention, as well as work or leisure time activities for inmates (Gratz, 2014).

Gratz (2014) further suggests that if prisons were be governed in a consistent as well as intelligent way, it would be possible to increase the quality of the penal system without much effort and extra need for resources. He further contends that if most of the prisons would achieve only 80% to 90% of the standards of the very successful prisons in the relevant areas (e.g., work and education), the Austrian penal system would be in much better condition.

The final main issue concerns human resource management. There are several weaknesses which have received particular attention. First, there are no staff development programs. Besides the annual appraisal interview, which is prescribed by law, there are hardly any other tools available. Second, because staff recruitment is controlled by the staff council, hiring decisions are very bureaucratic, slow, and time-consuming. For prison managers, it might often be quicker and more efficient if they simply agree with the decisions of the staff council. Third, the penal system is plagued by high employee absentee rates. Lastly, it is still not clear whether prisons experience an actual lack of resources concerning their staff, or whether the inflexible system reinforces the scarcity (Gratz, 2014).

For prison management, this has a number of overall implications: Prison managers not only require a certain level of technical know-how about management, leadership, and organization, they also need skills to deal with abnormal behaviors (Gratz, 2014). Consequently, the complexity of dealing with a variety of subject matters – which may often be in contradiction with each other – can be considered to be an essential part of the occupation of prison manager. ‘Good’ prison management, accordingly, is substantially more difficult and comprehensive than
the management of other types of organizations and requires a high standard of modern management skills.

4.1.4 Complexities and competing rationalities in the Austrian penal system

Despite recent efforts in Austria concerned with cost saving, ‘good’ prison management is not only about this specific problem (or NPM aspects in general). Although cost efficiency is an essential topic for the public sector and the administration of prisons, the issue of prison management involves more stakeholders and their different needs and perceptions. Typically, such stakeholders include prison staff and management, inmates, the inmates’ families, the media, politicians, lawyers, the general public, etc. (e.g., Bryans, 2007). Due to the considerable number of divergent needs and claims of these different stakeholders, the existence of various competing rationalities, or logics, at the field level can be expected. Mehigan and Rowe (2007: 373), for instance, point out that what is good for society may not be what is good for criminal justice. To give an example, whereas for an inmate ‘good’ management could include having a bed, food, or the absence of violence (in the prison), for the public it could refer to an increased feeling of safety as well as the impression that justice has been served (which means prisons should not be too comfortable). Thus, it can be said that the various stakeholders have different understandings of ‘good’ management because of their divergent underpinning logics. Some of these aspects might be considered as more relevant ‘issues’ (in the sense of essentially contested topics; e.g., Hoffman, 1999; Meyer, 2004, 2008) in the Austrian context (e.g., cost saving), while others (e.g., acceptance of human rights) are included in a broader consensus on ‘good’ management and governance in Austrian prisons. Heterogeneity in perspectives on ‘good’ prison management is not restricted to organizational practice as it can also be found in extant literature. Books and papers on prison management are dedicated to various topics and perspectives, mirroring the pluralism found in organizational practice. The question is which institutional logics prevail in a certain context (or organizational field; e.g., DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Wooten & Hoffman, 2008)? How do organizations as well as prison managers handle the challenge of institutional pluralism; and maintain legitimacy and the capacity to act in the face of divergent and often contradictory demands (e.g., Greenwood et al., 2011)? In order to reconstruct the different perspectives on ‘good’ prison management, I use the concept of field-level logics. These field-level logics – as elaborated in the conceptual framework of this thesis – also manifest in organizations and have concrete impacts on the daily work of organizational actors. A second objective of this study is, therefore, to assess the ways in which the multiple logics found in the field are also experienced by prison managers. Specifically, which ones are perceived as being in a state of contradiction or at least tension?
4.2 Methodology and research strategy

Methodologically, this study is located within the interpretative research paradigm (e.g., Flick, 2014; Flick, von Kardorff, & Steinke, 2004; Froschauer & Lueger, 2009; Richards, 2015; Richards & Morse, 2013). The interpretive reconstruction of distinct logics (from data sources such as media articles and interview protocols) is the central methodological focus of this dissertation. Logics cannot be observed directly but manifest themselves in discourse in different ways (like, for instance, vocabularies, accounts, narratives, or figures of speech). Therefore, a discourse analytical strategy is used to address the aforementioned research question (for a general overview of discourse analysis see, e.g., Gee, 2014; Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Wodak & Meyer, 2016).

According to Grant, Keenoy, and Oswick (2001: 8), "the important role of discourse [...] [is] constructing and maintaining social reality". Organizations only exist "as their members create them through discourse. This is not to claim that organizations are 'nothing but' discourse, but rather that discourse is the principal means by which organization members create a coherent social reality that frames their sense of who they are" (Mumby & Clair, 1997: 181). Despite the different forms of discourse analysis, all "are interested in the effects of discourse and in how particular ways of constructing meaning through language enable or prevent, empower or constrain, action" (Flick, 2014: 144). Discourse analysis concerns the reconstruction of meaning structures at an institutional, organizational, or social actor levels (Keller, 2011a), but is – despite containing the word 'analysis' – itself not a method of analysis in the technical sense. Therefore, two primary methods of text analysis (content analysis and hermeneutical analysis) are used as concrete analytical tools (for more details see below). As I will explain in more detail below, the content analytical part of my analysis involves both the reconstruction of the central building blocks of institutional logics as well as the most prominent metaphors used by prison managers in the field. The hermeneutical part of the analysis, in contrast, draws from a variant of discourse analysis grounded in the phenomenological sociology of knowledge (e.g., Keller, 2011b), and is, therefore, highly compatible with the epistemological foundations of institutional theory.

4.2.1 Sampling and data collection

The empirical analysis draws from an extensive data set that allows access to the prevalent meaning structures both at the field level of the Austrian penal system and the manager level of prison managers in Austria. I rely on two primary data sources: media articles drawn from a variety of Austrian newspapers and interviews with several (former) prison managers.

Media articles: In order to address the first part of the research question – the reconstruction of the relevant constellation of logics within the field –, I follow Meyer (2004) in focusing on the 'signifying work' happening in a particular field, and in using DiMaggio and Powell's (1983)
‘totality of relevant actors’ for defining the ‘issue field’ (Hoffman, 1999) as the sum of all actors that take part in the discussion of a particular issue. Such definition includes all actors constituting the prisons ‘authorizing environment’ (e.g., Moore, 1995) (e.g., the federal government, particularly the Federal Ministry of Justice, the public, judicial institutions, NGOs, etc.). As Meyer (2004) outlines, issue fields emerge around controversially discussed issues and encompass negotiations about which of all the different interpretations and attempts at sensegiving eventually succeed and stabilize. It is important to recognize, on the one hand, on whose behalf speakers in the media are using their voice; and, on the other hand, which issue(s) they are primarily talking about. Media articles allowed me to capture the actors mentioned in public discourse in connection with which specific topics, independent from what exactly they speak about.

The data collection process was conducted in two primary steps. First, I collected more than 700 newspaper articles from four different Austrian newspapers in the years 2004, 2009, and 2014. I used the wiso Presse – database to conduct a search for all newspaper articles dealing with prisons in Austria (main keywords: ‘Gefängnis’; ‘Justizanstalt’; ‘Österreich’). This strategy generated more than 1,000 hits. After eliminating all redundancies, the totality of collected articles amounted to 746, which were then classified into 310 highly relevant articles, 277 relevant articles, and 159 irrelevant articles (for more details, see Tables I to III in the appendix). The longitudinal nature of my data allowed me to explore whether and how topics, stakeholders and even their language use might have changed over time. The choice of newspapers aims, on the one hand, to cover a broad range of audiences (e.g., with different social backgrounds) and, on the other, to cover most of the ongoing discourse by including daily and weekly newspapers, quality and tabloid newspapers as well as newspapers focused on exposure stories (e.g., Meyer, 2004). I chose Kronen Zeitung which is Austria’s most widely circulating tabloid newspaper. All articles were short and written in very simple language to appeal to a broader range of the population (Kronen Zeitung, 2015; see also Ulrich, 2014). Falter is a Viennese left-liberal minded newspaper. It is published once a week and is famous for its investigative journalism (Falter, 2017; see also Ulrich 2014). Die Presse is a traditional (since 1848) Austrian daily quality newspaper with a civil-liberal focus. Most of its readers have a higher or ever postsecondary education (Die Presse, 2017d; see also Ulrich, 2014). Finally, Kurier is – similar to Die Presse – a daily quality newspaper, which is also liberal as well as center right oriented. Although it tries to reach the general public, most of its readership has a high level of formal education (Kurier, 2016; see also Ulrich, 2014).

In a second step, I also collected all newspaper articles from the magazine Profil between 1970 to 2015 in order to see if institutional logics have changed over longer time spans. Profil is one of the most prominent weekly transregional magazines. Its readership mainly belongs to the social and economic elite, with higher than average levels of education. Like Falter, it has a left-
liberal approach and focuses on investigative journalism (Profil, 2017; Ulrich, 2014). Again, I used the *wiso Presse* – database and the *Profil* online browser; and searched for the same keywords as before. I also went to the library and manually scanned older articles, as the online database is only available starting in 1998. In total, I collected 210 newspaper articles and clustered them again into their level of relevant: highly relevant (36 articles), relevant (57 articles), and irrelevant (117 articles). For more detail, see Table IV in the appendix. *Table 2* below provides a detailed overview of all five newspapers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Die Presse</th>
<th>Falter</th>
<th>Kronen Zeitung</th>
<th>Kurier</th>
<th>Profil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Founding year</em></td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Frequency of publishing</em></td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Copies</em>: printed sold</td>
<td>78,963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>849,075</td>
<td>170,832</td>
<td>77,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67,633</td>
<td></td>
<td>748,821</td>
<td>131,613</td>
<td>67,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Circulation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amount</em></td>
<td>274,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>2,616,000</td>
<td>602,000</td>
<td>440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Political alignment</em></td>
<td>civil-liberal</td>
<td>left-liberal</td>
<td>variety of options (populist)</td>
<td>center right, liberal</td>
<td>left-liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Readership</em></td>
<td>higher educational attainment</td>
<td>higher than average education</td>
<td>mainstream, general public</td>
<td>diverse educational backgrounds</td>
<td>higher than average education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,2ÖAK (2017) – weekly average

*Table 2: Key characteristics of the print media*

**Interviews:** For the second part of the research question – the reconstruction of institutional logics enacted and metaphors used by prison managers in order to assess the complexity manifested in their shared narratives –, I shifted the focus from a stakeholder perspective (field level) to a managerial perspective (individual level). I conducted eight narrative interviews (e.g., Holtgrewe, 2006) with (former) prison managers from September 2014 to December 2014. Each interview lasted between 45 minutes and 95 minutes. All of them were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim (including every pause, slip of the tongue, etc.) which is important for a hermeneutical analysis as described below in more detail.

The composition of the sample, and consequently the case selection, is based on the principle of ‘theoretical sampling’ (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and the strategy of maximum difference. This means that the starting point for data collection and data interpretation is one specific case. This case is analyzed and afterward contrasted to other cases with the aim of achieving either a minimum level of variation between the cases (theory reliability) or a maximum level of variation (theory generalizability) (see also Lueger & Vettori, 2014). Further interview
partners or cases are only included in the study as long as they can be expected to add new information for a better understanding of the emerging system of meanings (for the ideas of ‘constant comparative method’ and ‘theoretical saturation’, see, e.g., Bowen, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). For pragmatic reasons (primarily the availability of interview partners), I conducted eight interviews in advance and started with the case analysis afterwards.

4.2.2 Data analysis – Methods and analytical procedures

For my empirical analysis, I use two primary and well-established tools of analysis within the qualitative paradigm: content analysis (e.g., Gläser & Laudel, 2010; Krippendorff, 2013; Mayring, 2010; Schreier, 2014) and hermeneutical analysis (inspired by, for instance, Oevermann, Allert, Konau, & Krambeck, 1979; see also Froschauer & Lueger, 2003; Lueger 2010; Lueger & Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, 1994; Lueger & Meyer, 2009). In the following sections, I provide a brief overview of each analytical approach and then go into more detail in the description of the analytical steps.

4.2.2.1 Methods

Content analysis: Content analysis is a common method within qualitative social research. It is an “unobtrusive technique that allows researchers to analyze relatively unstructured data in view of the meanings, symbolic qualities, and expressive contents they have and of the communicative roles they play in the lives of the data’s sources” (Krippendorff, 2013: 49). Content analysis was originally devised to analyze large amounts of text. Therefore, its roots go back to the time when the mass media was established. At the beginning, the idea was based on a quantitative approach. However, main opponents pointed out that a purely quantitative form of analysis was unable to consider varying meanings in different text segments. Therefore, researchers such as Mayring developed a qualitative approach to content analysis at the beginning of the 1980s. His procedure differs from quantitative content analysis insofar as the theoretically reconstructed category system is constantly checked against the raw data and adapted accordingly. In this way, the general openness of qualitative methods is utilized for the development of an inductively derived system of coding categories (Gläser & Laudel, 2010). Nevertheless, Mayring’s content analysis is still often criticized because it retains many characteristics of a quantitative approach (e.g., Krippendorff, 2013).

Berelson (1952; quoted in Krippendorff, 2013: 50) lists 17 reasons for the use of content analysis, which include: “to describe trends in communication content [or] to compare media or levels of communication.” Holsti’s (1967; quoted in Krippendorff, 2013: 51) approach is very similar. He identifies three principal purposes:
“(1) To describe manifest characteristics of communication – that is, asking what, how, and to whom something is said; (2) To make inferences as to the antecedents of communication – that is, asking why something is said; (3) To make inferences as to the consequences of communication – that is, asking with what effects something is said”.

Despite a plethora of streams and analytical procedures referred to as content analysis, three main characteristics can be identified: “qualitative content analysis reduces data, it is systematic, and it is flexible” (Schreier, 2014: 170). The fact that content analysis is meant to actually reduce data differentiates it from a variety of other qualitative techniques which commonly add to, or at least contextualize data (see, for instance, hermeneutical analysis below). Instead, the researcher ‘compresses’ the data in order to focus on those aspects of meaning that are of direct relevance for the respective research question. The systematic nature of content analysis requires that the whole data set is systematically examined, instead of focusing on individual parts (again, for a different approach, see hermeneutical analysis below). In contrast to more open research methods, content analysis often relies on a specific set of analytical steps that are often iterative and repeated in a cyclical manner. Finally, despite its systematic character, qualitative content analysis is more flexible than comparable quantitative approaches. Instead of deductively coding for pre-existing categories, codes are usually created through constant iterations of comparing the emerging theory to the material. This ensures that interpretations are always firmly grounded in the data, but are also anchored in the emerging conceptual explanations (Schreier, 2014).

For this study, I combine standard qualitative content analysis with an adapted procedure for extracting metaphors from the material. The analysis of metaphors has increased in qualitative social sciences over the years, and particularly in discourse analysis. Despite gaining importance, metaphor analysis (Kruse et al., 2011) does not have a standard analytical procedure. My analytical take, accordingly, starts from the seminal definition of Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 3), which identifies metaphor as a specific form of language, thought, and action:

“Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish – a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Moreover, metaphors is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason, most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in though and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in term of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.”

As outlined in the conceptual framework, metaphors have the ability to transfer not only literal but also specific meanings in order to make sense. Schmieder (2007) points out that metaphor analysis, on the one hand, includes rhetorical devices like metonymy, synecdoche, similarities/comparison, antonomasia, and personification. On the other hand, it excludes so-called lexicalized metaphors, like for example ‘chair leg’, because a chair leg is a chair leg, and nothing else, even though the word’s origin is metaphorical. In the analysis of metaphors, I apply the definitions and boundaries elaborated in chapter 3.2.2 to the coding of my data. As I will describe in more detail in my analytical steps, I use such broad coding rules to identify common
metaphors in the discourse, and categorize them with regard to the source domain to which they refer.

**Hermeneutical analysis:** The strand of hermeneutical analysis applied in this study is originally based on an objective hermeneutic approach. Its primary aim is to “reconstruct latent structures of meaning that underlie social practices and subjective meanings” (Lueger, Sandner, Meyer, & Hammerschmid, 2005: 1147; see also Oevermann, 2002). For the interpretation process, the focus lies on ‘text’ components. However, ‘text’ in a hermeneutical sense does not mean only written language per se, like interview transcripts or statute laws. A ‘text’ can also be a video, pictures or artefacts like buildings (e.g., Lueger & Vettori, 2014; Maiwald, 2005; Meyer, Höllerer, Jancsary, & van Leeuwen, 2013). Consequently, it is not necessary to analyze the whole 'text' in detail, because “the relevant meaning structures are at least latently represented in every component of the material” (Lueger & Vettori, 2014: 32; building on Oevermann, 2002).

The hermeneutical approach consists of three key characteristics: First, the text has to be divided into small units of analysis, and for each analytical part criteria of validity must be generated (Lueger & Vettori, 2014). Second, hermeneutical analysis is based on the principle of ‘extensive interpretation’. This means that for each meaningful element of text, it is important to gain as many different ‘ways of reading’ as possible; and, for there to be no ‘true’ or ‘false’ interpretation. Interpretations are narrowed down as the analysis proceeds, with ‘implausible’ meanings becoming continuously excluded on the basis of text further down the sequence. It is important to constantly reflect on the findings and also the method in a critical way as the interpreter’s previous or theoretical knowledge might have an influence on the interpretation (cf. Oevermann, 2002; Lueger & Vettori, 2014). Third, in order to reconstruct the underlying meaning structures it is important to stick to a chronological order. “This principle is owed to the assumption that structures of meaning also follow a principle of sequentiality” (cf. Overmann, 2002 quoted in Lueger & Vettori, 2014: 33). Following Vettori (2012), this means that not all parts of a text must be interpreted as they might not be important for the research question or the information may be reductant. However, it is not advisable to go back to an earlier sequence of the text as the gained knowledge about the case might influence the interpretation (see also Lueger & Vettori, 2014).

### 4.2.2.2 Analytical steps and procedures

In order to answer my research questions, my analytical procedures fall into two major blocks of analysis. First, I analyze the media articles (field-level data) with content analysis approach, and second, I analyze my interviews (manager-level data) using content analysis and hermeneutic
analysis. Within each of these two blocks, the analysis proceeds in several steps. As common in qualitative research, the analytical procedure is presented in a linearized way, although actual analysis proceeded in a more cyclical manner and involved several iterations of ‘going back and forth’ between analytical steps – and even between the two major blocks of analysis in order to enhance the validity of results.

**Block 1: Analyzing the newspaper articles.**

As mentioned before, I use two different samples of newspaper articles in order to answer my research question. I started my analysis with a collection of newspaper articles from *Die Presse, Falter, Kurier, and Kronen Zeitung* from 2004, 2009, and 2014. All newspapers were downloaded from the *wiso Presse* – database and read carefully. I clustered them according to their relevant – highly relevant (meaning having an impact on management), relevant (related to prisons), and irrelevant (article is not about Austria or it is about an unrelated topic like police detention). In the next step, I identified (if available) the author’s name, date of the newspaper article, topic(s), and all actors mentioned in the article. This allowed me to gain a general understanding of the field and the issues within the discourse, which was helpful to develop general guidelines for my interviews.

Furthermore, in order to reconstruct institutional logics at the field level and explore whether and how the constellation of logics has changed over time, I conducted content analysis across all newspaper articles from *Profil* between 1970 and 2015. Again I clustered them into highly relevant, relevant, and irrelevant. Like the other newspaper articles, I identified the author’s name, date of the article, and the topic. However, in contrast to the to other articles, I did not identify the actors mentioned; but, instead, analyzed all speakers and their explicitly voiced opinions in order to show who says what about which issue.

For the reconstruction of the institutional logics pervading the field – the core part of my analysis – I then applied a coding procedure inspired both by grounded theory (e.g., Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and Mayring’s (2010) variant of content analysis. I only analyzed the highly relevant newspaper articles in detail and started by dividing texts into relevant units of analysis (‘units of meaning’) according to ‘switches’ between topics in the article. Through multiple rounds of paraphrasing passages, I reduced texts to highly compressed and abstracted collections of meaningful codes. Throughout this process of reduction and abstraction, I was guided by my research topic, which was the management of prisons. Eventually, the central meanings of each article could be expressed as a set of codes, each of which represents a specific aspect of the public discussion on prisons in Austria. After the first round of coding – what Saldana (2009) calls a ‘first cycle’ and Glaser and Strauss (1967) term ‘open coding’ – the central ‘pillars’ of the emerging
discourse became apparent. I then conducted a second round of coding – ‘second cycle’ or ‘selective coding’ – in which I continuously and systematically compared the codes generated in the first round and refined them in order to arrive at a reduced number of codes that were consistently applied throughout all articles and were used as the basis of creating an elaborate system of categories – which I grouped and understood as the ‘building blocks’ of distinct institutional logics in the field. Such procedures correspond to ‘patterned coding’ according to Saldana (2009), which already includes drawing inferences in order to identify emergent themes, configurations, or explanations. The result was a smaller and manageable number of themes and categories. In the third step of coding (‘theoretical coding’), I interpreted the codes generated so far in light of the institutional logics perspective and aggregated them in a way that fit the model of the interinstitutional system proposed by Thornton et al. (2012). Essentially, I (re-)arranged ‘building blocks’ in a manner that helped me identify their central similarities and differences, which eventually enabled me to ‘fill in’ the characteristics of each logic on the Y-axis of Thornton et al.’s (2012) model. The complete coding process was supported by the qualitative analysis software MAXQDA.

**Block 2: Analyzing the interviews**

The second analytical block was devoted to the systematic analysis of the interviews. This process was conducted in three main steps: Hermeneutical analysis, standard content analysis, and metaphor analysis. As my content analytical procedure was basically the same as in the first block, I focus here on explaining the hermeneutical parts of the analysis and only go into the content analysis part briefly.

**Hermeneutical analysis:** I started the analysis of my interviews with an in-depth hermeneutical analysis because such approach requires that the researcher is as unfamiliar with the data as possible in order to facilitate extensive interpretations. The strength of hermeneutical analysis is that it provides access to deeper, more latent levels of meaning than standard content analysis, which commonly focuses on manifest aspects of texts. The main advantages of the hermeneutical part of my analysis was twofold. First, it served to sensitize me to the main dimensions of social meanings that underlie the understanding of prison managers in my sample. This was a useful resource for identifying and distinguishing institutional logics in the subsequent content analysis. Second, the findings from hermeneutical analysis also facilitated a more in-depth understanding of the manifest statements found within the interview and was therefore useful in identifying contradictions and tensions between logics. For instance, the central tension between the need to flexibly adapt to emergency situations and the distinct understanding of organizational unity as ‘silos’ which allowed for a clear assignment of blame would have remained largely hidden had analysis only focused on analyzing the explicit content of the interviews.
To analyze interview protocols, I used three hermeneutical tools as described in more detail below. The detailed steps for fine structure analysis and system analysis are provided in Table 3. For both analytical tools I adapted Froschauer and Lueger’s steps of hermeneutic analysis (Froschauer & Lueger, 2003; see also Lueger, 2010; Lueger et al., 2005). The steps of my subsequent topic analysis are detailed in Table 4. According to Lueger (2010), interpretation rules should be seen as heuristics; this means that there is not ‘one’ way to interpret and analyze a case, but that interpretation is guided by specific principles. All my methods are based on Froschauer and Lueger (2003; Lueger, 2009, 2010), however, I modified the methods to fit my research context and research question(s). For pragmatic reasons, I conducted and analyzed all the interviews myself. However, to ensure the validity of my interpretations I had regular meetings with other researchers who have been working with hermeneutical methods for a long time. Furthermore, I interpreted at least one passage within each case within a group of different people. All of them had specific backgrounds, which helped me to gain a lot of different ‘ways of reading’.

**Fine structure analysis** is a tool for interpreting small units of a text. The main aim is to reconstruct and analyze the underlying meaning structures in a very fine-grained way. In the first step, I selected specific sections of each text (around 5 to 10 lines). According to Lueger (2010), this could be either a start of a dialog, an end of an interaction section, an unsuspicious or a very prominent part of a text (e.g., abrupt change in style). Afterwards I broke these text down to their smallest units of meaning while still maintaining their import (see also Lueger & Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, 1994), like a word or even a short sentence. Each unit of meaning was then analyzed separately (one by one) and in detail without prior knowledge of how the text proceeds (‘principle of deconstruction’). Each unit of meaning helps to understand the structure and the underlying logics of the case by generating new hypotheses, endorsing, modifying or even rejecting them (Lueger, 2010; see also Lueger et al., 2005).

**System analysis** can be seen as a modification of fine structure analysis. Whereas fine structure analysis focuses on the reconstruction of highly latent meaning structures within the text, system analysis concentrates on the process dynamics of complex social systems, like an organization. Furthermore, it is possible to examine bigger amounts of text. This usually comprises entire interviews instead of only small parts. For this reason, fine structure analysis and system analysis can be usefully combined. I broke individual interviews down to topic-related units (maximum of half a page) – for example every new sequence of an issue – and analyzed those parts as a whole. In contrast to fine structure analysis, it is possible to interpret without a group; however it is advisable to discuss preliminary results with other people (Lueger 2010; Lueger et al., 2005, Lueger & Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, 1994).
### Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Typical questions to be asked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Paraphrase (Focus: manifest content) | What is the information in the unit according to everyday meaning?  
Which issue has been chosen? |
| 2 Intention of the interviewee (Focus: typified subjective meaning – what is the intention of the interviewee) | Taking the viewpoint of the interviewee:  
What could s/he want to say without explicitly speaking it out?  
What could s/he thereby want to point out to the interviewer?  
What are her/his interests? |
| 3 Extensive interpretation: Latent elements of the unit analyzed and objective consequences for behavior (or the system) (Focus: typified objective meaning – what is the underlying meaning) | What are the typical conditions under which such a statement is perceived as meaningful?  
What elements of social meaning are included in the text beyond the typified intentions?  
What are the different meanings that unfold if the unit is read with varying intonation?  
Linguistic characteristics:  
Meaning of generalization (like: one, everybody, people, etc.)  
Are the verbs explicit enough (regarding who, whom, what)?  
Specific grammar used: active/passive voice, conditional clauses, etc.  
Other linguistic specificities: use of words, dialect, repetitions, breaking off, slips of the tongue, etc.  
Which people and issue are mentioned?  
All other possible meanings of the unit |
| 4 What are the consequences for the subsequent unit of meaning? | What are the possibilities to carry on? How could the narrator proceed?  
What statements could be expected?  
Are there any restrictions? |

**Table 3: Interpretation scheme for fine structure analysis and system analysis**

*Topic analysis* is a very fruitful tool to gain an overview of – manifest as well as more latent – topics within a text, analyze their characteristics and main arguments, and explore their context. Those key characteristics are very useful to reduce and summarize content as well as the amount of text by showing how topics are discussed in a similar or different kind of way between or even within an interview (Lueger, 2010). I also used topic analysis to reconstruct additional latent meanings. However, instead of focusing on small segments of the text or a short sequence, I used a larger amount of text – related to one topic (‘issue block’) – for interpretation, something that is covered neither by the fine structure analysis, nor by the system analysis. Accordingly, I looked for topics of interest to answer my research questions. Afterwards, I used my interpretation scheme for topic analysis following every single step (see Table 4): First, I started by analyzing every ‘issue block’ separately by utilizing the first four steps dealing with questions about the topic, context, characteristics, and visuals. Second, I matched all issues within a case and continued with questions about contextualization (step 5). Finally, I compared all issue blocks within and between the cases in order to find similarities and differences and also to link them in a broader way to my research questions (steps 6 and 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Typical questions to be asked for every issue block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Paraphrase</td>
<td>What is the topic of the block?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Context</td>
<td>Who mentioned the topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In which context was the topic mentioned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Characteristics</td>
<td>What are the main characteristics (meaning the most important components of the topic description)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Visuals</td>
<td>Imagery: What kind of verbal images are used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context: Short description of what they stand for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life-world context:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is their ‘typical’ context of usage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the underlying logic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What should this picture evoke in this context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contextualization</td>
<td>In which broader context was the topic mentioned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who carries on with this thematization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which actors are associated with this topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What could be the reasons for that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHRONOLOGICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any specific structural connections in the order of a topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there any change of subjects or following connotations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any specific argumentation structures that can be identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the internal context of a topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What could be possible reasons why this topic was mentioned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which logic can be identified by analyzing the internal structure of how the topic was discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Comparative Analysis</td>
<td>DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are there any differences in topics or ways of dealing with a topic within or between the discussions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPLANATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of underlying logics can be found behind different descriptions of topics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Summary</td>
<td>How can the results of the analysis be included into the context of the research question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are topics, characteristics as well as contextual conditions connected?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Interpretation scheme for topic analysis

**Content and metaphor analysis:** In order to compare the field and individual levels, I also divided my interviews into small units of meaning (like short sentences or paragraphs) and coded them step by step. In this part of the analysis, I originally built on the codes used in my media analysis, but constantly extended the coding scheme whenever I encountered meanings that could not be classified with existing codes. Furthermore, I identified for every unit of analysis (in total 438): the central topic, specific vocabularies and conspicuous language used, analogical expressions that fit into the forms “prison is...”, or “prison is not”, and the metaphors used. The identification of logics proceeded analogically to the first block of analysis (media analysis). Overall, I found a
much stronger focus on management topics in the interviews, which led to the identification of additional logics at the manager level that did not appear as distinctly at the field level (for further details, see my findings).

For capturing metaphors, I built on Kruse et al. (2011) who suggested the following analytical steps: 1) identifying and collecting the relevant parts, 2) categorizing, 3) abstracting, and 4) interpretation and reintegration. After identifying metaphors in the text, I collected all words which I classified as metaphors in an Excel sheet and again scrutinized word by word whether it could be classified as a metaphor in general, and whether it constituted a still ‘living’ metaphor, in particular. I excluded ‘dead’ or ‘lexicalized’ metaphors from the sample because these have become part of everyday language and can, accordingly, not be expected to be a useful tool for dealing with institutional contradictions. However, in order to be as inclusive as possible, I followed Schmieder (2007) who argues that comparisons and idioms can also be included in metaphor analysis within the social sciences.

Whenever it was unclear whether a word was used metaphorically, I went back to the data and checked the context of use again. In addition, as a quality check, I asked colleagues to classify them as ‘living’ metaphor, ‘dead metaphor’, or ‘no metaphor’. I then categorized the remaining metaphorical expressions into 16 main categories and 57 subcategories which relate to ‘source domains’ and specific parts of source domains, respectively (for details and examples, see Table 20 in chapter 5.5.1). Kruse and colleagues (2011) point out that is very important to finish the identification and collection process before starting with categorization. Otherwise, there is a higher risk of overlooking words – as we tend to look for those categories and words we have already found before. Finally, in the interpretation and reintegration step, I scrutinized the function of the particular metaphor within the respective part of the interview. Due to the specific focus of my thesis, I adapted this step to reconstruct patterns linking metaphor and logics.
V  Findings

"In general terms, the extent to which a criminal justice system makes use of prison as a punishment may say a great deal about the view which civil society has of itself. An excessive use of imprisonment may indicate that a society is insecure or is punitive; that it wishes to exclude everyone whose behaviour is seen as a threat to what is considered to be the norm." (Coyle, 2002: 45)

In this dissertation, I investigate which competing understandings of ‘good’ prison management can be found in the Austrian discourse, and how prison managers respond to the institutional pluralism involved. I use two different types of data to answer my research questions (for an overview, see Table 5). For the first part, I relied on newspaper articles. My analysis was twofold: on the one hand, I focused on a historical overview in order to reconstruct the constellation of institutional logics during four different decades at the field level. This allowed me to show how the logics at the field level shifted over time. I used newspaper articles published in Profil between 1970 until 2015. I was particularly interested in the speakers within the media. On the other hand, I also collected newspapers articles from Die Presse, Falter, Kurier, and Kronen Zeitung from the years 2004, 2009, and 2014. In contrast to Profil, these articles were not part of the reconstruction of the field-level logics; instead I focused on the actors and topics mentioned within the discourse to gain better insight into the Austrian penal system. This was necessary in order to compare my results from the interviews with the media discourse (the relevant period of time in the interviews as well as of the second part of the media analysis were the years between 2000 and 2014).

In order to answer the second part of my research question – how institutional complexity is manifested in the shared narratives of prison managers – I focused on my interview transcripts. I shifted my focus of interest from the field level to the individual level. For the second sub-question, which refers to the relationship between these two levels, I also utilized the results from the media analysis.
RQ1: Which competing understandings of ‘good’ prison management can be found in the Austrian discourse?

RQ2: How does this complexity manifest in the shared narratives of prison managers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of logics at the field level</th>
<th>SQ2: Which logics can be found at the manager level?</th>
<th>SQ4: What is the relationship between logics that are invoked and the metaphors used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media I</td>
<td>When 2014</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Historical case (1970-2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which</td>
<td>Profil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>Building blocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td>To reconstruct the constellation of logics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Chapters 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SQ1: Who are the relevant actors in the field?

SQ2: How is the relationship between logics experienced at the manager level? Do these logics peacefully co-exist or can tensions be identified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media II</th>
<th>What Relationships between logics</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Focus 2004/2009/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which</td>
<td>Die Presse, Falter, Kronen Zeitung, Kurier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Actors mentioned¹⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>Topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td>To better understand the media discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>てるmost relevant for contextualizing the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Chapter 5.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQ4: What is the relationship between logics that are invoked and the metaphors used? Which metaphors are used to simply enact specific logics, and which metaphors help manage institutional pluralism?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Metaphors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why To investigate the enactment of (relationships between) logics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Chapter 5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Research questions and data

The following chapter is structured in three main parts. First, I start by presenting the prison world from the media perspective and show how I identified the field-level logics. Second, I shift my focus to the individual level and describe the prison world from the perspective of prison managers (my interviewees). Similar to the field-level logics, I also identified logics prevalent at the individual level. In the third part of this chapter, I compare the results from the field level to...

¹⁵ I analyzed actors mentioned and not speakers because Kronen Zeitung also Die Presse have mostly very short articles.
the individual level. I then give more information about the relationships between the manager-level logics in part four. Finally, I focus on the metaphors used in my interviews.

5.1 The Austrian prison world in the media

In this sub-chapter, I provide an overview of the penal system between 1970 until 2015 from the media perspective. I first highlight the most relevant topics for prison management. I used all articles from the five newspapers. In the second part, I summarize the results in four central topics which have dominated media discourse over the years. Third, I give an overview of the building blocks, which I used in order to reconstruct the field-level logics. I reconstruct – in the fourth part – the constellation of the field-level logics from the media perspective and outline, finally, insights into the characteristics and dynamics of the field-level logics.

5.1.1 Historical overview

The historical overview is based on 93 articles from Profil, 75 articles from Die Presse, 37 articles from Falter, 59 articles from Kronen Zeitung, and 139 articles from Kurier. I clustered the results into four time periods – the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s, and 2000 until 2015 – to gain a deeper understanding about the main topics in the different time periods and also actors who commented on these issues.

Period 1 – The 1970s: In the 1970s, there were heated debates about Christian Broda’s penal reform (see chapter 4.1.1). One main topic under debate centered on the punishment of sexual deviance, particularly adultery and the punishment of homosexuals. During this time, societal opinion about homosexuality changed a lot. A central question was “whether Austria could be removed from the list of the final four European countries which continue to punish homosexual acts between adults” (Profil 01/1971). In the media discourse, politicians (especially those in the two largest parties, ÖVP and SPÖ) and religious groups were especially vocal on this issue. Other topics under discussion were the death penalty as well as castration for sexually-deviant criminals. The media reported that in 1966, some parts of the general public in Austria not only called for the death penalty, but also demanded that inmates be subjected to various forms of punishment such as “chopping off a finger, daily beating, public torture, castration, etc.” (Profil

---

16 ÖVP (Österreichische Volkspartei) means ‘Austrian People’s Party’
17 SPÖ (Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs) stands for ‘Social Democratic Party of Austria’
10/1973); and in 1971, 81% of the Austrian population asked for harsher penalties for sexual offenders, including corporal punishment or worse. This illustrates that punishment was an issue in the media and that it was supported by the general public. One prominent psychiatrist even advocated public castration “for very aggressive sex offenders because the maximum penalty of a life sentence in prison is not severe enough”. This suggestion received a lot of support from the wider public. For example, one citizen argued that sterilization was a good solution and another wrote in a letter: “Sterilization doesn’t hurt anyone and this kind of evil needs to be rooted out” (Profil 10/1973).

When the new Correctional Services Act was introduced, media coverage was high, particularly as the reform of the penal system brought several changes and, hence, a different understanding of what punishment should look like. First, for example, the new law made it possible to impose monetary penalties instead of short prison sentences (which were often described as unreasonable in the media). Because less people were imprisoned, the new law helped to reduce the likelihood of overcrowding in prisons – as 4 out of 5 offenders were ‘short term inmates’ at the time. The new law was also expected to facilitate and improve the resocialization process. Second, different prison sentences were simplified to one form of ‘unitary punishment’ (‘Einheitsstrafe’). Third, preventive detention – also known as involuntary forensic placement – was introduced for particularly dangerous inmates who had a higher risk of recidivism. The overarching goal was to establish a more humane prison system, and to create a detention facility where certain inmates could be housed for up to ten years after serving their sentences – that is, if a psychiatrist deemed the inmate as still posing a threat to society. Despite widespread acceptance of this new form of imprisonment, the media criticized that it concentrated decision making authority in the hands of just one person – the forensic psychiatrist. Because only he/she had the power to decide whether an inmate had to stay longer, inmates’ fates were effectively tied to the judgement of one person (Profil 08/1975). As will be seen in the remainder of my findings, involuntary forensic placement remained a central issue of debate until this very day.

The new law also extended the rights and opportunities of inmates during imprisonment and gave prisons the right to establish libraries in order to fulfill their educational function. For the most part, prison managers fully supported this change as it had a positive impact on safety and security issues. As one manager pointed out: “Inmates who read are better than inmates who talk”. He further explained that about 90% of the inmates took advantage of their right to borrow books. This positive assessment was echoed by those on psychiatric care side – who argued that books had a strong and positive impact on the resocialization process. Inmates, however, criticized that there were few good books; and special requests for books often could not be granted because it caused too much additional work. At the juvenile detention center, there were even books written in Kurrent, an old style of German handwriting that had come out of fashion
some time ago. Most of the books available were donated by public libraries, which used this system as an opportunity to get rid of old books they did not need anymore. Yet, according to one prison officer, most of the inmates were happy to have anything to read at all (Profil 03/1973).

The media also reported that the new law gave inmates writing privileges in prisons. This change, however, increased the administrative workload of prisons because all correspondence had to be checked and censored in order to identify any hints of plans to escape – which was a major fear amongst the wider public (Profil 06/1971). In a book, a former inmate described the forms of control and the clear hierarchy in prisons. He explained that only certain inmates were given the privilege to write and to possess writing tools. All written material had to be handed in, like all other correspondence, for regular censorship. He described an incident where a prison officer found a contraband notebook in an inmate’s cell. The officer gave the inmate two choices, either report the infraction and get permission to keep the notebook, or have it confiscated. Although the inmate chose the first option, the prison officer tore the notebook apart and threw it away (Profil 07/1979). This is an illustrative example of the clear hierarchy and power structure within prisons. Despite the attempt to open up the prison world more, the law entitled prison managers strict control over inmates’ contact with the outside world. According to an article in Profil: “From the middle ages to 1970, such curtailments of rights were justified by the public who reasoned that prisons were not sanatoria. Once the Correctional Service Act was introduced, resocialization became an important goal of the penal system. One important change introduced in the law was the criminalization of sadistic acts against inmates. Despite giving inmates more rights, the law also gave prison officers the authority to take away privileges such as writing and receiving mail if there were security concerns” (Profil 06/1971).

In addition, the new law not only gave prison managers more rights, but also gave inmates the right to lodge complaints to the Federal Ministry of Justice. This right was well-received by inmates. However, it was often abused. Only about 10% of the 1,000 reported complaints by inmates were deemed to be reasonable and justified (Profil 06/1971). At the same time, inmates claimed that this right was also used against them – as one former inmate complained, before he left the prison, he was forced to withdraw all of the 104 complaints he had lodged. According to Profil “this was the price to pay for liberty. Withdrawing all of his complaints was supposed to prove that he had learned to adapt to society” (Profil 07/1979).

Despite all the improvements related to the new law, the media reported that, according to a study, Austrian prisons still lagged far behind those in Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, France, England, and Switzerland. According to the study, an Austrian prison was like “a dark dungeon of the last century”. For instance, whereas in Scandinavian countries as well as the Netherlands, all inmates already had single-occupant cells, Austrian still had open toilets, which
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107 were not adequately separated (Profil 08/1978). Accordingly, another prominent topic in the media discourse were the daily problems and inacceptable conditions within Austrian prisons. Two prisons in particular, Prison Josefstadt and Prison Stein, garnered widespread attention in the media. Regarding Prison Josefstadt, for example, there were numerous reports about overcrowding, high levels of aggression and abuses (which was confirmed by professionals within the prison). Furthermore, although the new law opened the doors for prison work programs, there was a lack of jobs for inmates. Not only were companies afraid to hire inmates for fear of damaging their reputations and public images, but the general public also saw inmates as competing for their jobs. These attitudes negatively impacted the job opportunities for inmates. Courageous prison managers and inmates, as well as between prison officers and inmates. 

Prison Stein also struggled with other issues such as illegal money. A former inmate claimed that the illegal cash flow at Prison Stein is, at the minimum, 10 million Austrian Schilling (ATS; about EUR 36,336). During the world football championship 1974, an inmate, who had worked in the prison, was accused of theft. He was immediately arrested and sent to prison for 30 years. At minimum, 25% are repeat offenders, some of them die and others are not caught. But no one gets sent to other houses [jails] some of them die. But no one gets cured" (Profil 06/1971).

Prison Stein also struggled with other issues such as illegal money. A former inmate claimed that the illegal cash flow at Prison Stein is, at the minimum, 10 million Austrian Schilling (ATS; about EUR 36,336). During the world football championship 1974, an inmate, who had worked in the prison, was accused of theft. He was immediately arrested and sent to prison for 30 years. At minimum, 25% are repeat offenders, some of them die and others are not caught. But no one gets cured" (Profil 06/1971).

Prison Stein also struggled with other issues such as illegal money. A former inmate claimed that the illegal cash flow at Prison Stein is, at the minimum, 10 million Austrian Schilling (ATS; about EUR 36,336). During the world football championship 1974, an inmate, who had worked in the prison, was accused of theft. He was immediately arrested and sent to prison for 30 years. At minimum, 25% are repeat offenders, some of them die and others are not caught. But no one gets cured" (Profil 06/1971).
of the inmates did have jobs, although the wages were very low. Inmates earned about ATS 2.00 (0.15 euros) per hour – with half of it going to the inmate and the other half to the organization. In order to address overcrowding, single-occupant cells were shared by two inmates – which often led to violent clashes. The accumulated need for physical activities was often unleashed against the staff or between inmates. However, as long as the violence and fighting was contained within the cells, prison officers saw no need to intervene. It was only when fights took place in public areas that prison officers intervened. Although prison officers only noticed a couple of the conflicts, a lot of disciplinary fines were imposed to keep security up (Profil 06/1971). One escaped convict was asked by a judge whether it was really so terrible inside – to which he replied: "You have no idea what is happening in there". He described the terrible conditions, including starvation, violence, etc. He further pointed out that he would try to escape again (Profil 10/1972).

In response to these failings and shortcomings in the prison system, the media also pointed out the emergence of novel models of understanding and managing prisons. In 1974, for instance, newspapers reported on the so-called 'Miracle of Stein', as Prison Stein got a new prison manager (Profil 10/1974). A former inmate who had been incarcerated there for 14 years wrote that when the former prison manager was in charge, conditions were very hard and inhumane. Several incidences, such as hunger strikes, knifings, and self-mutilation, were made public (Profil 03/1980). The new prison manager, however, treated inmates like human beings – which was revolutionary at that time. According to him "[w]e should not blame a person for misbehaving when he/she was not given any chances or opportunities in life, because he/she is from a certain socio-economic milieu". The new prison manager addressed the issue of overcrowding by decreasing the number of inmates. He expanded workshops and provided occupational therapy, expanded the library, allowed inmates to eat with knives and forks (some inmates were, after ten years of imprisonment, not able to adequately handle cutlery anymore), and allowed inmates to read newspapers. One inmate said: "When he came, the brawls stopped immediately". The new prison manager also tried to convince prison officers that relaxed imprisonment leads to better safety and security – more so than walls, beatings, and special safety measures. However, this led to a lot of criticism from prison officers who did not agree. Especially when two inmates who had tried to escape received tea and dry clothes (in order not to get sick) instead of a beating (Profil 10/1974).

To summarize, at the beginning of the 1970s, punishment issues (such as the death penalty or castration) have been more present in the media. With the introduction of the new law, the focus of media coverage shifted to issues related to this change, such as financial penalties, implementation of involuntary forensic placement, libraries in prisons, and other additional rights for inmates. However, there was also a lot of critique about the conditions in prisons and their
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inability to fulfill their public mission – particularly two prisons: Prison Stein and Prison Josefstadt.

**Period 2 – The 1980s:** During the 1980s, the media discourse on prisons was almost exclusively negative and critical. Especially at the beginning of the decade, the *consequences of the ‘new’ law introduced in the 1970s* became apparent. There was a lot of criticism that Christian Broda’s humane penal system had failed. Especially Prison Göllersdorf often served as a negative example within the media in the 1980s.

In general, the *measures of involuntary forensic placement* did not earn a lot of positive publicity. On the one hand, it was criticized for treating inmates ‘too well’ and that the system was ‘too soft’. On the other hand, there were complaints that prison conditions were inhumane and medieval and that no improvements were made inside. For these reasons, critics claimed that it was not surprising that so many inmates were relapsing (Profil 12/1988). A social worker also noted problems with the psychiatrists in prisons: “They have a monopoly. This is a mafia of only a few judges in white gowns, who decide about years of an inmate’s life” (Profil 06/1981). A prison psychologist provided insights into the contrary experience of psychiatrists. He pointed out that the language used by prison officers and psychologists was different. “Prison officers talk about ‘inmates’, we talk about ‘patients’. The first one is the language of prisons, the other one is of medicine”. According to him, one of the main problems was that prisons had insufficient staff to handle dangerous inmates. Consequently, the only way to deal with such inmates was to give them sedatives (Profil 09/1987). When measures of involuntary forensic placement were introduced in 1975, the main idea was to improve the resocialization process and to protect society. But after six years, results showed that judges used it differently – often invoking it in order to send inmates back behind bars after they had served their sentences. Courts were imputed that if they could not handle the people they were characterized as dangerously disturbed and were detained indefinitely (Profil 11/1981). As a consequence, inmates were incarcerated for extended periods of time (Profil 09/1986) – and despite good behavior, their prison sentences were rarely reduced. According to the media this led to heightened levels of frustration among inmates, but also had the effect that they were not afraid of prisons anymore (Profil 08/1987). Thus, ‘tricky’ people had fewer chances than ever before, which led to a lot of criticism regarding failed resocialization. The real challenge started as soon as those inmates were released because they had to prove themselves for another ten years. While the law mandated that they undergo psychiatric therapy during this time, the question of who would fund this treatment remained unclear (Profil 11/1981).

In order to maintain contact with the ‘real world’, another aspect of the law stipulated that inmates had the right to get ‘prison vacation’. However, this led to a public outcry because of
worries that inmates would receive more freedom at the expense of public safety. For example, at Göllersdorf, the media reported that the local council organized a silent demonstration against more humanity within the penal system. Between 300 and 400 people who lived in or around Göllersdorf met to protest in front of the prison. Although the medical manager of the prison guaranteed that only inmates who were no longer dangerous were allowed to go outside, it still led to a lot of anxiety within the local public. One civilian said: “The first one we see we will beat so that no one will want to leave the prison anymore.” Other critics suggested that inmates should be sent to Moscow or Siberia, or even executed. One woman pointed out that women were no longer safe. The mayor, who was a prison officer at Prison Göllersdorf at the time, expected protests, but he did not expect this level of negative and emotional response (Profil 02/1988). Such backlashes against more humane prison sentences were exacerbated by a number of incidents that achieved prominence in the media. This further raised questions about some of the new rights provided to inmates; and prompted tightened security measures. For example, there was a case of an inmate raping a 19-year old girl during day parole. As a consequence, the Federal Minister of Justice at the time reduced the number of paroles to a minimum despite prison managers’ plea for more means to resocialize inmates (Profil 02/1986). This example illustrates the challenges facing the penal system. On the one hand, the penal system is expected to resocialize inmates; yet, on the other hand, it should also keep the public safe. Furthermore, for victims and their families, retribution is paramount, and the broader public demands that it should be obvious that inmates suffer (Profil 12/1988).

In contrast to discussions about the shortcomings and the overly ‘soft’ nature of the new law, there were ongoing heated debates about the inhumane condition in prisons carrying into the 1980s – including stories of 15 or more people sharing a room without warm water or separate toilets – as well as the limited jobs available in the prison work program. Other complaints centered on limited educational opportunities and further problems with involuntary forensic placement. For example, a social worker reported in 1981 that every second social worker in the prison systems quits after three to five years “because the judicial administration is not interested in delinquent people”. The issue was that “doctors, social workers, psychiatrists, and pastors are there just as tokens” within the prisons. A lawyer and philosopher said: “Punishment which means violence cannot restore the disturbed peace, because it is in itself the beginning of aggression. […] Especially our wish for punishment makes resocialization so difficult”. In a personal diary, one inmate noted that the main problem with resocialization is that therapy is only available during working time. During the weekends the cells are locked after lunch time. They are too few opportunities for further education (Profil 02/1986) which makes the resocialization process much more difficult.
A prison manager, who gave an interview to the media, agreed that the main problems of involuntary forensic placement at the time was the preparation for release; as well as the starting conditions outside the prisons. The substantial duration of the release procedures had a negative impact on the penal system. Furthermore, there was the sentiment that inmates who could not be treated in a successful way, and those that did not want to get treatment, were blocking available treatment spots for more willing and/or deserving inmates. He further pointed out: "The tedious work we do in prison is often destroyed due to a lack of a working release procedure" (Profil 02/1986).

Beyond measures of involuntary forensic placement, pretrial incarceration was criticized frequently, and media coverage on this topic was substantial. In particular, a ‘blame game’ played out in the media where basically everybody agreed that things were not going great, yet there was little agreement on who was responsible. The president of the bar association at the time said that "pretrial incarceration is a substitute for torture in Austria". The media reported that the number of people in custody had increased enormously within the last couple of years. Still, Christian Broda argued that the 30% increase in “custodial inmates since 1975 is not related to the introduction of the [at that time] new Criminal Code nor to the actual criminal statistics”. However, Die Presse wrote: “We are wondering – if criminal statistics is not a good proxy for justified cases of taking people into custody, then it would mean that within the last six years, judges have been infiltrated by sadists”. This led to an immediate reaction from a duty of the bars of judges who defended the judges arguing: “No one will deny human rights, but if the pre-investigations take a long time, it is a technical problem, not the fault of the judges” (Profil 10/1982).

This heated debate did not change the fact that Austria still had the highest number of custodial inmates in central Europe at the time. They were not only kept for a very long time, but according to Profil, also treated in an inhumane way. According to a lawyer, “pretrial imprisonment is simply inhumane” as more than 1,000 custodial inmates “are kept like animals”. The prison manager of Prison Josefstadt at the time confirmed the (inhumane) conditions to the media and further said: “I have serious concerns regarding the high number of inmates. We are hopelessly overcrowded”. As prisons did not have enough beds, inmates had to sleep on camping beds. Prison conditions were tough. Inmates were only allowed to talk to their visitors for 15 minutes through protective screens. A wife of a custodial inmate complained that “you are not able to hear anything because everyone is screaming, it is even hard to hear your own voice”. Toilets were separated by curtains and showers were limited to once a week. Inmates were only allowed to have one book per week and one newspaper per day, and movie viewings were limited to once every two weeks. In consequence, it was criticized that the whole administration, including the law, exhibited medieval standards (Profil 03/1982).
According to the *Profil*, every second inmate was unnecessarily in prison at that time. The unacceptable nature of some procedures was illustrated by one high profil that led to a lot of debates. A custodial inmate had to spend more than two years in custody without a court hearing. He was locked away with felons and was given only four square meters of space. Moreover, he was forced to take medication: "Since I have been here, I was forced to take more than 2,300 drugs". After that, he felt mentally and physically broken. Lawyers agreed that the decrease in the number of people sent to prison was misleading because in many cases, people were sent to prison sentences for little to no reason. A former city council member who was arrested for suspicion of fraud said: "I was not allowed to talk to anyone in my family for four weeks. You have no idea how this destroys you. When I said that I have overcome my prison time, I mean it only physically but not my psychological health" (*Profil* 10/1988).

Another big issue in the 1980s – which extended well into the 1990s – were the *precarious working conditions* for inmates. In 1981, inmates still earned only ATS 2.90 (0.21 euros) per hour (but they did not get any interest for it, nor did they receive unemployment benefits or any kind of pension; see also *Profil* 04/1989). The only way inmates could earn more was if they worked personally for prisons officers – for example, building prisons officers’ houses or fixing their cars. This was allowed by law and accounted for almost 30% of the work done by inmates. The opportunity to make an income was very important to most inmates. With this income, inmates could buy food and semi luxury goods (*'Genussmittel'*) (and according to the newspaper, toilet paper counted as a semi luxury good because inmates had to buy it) (*Profil* 06/1981; see also *Profil* 09/1987; *Profil* 01/1990). At the beginning of the 1990s, the situation was not much better. The plan was to raise the base wage from between ATS 3.30 (0.24 euros) and ATS 5.60 (0.41 euros) to between ATS 51.70 (3.76 euros) and ATS 77.60 (5.64 euros) (which equals 75% of the wage of a metal worker at the time); and also, to allow inmates to contribute to unemployment insurance (especially for the time after their release). However, a representative of a probationary service pointed out that this would mean "that we could make a profit from the inmates, the higher the number of inmates, the more money the government earns" (as half of it goes directly to the Federal Ministry of Justice) (*Profil* 09/1992).

One specific discourse strand in the media focused on the *women’s prison*, where conditions were not much better. For instance, 14 women had to share a 33 square-meter room with a toilet in the corner. According to the prison manager, improvements were underway, such as access to warm water in the cells and separate showers for each unit. Although leisure activities were still restricted to one event per week, he said: "We are working very hard on it. It is also a question of the climate. Previously, no one could have imagined that knives would be allowed in cells. Nowadays, every inmate has her own cutlery [...]. And there is also a change within the staff. The old guard is dying, and younger, more flexible councils are coming in" (*Profil* 10/1982).
An important change in the incarceration of women was the inclusion of an article in the law about a special type of incarceration which allowed women to bring their kids into the prison – which had already been introduced in 1977. Although this was a big improvement and an important milestone for creating a more humane penal system, it was very difficult to make the prison a place that was appropriate for raising kids. It led to heated debate in the media. In general, a representative from the Federal Ministry of Justice highlighted that he was “happy about the mother-child-unit”. A prosecutor reasoned that “this atmosphere is based on freedom”. However, a child neurologist, who was more critical, stressed: “At the first, it seemed that everything was fine, but the whole thing is just a temporary solution’. According to him: “The separation [of the mother from her child] should be right after birth so that the child can bond with its foster parents or the child should stay with the mother until they get released together.” One inmate recounted that after they took her child (aged 18-months) away: “I felt lonely. [...] Today is Sunday and I am going crazy because I miss my kid so much. As soon as I start thinking about the fact that I have to be here even though my kid need me, I go crazy”. “Children are allowed to stay in the prison until they are two and a half. Then the kids must go”, said a prison manager. In general, it was considered a privilege to be placed in such a special unit. Only a few got permission to be housed in the mother-child unit. A former inmate described the unit: “It is really a very good establishment. However, the conditions are horrible”. She noted that it was not easy for her daughter after their release because everything was new: “[...] she had never seen a tram or buses, she was staring at people. She was constantly looking and asking about everything” (Profil 04/1986).

Summing up, media discourse in the 1980s was characterized by a rather negative discussion on the consequences of changes to the law; while, at the same time, also criticizing the inhumane penal system, involuntary forensic placements, as well as failing resocialization efforts. The contradictions between the strands of two discourse can best be illustrated by the fact that failing resocialization was, at least in part, due to a renewed focus on safety. This focus emerged after tragic incidents that resulted from relaxations in incarceration proposed by the legal changes in question. Also pretrial detention and its conditions led to a high number of negative reports. Another big topic was the precarious employment situation, i.e., limited number of jobs and the low wages. Finally, a discourse on the specificities of the imprisonment of women – and especially mothers – emerged.

Period 3 – The 1990s: In the 1990s, media coverage of prisons mirrored the broader political and societal shifts of the decade. While some topics continued to be of relevance, new ones emerged. With the fall of the Iron Curtain at the end of the 1980s, the foreign population in prisons increased dramatically. One inmate recalled that in 1969 it was rare to see a non-Austrian inmate. “But now
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Austrians are a minority in these prisons”. One prison officer reported to the media that with all the different languages spoken by inmates, he had no idea which language he should study first. This increase of foreign inmates also had a negative impact on prison conditions. According to a prison manager, inmates were locked away in their cells for 23 hours a day. Not only did the cells accommodate more people than they should have, but the inmates could not even communicate with one another due to language differences. One inmate complained that they were treated like pieces of meat with numbers on them. In response to the accusation that people were being arrested for minor infractions (which was one reason for overcrowding), the president of the Reginal Court for Criminal Procedures (‘Straflandesgericht’) contended: "If there is a 'backlog' of criminality – and this is happening now – justice has to react. If you have a congestion and the strong preparation is not working, I cannot expect that a weaker one can help" (Profil 09/1991).

Another big issue in the 1990s was HIV. According to the media, inmates with HIV or AIDS were either isolated or ignored. The only advice inmates received from the prison psychologist was to push the thought about the disease to the back of their minds which was hardly possible. One inmate said: "You are sitting in your cell and you are thinking and thinking. [...] For me, it was important to have the opportunity to have someone to talk to about it. [...] Since I know that I am HIV positive [...] I am more aggressive and violent". A social worker from the Vienna AIDS support organization pointed out that "in general, people inside the prison – from prison officers to the doctor – cannot handle AIDS". Most of the HIV positive inmates were placed in single cells, because policy stipulated that all other inmates had to sign off on allowing HIV positive inmates to be moved into shared cells. But the HIV single cells also had a big advantage. Inmates in these cells were able to watch TV whenever they wanted, whereas all the other inmates were limited to one evening of TV per week. The situation, however, had changed a lot compared to 1987. Three years earlier "AIDS-cells were like medieval dungeons". One inmate described that although inmates diagnosed with AIDS had the right to go to gyms, no prison officers wanted to go with them. Furthermore, these inmates were not allowed to use the prison library. Also, airings with other inmates who were negative were not possible as those were afraid of the disease. The manager of the prison hospital justified this isolation as being in the best interest of inmates diagnosed with AIDS. Because of their weak immune systems, it would have been too dangerous for them to have contact with other inmates (Profil 08/1991).

Like in the previous two decades, media coverage of scandals in prisons continued. In Prison Stein, self-mutilation, violence and suicide were common. In the 1990s the prison was called a 'powder keg' which could explode at any time. Inmates were getting more and more desperate: One inmate stabbed himself in the liver, another set himself on fire, and a third injected himself with the blood of an HIV patient. Employees were at their limits. Further, companies outside were not willing to hire inmates – which was the only chance for inmates to go outside.
Prison officers complained to the media that, while the family members of inmates insulted people working in prisons as hangmen, as soon as their relatives were released, they were unwilling to help them find their way back. The general public retained their harsh stance against inmates, constantly expressing the wish to punish criminals (even to hang them). Civilians demanded that inmates be locked away with an almost religious fervor (Profil 06/1992). A prison psychiatrist said: "Right now, in the house, there is more tension than ever before". A social worker from the Austrian probationary service saw the abuse of alcohol and drugs as especially dangerous. Also, a staff council member confirmed to the media that attacks on prison officers were increasingly common. At the same time, however, a former inmate complained that inmates were being abused – like one incident when a prison officer broke an inmate’s jawbone. Moreover, the number of suicides increased. This was also confirmed by a prison officer who said: “We cannot stop suicides. There are many circumstances that we cannot control”. A former inmate added that the number of suicides in prison was much higher than the public knew (Profil 06/1992).

A second ‘powder keg’ in the 1990s was at Prison Garsten. A social worker from the Austrian probationary service reported to the media: “Garsten is one of the prisons with the most problems”. Like Prison Stein, it suffered from overcrowding, violence between inmates and between inmates and prison officers, insufficient staff, suicides, and drug and alcohol issues (see also Profil 04/1999). However, according to the social worker the main concern was “that conditions of the prison term have no correspondence with the life outside” which made the resocialization process even harder. “After a couple of years in prison, they [inmates; JW] are not in the position to live in a normal apartment building; and they are not able to take care of themselves. They need institutions with clear and rigid protocols”. According to his statement, they cannot turn off or on the light, and also clothes and food need to be prepared daily. He also pointed out that most of his clients were people who had just been released. Some of them purposely committed a crime so that they could go back to prison. He therefore sent a lot of former inmates into monasteries, where they could have a clear and structured daily life (Profil 04/1994). Another social worker confirmed this and added that one of the problems is that after serving a long sentence in prison, inmates are unable to cope with the outside world. They cannot even use a tram (Profil 12/1998). One inmate commented: “In prison, you ‘unlearn’ how to think for yourself”.

Similar to the rape cases in the 1980s, there was a scandal when one inmate murdered his girlfriend during his day parole. As a consequence, all other inmates were punished because day paroles were canceled. Another similar case gained a lot of media attention and had a great impact on the resocialization process. A probationer complained that there had not been any problems for 14 years yet “all inmates got punished after this incident – even though it was not their fault”.
However, a prison manager countered: “At the moment, our priority is public safety” (Profil 02/1994).

Another topic that continued from the 1980s was the issue of women in prison. A Prison manager at the time overruled the dress code and put mirrors all over the prison. The reason for that was “that inmates should feel like women and be able to take care of their appearance”. Only a couple of the inmates were able to start an apprenticeship. Most of the inmates – according to the prison manager – did not have enough intellectual capacity or motivation. One former inmate said: “As an inmate, the right to privacy and sexuality is taken away”. For women, being imprisoned is not easy. A former social worker said: “Separation from family, particularly from children, is especially hard for women”. An employee at the Institute for the Sociology of Law and Criminology, further noted that women suffer from an additional psychological burden: “A female criminal not only acted against the law, but also failed in her female role and is therefore a loser within society”. Like in the other prisons, there were complaints that the toilets were only separated by curtains and that the cells did not have warm water. Further, contact with former inmates was not permitted – as one ex-inmate complained in a sarcastic way: “In prison, you spend day and night together. But as soon as an inmate is released, you cannot have any contact with that person because people are worried that you might be a bad influence” (Profil 03/1992).

In summary, media discourse gained two new topics: First, the increase of foreign inmates in Austrian prisons since the fall of the Iron Curtain. Second, the issue of HIV and AIDS gained a lot of media attention at this time. However, some issues were also carried over from earlier decades. Similar to the 1970s, Prison Stein was criticized several times, but in this decade, newspapers reported more on drug problems as well as on the increase in self-mutilation and suicide in prisons. Finally, women and imprisonment remained an issue in the media, a topic which was also relevant at the beginning of the 2000s.

**Period 4 - The 2000s until 2015:** Ten years later, the situation for women in prison had not improved much. At the beginning of the 2000s, the prison manager of Prison Schwarzau said to the media: “You have no idea what it was like before. It was simply inhumane”. In spite of criticism that inmates were being treated too softly, he introduced several changes, including loosening restrictive prison rules, improving the training facilities, and allowing inmates to keep pictures of family members and friends – as well as plush toys – in their cells. In cases of good behavior, inmates were allowed to watch TV. A prison officer said: “[...] locked away, is locked away. Visitors only see the surface. What they do not see are the stories behind. Most of the time there is a relationship story. She sponsored him, [...] she drove the getaway car”. A representative from the Austrian probationary service highlighted: “If women become criminals, it is still a taboo”, especially if the offenders are also mothers. This very traditional picture of a woman in society
makes resocialization harder. "Men who commit crimes can hope for understanding. Mothers who misbehave cannot". A former inmate said that she wanted to celebrate the day of her release. But as soon as she was back on the street it was terrible. "Everything was so strange outside". This led to the question of whether the resocialization of inmates really works (Profil 05/2000).

Throughout the years, prisons and their management have continuously faced one major problem: a shortage of resources (e.g., Profil 10/2010) – including an insufficient workforce (e.g., Profil 06/2005), a general lack of space (Profil 06/2005), and a lack of financial resources. These three issues triggered a series of other challenges and problems, such as overcrowding, limited work opportunities for inmates, as well as poor and inhumane prison conditions. To give an example, as prisons were pushed to reduce operating costs, inmates had less access to warm water. One newspaper article even claimed that three inmates had to take a shower at the same time (Profil 05/2000; Profil 10/2004). In the following section, I describe these issues in more detail.

Similar to the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, a big problem was that the number of inmates reached a new peak (Profil 06/2003), which led to severe overcrowding (Profil 10/2004; see also Profil 06/2005). The prison manager of Prison Josefstadt at the time complained that the prison was 30% over capacity (Profil 06/2003; see also Profil 06/2005). Consequently, this led critics to claim that resocialization was not working as intended. The prison manager of Prison Josefstadt noted that only a few former inmates can make it after their release. Most of them came back again (Profil 06/2005). This problem was also highlighted by the prison manager of Prison Stein in 2010: “The penal system is not at all looking bright. Resocialization? Release on parole? How should this work with someone who is serving life in prison, who is a murderer, stateless, and only speaks Spanish?” He criticized the system and made it clear that some of the people would have to stay in prison forever. According to him, one of the main problems was that it had been very difficult to find care facilities willing to accommodate criminals, especially sex offenders (Profil 10/2010).

In addition to the increase in the number of inmates, the media also reported that the prison population changed a lot. Not only did the number of juveniles increase, but so did the number of foreigners – who came from 70 different countries at that time (Profil 06/2003). In Innsbruck, for example, 43% of the prison population were not Austrian (Kurier 01/12/2004; see also Kronen Zeitung 05/11/2004). Continuing the trend started at the beginning of the 1990s, prisons became ever more diverse in terms of ethnicities. One inmate even complained that years ago the penal system was more like a family, there was a team spirit. In 2005, there was an infusion of people from all different countries, making it impossible to communicate anymore (Profil 06/2005).
Prisons also had to deal with the fact that inmates were often sick or had serious health issues like heart disease or hepatitis. Health treatment for inmates became very expensive which led to public outrage (Kurier 19/10/2009). Furthermore, drug addictions and drug smuggling increased over the years (Kronen Zeitung 06/03/2009; see also Kurier 23/05/2009). A prison manager pointed out “this is the reality inside”. There are few inmates without psychological disorders or drug problems (Profil 10/2010). According to the state’s attorney, a critical problem involved mobile phones in prisons, because the phones were used to make illegal deals, like ordering drugs (Kurier 27/05/2009). Also, day paroles were often used for making drug deals (Kronen Zeitung 07/02/2009).

Additionally, the lack of resources, especially in terms of staff, created a lot of problems in prisons and therefore gained a lot of media attention. Due to understaffing, workshops and sports grounds had to be closed. This led to considerable frustration because, inmates wanted to work in order to earn some extra money. A deputy prison manager said that nobody complains about having to work. Instead, inmates complain if they do not have the opportunity to work. Prison managers advocated for the prison work system. As one prison manager described: “If we do not occupy the boys, they occupy us” and, thus, work opportunities are very welcome. However, one opponent was the WKO (The Austrian Economic Chamber), who was afraid of dumping prices. One representative said: “As the labor costs are much lower, they can offer much more for less money”. This can bring small companies into economic hardships. Many companies were also afraid that they might lose customers if it became known that inmates worked for them (Profil 10/2004; Profil 05/2000).

The staff council of the prison officers stressed that due to a lack of staff, there was more noticeable aggression. A representative from the work union said that 10 years ago aggression within the prison was eliminated when they hired more staff. “Now we are noticing that the climate in the prison is starting to collapse again” (Profil 05/2000). However, as there were not enough prison officers, inmates were locked away up to 48 hours. The prison manager of Prison Stein at the time pointed out that, consequently, the number of complaints increased enormously (Profil 05/2000). In 2009, the night shift in some prisons, for example, had to start at noon because of the lack of staff. Insufficient staff not only had a negative impact on prison conditions for inmates, but also raised safety and security concerns. For example, instead of two prison officers guaranteeing safety, only one prison officer had to fulfill this job alone (Die Presse 23/07/2009; see also Die Presse 27/06/2009). Another example in 2004 showed that on Sundays 18 prison officers were responsible for 400 inmates because there was not enough staff (e.g., Kurier 13/09/2004).

Understaffing led to issues of safety and security within as well as outside the prison. Newspapers reported on several escapes and escape attempts. For example, one inmate tried to
climb the wall but fell down, another two inmates escaped with a ladder. The prison manager of Prison Stein commented: “As prisons are overcrowded, inmates try more and more to escape because the physical pressure is getting higher and higher”. Also, the prison manager of Prison Josefstadt pointed out that the escapes are “the cumulative result of overcrowding, insufficient staff, and the establishment of organized crime” (Profil 06/2005).

To address the lack of resources, several suggestions were made in the newspapers during the 2000s. At the beginning of 2000, one idea was to privatize prisons. However, experts in the penal system advised against this. One expert said: “Construction or administration, maintenance, transport and maybe even care and treatment might be privatized, but not control and discipline”. The Federal Minister of Justice at that time shared this sentiment, arguing: “The penal system concerns the execution of governmental functions. As such, only peripheral services can be outsourced” (Profil 05/2000).

Another suggestion was to build more prisons. For the Federal Minister of Justice, the main problem was the high number of inmates from foreign countries (Profil 06/2003). Because Romanians were the third largest population in Austrian prisons, he suggested building a prison in Romania and sending these inmates back to their home country (Die Presse 16/10/2004; see also Kronen Zeitung 12/10/2004; Kronen Zeitung 08/01/2004). His reasoning was that building a new prison in Romania was cheaper than housing all these criminals in Austrian prisons (Kronen Zeitung 11/01/2004; Falter 04/02/2004). Thus, it would be a way to reduce the tax burden for Austrians (Falter 19/05/2004). A lot of support came from the SPÖ, who even suggested to think about spreading this idea to other countries like Nigeria (Kurier 03/01/2004). The Federal Minister of Justice supported this plan. The main problem, however, was that it was often difficult to confirm where people were coming from, because some of them did not have any citizenship (Profil 06/2005).

Plans were made for new prisons not only abroad, but also in Austria. In 2004, there was a proposal to build a second prison in Vienna. Since 2001 the number of incarcerated people increased by about 22.5% (from 6,900 up to 8,400) (Kurier 23/03/2004; see also Die Presse 04/02/2004). However, the whole proposal was criticized for two reasons. First, a new prison would not solve the underlying problem – notably, the reason behind the increase in the number of inmates (custodial and convicts) (Falter 28/01/2004). Second, it raised the question whether Vienna’s judges were much more conservative (Falter 19/05/2004), especially as there was a big difference between the East and the West in Austria (Kurier 18/07/2004). In 2009, there was another proposal that Salzburg should build a new prison. But the new location caused public outcry (Kronen Zeitung 07/11/2009). Neither the inhabitants of Wals nor Elsbethen (two municipalities in Austria) wanted to accommodate a prison (Kronen Zeitung 23/01/2009; Kronen
Zeitung 24/01/2009). There was a petition, and over 200 people of Wals protested (Kronen Zeitung 11/02/2009; see also Kurier 23/09/2009).

An additional proposal was to hire new professionals. For example, in 2004 the idea to retrain soldiers in order to help with safety in prisons, became popular (Kurier 23/12/2004; see also Die Presse 06/11/2004; Die Presse 22/10/2004), especially as the issue of understaffing at Prison Stein was critical and led to a lot of unease within the community. People were afraid that criminals could escape and pose a threat to public safety. As more workshops closed, the mayor saw the main problem as having inmates who were not occupied enough. The justice department argued that if they could they would have sent more staff to Prison Stein. But increasing the numbers of prison officers requires approval from the Federal Chancellery (‘Bundeskanzleramt’) (Kurier 02/09/2004). In 2014, Prison Stein struggled again to keep workshops open because of insufficient staff. But instead of retraining soldiers, the idea was to hire civil staff to run such workshops. This was meant to have a positive effect on the job market in this area. In addition, experts emphasized that this solution would have a positive impact on safety issues in prisons, because inmates who are bored often get aggressive and frustrated. Moreover, this solution would give inmates the opportunity get on-the-job training (Kurier 26/07/2014).

Finally, potential alternatives to prisons were discussed. Whereas the former Federal Minister of Justice saw no solution in electronic tagging or in release on probation, a member of the Federal Ministry of Justice demanded more probational releases as well as suggested replacing short sentences with community service. Furthermore instead of the rigid ‘locking away’ of inmates, she suggested introducing alternatives like night imprisonment or weekend imprisonment (Profil 06/2003). An expert of the penal system and a vocal proponent of alternative imprisonment pointed out that “1,000 to 1,200 prison spots could be opened up with probational releases and the use of other means like community service or electronic tagging” (Profil 06/2005; see also Profil 05/2004). These suggestions were supported by a prosecutor, who remarked that: "Diversion, release on probation, and community service only work for inmates who have a potential for resocialization: this includes national inmates and well-integrated foreigners". However such alternatives were not working for inmates from abroad (Profil 06/2005). Further, the results of a study in 2009 showed that criminals using probationary service had a decreased propensity to backslide compared to those in prison for a very long time (Falter 03/06/2009). The study showed that resocialization was successful only when the inmate had a good support network. In Graz, they introduced a new model where inmates could be released halfway through serving their sentences if they worked with probationers, social workers, doctors, therapists, and psychologists (Kurier 30/12/2009). If people do not have a social network anymore it is very likely that they will violate the law and have to go back to prison (Kurier 13/12/2009).
In 2009, a pilot test for electronic tagging was initiated. *Die Presse* published an article saying that 36 convicts were electronically tagged and had additionally been supervised by 'Verein Neustart'. There were only three cases where convicts had broken parole and had to be removed from the electronic tagging experiment (*Die Presse* 05/02/2009). As a promising alternative, and a means to reduce costs and overcrowding in prisons (*Kronen Zeitung* 24/02/2014), electronic tagging was introduced in 2010. However, in 2014, there was public outcry when the media reported that the president of an Austrian soccer club, despite having an electronic tag, went to the opera in Graz and celebrated his birthday in an expensive hotel. He was, consequently, however, sent back to prison (*Falter* 05/11/2014; *Kronen Zeitung* 30/10/2014).

Prison managers not only had to deal with a lack of resources, but also with the *same grievances that had plagued then the previous decades*, such as sexual abuses and suicides and fatalities. Furthermore, they had to manage novel procedural issues such data leaks (*Falter* 11/06/2014) or inmates accidentally being released too early (*Kronen Zeitung* 05/10/2014; *Die Presse* 07/10/2014). In 2003 and 2014, juvenile prisons received a lot of media attention after sexual abuse issues were exposed. In 2003 the *Jugendgerichtshof* was closed despite protests by the Federal Minister of Justice at the time. Juveniles were put into Prison Josefstadt. Even the CPT was shocked, especially because due to the lack of staff, every second day the doors were locked around 3pm – which led to a lot of aggression and brutality (*Falter* 14/07/2004). This trend triggered widespread discussion over whether juveniles should go to prison or do community service instead (*Kronen Zeitung* 21/11/2004). According to the prison manager of Prison Josefstadt, occurrences like sexual abuses always lead to public pressure, which then makes reform possible. For example, psychological treatment was improved (*Die Presse* 17/03/2004). This was important because there was an increase in the number of juveniles with mental illnesses, and prison officers were not adequately trained or qualified to handle this issue (*Kurier* 18/07/2004). From September 2003 to May 2004 the number of juvenile inmates doubled (from 55-60 up to 120-130). The prison manager further pointed out: “The penal system has taken over a task that originally belonged to psychiatric wards. Therefore, we would wish for an external establishment where problematic cases could be treated in a more efficient way”. This suggestion was well-received by a lot of psychiatrists (*Kurier* 14/07/2004).

Also, a case where a 14-year-old inmate was raped in 2014 put the decision of the former Federal Minister of Justice into question. There were increasing voices demanding a special juvenile prison. Therefore, the current Federal Minister of Justice started reestablishing one again (*Falter* 30/04/2014; *Falter* 10/12/2014; see also *Falter* 05/11/2014, *Kronen Zeitung* 28/04/2014; *Die Presse* 28/04/2014; *Die Presse* 13/05/2015). He also established a taskforce to help improve the resocialization of juveniles (*Kurier* 25/01/2014). Experts were working on an alternative to imprisonment, including assisted living communities. This was also highly
appreciated by social pedagogues: "Teenagers do not need punishment, instead they need to experience consequences". The more independent a teenager is, the more self-determined they can live. Such solutions would have a positive impact in terms of reducing costs. The cost for each juvenile in detention is around 300 euros per day, whereas in assisted living communities the cost would be between 160 and 250 euros (Kurier 24/01/2014).

Another main concern was the number of suicides in prisons, which received considerable media coverage – and was a continuous issue facing prisons over the years. As a prison manager pointed out “the idea of total control is utopian. If someone really wants to commit suicide, it is very hard to prevent it. We have to get rid of the naïve idea that everything is curable and controllable. Nothing in the penal system works 100%. People outside have no idea about the reality inside prisons” (Profil 10/2010). After a series of incidents involving one death and three suicides in prisons, an expert of the penal system gave an interview to Profil. He explained that suicides are often a phenomenon of imitation, especially if there are many mentally unstable people. Most of the time, years pass between incidents (Profil 07/2001). In 2014, for example, nine people committed suicide in prison (Profil 12/2014).

In 2004, a fatality case made headlines. An inmate died after he was injected with a drug to calm him down. The man attacked a fellow inmate and went on a rampage. He also attacked prison officers with a bread knife. It took nine prison officers to restrain him. To calm him down, he was placed in a special cell where he lost consciousness and died. As the inmate was HIV positive and also had hepatitis C, eight prison officers and the one fellow inmate who got hurt had to be tested (Kurier 20/08/2004; see also Kronen Zeitung 21/08/2004). In 2014, a neglected inmate caused a stir at Prison Stein. Although he was asked to go to the doctor, he did not follow the order (Falter 21/05/2014; Die Presse 21/05/2014; see also Die Presse 31/05/2014).

Also, involuntary forensic placement continued to make headlines. The current Federal Minister of Justice mentioned in an interview that in the last 15 years, involuntary forensic placement as well as administration of custodial sanction have been neglected because there was no money (Falter 09/07/2014). This led to a general discussion in the media of involuntary forensic placement, which was even described as a ‘blemish’ of the penal system (Profil 02/2015; see also Profil 07/2013). Opponents noted that inmates were treated in a very inhumane way. There was also the issue that inmates could not be adequately prepared for their release as long as the problem of insufficient resources continued. According to newspapers, in Prison Mittersteig, for example, inmates had to stay in prison because there was the general assumption that those people were dangerous – even though they were never examined by psychiatric experts, nor had a judge talked to them. A manager of the psychological department quit because according to him the situation was untenable. He complained that no one cared about the inmates at all (Profil 09/2000).
One pastor went straight to the point saying: “Prisons are like the final destination for lot of problems of our time” (Profil 06/2005). The impression was that, in order to save money, many people were sent to prison instead of hospitals or psychiatric wards (Falter 28/05/2014). This situation led to the criticism that people who get locked way as mental ill should also be treated accordingly. One study showed that the number of inmates in involuntary forensic placement had increased because of the higher risk likelihood of going to prison even for smaller offences and for longer times (Die Presse 22/05/2014). According to one newspaper article, the number of people in involuntary forensic placement increased fourfold whereas the number of inmates remained relatively constant. According to a member of the Federal Ministry of Justice who represented the Green Party, the main problem is that those people do not have advocated. He further claimed that no one cared about them because people are afraid something might happen. The security level is very high. A psychiatrist said: “Of course it is very difficult to predict how dangerous a person is. But nowadays nobody is willing to take any risks for the liberty of a single person anymore”.

According to a researcher at the Institute for the Sociology of Law and Criminology “murderers and serial rapists are not the biggest group in involuntary forensic placement, instead it is people who have simply threatened someone”. An expert within the Directorate for Penal Services, summarized the issue: “According to Michael Foucault, every society has a place of banishment. For us it is the ‘Forensik’ (meaning involuntary forensic placement; JW)” (Profil 07/2013). In addition, an expert on human rights stressed that if was very important to invest money in prevention work. He suggested that resocialization was not simply about moving involuntary forensic placement from the Federal Ministry of Justice to the Federal Ministry of Health. Rather, the main problem is that involuntary forensic placement leaves marks, such as experiences of violence, and therapy often starts one and a half years after referrals (Profil 02/2015).

Also, the staff council made an official statement after cases of abuse and neglect were made public – and issue connected to the lack of resources discussed earlier. The head of the staff council said: “We need more money and more staff. The addition of 100 new positions is just a drop in the bucket”. However, this raised an old debate, namely the political influence of the work union over hiring decisions (Kurier 11/07/2014). In this context, an expert of the penal system criticized that in no other area did the staff council have so much power in the recruiting process. He also highlighted that people were put in certain positions because of their political embeddedness, and not due to their abilities (Kurier 11/07/2014; see also Falter 29/10/2014). Therefore, he pleaded that more control over hiring decisions be given to prison managers (Kurier 11/07/2014). One prominent example concerned a prison manager who, despite an excellent career, lost a position to a candidate who had been suggested by the staff council, and the Federal Minister of Justice simply followed its recommendation (Kurier 09/04/2014).
In general, experts criticized the penal system highlighting the huge difference in imprisonment terms and conditions (relaxing imprisonment, employment of inmates, etc.) across different prisons even if they belong to the same category of prisons (Kurier 11/07/2014). In an interview, he pointed out: “The penal system never changes or improves because there is an archaic need for punishment within society and politics has no interest. […] We need to realize that prisons are complex service companies. Their tasks range from guarding inmates to running a business to providing medical treatment. Prisons as service companies have to orient themselves with modern principles” (Falter 29/10/2014).

In a nutshell, media reported most frequently on issues concerning a lack of resources (personnel, space, and financial) and the remarkable increase in the number of inmates, and consequently, overcrowding (including the high percentage of foreigners, but also that most inmates suffer from diseases and disorders). Other topics related to the lack of resources have been the shortage of working opportunities for inmates, as well as safety and security issues including a number of articles reporting on escapes or attempts to escape. There was a debate on how to handle the lack of resources, which can be summarized in four main suggestions: first, the idea to privatize at least parts of prisons (e.g., laundry); second, building new prisons (either abroad, like in Romania or Nigeria, but also in Austria); third, hiring additional staff (including retraining soldiers or employing civil staff for workshops); and, fourth, focus on alternative forms of imprisonment, like electronic tagging or weekend imprisonment. In addition to broad topics related to a lack of resources, there have also been a high number of articles on abuses and deaths in prisons. This further lead to debate on improvements within the juvenile imprisonment as well as the involuntary measurement placement.

5.1.2 Central topics in the media discourse over the years

Before I continue with the reconstruction of the institutional logics reproduced in Austrian media discourse, I start with a summary of the main topics on the basis of the historical case. When comparing the time periods, it becomes apparent that some issues remain relevant over several decades (e.g., prison conditions, safety and security) while others popped up and disappeared again (e.g., HIV). I identified four main topics in media discourse on the penal system: punishment (n=82), resocialization (n=51), safety and security (n=67), and humanity (n=77). In the 1970s, for example, discussions clustered very clearly around the issue of punishment. There were heated debates about punishing homosexuals, death penalties, and the appropriateness of castration. Especially in the last two examples, the media reported strong support from the general public. In contrast to all other decades, the church and their representatives seemed to have a much stronger voice. In addition, prison managers seemed to focus more on the idea of punishing people instead of resocializing them. For example, inmates were put into correction cells often.
However, the 1970s also saw a new law passed which introduced more resocialization. As a consequence, for example, libraries were established in prisons. Prison managers and psychiatrists appreciated this idea. Still, inmates complained about the poor quality of the books, especially as those books were very old and not particularly good. The second novel aspect related to resocialization was the obligation that inmates should spend their time in prison productively by engaging in work activities. On this topic, opinions were twofold. Inside the prison (including prison managers, prison officers, and inmates), work opportunities were very welcome for different reasons. For the staff, it was a way to reduce aggression, violence, and it had a positive impact on safety issues. For the inmates, it was an opportunity to earn at least some money to buy personal items (like cigarettes). The payment for the work, however, was a big issue through the 1980s and 1990s, because of the very low wages. However, companies were afraid of reputation losses if they hired inmates and the general public was worried that inmates would take from the broader job market. Finally, the WKO highlighted the danger of dumping prices as prisons could produce products much cheaper than regular companies.

In general, safety and security aspects have been an important issue throughout the years. On the one hand, in order to keep safety up in prisons, the aim was to keep inmates occupied (either with work or with leisure activities). On the other hand, in order to enhance safety for the population outside the prison, a new form of imprisonment had been introduced in the 1970s – the so-called ‘involuntary forensic placement’. This innovation, however, was often criticized as inhumane since, for example, it created an opportunity to keep people locked up virtually forever; and of tranquilizing inmates with doses of medication than offering proper but costly treatment. Furthermore, opponents like social workers and inmates also highlighted that no resocialization took place (e.g., 1980). Another issue relating to safety and security – which also led to considerable discontent within society, particularly since it was considered to facilitate rape or murder – was the idea to establish prison furloughs, and day paroles. Finally, the increasing number of inmates led to challenges of safety and security. This problem became highly relevant in 1990s after the Iron Curtain fell, and remained a public talking point in the 2000s. Furthermore, newspapers reported that the number of dangerous inmates increased over the years. The safety and security of inmates themselves became an issue as well, since inmates often suffered from diseases, like HIV or hepatitis. Particularly in the 2000s, suicides and fatalities became much more public than before.

The question of how a prison sentence should be experienced by inmates – for instance the issue of humane treatment – was important with regard to topics related to punishment, resocialization, and safety and security issues. Data show that it was an important topic in all four decades, especially in relation to issues of prison conditions. To give an example, overcrowding led to more aggression, lack of warm water, or separated toilets. This then led to more frustration,
and insufficient education opportunities for inmates, which had a negative impact on the resocialization process. In general, issues around work, working conditions, payment, and women in prison had been important from the 1980s until 2000.

Zooming further into the last 15 years, data shows that the main topics clustered around resocialization as well as safety, security, and control issues. On the other side, issues around punishment seemed to have decreased significantly in the media. Most articles had been published about electronic tagging (n=71), abuses in prisons (n=42), understaffing (n=34), and lack of space (n=30) which are all strongly connected to safety and security issues. Other main topics had been resocialization (n=19), as well as fatalities (n=27) and human rights (n=21). In most of these topics, prison inmates were mentioned. Only in a few exceptions did they not appear in the media, such as reports on understaffing, the idea to build more prisons, psychiatric detention centers, and reforms. Prison managers were mentioned only in one case directly, namely in the context of abuses in prisons. Table 6 gives a more detailed overview of the most common topics in the media between 2000 and 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Actors mentioned in this context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Electronic tagging</td>
<td>inmates, prison managers, prison officers, professional service staff, staff council, Federal Ministry of Justice, politicians, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Abuses in prisons</td>
<td>inmates, prison staff, prison staff, prison officers, Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Understaffing</td>
<td>prison officers, prison staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lack of space</td>
<td>inmates, prison staff, prison officers, Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>More prisons</td>
<td>local politicians, human rights organizations, other environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>inmates, prison officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Inmates, cooperation partners, national politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Juvenile imprisonment</td>
<td>inmates, professional service staff, inmates as victims, courts, other environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>inmates, professional service staff, Federal Ministry of Justice, human rights organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Resocialization</td>
<td>inmates, professional service staff, Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td>inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Proportion of foreigners</td>
<td>inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Psychiatric detention center</td>
<td>prison officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hardly any employment opportunities</td>
<td>inmates, prison officers, professional service staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Retraining of soldiers</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Most common topics in the media between 2000 and 2015

5.1.3 Building blocks – Identifying the main components of the media discourse

In the newspaper articles from Profil, I identified 25 different building blocks as a basis for reconstructing the institutional logics prevalent in the media discourse. As outlined in the
methods chapter, in general, each building block encompasses specific phrases from newspaper articles – which have been inductively grouped in order to reconstruct the prevalent set of institutional logics. These building blocks in the newspaper articles are divided into four categories (see Table 7), however not all building blocks were subsequently linked to a specific institutional logic, as some express more general topics that do not imply particular value spheres, but cut across several logics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management structure and practices</th>
<th>Mission and purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building block and frequency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management control (1)</strong></td>
<td>&quot;It becomes harder and harder to acquire commissions for our workshops&quot;, says head of Prison Stein, Johann Hadrbolec. &quot;One of our staff is specifically assigned to marketing. Still, people outside can find our products quicker and in at least equal quality elsewhere – sometimes even cheaper&quot;. (Profil 05/2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Management (4)</strong></td>
<td>&quot;We have a staffing problem that is escalating quickly&quot;. Two years ago, he had 300 prison officers, today, 650 inmates are supervised by only 280 officers. &quot;We would, at the very least, need 330 in order to fulfil our legal mandate&quot;, explains Hadrbolec (Profil 04/1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power to (4)</strong></td>
<td>In a course of three months, they [prison officers; JW] become acquainted with the criminal code and the basics of psychology and leadership. They learn what is useless to them in daily practice. &quot;Only practice teaches how to really act and behave. Humanity is something that is simply not always possible&quot; (Kretschmer). (Profil 03/1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management by objectives (6)</strong></td>
<td>Also with regard to visits and correspondence with the outside, the head of prison is the final authority. Further contact with fellow inmates is not allowed. The reason given is that these women should be protected from bad influence. (Profil 03/1992)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rate is 80 percent. The implications can be clearly seen in Prison Stein. (Profil 06/1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucratic process (2)</th>
<th>Resocialization (37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Permission to write letters has to be granted or rejected by formal decree&quot;. (Profil 06/1971)</td>
<td>[...] arrives at the conclusion that the prison is insidiously designed in a way that minimizes the chances of resocialization into society. (Profil 06/1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The penal system has to achieve very different things simultaneously. It needs to 'resocialise', detain inmates securely, constitute some kind of punishment, and show everybody that inmates are in a bad spot. This creates unsolvable conflicts between objectives. (Profil 12/1988)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Safety (44) | This would endanger order in the prison. For instance, it would be possible to hang yourself [inmates; JW] with a handkerchief. (Profil 08/1971) |
|-------------| The ban of specific cosmetic items in prisons is due to security issues. "You can buy everything in prison – but there we can be sure that nothing has been smuggled in". For instance, drugs in packs of cigarettes or tools in wooden slippers. (Profil 10/1982) |

| Control (14) | Dietmar Stegmaier, security officer, regrets that "something like that is unavoidable. We simply cannot supervise inmates every single minute. If somebody wants to cut himself, he will eventually succeed". (Profil 04/1994) |
|-------------| About a third is actually supervising inmates directly. The rest is occupied with keeping the workshops going. (Profil 06/1971) |

| Punishment (82) | Consequently, in the "country with the highest rate of pretrial detentions in Europe – with the exception of Turkey" (Dr. Roland Miklau from the Federal Ministry of Justice), there must be other reasons to incarcerate people on a simple suspicion. (Profil 03/1982) |
|----------------| The constant feeling of powerlessness and the disenfranchisement had been the worst, Kogler remembers. "You can’t even decide on the most personal and intimate things". (Profil 03/1992) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal factors affecting management</th>
<th>External factors affecting management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building block and frequency</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of the organization (2)</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Stein is hell.&quot; There, an expert in the Federal Ministry of Justice, explains, all coordinates regarding problems and issues meet each other. &quot;The positive sides of the penal system are very rarely observed in Stein&quot;. (Profil 06/1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law (45)</strong></td>
<td>A Criminal Code that speaks of resocialization rather than retribution should not be enacted in a way that locks inmates away for 23 hours a day without any meaningful ways of occupation. (Profil 10/1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Prison Kreme-Stein, Austria's largest prison, water has become scarce. At least, this is true for warm water. The law allows for two showers a week. Recently, the prison minimizes water usage and saves ten percent in energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clients (6)</strong></td>
<td>150 inmates are addicts taking part in a methadone substitution program; almost every third is diagnosed with a mental issue; inmates stem from 70 different nations. And, as prison manager Prechtl explains, „only very few succeed in not going back to prison after release“. (Profil 06/2003). Prison manager Christian Timm does not necessarily deny this in a talk with Profil. He reports about the “reality inside” and the substantial difficulties that prison officers as well as inmates are confronted with. He claims that these days, there are hardly any inmates that do not suffer from mental problems, are addicts, or are otherwise displaying behavioral problems. Additionally, he describes inmates as generally – and justifiably - restless and impatient, and harboring a “high degree of neediness”. (Profil 10/2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Politics (3)</strong></td>
<td>Since the vote on the amendment of the criminal code shall be conducted secretly and without <em>Klubzwang</em> [a rule binding delegates to the party line; JW] – as a matter of conscience rather than party politics – they could voice their doubts anonymously. That would topple the law if there were not at least as many delegates on the other side that are secretly in favor of Broda’s plans. (Profil 01/1972) The small group of left-wing intellectuals and liberals that plays a certain role in the top-tier committees of the SPÖ [the social democrats; JW] does not speak for the whole party. (Profil 01/1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources (48)</strong></td>
<td>For this, the law mandates (in a well-meant way) psychiatric treatment. That’s all fine and well – but who will pay for this? (Profil 11/1981) Too many inmates, to little staff – in Austria’s prisons, the situation is becoming more precarious by the day. (Profil 06/2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media (11)</strong></td>
<td>Even the <em>Kronen Zeitung</em> is in favor of impunity these days. (Profil 01/1971) In the provinces [<em>Länder</em>], a certain populism is prevalent. “Maissau can breathe easily again”, the “Niederösterreichische Nachrichten” [a local newspaper; JW] claimed a month ago, when an initiative in the district of Hollabrunn brought down plans for a project regarding the accommodation of psychologically challenged lawbreakers. The lobby of proponents is not nearly as vocal. (Profil 07/2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanity (77)</strong></td>
<td>Humane prison sentences mean, for instance, preventing that inmates have to do their bathroom deeds in front of others, which is humiliating. (Profil 11/1984) The local council of Göllersdorf unanimously decided some days later to protest the planned humanization of prison sentences. (Profil 02/1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental factors (9)</strong></td>
<td>Not only the prison of the regional court – all across Austria, the number of pre-trial detentions has increased dramatically in the last years. (Profil 03/1982) The most politically charged problem is the high degree of foreign inmates. (Profil 06/2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reform (40)</strong></td>
<td>The reform mandates to pursue humanity and effectiveness as combined objectives. The lawmaker is therefore challenged to measure the reality according to these demands. (Profil 02/1986) Ever since, there is an „alien element“ in the penal system. “A great establishment”, as former inmate Helga Höldmoser thinks, “but the conditions there are catastrophic” [talking about mother-child imprisonment; JW] (Profil 04/1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The public (13)</strong></td>
<td>Last Monday in the early hours, about 300 to 400 inhabitants of Göllersdorf met in front of the prison for a ‘silent protest’. (Profil 02/1988) “At this time, we need to focus on the public’s need for safety”. (Profil 02/1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other sources of influence (6)

Accordingly, fronts are hardened completely: Broda wants to relax detention, the responsible state prosecutor rejects the idea, and the responsible judge does not have the guts to do anything. (Profil 06/1982)

“You cannot completely hold a person who never had any chance, whose socialization has already predicted his downfall, responsible for his failings.” (Schreiner). (Profil 10/1974)

### Religion and church (4)

The statement of the church has critics among its own ranks. “Even when a legal commission of the episcopal conference issues a statement”, says catholic legal expert professor Dordett, “the bishops have to be aware that this specific statement is not in line with the Holy Spirit. If the commission had been composed differently – maybe by including parts of the congregation – its judgement might have been different”. (Profil 01/1971)

“The church”, as a concerned party explains sarcastically, “has always been in favor of self-flagellation – it enjoys the thorn in its own flesh.” (Profil 01/1971)

---

**Table 7: Building blocks at the field level**

The first category is called ‘management structures and practices’ and has five [17] building blocks. Compared to the other field-level categories, it is the smallest one. The main question behind this category is: what does management in prisons look like and how is it fulfilled? Accordingly, it contains all units of analysis dealing with management issues, like for example, staff management (e.g., understaffing), management by objectives, but also bureaucratic processes.

The second category focuses on the ‘mission and purpose’ of a prison. Consequently, the main question behind this category is: What are the duties and tasks of a prison? It consists of nine [224] building blocks which can be clustered into resocialization tasks (including those aspects of resocialization that happen inside the prison like, for example, educating inmates and giving them special treatment to prepare them for their release), safety and control tasks (focusing on safety issues inside and outside the prisons), and punishment tasks. These three tasks are very similar to the § 20 of the Correctional Service Act.

---

18 Numbers in brackets denote the frequency of phrases related to a specific building block in the sample of newspaper articles.
The third category relates to ‘internal factors affecting management’ and deals with restrictions and the specific characteristics of the penal system. In this category, four building blocks are identified, including the lack of resources (financial, spatial, and staff), nature of the organization, and clients. It also includes ‘humanity’ and ‘inhumanity’ focusing more on the question how these prison tasks should be fulfilled.

The fourth category is of ‘external factors affecting management’. Whereas the first three categories focus on the internal perspective of the prison, this category adds the external influences from the prison environment. It includes eight building blocks, which all have an impact on prison management, like external stakeholders (e.g., the general public, politics, media, and the church).

5.1.4 Reconstructing the constellation of field-level logics from the media discourse

Through constant comparison of the building blocks, I identified three dominant logics in the media discourse: a ‘logic of punishment’, a ‘logic of resocialization’, and a ‘logic of discipline’ (for more details on the coding and analyzing process see chapter 4.2.2.2). Furthermore, I found traces of the ‘managerialism logic’ which was – compared to the others – very ephemeral in the media discourse. Accordingly, I provide more details on the logic of managerialism in my discussion of the manager level (see chapter 5.2.6). In this chapter, I will describe the ‘logic of punishment’, the ‘logic of resocialization’, and the ‘logic of discipline’ in more detail. Table 8 provides an overview of the building blocks within each logic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Resocialization</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Managerialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Blocks</strong></td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resocialization</td>
<td></td>
<td>objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Building blocks of the field-level logics

The logic of punishment

I follow McPherson and Sauder (2013) in arguing that the ‘logic of punishment’ "represents the field-level manifestation of the logic of the state (see McPherson & Sauder, 2013: 172). The logic of punishment’ revolves around the idea of the deprivation of freedom. People who violate the law should take responsibility for their (mis-)behavior, and the state should ensure justice. The main proponent of this logic in the media discourse is the general public. However, how punishment is fulfilled has changed over the years. As described before, the understanding of punishment
included much more violence (e.g., correction cells or death penalty) in the 1970s. In those times, prison managers had a different approach and understanding of punishment. Nowadays, punishment is understood in a much more humane way.

I identified the logic of punishment by clustering all those buildings blocks dealing with aspects of punishment. In this case, the logic was clearly bounded in the discourse. Only one building block in the data corresponded to this logic, namely punishment. Typical statements in the newspapers were: “as he was again put into a correction cell” (Profil 08/1970), “the penal system still serves as [...] revenge in the public's mind” (Profil 12/1985), those who create trouble “were put into isolation, often for several months. To be permanently locked away has devastating effects on mental and cognitive capabilities” (Profil 06/1991), “you get locked away and you are left to yourself. Such punishment is only comprehensible if you understand it as a form of revenge” (Profil 06/2003). Therefore, keywords are, for instance, ‘correction cell’, ‘lock way’, ‘punishment’, and ‘penalty’.

The logic of resocialization

The second logic which I identified is the logic of resocialization. In contrast to the work of McPherson and Sauder (2013) as well as Toubiana (2014) who talk about a ‘rehabilitation logic’, this logic encompasses a broader understanding. The logic centers on the objective to not only treat inmates in a medical sense, but also to support inmates, give them perspective, and prepare them for their release. The ‘logic of resocialization’ consists of several building blocks, such as educate, care, rehabilitation, prepare, and resocialization. Educate includes educational measures, such as giving inmates a routine and opportunities to work or to pursue further education. Care has a very supportive meaning. Prepare includes the aim to reintegrate inmates into society again. Proponents of this logic are primarily social workers and prison managers. Examples of phrases employed to invoke the ‘logic of resocialization’ are: “it seems that for Bernhard [an inmate; JW] neither the financial penalties nor the prison sentences have been either a deterrence or had a resocializing effect” (Profil 11/1980), “inside, in Schwarzau, someone has at least taken care of her” (Profil 05/200), “the educational training is confined to cooking or waitressing [...] those are the areas where women have the best opportunities to find a job after their release” (Profil 03/1992). Therefore, typical keywords are, for instance, ‘resocialization’, ‘education’, ‘educational function’, or ‘medical treatment’.

The logic of discipline

This logic centrally draws from Foucault’s idea of discipline. According to Foucault, discipline “is a ‘technology’ aimed at: ‘how to keep someone under surveillance, how to control his conduct, his
behavior, his aptitudes, how to improve his performance, multiply his capacities, how to put him where he is most useful: that is discipline in my sense" (1991: 191 quoted in O'Farrell, 2005: 132). Accordingly, Foucault explicitly talks of prisons as disciplinary institutions. The 'logic of discipline' encompasses not only surveillance and control issues, but also safety and security aspects. The main purposes are generate feelings of safety among the general public. This means that dangerous people should be kept in prison as long as necessary and that there should be no escapes. It also means that the safety and security standards in prisons should be kept high. Riots or fights between inmates and between inmates and staff should be avoided. Main proponents are the general public as well as the staff council of the prison officers. Examples are: "a prison officer is watching – being moderately strict – whether the rules and regulations are complied with" (Profil 06/1971), "across Austrian prisons there is an insidious aggravation of aggression [...] but it will be dangerous until the end of the year" (Profil 22/05/2000), "attacks have increased against prison officers" (Profil 06/1992), "first of all we have to address the need for safety and security of the general public" (Profil 02/1994), "the wish for safety and security became hysteria" (Profil 07/2013). Keywords are ‘safety’, ‘security’, ‘aggression’, or ‘control’.

Building on Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012), McPherson and Sauder (2013), and Toubiana (2014), Table 9 provides an overview of the central characteristics of each logic. Each logic can be characterized by its 'source of legitimacy/central values' (how can it be legitimated), 'source of authority' (which authority provides agency within the logic), 'focus of attention' (what is the main purpose), 'basis of strategy' (how should the purpose be fulfilled), 'target of legitimacy pursuits' (who makes legitimacy judgements), and 'primary associated role identities' (through which role identities is the logic enacted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Resocialization</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of legitimacy/ Central values</td>
<td>Retributive justice</td>
<td>Man as social animal</td>
<td>Safety, security, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of authority</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Professional expertise</td>
<td>Position in the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of attention</td>
<td>Proportionality</td>
<td>Success of reintegration</td>
<td>Control mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of strategy</td>
<td>Deterrence</td>
<td>Minimize recidivism rate</td>
<td>Minimize risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of legitimacy pursuits</td>
<td>Judicial system</td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Inmates’ families</td>
<td>Working union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>Staff council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary associated role identities</td>
<td>Prison officer</td>
<td>Prison officer</td>
<td>Prison officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prison manager</td>
<td>Prison manager</td>
<td>Prison manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Key characteristics of 'punishment logic', 'resocialization logic', 'discipline logic'
5.1.5 Characteristics and dynamics of the constellation of field-level logics

In the following (see Figure 4), I provide an overview of the constellation of logics in the media discourse for all four field-level logics within each of the four different time periods. To see how frequently each logic appears in each period, I used the number of codes from Profil. More specifically, I used MAXQDA’s total frequency counts of codes for each logic (as an aggregation of frequencies of the respective building blocks), already divided into the four different periods. Then I compared them to each other for each time period (1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000s).

![Figure 4: Constellation of field-level logics between 1970 and 2015](image)

According to the data, all four field-level logics appeared in all four periods. The ‘logic of discipline’ was the most frequent one in the 1970s, 1990s, and the 2000s. The only exception was in the 1980s, in which the ‘punishment logic’ dominated. One reason for this could be that prisons were strongly criticized as being too humane during this decade. Consequently, the media reported more on punishment issues in order to calm the public. Apart from the 2000s, the ‘resocialization logic’ was less frequent in the media discourse than the ‘punishment logic’ or the ‘discipline logic’. The strong focus on discipline can be explained by the fact that this logic includes all issues about safety, security, and control. Compared to the ‘resocialization logic’, disciplinary issues represent

---

19 Note: Only in the last period (Profil 2000s) the interval does not cover not ten but fifteen years.
the main concerns of the general public. Oftentimes, the media focuses on topics that society wants to hear about. Of course, through their agenda setting function (e.g., Gamson, 1992; Meyer, 2004), the media also channel public attention. For the general public, prisons are places where the government must have everything under control and therefore protect society. Finally, the ‘managerialism logic’ was very peripheral in all four periods. This suggests that the management of prisons per se is not an issue that is discussed intensely in the media discourse.

I also identified the actors expressing specific field-level logics in their statements. I analyzed the newspaper articles in Profil from 1970 to 2015 with regard to the dominant speakers. Again, I used MAXQDA to see how often (number of hits) speakers invoked a specific logic, or, to put it more technically, I looked at the number of overlaps between speakers and field-level logics. I also distinguished between internal actors and external actors (see Table 10). In total, I identified four clusters. First, speakers who talked about all four field-level logics. Second, speakers who link to three of the four field-level logics. Third, speakers who link to two of the four field-level logics. Finally, speakers who are related to only one of the four field-level logics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Resocialization</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Managerialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former inmate (7)</td>
<td>Prison Manager (9)</td>
<td>Prison manager (12)</td>
<td>Prison officer (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate (7)</td>
<td>Former inmate (3)</td>
<td>Inmate (5)</td>
<td>Prison manager (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison manager (3)</td>
<td>Management (3)</td>
<td>Staff council (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison staff (3)</td>
<td>Prison officer (2)</td>
<td>Former inmate (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officer (2)</td>
<td>Professional service staff (2)</td>
<td>Management (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service staff (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional service staff (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff council (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prison staff (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice (4)</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice (3)</td>
<td>Expert (4)</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer (3)</td>
<td>Court (2)</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice (3)</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (3)</td>
<td>Care facility (2)</td>
<td>Media (3)</td>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care facility (2)</td>
<td>Expert (2)</td>
<td>Others (2)</td>
<td>Expert (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court (2)</td>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice (2)</td>
<td>General public (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public (2)</td>
<td>Prosecution (1)</td>
<td>Local public (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local politicians (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Frequencies of external and internal speakers in relation to field-level logics

Actors who invoked all four field-level logics are prison managers, experts, the Federal Minister of Justice, and the Federal Ministry of Justice. However, not every speaker talked about each logic equally often. Prison mangers, for example, spoke a lot about ‘discipline’ (n=12), and less about ‘resocialization’ (n=9) or ‘punishment’ (n=3). They also rarely talked about ‘managerialism’ (n=2), however this can be explained by the fact that managerialism in general
was not a big topic. Furthermore, an explanation is that they mostly responded to accusations related to safety and security issues. Shifting the focus to external speakers, the Federal Minister of Justice invoked the ‘punishment’, ‘discipline’, and ‘managerial’ logics once, and the ‘resocialization’ logic twice, whereas the Federal Ministry of Justice mostly enacted the ‘punishment’ (n=4), ‘discipline’ (n=3), and ‘resocialization’ (n=3) logic three times, and the ‘managerialism logic’ only once. This could be due to the Federal Ministry of Justice having to give official statements on incidents in prisons. In addition, the amount of comments within the media from experts varied, they mostly invoked the ‘discipline logic’ (n=4), sometimes the ‘punishment logic’ as well as the ‘resocialization logic’ (n=2), and only once the ‘managerialism logic’ (n=1).

The second group consists of former inmates, (current) inmates, professional service staff (such as social workers, psychiatrists, etc.), and prison officers. Former inmates mostly enacted the ‘punishment logic’ (n=7), whereas ‘discipline’ (n=3) and ‘resocialization’ (n=3) seemed to be less important for them. A reason for this could be that (former) inmates used the media as a conduit for voicing their complaints. Professional service staff draw mostly on a ‘discipline logic’ (n=3) and ‘resocialization’ (n=2), and hardly on ‘punishment’ (n=1). One explanation is that social workers and psychiatrists commented on drug abuses and involuntary forensic placements, which is often related to safety and security as well as resocialization issues. Prison officers, on the contrary, mostly enacted the ‘managerialism logic’ (n=3), e.g., problems of understaffing, but also ‘punishment logic’ (n=2) and ‘resocialization logic’ (n=1). The final actors in the second group are (current) inmates. Similar to former inmates, they mostly drew on ‘punishment’ (n=7), followed by ‘discipline’ (n=5), and ‘resocialization’ (n=1). Again, ‘managerialism’ is not an issue.

The third cluster encompasses actors who link to two field-level logics. The first group, invoking both ‘punishment’ and ‘discipline’ are staff, the general as well as the local public, the staff council, and others (including actors such as the WKO). Whereas staff drew slightly more on punishment, the general and local public enacted both field-level logics equally. In contrast, the staff council and others invoked the ‘discipline logic’ more often. One reason could be that for the latter two actors, safety and security issues were the main focus, especially as the staff council is the representative of prison officers. The second group are actors who drew on ‘resocialization’ and ‘punishment’. This group encompasses courts and care facilities. In both cases, they invoked ‘punishment’ and ‘resocialization’ equally frequently. Finally, management (including people in a leadership position within the prison, but not the prison manager) drew on ‘discipline’ and ‘resocialization’. One reason could be that they see safety, security, and resocialization as the main important issues for people working in prisons.

The last group are actors who only enact one field-level logic. Whereas the prosecution drew once on the ‘resocialization logic’, media drew on the ‘discipline logic’. It can be argued that the media often represent the view of the public or write about things the public wants to
read about which are, as mentioned above, safety and security issues. Finally, speakers who only invoked punishment are local politicians (such as mayors), the church, and lawyers. Notably, all of the actors related to the last group are external speakers.

This relates to my first sub-question – who are the relevant actors in the field? I follow Meyer (2004) and focus, in order to answer the sub-question, not only on the speakers, but also the actors mentioned in each context. Consequently, I started by analyzing the newspaper articles from Profil between 1970 and 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal speakers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>External speakers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>External speakers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former inmate</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>Staff council</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison manager</td>
<td>20.73%</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>Care facility</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officer</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>First authority</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Local public</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of justice</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
<td>Inmates’ families</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National politicians</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>Other environment</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local politicians</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=199 (52.23%)  n=182 (47.44%)

Table 11: Internal and external speakers in the media

As illustrated in the Table 11 above, I clustered the speakers into internal and external ones. The findings show that the most prevalent speakers in the medial discourse are prison managers (20.73%), followed by the Federal Minister of Justice (11.02%), inmates (8.66%), experts (7.87%), professional service staff (7.61%), and former inmates (6.82%). One explanation is that prison managers often justified or clarified what was happening in prisons; a representative of the Federal Ministry of Justice commented on occurrences in prisons; and inmates or former inmates used the media as a voice for grievances.

In addition, I investigated how often actors were mentioned in Die Presse, Falter, Kurier, and Kronen Zeitung in 2004, 2009, and 2014 (see a general overview in Table 12 below). As the Kronen Zeitung, in particular, has very short articles which hardly include any speakers (which was also the case for Die Presse), I decided to focus on the actors mentioned and not the speakers in the issue-field.
The results show that when focusing only on the actors mentioned, inmates (20.43%) are the most frequent ones in the newspapers. One reason that inmates feature more prominently in newspaper articles rather than speakers is that there was substantial coverage of suicides or escapes in prisons. Prison officers (8.16%), the Federal Ministry of Justice (8.11%), courts (8.05%), and the Federal Minister of Justice (6.54%) also seem to be relevant actors.

Summing up, at the field level, I identified four different logics 1970 and 2015, namely a ‘punishment logic’, a ‘resocialization logic’, a ‘discipline logic’, as well as a ‘managerialism logic’. ‘Punishment’ and ‘discipline’ have been more prevalent in most time periods compared to ‘resocialization’ and ‘managerialism’. I also show which of the actors in the field commonly enact the different field-level logics and how often. Finally, I illustrate who the relevant actors in the field are by distinguishing between speakers (analyzing Profil from 1970 to 2015) and actors mentioned (analyzing Die Presse, Falter, Kurier, and Kronen Zeitung in 2004, 2009, 2014). The results show – combining both analyses – that prison managers, inmates, and the Federal Ministry of Justice are the most relevant ones (measured in terms of occurrences in the media).

5.2 The Austrian prison world from the perspective of prison managers

In this chapter, I characterize the Austrian prison world as constructed by the prison managers that I interviewed. This relates to both parts of my research questions. My interview data allowed me to see which field-level institutional logics are actually experienced by prison managers at the individual level – and, additionally, to see whether new logics appear that are not enacted in the media discourse. It also enabled me to reconstruct the relationships between logics as experienced at the micro level. Consequently, it relates to the second part of my research questions, which asks how institutional complexity manifests in the shared narratives of prison managers.
To contextualize these findings, I start by briefly characterizing the typical careers and related professional understandings of prison managers. In Austria, there are two possible ways to become a prison manager. First, most prison managers start as prison officers. This means that, as a prison officers, they must have an Austrian citizenship and either have finished school or completed vocational training. They must be at least 18 years old, have a driver’s license, be physically healthy, etc. During their time working as prison officers, they have to pass several exams in order to climb the career ladder. Consequently, most prison managers have a lot of professional expertise as well as practical experience by the time they reach this position. Some of them even decide to study law or management while they are working as prison managers because knowledge of the law is crucial to fulfilling tasks and duties properly. Prison managers may also have alternative backgrounds – for instance, past employment in the military, as teachers, pastors in prisons, or even in the political sphere. This latter carrier path – which is often the exception – is to start with a university degree (e.g., often in psychology). These managers are mostly managing involuntary forensic placement. My interviewees mirrored these backgrounds. Most of them came from the ‘classical school’ and started working as prison officers several years ago (also with different backgrounds) and only a few of my interviewees entered the field with the alternate carrier path.

The narrative I present here is meant to provide a contrast to the one reconstructed from the media discourse. Although some topics are certainly overlapping, it is also striking that the crucial issues seem to differ considerably between the field and the individual levels. Similar to the media discourse, the social reality reconstructed from my interviews with prison managers is not ‘the true’ account of what is going on, but represents the socially shared reality that these actors experience and the shared narratives they construct. The focus on latent and shared aspects of meaning, however, also means that I do not present individual and idiosyncratic accounts here, but a shared life-world that is intersubjectively available to prison managers and guides their collective understandings of what is going on. The combination of content-analytical and hermeneutic methods of analysis allowed me to reconstruct the guiding logics behind the individual accounts and to compare them to those found in the media discourse.

In this chapter I, start by giving an overview of the prison environment and describe the most important stakeholders having an impact on prison management. Then, I narrow my focus to prisons as organizations and describe the purposes of imprisonment, types of prisons, and the challenges of managing prisons from a prison manager’s perspective. I continue with the tasks and duties of prison management, restrictions, and reform initiatives. I also add my insights from the hermeneutical analysis, before I present the building blocks as well as the logics which I identified at the individual level. Finally, I outline the constellation of the manager-level logics and their characteristics.
5.2.1 The prison environment

Prisons, like any other organization, are embedded within a broader social environment. One interviewee explained: „In the frozen structures of the prison world, it is difficult to change anything because there are also environmental pressures which constrain the agency of a prison manager. In general, everyone must work together to accomplish a goal. But several environmental pressures are working against you, and this is noticeable." (I6)\textsuperscript{20} I highlight those stakeholders who emerged from the analysis as relevant for prison managers and their daily work. This includes courts, other prisons, the media, the broader public, legal protection associations, and politicians. In my interviews, three out of eight prison managers stressed the importance of the prisons’ relationship with courts because judges' decisions on sentencing and paroles have critical implications for the management of prisons. Essentially, this means that – despite the bureaucratic nature of prisons – there is considerable leeway (and need) for relationship building. For example, if connections are well established, it is possible to make special agreements, such as having inmates released on probation for good behavior (I8). However, good connections are not always enough. For inmates in involuntary forensic placement, it is harder because they have to find establishments where they can be supervised after they complete their prison sentences. Even though a judge might decide to release these inmates, there is no place for them to go. As a consequence, these inmates may have to stay in prison indefinitely (I8).

Furthermore, most of the prison managers noted that it is important for a prison to have good relationships with other prisons in Austria. For example, if an inmate causes trouble, he/she can be sent to another prison (I7, I3). This is important to keep safety and security in prisons high. In addition, contact with other prisons provides a conduit for exchanging ideas (I7). As the ‘inner circle’ of actors in the prison landscape is rather small (I2) it is easy to stay in touch. In general, prison managers experience a good network not only between prison managers, but at all levels (I1).

Within the broader prison environment, one of the key players is the media. In contrast to courts and other prisons, there is little opportunity for prison managers to influence this stakeholder through relationship building. Consequently, the media is portrayed primarily as a problematic part of prisons’ environment. Six out of the eight interviewees stressed that the media has an enormous impact on the decision making processes of a prison manager – particularly as the media influences political as well as public opinion. A prison manager faces a great deal of pressure when his/her prison receives a lot of negative publicity (I9). For example, if the media

\textsuperscript{20} The “I” indicates a reference to a specific interview (from one to eight).
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reports that too many inmates are being given day paroles (typical reasons are marriage, visiting family, or work), prison managers have to be more vigilant in order to reassure the public (I8). Prison managers therefore become more cautious and restrictive in approving such paroles. As one interviewee said: „A single decision by a prison manager can have an impact on the decision making process of all other prison managers” (I4). An illustrative example is the decision concerning electronic tagging. As noted earlier, the case of a prominent convict, who went to the opera despite wearing an electronic tag, sparked widespread outrage and scrutiny after the media reported the incident. As a consequence, the use of electronic tagging was called into question (I4). Although it was the decision of only one prison manager the whole penal system was heavily criticized. Because of possible reverberating implications, it is necessary for a prison manager to carefully consider all possible scenarios before making a decision. This creates a number of complications for preparing inmates for their release (I8). To make matters worse, according to the interviewees, every negative headline is reported to the office of the Federal Minister (I8, I3). This leads to formal instructions, which have to be implemented by the prison managers and may include staff decisions, such as temporary suspensions. This, then, has a negative impact on the motivation of the employees; and sick leaves rise as a consequence (I8).

In general, there is a shared understanding that no one wants to read about the penal system. For prison managers this means that no news is normally good news, while positive media coverage hardly ever happens. Prison managers also feel that the media has little opportunity (and motivation) to report objectively on prison issues. This is primarily caused by substantial information asymmetries, which may influence media reporting in several ways. For instance, one problem with the media is that if an employee speaks to a journalist, this may be due to personal frustrations, which are then presented as objective fact. Consequently, according to the interviewees, it is often questionable if media reports are really objective and neutral. It seems that some parts are often exaggerated for increased effect. In most of the cases, reporting concerns some kind of banality that happens a hundred times every day (I1). But, as one of the prison manager stressed, this problem also accrues to the fact that society has little knowledge about the penal system, and therefore those stories have a big effect on the whole prison landscape (I2).

On the other side, there are also negative headlines that draw attention to problems that need fixing, and such coverage is important in order to improve the penal system and to obtain the necessary resources. For example, after big scandals in the juvenile prison at Prison Josefstadt, the prison received more money. This was money they needed to make changes as well as to hire more social pedagogues (I4). However, even when media reports are justified, prison managers feel that there is a substantial bias in the media sphere. One interviewee described issues about neglected inmates and abuses within the prisons: “70% or even 80% of the criticisms are justified.
Things have happened which should not have happened. That is true [...] But I also think that many positive things are happening” (I4).

Another major player commonly mentioned by prison managers is the broader public. Throughout all the interviews, there is a shared consensus that the penal system is not only part of society, but it is also governed by it (I6). However, according to the interviews, it seems that society has an inaccurate understanding of the Austrian penal system (I1). The public expects that every move in public prisons is supervised, controlled, and carefully scrutinized. But, in reality, this is not possible. Some inmates work in enterprises outside of the prison, which makes it impossible to have complete control and prevent issues such as smuggling. These issues are typically highlighted and scandalized in the media. Consequently, prison managers pointed out that society has little understanding of how these issues arise, and their tolerance of them is very low. For prison managers, this creates a major challenge – as the public often has a different perception of the reality in prisons and how things actually work (I2). While it would be ideal for these issues to be eradicated, “it is unfortunately common in here” (I2). Another interviewee said:

> „From my understanding, the wider public’s tolerance of these issues is decreasing rather than increasing. We have to live with ‘weirdos’. Those people exist in every society and as long as they are not dangerous... I can give you an example [...]. Last year a 73 or 74 year old mentally-unstable woman threw flowerpots out of her window. Passersby called the police and when the police came, one police officer was hit in the arm by a flowerpot. Any time a police officer is injured, the incident is immediately taken up by the courts. [...] the woman was, therefore put in involuntary forensic placement for several months, which costs about 450 euros per day. [...] The question was raised about whether this woman was really so dangerous that the state had to pay 450 euros per day to place her in this facility or whether placing her in a normal geriatric facility would have been sufficient – that way a) she would not be put into the penal system, and b) the costs would be drastically reduced. However, the woman was locked away, the ‘disturbance’ was dealt with, and the wider public was happy again” (I2).

What this quote demonstrates is that prison managers think that for society, it is important that offenders are ‘removed’ and locked away. This strongly corresponds to the findings from the media discourse, which showed that prison managers are strongly aware of how the media both portrays and channels public opinion. However, interviewees pointed out that one thing that is often overlooked is that – although the “penal system is not a reflection of society” – it is at least a part of it (I1). This means that the people inside eventually get out again.

The next main stakeholder, which almost all of the interviewees highlighted, are legal protection associations like the Austrian Ombudsman Board21 (I5, I3) and CPT. Prison managers understand that as the deprivation of freedom is the harshest penalty the state can impose, it is critical to have supervisory authorities from outside. Not only does the public need to be

---

21 Due to the implementation of the optional protocol to the UN Convention against Torture (OPCAT), the commissions reporting to the Austrian Ombudsman Board are authorized to visit and review prisons (FM, 2016: 11).
protected, the people inside the penal system do as well. As the Austrian Ombudsman Board is a rather new organization (in its current form, it exists since 2012), it is still acting in accordance with the rules which can take a lot of time to distinguish between complaints which are reasonable and those that are not (I2). However, their function is primarily to observe whether prisons are acting in accordance with the law, whether inmates are being treated well, and look into any complaints or other issues. Although there is more and more supervision from outside, and although such legal protection associations, like the Austrian Ombudsman Board’ point to a lot of necessary changes, prison managers complained that in comparison to the number of complaints, hardly anything is happening because this would need resources which are not available at the moment (I1).

Closely tied to the judicial system is another important player, politicians. Politicians have a great impact on the management of the prison system (I8, I4), especially the Federal Minister of Justice (I4) – who has the highest authority in the penal system. Since the Federal Minister of Justice has the authority to decide how laws need to be executed, this means that changes rest in its’ hands. For instance, a Federal Minster could institute policies that allow inmates to work outside the prison, or policies that strictly prohibit this (I8). This is also reflected in the broader context, like reform efforts, within the penal system. One interviewee pointed to the ambivalence characterizing relationships between prisons and the responsible minister: “Some [Minister of Justices; JW] want to change things, some are more cautious, some are more neutral and view the penal system as a necessary evil, but in reality no one really wants it, I think” (I4). One of the main problems with the Federal Ministry of Justice is that the cabinet is at the interface to the Federal Minister of Justice and consequently has a lot of power. For this reason, also the staff council tries to get their people in there (I2).

5.2.2 Organizational characteristics of prisons

Apart from outlining the interactions with – and pressures from – the external environment, my interview data also allowed for the reconstruction of the shared understanding of prisons as a specific kind of organization. Among the interviewees, there is a general understanding that prisons, and the penal system are very hierarchical. The roots of the penal system trace back to the military (I6). Nowadays, prisons are characterized more as service companies (I6, I5) that are still influenced by old Weberian traditions. Although processes and responsibilities are clearly defined, processes (e.g., decision making processes) can be very slow because of a high degree of bureaucracy (I1) – which is described as “very rigid and frozen” (I3). Throughout the interviews there was the understanding that prisons are also characterized by clear rules, guidelines, regulations, and orders for how to act (I1, I2, I7). Their tasks and duties are precisely determined by legislation. The law says exactly what to do with people inside prisons. This includes orders to
"discipline them [inmates; JW], treat them as human beings, and not to punish them for a second
time". The societal functions of a prison are defined by § 20 Correctional Service Act. One
interviewee echoed the law, stating “punishment, [...] socialization, and security [...]”. The more
that one focuses on a specific purpose, the more the achievement of the other purposes comes into
doubt" (I5). Consequently, contradictions are especially evident in the penal system.

The law not only has a great impact on the way inmates are treated, but also on decision
making processes (I8) – not to mention safety and security issues in prisons (I7). To give an
example, a prison manager has the right to make use of administrative sanctions (I2). This means
that when an inmate does not behave properly, he or she can be disciplined (I6). Consequently,
the law gives prison managers a lot of power and scope for action. As one interviewee puts it:
"This makes high-quality execution of the prison sentence possible, because there is room for
maneuver as the law is not very rigid" (I2). Therefore, there is the shared understanding that it is
important to know how to interpret the law, because there is also the risk that the law is
incorrectly interpreted or not fully implemented.

Since prison managers were quite vocal about their shared understanding of the prison as
an organization, the next sections give more detailed insights about the shared narrative
regarding which purposes imprisonment should fulfill, which types of prisons exist, how they
differ with regard to management, and what the challenges are for prison managers (from their
perspective). These are all topics that were largely absent from the media discourse, but have
been extensively discussed in scientific literature. Accordingly, the following sub-sections both
complement and contrast the information gained in the literature review.

5.2.2.1 Purposes of imprisonment

The law mentions the following primary objectives: One of the main functions of the prison is to
discipline and educate inmates in order to resocialize them. According to the interviewees, it is
important to give inmates a daily routine and some structure in order to achieve this objective.
For example, they should get up in the morning and go to work (I8). This could be either within
the prison – as most prisons have their own workshops (for example, Prison Stein has 29
workshops) – or outside of the prison. Some inmates are part of a prison work program – where
inmates are permitted to leave for work during the day, but are required to return to the prison
in the evening (I8). The aim is to allow inmates to follow the daily structure of a normal citizen
(I4). Some of the prison managers pointed out that this means also that inmates should not only
work six or six and a half hours per day, like they do now, but instead go to work for eight hours
every day. Furthermore, there should be the possibility of participating in a variety of leisure
activities (e.g., like painting class or gym facilities (I7)) or even access to advanced education (I4).
This could have a positive impact on the security level within prisons. As one interviewee puts it, there is the idea that if inmates are occupied, they have less time to create problems (I8).

These measures contribute to the bigger goal of preparing inmates for their release and eventual reintegration into society. One interviewee said: “The aim is, on the one hand, to treat the inmates in a way that corresponds to their individual problems. On the other hand, occupying them through employment or training will help them find a job afterward which is not that easy” (I6). Consequently, time in prison is not just about punishing criminals (in the sense of merely ensuring that they serve their prison time), but to give them a clear perspective of what things will be like afterwards. This should also motivate inmates to work on themselves (both mentally, but also in terms of qualification) and is important “because if someone has no options anymore, he/she can become much more dangerous” (I8). Such preparation is – in line with the bureaucratic nature of the organization – strictly planned and executed. One tool is the correctional implementation plan which provides a timeline of the prison sentence – with milestones to show, for example, when therapy should be finished or when inmates should be allowed to get day paroles for better preparation for their life afterwards.

“If someone has been in prison for 15 years, he/she needs to be prepared before his/her release. A recently released convict usually cannot use the subway or even go shopping. There are so many convicts who live in the countryside and do not want to drive to Vienna or other big cities because they are overwhelmed and cannot handle the situation” (I8).

Therefore, it is important to prepare inmates properly “thus to ‘sell’ those inmates in a better way to the prison courts, as well to ‘market’ this person better as a product, in order to get a release on probation” (I8).

Another main purpose of a prison has to do with punishment. Although there is a general consensus that this is a key function of prisons, there is a great deal of debate over how punishment should be carried out – as well as over what punishment means. In contrast to the media discourse, punishment is not seen as the focus by prison managers, and punishing inmates is regarded quite critically. Prison managers see their role in reintegrating inmates and not punishing them for a second time. However, the reality is that the purpose of imprisonment is to restrict or remove inmates’ right of freedom. There is no other area where the state intervenes in a person’s rights to such an extent (I2). As one interviewee noted:

“It must be said that this is still punishment. So, if someone [meaning the public; JW] has concerns that the punishment is not severe enough there are always ideas about plank beds and so on, but this is something that does not exist anymore, there is a normal bed and one has a better mattress, the other one is slightly worse and if it is the worst it will be changed. That is how it is. [...] It is all about the reduction of freedom, and this is what is happening. Even if an inmate can decide to watch TV in the evening or to go to an event or to go to another inmate’s cell, essential things cannot be decided by this person. But this is ok because of what this person did in the past” (I4).
The question is then how a prison sentence should be served. One important consideration deals with issues of humanity, which has become increasingly important in the last 40 years. Despite the scandalous image portrayed by the media with regard to conditions in Austrian prisons, prison managers seem to unequivocally subscribe to the mandate of humane treatment of inmates. The main challenge is to treat inmates like human beings (I8) no matter what they did. Even though prison managers and officers are intimately aware of the reasons for which individual people are in prison (I1), they still must act professionally. “The penal system is of course – as a former Federal Minister of Justice said – not paradise [...] however it is also not a place where human beings are exterminated [...]” (I4). Interviewees, accordingly, stressed measures taken to increase the humanity of the penal system. For example, Prison Graz-Karlaú closed an ‘Absonderungsabteilung’ for solitary confinement which has been “the worst part in the prison” (I7). Inmates who had broken rules (e.g., smuggle, sheeting, fighting with other inmates, etc.) had to stay there for several days. This part of the prison was renovated and repurposed for leisure activities and work (e.g., gym and workout area). Being humane also includes providing some level of privacy – meaning that some aspects of an inmate’s daily activity cannot be observed, like, for example, having cameras in the bathroom. The aim is to increase the number of single cells and create some place for privacy because every person has the need to have some space of her or his own. Often inmates have to share a cell – so they will put blankets in front of their beds in order to achieve a little bit of privacy (I4).

Another main concern which was highlighted by the prison managers was safety. As mentioned before, one way to ensure safety is to keep the inmates occupied. Safety has two aspects in the shared narratives of prison managers. The first is inside the prison – which includes concerns for the safety of inmates themselves and the safety of prison staff (I8). To ensure safety within prisons, it is important that prison managers get information about inmates who might make trouble or pose some danger to themselves or others. Either those inmates need special psychological treatment or they need to be placed in another prison (I7). The second aspect of safety is outside of the prison – that is, the protection of society from dangerous criminals. This means that inmates need to be securely locked away and there should not be any escapes.

5.2.2.2 Types of prisons

In the interviews, it was highlighted several times that there are three different types of prisons in Austria. This is relevant for management issues, since each type of prison houses a different kind or category of inmate. As such, depending on the type of prison, its management will differ. Involuntary forensic placement houses inmates who need medical or psychological treatment because they are ill. They require special care in order to resocialize them into society – e.g., treatment for mental or emotional issues (I8). For these inmates, even though their prison
sentences are over, they may be required to stay in prison because it would be too dangerous to release them (I7). *Correctional facilities* house inmates that are considered very dangerous – i.e., that require maximum security. These inmates are typically incarcerated for longer periods of time. These two types of prisons are very different from *regional court prisons*, where inmates are incarcerated for maximum of two years. The turnover in court prisons is quite high, which poses a challenge for prison managers – who essentially have to manage a "very fluid organization" (I1). Prison Josefstadt, for example, has about 7,000 new inmates a year and is a distribution center for all inmates who have to be transferred to another prison (I4). One interviewee noted that in prisons like Prison Josefstadt, new problems can pop up from one minute to the next, and a prison manager has to solve each problem very quickly even though he has never encountered it before (I4). Some of problems can be dealt with, while others are unpredictable and come at prison managers full tilt (I1, I4). For these reasons, the prison manager and the staff have to be very flexible. Such a characterization is somewhat surprising, since it seems to stand in stark contrast with the characterization of prisons as clear and rigid bureaucracies.

For instance, a main challenge are contagious diseases, like Ebola or HIV – which prison managers and officers may have had little experience with or knowledge about. One of the interviewees explained that in the case of Ebola, one of the first reactions was that prison officers received a distance thermometer and information sheets. However, employees were afraid because there was a lot of insecurity, especially as there was the risk that people were taken into custody during the incubation period. However, as a prison’s duty is to house those people, inmates had to stay inside (I4). Such situations are very challenging. According to an interviewee, this situation was similar to that of HIV during the late 1980s. Few managers and prison officers had any knowledge of or experience with HIV. People thought that HIV was spread through coughing (I4). Because prisons were overcrowded, the question of where to put these inmates was hotly debated. The only thing a prison manager could do in such situations was to hope that some inmates would be cooperative and accept these newcomers into their cells – but the challenge was that they had to live together in very small cubicles without having any idea how this disease is passed on. One interviewee said: "Those things are really challenging. However somehow it has always worked out" (I4). This implies that being a prison manager requires a substantial capacity for ‘muddling through’ (e.g., March, 1978) and, for improvising despite the strong restrictions of bureaucracy and law.

5.2.2.3 Challenges of managing prisons

In the interviews there was a shared understanding that the biggest challenges in prisons have to do with the people inside. Although prisons need to be managed like any other organization, it must not be overlooked that “prisons are violent places” (I4). According to the prison managers,
serving prison time is very hard from the beginning to the end. No one is inside a prison of his/her own free will (I4). Moreover, it is often a new situation for many inmates, which requires time for them to orient themselves (I1). Again, this underscores the importance part of improvisation in prison management. The interviews suggested that, more often than one might expect, managing inmates resembles a delicate ‘dance’ in which both parties try to cope with uncertainties while constructing their mutual relationship. However, while prison managers and prison officers have a legal mandate to treat inmates with humanity and respect, no such mandate exists for the other side. Knowing the ‘other’ (i.e., different types of inmates) is therefore essential for the job.

Like the elderly, (mental) ill, and handicapped, inmates are a marginalized group in society. Inmates are people delivered to the justice; and for whom prison managers have responsibility for. Whereas the court is responsible for issuing judgments, prisons are responsible for handling the prison sentence. Unfortunately, it is doubtful whether prisons and the people working in them can fully rehabilitate inmates (I1). Therefore, the aim is generally to ensure that inmates complete their sentences, and as far as possible, to serve their time without experiencing ‘further damage’ – for the time they spend in prison often leaves marks.

In general, inmates are not representative of society. Whereas most people have a sense of right and wrong, or a conscience, interviewees felt that inmates do not always conform to such societal norms. One interviewee pointed out that even though the “average citizen does not like to pay taxes, pay for a newspaper, or buy a ticket for the tram, he/she will do it […] because these citizens have a natural sense of what is right and what is not” (I1). People in prisons, however, are often born and raised in lower socio-economic milieus, which tends to increase the likelihood that they will engage in criminal activities (I3, I1). They are often repeat offenders (I1). Within prisons, there is a high number of inmates with emotional disorders, illnesses, drug addictions, and personality disorders. This number has increased sharply over the years and could be a reason why suicide has become a big issue in prisons all over the world (I2). To address this issue, inmates are often required to take stronger medications and receive extensive treatments (I4, I3, I6). Prison managers perceive inmates as a type of person that does not conform to societal norms, either due to an inherent disposition or because of failed socialization. The logical implication is that inmates cannot be handled in the same way as any ‘normal’ person, but instead require special treatment and handling. In consequence, inmates are not only physically separated from the people outside, but also in terms of their categorization.

Prison managers stressed that it is very important to understand inmates and what they are capable of doing (I7). Inmates who are willing to cooperate are easier to work with. For example, one interviewee said that he has regular meetings with certain inmates because it is important for him as a manager to get information about injustices or abuses. Inmates have certain expectations and hopes when they talk with the prison manager (I8). But, on the other
hand, there are also inmates who are not willing to talk with prison officers, or to meet with psychologists or social workers (I4). These inmates try to avoid all contact with other people. Therefore, it is important to be aware that “not everyone in prison wants to be resocialized or wants to be a member of the society again. There are people who are evil. They want to make your life [as a prison manager] harder” (I7). Again, such statements point at processes of rationalization that help prison managers cope with people deviating from societal norms. It also facilitates classifying inmates into different types that require different forms of handling.

Compared to many other countries, the number of inmates in Austria is relatively high. In countries like Germany, the numbers are going down; but in Austria, they have stayed at a very high level. “This means the penal system is at capacity or over-capacity” (I2). Most of the interviewees pointed out that many prisons are overcrowded which has an (negative) impact on the quality of life in prisons (I2, I3, I6). In general, the discussion about a well-designed quality management system in prison management is twofold. The main critique is that such a system absorbs a lot of resources and it is often just for show (‘Potemkin villages’), creating a lot of paperwork. However, simple tools like self-evaluation (e.g., inmates who get released should fill out a form) can be very useful in order to get an overview of what works well and what needs to be improved within the system (I5).

Another important issue – which was highlighted by almost all my interviewees – was the increasing diversity of the prison population. Over time, the composition of the prison population in Austria changed a lot – especially after the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989. Before, the proportion of foreign inmates was much lower. Nowadays, inmates from foreign countries constitute around 50% of the prison population. This trend has created a number of challenges for both inmates and prison officers – including communication problems, inter-ethnic conflicts, and religious issues (e.g., I5, I4). At Prison Josefstadt, for example, inmates come from more than 50 different nationalities (I2) – but prison officers speak only some of the languages (I1). Furthermore, inmates from different nationalities are often required to share cells – especially if the prison is overcrowded. This situation can create problems and raises security issues, which means that some inmates must be separated (I8). In addition, the aging population is a critical challenge for prison managers. This demographical change is also reflected in the prison population (I4). The trend has led to a need to create special establishments for the elderly in prisons – or, at least a need for smaller prisons. From 2000 until 2014, the number of mentally ill inmates also doubled (I2). Summing up, prison managers view inmates as the main challenge of managing prisons for two reasons. First, inmates vary substantially in their characteristics, whether this means language skills, health, or willingness to cooperate and better themselves. Second, the composition of inmates has changed over time. Combined, these two aspects create situations in which prison staff have to constantly adapt and improvise in order to meet their public mandate.
A second considerable challenge that prison managers highlighted is dealing with the staff council – which has had a major impact on the penal system, especially in the last 15 years (12). By law, the staff council has the duty to cooperate with prisons and to represent prison employees. Within the penal system, there is a general understanding that the function and duties of the staff council are both useful and necessary. However, the interviewees also stressed that its power has greatly increased and consequently, that the council has overstepped its area of responsibility (12). This is often used as a negative example of ‘excessive politicization’ (‘Verpolitisitierung’) (13). As one interviewee stressed: “It is ok, I don’t have something against the staff council, by god, but it clogs everything a little bit” (14). To give an example, the staff council has a lot of power to act, especially in the case of staff recruitment. Although it is not required by the law (‘Personalvertreungsgesetz’), there is the convention that in cases where there is an open position, an agreement between the prison manager and the staff council needs to be found. Another example is the adaption of working hours. In order to change official working hours, the staff council must consent, because it is a so-called ‘Gesamtdienstplanänderung’ (17). But as soon as employees are unhappy with the situation, there are few chances to convince the staff council.

Consequently, there have been calls to reduce the power of the staff council – as their influence has gone beyond the law, especially regarding hiring decisions and issues related to task administration (‘inhaltliche Vollzugsfragen’) (15). As one interviewee said: “They [staff council; JW] not only pursue the staff council agenda, they try to interfere with prison politics” (12). Therefore, some people believe that prison managers should be granted more power over staff management and staff recruiting; and "that the staff council needs to focus on staff council agendas and not power politics and prison politics” (12).

Finally, apart from inmates and the staff council, there is also a shared understanding that many prisons in Austria are too big, which creates additional problems and challenges. Smaller units have an advantage in terms of management. For example, smaller prisons would mean that managers have more time to focus on inmates and their needs (18) – which is especially important given the changes in the prison population over the years. Consequently, a working group within the Federal Ministry of Justice has been established to deal with this issue. One proposal is to have one part of involuntary forensic placement (namely the ‘involuntary forensic placement after § 21 1’) be moved outside the jurisdiction of the Federal Ministry of Justice – placing it, instead, under
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22 “The Austrian penitentiary system distinguishes two groups of mentally disturbed lawbreakers to be accommodated in involuntary forensic placement: Firstly, these are persons who have committed a crime punishable by a prison term of more than one year, but cannot be punished because they committed the crime under the influence of a mental state excluding their criminal responsibility, based on a higher degree of mental or psychic abnormality. Forensic placement is furthermore predicated on the danger that such persons, due to their personality, their state of mind and the nature of their crime, would otherwise, under the influence of their mental or psychic abnormality, commit another punishable crime with serious
the Federal Ministry of Health. This would have a great impact on the available prison spots. One of the interviewees stated: “I believe that we should think about how we can organize this in smaller units because such a total institution in a dimension like Stein [note: this is a prison–correctional institution with a total of 817 male inmates and forensic inmates (FMJ, 2016: 64); JW] is clearly pushing the limits” (I8). Each prison should have around 200 to 250 inmates but not more (I5, I1).

While these first two sections have shown how prison managers characterize the broader context of prison management, the next section presents their construction of the job itself – what prison management is, and how it is conducted.

5.2.3 Prison management from the perspective of prison managers

I start this section by providing an overview of the tasks and duties of prison managers from their perspective, then continue by highlighting perceived restrictions to management; and conclude with their assessment of how prison management should be reformed and improved.

In all of the interviews, there was the shared narrative that managing a prison is not an easy task. According to the interviewees, it requires a lot of knowhow and expertise – including extensive knowledge of the law so as to know the degree of discretion one has in making decisions (I1, I2). Other important qualities and skills mentioned were authenticity, ability to make reliable decisions, to have clear goals (I7), to communicate in a very direct and clear way, to be (in general) an optimistic person, accept and tolerate different professions, and to have endurance. One interviewee said: “It [can] take years to get employees on board, but if you say I have long staying power then it is possible to do a lot” (I5). The challenge is that a prison manager always has to adjust to the conditions, because conditions cannot be changed (I4). Furthermore,

“[...] it is important to know that it is not easy to manage [...] a prison. You are susceptible to attacks by inmates, you are continuously reported on and investigated for abuses of authority, and you have to deal with a lot of things that are very unpleasant. If you enter this line of work, these are things you really must be aware of” (I7).

According to one of the prison managers, this is the reason why many civil servants do not want to become prison managers. They prefer to stay in middle management (I8).

[...]The second group of persons to be accommodated in involuntary forensic placement are those who have committed a crime under the influence of mental or psychic abnormality but being componens. In such a case, forensic placement is to be imposed together with the conviction. Also the number of these persons has almost doubled since the turn of the millennium. Placement and treatment of these mentally disturbed lawbreakers is carried out in the Prison Vienna-Mittersteig, as well as in special, separate wards in the large correctional facilities Garsten, Stein and Graz-Karlu, to a smaller degree also in the Prisons Schwarzau and Gerasdorf” (FMJ, 2016: 30).
5.2.3.1 Tasks and duties of prison managers

The tasks of prison managers can be divided into internal and external tasks (I1). On the one hand, prison managers have an external function – serving as representatives of the organization. On the other hand, they are the head of authority (‘Behördenleiter’) which is the most official one (I2). Prisons are monocratic organizations meaning that “basically [prison managers are; JW] responsible for everything” (I1). One of the key tasks of a prison manager is to make decisions (I2). The interviewees pointed out that they have to decide almost everything inside a prison. However, those decisions are often very complex and interwoven with a lot of different units which are not obvious at first sight (I1). Decisions can have important implications in several areas e.g., changing the daily structure of inmates will require personnel, legal, as well as organizational changes (I3). As one of the interviewees explained, prisons generally have a ‘cooperative leadership’. This means that everyone has to fulfill his or her duties. But in the end, it is the responsibility of the prison manager to ensure that all units work properly together (I4). Such a characterization of general duties reinforces the image of prison management as a ‘messy’ affair. While the general legal framework for prison managers is precise and rigid, everyday business means dealing with diverse tasks flexibly.

A prison manager’s decision making power, however, is generally limited to decisions concerning inmates. Prison managers can decide to relax the terms of imprisonment (including approving day paroles and decisions about electronic tagging), whether inmates who have served less than six months in prison can work or not (I6), how to cooperate with companies outside the prison (I2, I3), and also the types of privileges inmates can have – e.g., if an inmate is allowed to have a TV, to receive visitors for extended periods of time, to keep specific belongings, to have access to his/her money for specific investments, or even to have a play station. For instance, it could be that when an inmate has to change prisons, he/she may have to give up the play station because the prison manager of the new prison does not permit it (I6). Furthermore, prison managers have to make decisions on how to handle complaints (which range from food to prison officers), such as whether he/she talks directly with inmates or simply issues a written notification (I2). This decision making power leads to a great deal of variance between different prisons – even though the prisons have similar functions and populations (I5). That being said, decisions concerning resources, especially staff resources, are outside the control of prison managers (I5), a point which led to lot of criticism from all interviewees.

In general, there are a couple of management duties that need to be fulfilled every day to keep the business running. These include daily meetings to share information and get everyone on the same page (I7, I8) – e.g., information about staff (e.g., Are there any reports from the prison officers, especially did anything happen during the night shift? Are there any sick leaves? Can all enterprises be open on this day or is there any understaffing? Are there any new employees?),
inmates (e.g., Is there a need to bring them to the hospital? Are there any complaints from inmates? Are there any suicide attempts or any releases?), visitors (e.g., Is anyone coming today, like media?), or events (e.g., Are there any workshops today, like burn out prevention) (see also I2, I4, I1). Although daily meetings take up a lot of time, it is generally considered to be a very efficient way to collect and share essential information (I1). The people attending these meetings differ across prisons and institutions. Beside the prison manager, the head of the prison officers is typically present, which is the executive heart” (I2). Anyone who has information or who needs information is usually included in these meetings (I1, I2) – which generally includes people from the middle management level, like deputies, the head of the prison officers, sometimes also the head of the unit of care, meaning from the social work, from the psychological work (I2) or the ‘middle-manager of the outposts’ (I4). Besides exchanging information, these meetings are also used to distribute work orders, get feedback from all units, get information about what is going on at the moment, and what needs to be done next (I1). For the rest of the day, a prison manager spends his/her time in other meetings or on telephone calls, especially if there are problems that need to be resolved – such as problems with his/her employees, or issues with public authorities, prosecution, courts (I6, I8, I9) police, or other authorities (I4).

Most of a prison manager’s time is typically spent on staff agendas, which is considered to be a prison manager’s personal duty (I6, I5). Typical tasks are staff recruiting, staff appraisals, and approval of special leaves (I4). According to the prison managers, it is important for them to keep tabs on sick leaves – i.e., to see how many people are sick on a certain day, or who is often taking sick leave (I7). Sick leaves affect the whole prison because workshops may need to be closed as the prison officers (who are not sick) have to bring inmates to the court or to the hospital. If workshops are closed, inmates cannot work or receive income, which causes frustration and displeasure (I6). Therefore, it is necessary to establish a working system of leadership and management. This means that middle managers have to observe their subordinates to ensure that there are no behavioral or performance issues (such as frequent short sick leaves, alcohol problems, and inadequate or improper treatment of inmates). It is important that such issues be reported to the prison manager.

Another concern for prison managers is staff development. It is considered common knowledge that employee satisfaction levels tend to be quite low in prisons. According to the interviews, a lot of people working in prisons are frustrated. This has a negative impact on the quality of work within the penal system. Employees with special backgrounds and training are needed in several areas (e.g., juvenile imprisonment and involuntary forensic placement). At the moment, prison officers have to not only fulfill their duties, but also take on extra responsibilities (I4). Most believe that the job and responsibilities of a prison officer will get much more challenging in the future. It is recognized that there is a need to bring certain professionals into
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the penal system – for example, psychologists, social workers, and social pedagogues who have specialized backgrounds could help handle aspects related to ‘care, education, and training’. These professionals could focus on education issues, reappraisal of a person’s crime, as well as help prepare inmates for their release. Furthermore, most of the interviewees suggested that civilians could be employed to manage workshops, so that prison officers could focus on ensuring security and order (I7, I4, I5), like the “police of the prison” (I5). One interviewee also pointed out that there is a need for more teachers in the penal system. “There should be more classes, because I think if I want to socialize, resocialize, or change a person in a positive way, education is very important. I think this is an area where we should invest some money” (I4). Overall, these findings suggest that the diversity of inmates requires a similar diversity of staff in order to address the special needs of different types of inmates as well as different stages of imprisonment. The qualifications of staff, accordingly, are a primary factor in providing services of high quality.

According to the interviews, it is very important to have the right people working in prisons; and to also make sure that these people are well trained. Working in prisons is very demanding. There are inmates that have done terrible things, yet the people working in prisons are expected to be objective. “We are not here to judge them. We have to work with them. And this is, of course, not often easy” (I4). Accordingly, as interviewees pointed out, not everyone is cut out to work in prisons. It is important that people working in prisons are able to separate their work and personal lives; and, that they do not develop prejudices easily. It is also important that they are socially skilled (I1). Money should be invested into training for new employees to prepare them properly for their jobs and tasks (I4). There is currently a project underway to standardize the recruiting process. This project focuses on all applicants for prison officer positions. It assesses basic attitudes and values concerning radicalism, xenophobia, etc. (I2).

What can we learn about successful prison management from these insights? Like in every business, there are always questions of what success is and how it can be measured. One interviewee questioned whether it was even possible to manage a prison in a successful way (I6). In the interviews, there were several examples raised about what success could be. One example of success is that “inmates are locked away and that they cannot harm anyone anymore, which has a positive effect on media reporting” (I1). Prison managers see it as a success if the tabloids are not writing negative stories about the penal system or “if no one is talking about prisons at all” (I6). It should be noted, however, that although the media publishes negative stories about prisons, prison managers perceive them as relatively rare. It is important to see these stories in relation to the whole prison system. If a few bad things happen in certain prisons, it is not bad considering there are about 9,000 inmates in Austria (I3).

But success also has a ‘customer-centered’ perspective. According to one prison manager, success can also mean that when a prison manager encounters a (former) convict on the street,
they are able to greet each other in a civilized way. Additionally, it may either mean that the recidivism rate (at the moment it is about 90%) is decreasing (16), or that full employment of inmates is reached (15). Another interviewee said that, for him, success is when a certain percentage of inmates can work outside the prison. In general, it is perceived as a very challenging task “because on the one hand we should not allow anyone to leave the prison, but on the other, we must let them go outside” (16). Another example of effective and successful prison management is the implementation of projects, like electronic tagging. Until 2014, about 2,500 people qualified for electronic tagging, and only 150-180 dropped out. This is considered a very high success rate (17). Just like the challenges of prison management, such findings suggest that the definition of ‘success’ is complex and multidimensional. However, it is noteworthy that not a single interviewee mentioned retribution or punishment as a criterion for successful prison management.

5.2.3.2 Restrictions to management

There are several limitations and constraints that, according to the interviews, prison managers have to deal with, like for example a lack of resources (financial, staff, and spatial), bureaucracy and inflexibility, as well as the lack of decisional freedom concerning staff agendas. First, in terms of the lack of resources, there is the shared understanding that it is difficult to fulfill tasks and duties in the prison without adequate resources. There is a need for a certain amount of resources as well as clear guidelines (13). Only with a sufficient amount of resources – including staff, money, and buildings – can the management of the prison be effectively carried out (18). One interviewee pointed out: “What has not been considered yet is that if the work should be done properly, according to the law and still be humane, this would need more resources” (11). However, as also suggested by the media discourse, prison managers believe that the public’s tolerance for errors in prison management is declining, as is their acceptance and understanding of marginalized groups in society. In addition, in the last few years, financial resources have become even scarcer, so that there is in general less money available (12). One interviewee said: “My impression is that the number of people who need money from the government and those who do not make money for the government, instead they need money is increasing, and inmates are at the end of the line to get anything” (11). Therefore, according to one of the interviewees, it depends on politics and/or society whether they want to spend money on the penal system (11).

Second, prison managers face a great deal of bureaucracy in the penal system. This also creates a high degree of inflexibility concerning staff agendas. One reason for this inflexibility is the so-called ‘staff plan’ (‘Funktionsbesetzungsplan’), which was emphasized in some of my interviews. This plan defines who does what in which position. Therefore, it “cements a person in this position” (12) and tools like job rotation are almost impossible. A person cannot move to
another position until one is free. “This means you have to work with the people you get. And you cannot shift anyone around. Once someone is in a position, he/she has to stay in that position – the whole system is not really flexible” (I6). The interviewees suggested that problems arise when people are placed in the wrong positions (as measured by their abilities) (I7, I3). Additionally, there are often issues of bottlenecks. This means that it must never happen that there are actually too few people working in a prison (I3). Consequently, those staff plans create barriers because it is almost impossible to move people from one position to another (I3). Only in cases of emergencies are exceptions possible. This leads to the situation that several employees who still have free working time are not allowed to take on other tasks because they are only entitled to their ‘working position’ with specific kinds of task and duties (I6). According to my interviews, there is also a need to flatten the hierarchy in order to raise the flexibility of the system. As one interviewee said: “I would appreciate it if there were less Chiefs and more Indians and especially to have more flexibility that people can work wherever they are needed” (I2). In this system there are “deputies of the deputy and probably of the deputy’s deputy” (I2). Staff should be able to work on different tasks and positions – if there is a need.

Such insights clearly show that there is a certain disconnect between the requirement of reacting flexibly and improvising in order to deal with everyday life in prison and the rigidity of the bureaucratic design of the organization. Interviewees clearly suggest that this leads to sub-optimal results. Additionally, due to the high level of bureaucracy, they experience a certain trade-off between administrative tasks and providing care for inmates. Either prison staff focus their available time on their management duties or on inmates (I1). For example, prison officers have to control all day paroles of inmates (I8): they have to document every single step an inmate takes (from the workplace to therapist appointments, etc.) (I7). This creates an immense amount of administrative work (I7, I1).

Third, and counteracting the above mentioned importance of having qualified personnel in the right positions, prison managers are constrained because of a lack of staff responsibility, which is a byproduct of the staff plan. Prison managers cannot hire people, or fire them (I2). Prison managers cannot even choose their own team of middle managers. For this reason, it is even more important to have the right people at the “strategic points, where they can do a good job” (I7). According to the interviews, before it was usual that the Federal Minister of Justice would have hired the person who was suggested by the prison manager. Nowadays, a prison manager can only suggest someone for a position. However, the main problem is that often – even for lower positions – there are divergent opinions, especially between the prison manager and the staff council. If the two do not find an agreement, the Federal Minister of Justice (as second authority) decides in the end. This decision is often not in the interest of the prison manager. As a consequence, the prison manager often gets employees he or she does not want, as he or she does
not see them not as the best option. This leads to the effect that the relationship between the prison manager and the new employee suffers from the very beginning. “It requires a lot of discipline to differentiate between the personal and the professional” (I4). In the interviews, it was clear that prison managers were not happy to have responsibility over everything this person did (I4). Therefore, managers believed that if they were responsible for this persons, it should be their decision who to hire, particularly in key positions (I2). Furthermore, it was highlighted that recruitment processes could take up to one year because there are first and second authorities involved. As one of the interviewees said: “This is also an intolerable condition for management when a key position is free and cannot be filled because there are so many divergent opinions between the prison manager and the staff council” (I4). There have been initiatives including projects like flexible personnel placement in the penal system, which were aimed at loosening the bonds of the staff plan and the rigid human resource practices – one of which was run by Wolfgang Gratz (I7). However, despite these initiatives, to date there have not been any big changes within the system. Interviewees often voiced their desire for broader reforms, which I will discuss in more detail in the following section.

5.2.3.3 Reforms and innovations

The prison managers commonly stressed that there is a need for more innovation or even comprehensive reforms in prisons. Most generally, they suggest that the prison system should encourage and support prison managers and employees in trying new things in order to improve it. However, interviewees also mentioned that not all prison managers are open to innovation. Rather, some of the ‘old guard’ still have very different professional identities. While the managers interviewed were interested in international best practices and some were open to organizational development and supervision, they also mentioned colleagues who defined their jobs in a very bureaucratic way, or even worse who did not care at all (I5).

The interviewees indicated that the last big reform of the penal system was initiated by Christian Broda within the 1970s (which has been discussed extensively in the media; see chapter 5.1.1). Since then, there have hardly been any reforms aside from structural changes. Most of the initiatives have been smaller changes, like the addition of prison psychologists (I6). Although there have been several initiatives, in the end they all failed and were never implemented. Under the guidance of Dieter Böhmdorfer (a former Federal Minister of Justice), for example, there was even a cooperation attempt with a management consultancy. This revealed a lot of weaknesses within the penal system which needed to be changed, but again nothing happened (I4). As some of the interviewees criticized, something often must happen in order to get money or political support to change something (e.g., sexual abuses within the juvenile imprisonment) (I6).
Reforms can be a very challenging to carry out in the penal system as it is a very sensitive area, where failure can even cost the Federal Minister of Justice his job. As a consequence, interviewees felt that only piecemeal or minor reforms tended to be implemented. One example was the Directorate for Penal Services (as mentioned before). The original idea was to give prison managers primary authority (‘Dienstbehörde’) so that they could make staff decisions. However, this reform was not implemented in its original form; and prison managers never gained authority over staff decisions. Although the Directorate for Penal Services was – according to some interviewees – never really welcomed, it was still founded as a first authority on 1.1.2007 (I4). At this time, the idea of a Directorate General inside the Federal Ministry of Justice already existed but was prevented by some heads of government departments (‘Sektionschefs’) (I6). Finally, after nine years the Directorate for Penal Services was terminated and the Directorate General was established within the Federal Ministry of Justice (I6).

The way that inmates are treated has changed a lot over the years. New forms of punishment have been established and there is the general understanding that others still need to be established. Whereas in the 1970s, inmates could be locked away for 23 hours a day, nowadays the emphasis is less on containing inmates but instead on reintegration (I7). One example of the modern execution of a prison sentence is electronic tagging. It is an alternative to the classic form of imprisonment, and is considered by interviewees to provide a lot of benefits for several stakeholders involved. In the interviews, it was stressed that those who are electronically tagged are not pulled out of their social environment. If they fulfil the requirements of electronic tagging, they can still go to work, stay at home, and have contact with their family and friends. Although electronic tagging is common in many countries, it took some time to become established in the Austrian penal system (I2). In Austria, opinions about the use of this innovation are divided (I3), because electronic tagging is often not associated with punishment or prisons. But electronic tags are – if they are used correctly – still a very harsh punishment as one interviewee explained, it means that people have a “prison inside their head” (I7.) A concept, which is similar to electronic tagging, is the idea of ‘weekend imprisonment’. According to a prison manager, this would also have a positive impact on resources, especially on space and staff. Furthermore, there are also alternatives to imprisonment for juveniles, like community services. The main idea is that teenagers should not have to go to prison if it is not absolutely necessary (I3). From the perspective of prison managers, such new forms of punishment are primarily positive in their outcomes, as they both facilitate resocialization and decrease the burden of scarce resources. However, prison managers suggest that the general public remains skeptical of these measures because the measure to not correspond to their understanding of what constitutes imprisonment.
Another way to open up the penal system to innovations mentioned during the interviews is the construction of new buildings, as architecture has an impact on how prison sentences can be executed. One interviewee said:

“If it is possible to build a new penal system it would need a lot of new prisons, because the equipment is from the 60s, 50s, 70s. I do not mean the furnishing but the design of the rooms, where therapy was not an issue, where a lot of things were not an issue. If I want to have a working company, then I need rooms for therapies, for working stations and so on” (I6).

One example of a successful new building mentioned in the interviews is Prison Korneuburg, where it is possible that working stations can be open 24 hours a day (I4). In Prison Simmering they rebuilt one part so groups can live without any bars – so-called ‘Wohngruppenvollzug ohne Gitter’ (I5). In Switzerland, for example, they have, in general, a more open system concept (‘offene Haftplätze’). Around 25% to 30% of the inmates are living in partial imprisonment (‘Halbgefangenenschaft’).

Furthermore, the introduction of the judicial support agency, which allows to hire different professional inside the prison beside the staff plan also had a positive impact on the penal system according to my interviews. Only management positions cannot be recruited. Other examples are the reestablishment of the Taser in the penal system as well as improvements in juvenile detention centers and women prison. In general, the imprisonment of juveniles is considered to be very challenging. It is very hard to treat the issues of teenagers in two or three years, especially if those teenagers have behavioral disorders. It might be possible to lay the foundations for rehabilitation during the time of imprisonment, but it is hard to say if it is possible to change this person’s social values. The aim during their sentence should be to change their behavior in a positive direction – so that they do not commit another crime and get sent back to prison (I7).

Interviewees conceded that there are still several things which need to be improved and that these improvements need time (I4). To give an example, there is a perceived need to think about a new working hours model. Other countries, for example, have introduced a two-shift operation (‘Zeitschichtbetrieb’). This has the advantage that there is more time for therapy. This could mean that people either work from 6am to 2pm or from 2pm to 10pm. One group of inmates has therapy in the mornings and the other group has it in the afternoon. This would also make it possible that the working hours inside the prison can be adapted to those outside – as well as the leisure time. One interviewee stressed: “I would adjust the working hours of the prison officers based on the needs of the penal system meaning the need to reintegrate people into society” (I7).

In Austria, all employees are leaving at the same time as the normal working hours are between 7am and 3pm. Consequently, this idea would “fail with the civil servants, not with the inmates. Those are inside anyways” (I6). But it would be nearly impossible to discuss this issue with prison
officers and their staff councils, because it would require that the prison officers change their minds or as one interviewee said: “There are many aspects in which we would have to rethink things” (14). The discussion about working hours fits neatly into the bigger issue of aligning the dynamics of everyday work with the inflexibility of the system. Overall, it can be contended that most interviewees experienced a distinct disconnect between the design of the bureaucracy and the needs of meaningful prison management. In the following section, I will go into more detail regarding the latent meaning structures emerging from the interviews.

5.2.4 Delineating the paradox – Meanings and contradictions of prison management

In summary, the content analysis combined with my additional hermeneutical analyses (see chapter 4.2.2) revealed a number of specific, latently present issues prevalent in prison management. These issues underlie the everyday life of prison managers and explain tensions, paradoxes, and specificities. In the following section, I will elaborate on the most remarkable of these issues which I found in my interviews, namely the liquid cage, the taylorized blame game, the playmakers, and the butterfly effect.

The liquid cage

Throughout the interviews, it was emphasized that Austrian prisons are characterized by very clear structures and processes building on the Weberian bureaucratic tradition. A lot of decisions and their functions are based on laws. Therefore, it is vital to know exactly what the law demands, and also where and how to find room to maneuver. On the other hand, important incidents and serious problems generally emerge within seconds and demand immediate action and improvisation. Prison managers seem to live with this paradox: Although everything seems to be under control and ‘running’ smoothly, they have to prepare to act and solve problems and issues within minutes not knowing anything about the consequences. As a result, there is a big difference in how things happen (namely very fluidly and quickly) and the way in which prison managers have to act (namely according to the law and strict bureaucratic procedures) and, therefore, they must find room to maneuver in order to provide adequate solutions.

Another example of prisons being a cage is that prison managers cannot choose the people they have to work with, neither the inmates nor their staff. Therefore, the people inside are the biggest challenge. One reason for this is – as mentioned before – the staff plan which supports the rigid system. Three implications based on my data could be drawn. First, prison officers are often difficult to motivate, as there is hardly any potential for staff development. It might happen that they just ‘work to rule’. Second, the closest employees do not necessarily need to be those who prison managers trust the most, as they cannot choose their middle management. Instead, those
are just the people who prison managers see regularly. Therefore they express the wish to gain more flexibility and staff autonomy in order to manage prisons in a more successful way. Third, like the architecture, the system and the structures, determine management issues to a great extent. Whereas people can be changed and replaced, the system and the predefined tasks and duties stay. Prison managers also highlighted that prisons are organized in a way that they can survive without a manager for a certain period of time (especially as recruitment can take months if there is no agreement with the staff council). This implies that prisons are similar to machines running automatically because everything is clearly defined in advance. Moreover, the architecture has an impact on the kinds of imprisonment (open, closed) that can be achieved.

The taylorized ‘blame game’
The liquid cage is accompanied by the Taylorism of the justice system. This means that all tasks are separated in a very distinct and clear way. Whereas the court is responsible for the conviction (‘it punishes the inmates’), ‘Verein Neustart’ is responsible for the reintegration of the inmates. Between these two steps, the prison is a place where employees (prison officers, social works, etc.) have ‘to work’ with the inmates in order to execute of the prison sentence. According to the data, prisons have a kind of ‘sandwich’ function and are therefore not responsible if inmates relapse. There is often the idea that inmates are sent before the court, then they are brought to the ‘black magic box’ (prison), and all of a sudden there is a completely new person coming out. However, this does not correspond with reality. Prisons cannot change people, they can only provide and create conditions for it.

Prison managers mostly blame the interface between the inside and outside of the prison which is not working properly. Therefore, for them the high recidivism rate is a failure from outside, depending on what is happening or not happening there. Consequently, the question of ‘who is in charge’ and ‘who is responsible’ shifts. Success stories are mostly attributed to prison management (‘I’); failures are mostly handed back or passed on in the taylorized system, or, if this is not impossible, explained by a lack of resources (money, space, staff) or the complexity of handling three influential stakeholders (politicians, media, and society – also in their function as taxpayers).

The playmakers
Another main finding in all the interviews was the importance of several stakeholders, like politicians, the media, and society. It seems that these stakeholders have a lot of power and can influence the governance of the system, whereas prison managers are like puppets in the system. It appears that the media influences the general public in terms of what they should think, and
politics in terms of when and how they should act. However, it remains unclear in which direction the causalities are going. It might also be that the media reports what society wants to read and not the other way round.

Furthermore, the staff council is one of the most dominant players in the system. Through all the interviews they are criticized for having too much impact and power over staff decisions. However, it is remarkable that the interviewees always justify and emphasize their importance (e.g., “not that I have anything against the staff council”) before they say something negative. This gives them a unique position in the penal system.

**Butterfly effect in a “total institution”**

Finally, the data showed that decisions and decision making is highly relevant in this area. According to my interviews, one of the key tasks of a prison manager is to make decisions all day long, as a prison manager is responsible for almost everything that goes on in a prison (except for decisions regarding staff recruitment). Therefore, it is very important to have information available, or at the very least to have access to all important information in order to make decisions. Although prisons seem to follow a clear hierarchy and clear procedures there are also a lot of interwoven structures that are not visible. As a consequence, every decision which is made comes with a kind of ‘butterfly effect’. This means that one simple decision can have an immense impact on the whole system. Consequently, it is necessary to know the organization very well, particularly knowing all informal as well as formal processes and how to use them. Even if prison managers have worked in the penal system for several years, each prison has its own characteristics which are not visible to an ‘outsider’ (who has not worked there for years). This suggests that many processes are institutionalized and not scrutinized anymore.

### 5.2.5 Building blocks – Identifying the main components of the interviews

In order to compare the constellation of logics at the individual level with the one at the field level, the interviews were analyzed in much the same way as the media discourse (see also chapter 4.2). Within the interviews, 32 different building blocks could be identified in order to reconstruct the institutional logics. Like before, those building blocks can be separated into four categories (for detailed descriptions see Table 13), and again not all building blocks are subsequently linked to a specific institutional logic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management structure and practices</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Mission and purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building block and frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building block and frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management control (37)</strong></td>
<td>“[make sure] that all 27 workshops are open and running” (I8/4)</td>
<td><strong>Educate (12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It is necessary that we should think about how we can get smaller units [meaning: prisons; JW] because managing such a total institution the size of Stein is pushing the limits” (I8/13)</td>
<td>“[achieve] that they find themselves in a clear structure during the day and are kept occupied” (I8/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the second one is the governance element of management, how do I manage what?” (I6/11)</td>
<td>“the daily routine of an inmate should be adapted as far as possible to the daily routine of people in liberty” (I4/23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational development (19)</strong></td>
<td>“change processes can be very productive” (I6/21)</td>
<td>“I would probably try to do it in a way that the incarcerated persons get the chance to find back into a structured life” (I3/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“to change the whole system” (I6/40)</td>
<td><strong>Guide (6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it would need a working system of management and leadership” (I5/17)</td>
<td>“[that inmates are treated in a reasonable way” (I5/45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff management (68)</strong></td>
<td>“to employ certain people at strategic spots in the organization” (I7/18)</td>
<td><strong>Care (11)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“you need to focus on staff development programs” (I7/8)</td>
<td>“that people are really treated individually, taken care of, that they have their specific problems acknowledged” (I8/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it would need a working team, not only light workers” (I5/44)</td>
<td><strong>Rehabilitation (9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making (16)</strong></td>
<td>“[I have] relaxed conditions” (I8/11)</td>
<td>“taken care of received individualized therapy” (I8/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“but he [prison manager; JW] is responsible for every decision” (I2/3)</td>
<td>“because they are people with mental illness [...] which need medical treatment” (I8/23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power to (20)</strong></td>
<td>“there should be as much authority as possible for decision making for the prison manager” (I5/1)</td>
<td><strong>Prepare (36)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“especially regarding decisions concerning inmates, there is a broad variance between different prisons” (I5/5)</td>
<td>“plan for the time in prison” (I8/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing by objectives (24)</strong></td>
<td>“what is success?” (I6/28)</td>
<td><strong>Perspective (9)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I have made this my personal goal” (I8/15)</td>
<td>“to think about what can be after prison time is over” (I7/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“to be authentic, also to make promises you can keep” (I7/11)</td>
<td>“nevertheless, give them a perspective so that they work on themselves” (I8/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureaucratic process (24)</strong></td>
<td>“We are bounded by very rigid guidelines, rules and regulations, which make it almost impossible for us to move in a certain direction with our staff.” (I7/1)</td>
<td><strong>Maintain (14)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The administration is exploding. We are administrating every single step”. (I7/29)</td>
<td>“those people who are in a rather well-structured setting should not be torn out of it” (I2/68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“So that you don’t put them back in prison, destroy their embeddedness in social structure outside and then try to push them back into society, resocialize them with a lot of effort. This is a destructive effect that is, if you think about it, completely futile”. (I7/35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety (15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Maintain (14)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it is also about safety” (I4/22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Security (9)  “attacks on civil officers or if someone hurts himself or try an escape” (I4/86)

Control (10)  “If the state can have everything under control anywhere at all, then it must be in prison, where everybody is locked away”. (I2/24)

“It is important to know to which actions they are capable of, and how you can prevent them”. (I7/15)

Routine (3)  “We are well-advised to let people outside [of their cells] because then they experience a structure during the day, they are occupied and so they do not have time for stupid ideas, and keep us busy in the evening”. (I8/16)

Punishment (31)  “The general public has the opinion that they [inmates; JW] are treated too well, they should be punished much harder”. (I4/6)

“especially where people are deprived of their liberty - there can be no greater impact of the state on the life of an individual person” (I2/27)

Internal factors affecting management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building block and frequency</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the Organization (46)</td>
<td>“As an external person, you can’t really know either the system nor the specific house. And when you are from within the ‘family’ of the penal system, then each house has its own specificities. And even as the head of one house, you only realize some things after two or three years, because they are perceived as so normal that nobody talks about it.” (I6/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources (46)</td>
<td>“It is clear to many of us that the general conditions are not optimal. There is, partially, no willingness to put money into the system. All of this requires money, and of course, politics comes and says, those that have done something, they will get some additional money to become even better”. (I3/33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External factors affecting management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building block and frequency</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law (40)</td>
<td>“Inmates commit ‘misdemeanors’ [‘Ordnungswidrigkeiten’], as the law calls it” (I2/51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics (19)</td>
<td>“Well yes, if the media hears about this then they are very critical about it, and then you will have to deal with parts of the political landscape”. (I3/16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“That is what Minister Berger wanted to do, but that did not work out, because then Molterer said ‘that’s enough’, and then we had a re-election. That meant that the Ministry changed colors again, from black to red [a minister from a different party; JW]”. (I4/47)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Staff representation (30)</th>
<th>Inflexibility (26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“If I compare this with other countries where they work in two-shifts [...] this is not possible with our working union”. (I6/41)</td>
<td>“we are bounded by the staff plan” (I7/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In my opinion, a second main challenge is the working union and the working union’s law [...] the working union is very powerful within politics, they do not represent the employees but they also try to do prison management”. (I2/10)</td>
<td>“once in this job or position, always in this position, and therefore the whole system is not really flexible” (I6/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“there is a need for more flexibility, so that we can use people more flexibly wherever there is a need” (I2/42)</td>
<td>“there is a need for more flexibility, that we can use people more flexibly” (I6/16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clients (32)</th>
<th>Media (21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yes, there are of course a lot of challenges, one of which are the inmates that we have to take care of”. (I3/11)</td>
<td>“This is, of course, sometimes a hindrance because – maybe not as dramatically in the larger cities, but in the outpost in Asten. For instance, if an inmate is on parole and goes to work outside, and this becomes known through the local media, then the local population will start to feel uncomfortable”. (I3/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There are inmates that cooperate, with them you can achieve something. And there are inmates that don’t even talk to us, they just live their lives, they simply get everything they absolutely need”. (I4/6)</td>
<td>“Well, it would be nice, so to say, well, the ideal image would be if the penal system would not appear in the public debate at all, whether positively nor negatively, so that everybody can work together in a good way”. (I4/3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy (22)</th>
<th>Field cooperation (34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“That is the Directorate for Penal Services which is responsible for how we fulfil our tasks, as the next tier of hierarchy” (I6/1)</td>
<td>“We also have relevant external environments, courts, district attorneys, other authorities, external care centers, commissions which observe the prison landscape, like the OPCAT-Commission.” (I3/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The penal system is a very hierarchical system”. (I6/1)</td>
<td>“And there it is often very, very difficult to find organizations which employ these people after their release”. (I8/9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanity (14)</th>
<th>Accountable (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“treat them like human beings” (I8/1)</td>
<td>“Additionally, there are a lot of agencies for legal protection, like the public ombudsman and the CPT. We are very thoroughly supervised and controlled here” (I7/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And inmates are also citizens, right, and when they are foreigners, they are still eligible to basic human rights. This raises the question of which standards you have in imprisonment, which, at this time, is very much dependent on which prison you are put in”. (I5/6)</td>
<td>“Well, only a few days ago I was visited by the human rights commission, and they examined us. And we are always checked by the OPAT, that is a part of the public ombudsman, they check whether everything is conducted according to the law, whether inmates are treated as well as they should be, whether there are complaints, whether something should be changed, and so on”. (I1/31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Factors (33)</th>
<th>Reform (31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Well, as I just said, it is possible that within ten years, the composition of inmates has suddenly changed considerably, and if you have 9,000 instead of 7,000, and you manage the prison in a way that nothing happens”. (I5/31)</td>
<td>“Well, I can say that in the first part of the past decade, there have been a lot of reform efforts. There was one big project, that was still in the time of Böhmendorfer, where we collaborated with a management consultancy. A lot has been discussed then, “So, the technology is much more differentiated, there’s these different data that you can manager and access much more easily”. (I1/26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“This means that when I have a good management, then it is possible to achieve reforms, no matter whether that is the option to have a Play Station or personnel development. Consequently, what does a prison manager need as an education, as a training, what kind of social competencies does he need and so on?” (I6/23)

The first category – ‘management structures and practices’ (n=208) – has seven building blocks. Compared to the newspaper articles of Profil – where it was the smallest category – it is now the second biggest one. Like before, but more elaborated, it includes all codes dealing with management and control issues, such as general management issues (e.g., how information chains work in prisons), performance issues (e.g., what is success and how can it be measured), but also the area of staff management, including recruiting and staff development. Furthermore it encompasses topics about reorganizing the penal system and implementing new management tools as well as who is allowed to make what kind of decisions. The category ranges from classical management issues to bureaucratic processes.

The second category – ‘mission and purpose’ (n=165) – is almost identical to the newspaper articles and has twelve building blocks. The main difference is that resocialization consists of more differentiated building blocks, such as guide, perspective, and maintain. Again it includes building blocks dealing with safety and control as well as punishment.

The third category – ‘internal factors affecting management’ (n=180) – deals with restrictions and specific characteristics of the penal system. It has six building blocks. Typical restrictions in prisons are the lack of resources (financial, spatial, and staff), inflexibility (especially concerning staff), and a strong hierarchy. Specific characteristics, on the other side, contain everything that concerns the nature (unique characteristics) of the organization (for example if a certain type of prison has to fulfill specific rules and the prison manager cannot ignore them) as well as the inmates (as an independent building block). Furthermore, it includes the building block humanity.

The last category encompasses the ‘external factors affecting management’ (n=222). This category includes eight building blocks, which all describe different factors that impact prison management, like external stakeholders (e.g., politics, media, staff council, and environmental factors).
5.2.6 Reconstructing the constellation of manager-level logics from the interviews

For the purposes of this study, I define the manager level as comprising all occupants of a particular social role, that of 'prison manager'. Similar to the media discourse – which represents the field level – I also identified three logics dealing with the ‘purposes’ of a prison at the individual level: ‘logic of punishment’, ‘logic of resocialization’, and ‘logic of discipline’. For these three logics, I build on the descriptions of each field-level logic (see chapter 5.1.4). Consequently, I only highlight if there are any differences at the manager level compared to the field level and give examples from the interview material. Like before, the 'logic of managerialism' emerged from the analysis, but I also identified two additional logics concerning 'how' management tasks are fulfilled: a 'logic of bureaucracy' and a 'logic of corporatism'. I describe these additional logics in more detail below (for the respective building blocks, see also Table 14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Blocks</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Resocialization</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Managerialism</th>
<th>Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Corporatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Inflexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>management</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Power to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td>by objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Building blocks of the logics at the manager level

The logic of punishment

Similar to the field level, the ‘logic of punishment’ is manifested in only one building block. Again, the main rationality is to punish people who violate the law, meaning to deprive them of their liberty. Whereas the general public asks for more punishment, prison managers in general think the current level of punishment is sufficient. Examples of phrases coded in the interviews are: “the general public has the opinion that they [inmates] are treated too well, they should be punished in harsher ways” (I4/6), "it must be said, this is still a penalty [...] however, the essential things in life cannot be decided by inmates themselves in prison, like liberty, but as they have done something wrong before, this is ok, I must say” (I4/24), “especially where people are deprived of their liberty – there can be no greater impact of the state on the life of an individual person” (I2/27). Furthermore, typical key words used by the interviewees talking about punishment are: ‘to punish’, ‘punishment’, ‘penalty’, ‘to sanction’, or ‘to lock away’.
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The logic of resocialization

As mentioned before, the main purpose of this logic is to reintegrate inmates back to society – either by providing support and special treatment while they are in prison or by promoting alternative imprisonment systems in order to maintain their social structures (like work, accommodation, relationships). Building blocks used are: *educate* (meaning to give inmates a structure to reintegrate them back to society), *guide* (to work with inmates and support them with special leisure activities), *care* (to treat inmates individually and also try to fix their problems), *prepare* (to support inmates for the time after their release, e.g., that they can work outside), *maintain* (that people's lives and structure are not destroyed in prison), *perspective* (to make plans during imprisonment in order to prepare them for the time after), and *rehabilitation* (to give them special medical treatment). Whereas 'educate', 'guide', 'care', and 'rehabilitation' relate more what is happening inside the prison, 'maintain' expresses the idea that social structures should be protected, and 'prepare' and 'perspective' concern the time in between, namely at the interface between inside and outside the prison. Examples for each building block used in the interview are – for educate: "the daily routine of an inmate should be adapted as far as possible to the daily routine of people who are free" (I4/23), for care: "what is the aim? The aim is on the one hand to treat inmates according to their problems" (I6/6), for guide: "that inmates are treated in a reasonable way" (I5/43), "to focus on the clientele" (I8/7), for rehabilitation: "because they are people with mental illness [...] which need medical treatment" (I8/23), for prepare: "plan for the time in prison" (I8/3), "it is necessary to prepare people during their later time in prison" (I8/11), "prepare for release" (I3/15), for perspective: "to think about what can be after prison time is over" (I7/2), "nevertheless give them perspective so that they work on themselves" (I8/6), and for maintain: "those people who are in a rather well-structured setting, should not be torn out of it" (I2/68). Keywords are: 'daily routine', 'prepare', 'working opportunities', etc.

The logic of discipline

The 'logic of discipline' at the manager level consists of four building blocks: *safety, security, control, and routine*. Like before, safety and security were used in connection with quotes highlighting the objective of maintaining safety and security inside as well as outside the prisons. Control focuses on statements stressing that inmates need to be kept under surveillance and that prisons are places where everything must be under control. In addition, routine, stresses the importance that inmates need to have a daily routine in order to maintain high levels of safety and security inside the prisons. Examples of phrases in the interviews for control are: "if the state can have everything under control anywhere at all, then it must be in prison, where everybody is locked away" (I2/24), "it is important to know to which actions they are capable of, and how you can prevent them" (I7/17). For safety and security statements included: "it is also about safety"
Findings (I4/22), “attacks on civil officers or if someone hurts himself or tries to escape” (I4/86), “it is important that the general public feels safe again” (I6/17); whereas for routine: “we are well-advised to let people outside [of their cells; JW] because then they experience a structure during the day, they are occupied and so they do not have time for stupid ideas, and keep us busy in the evening” (I8/16), “no work means no money for inmates, no money means frustration” (I6/38). Therefore, typical keywords in this context are ‘safety’, ‘security’, ‘suicide’, ‘self-mutilation’, or ‘dangerous’.

For the next two logics I follow Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006a, 2006b; see also Meyer et al., 2013) who distinguish between a ‘legalistic-bureaucratic’ and a ‘managerial’ logic in the Austrian public sector. In their work, they show that “managerial reform ideas are currently challenging old administrative orientations” (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a: 1012). According to Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006b: 105) the “classical ‘dysfunctions’ of a Weberian bureaucracy [mentioned in their interviews are; JW]: inflexibility, overregulation, hierarchy and centralization, bureaucracy in general as well as deficits of civil service and budget regulation”. Consequently, what managers want is more autonomy and flexibility on the one hand, and more resources, on the other.

The logic of bureaucracy

The logic of bureaucracy builds on the Weberian understanding of bureaucracy. Typical core values of bureaucracy are, for example, legality, correctness, loyalty, continuity as well as stability. This mode of governance is based on laws and rules. In general, the system is very hierarchical and centralized. Typical evaluation criteria are duties and rights (e.g., Meyer et al., 2013). The basis of strategy is to increase coordination and predictability. As mentioned before, keywords, such as inflexibility, overregulation, and hierarchy are often associated with a bureaucratic understanding. This logic also consists of three building blocks – namely, hierarchy, bureaucratic process, and inflexibility. Hierarchy summarizes all phrases talking about a chain of command and clear structures. Inflexibility is typically mentioned in the context of staff management, but also the working hours of employees. Bureaucratic process expresses at its core the understanding of Weberian bureaucracy. It includes quotes highlighting bureaucratic processes, the ‘Beamtentum’ (civil service), practices such as ‘Pragmatisierung’ (a form of ‘tenure’ in civil service), etc. Examples of phrases are: “we are bounded by very rigid guidelines, rules, and regulations, which make it almost impossible for us to move in a certain direction with our staff” (I7/1), “we are bounded by the staff plan” (I7/2), “once in this job or position, always in this position, and therefore the whole system is not really flexible” (I6/31), "there is a need for more flexibility, so
that we can use people more flexibly wherever there is a need” (I2/42), “the administration is exploding. We are administrating every single step” (I7/29), “it is the Directorate for Penal Services which is responsible for how we fulfil our tasks, as the next level of hierarchy” (I7/7), “the penal system is a very hierarchical system” (I6/1). Typical keywords are: ‘staff plan’, ‘rigid’, ‘less room to maneuver’, ‘less flexible’, ‘control’, ‘regulation’, ‘rules’, ‘guidelines’, ‘reports’, ‘administration’, ‘delegate’, or ‘orders’.

The logic of managerialism

Meyer and colleagues (2013) describe the ‘managerial logic’ as a logic focusing on results. The core values are performance orientation, efficiency, and effectiveness. Whereas the ‘bureaucratic logic’ is very stable and focused on continuity, the ‘managerial logic’ is characterized by being flexible, innovative and progressive. The focus of attention lies on goals as well as results, which is also reflected in the mode of governance. The ‘logic of managerialism’ consists of six building blocks dealing with management issues. Management control highlights general management ideas, such as daily routines; organizational development stresses reorganization ideas as well as the establishment of new management concepts; staff management deals with all kinds of issues concerning employees; managing by objectives summarizes quotes dealing with performance measurement, quality management, and efficiency; and decision making as well as power to describe decision making processes and room to maneuver. Examples of typical statements are: “It is necessary that we should think about how we can get smaller units [meaning: prisons; JW] because managing such a total institution the size of Stein is pushing the limits” (I8/13), “the second one is the governance element of management, how do I manage what?” (I6/11), “in general, I am responsible for everything” (I1/12), “change processes can be very productive” (I8/21), “to change the whole system” (I6/40), “you need to focus on staff development programs” (I7/8), “it would need a working system of management and leadership” (I5/17), “it would need a working team, not only lone fighters” (I3/44), “I have made this my personal goal” (I8/15), “what is success?” (I6/28), “to be authentic, also to make promises you can keep” (I8/11), “there should be as much authority as possible for decision making by the prison manager” (I5/1), “but he is responsible for every decision” (I2/3), “especially regarding decisions concerning inmates, there is a broad variance between different prisons” (I5/5). Typical keywords appearing in this context are: ‘jour fixe’, ‘general strategies’, ‘change processes’, ‘innovative’, ‘staff agendas (development, recruiting)’, ‘sick leaves’, ‘goals’, ‘success’, ‘recidivism rate’, ‘quality management’, or ‘decisions’. 
The logic of corporatism

Following Meyer and Höllerer (2016, 2010), I suggest that the ‘logic of corporatism’ emphasizes the importance of corporatism in Austria. Organizations within the idea of the ‘social partnership’ still have a substantial impact on political decision making in Austria. Social partnerships include, for example, ‘The Chamber of Labour’ and the ‘Austrian Trade Union Federation’, which represent the interests of employee and ‘The Austrian Economic Chamber’, which represents the interests of employers.

"The construct of social partnership is built upon a tacit and informal agreement between the government and the major employer and employee associations and has dominated the socioeconomic environment to such an extent that the Austrian system generally ranks near to or at the top in empirical studies on corporatism" (e.g., Lehmbuch & Schmitter, 1982 quoted in Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a: 1244). Meyer and Höllerer (2016) also point out that Austria has been labeled the ‘country of corporatism’ (see also Traxler, 1998), and Gourevitch and Shinn (2007) rank Austria at the extreme end of a coordination index measuring corporatism.

The logic is defined by one building block highlighting quotes dealing with the impact of the staff council. The logic's source of legitimacy is grounded in the idea of balancing interests between employees and the employer. Main proponents are the prison officers, as their rights are represented. Examples in the interview data are: "if I compare this with other countries where they work in two-shifts [...] this is not possible with our working union" (16/41), "in my opinion, a second main challenge is the working union and the working union's law [...] the workers' union is very powerful in politics, they do not represent the employees but they also try to do prison management" (12/10), “to make it clear, the workers' union pushes people into certain positions” (12/14). In addition, the following keywords have been mentioned often: ‘strong staff council’, or ‘impact of staff council’.

Table 15 summarizes the additional three logics at the manager level. In order to describe the main characteristics for bureaucracy and managerialism, I build on Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006b) as well as on Meyer and colleagues (2013). For an overview of the logics dealing with ‘punishment’, 'resocialization’, and ‘discipline’, see chapter 5.1.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Corporatism</th>
<th>Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Managerialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of legitimacy/Central values</td>
<td>Balance of interests</td>
<td>Stability, legal compliance</td>
<td>Economic, efficiency, effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of authority</td>
<td>Democratic mandate</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Know-how, leaderships skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of attention</td>
<td>Particular interests</td>
<td>Rules, duties, and rights</td>
<td>Objectives, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of strategy</td>
<td>Increase influence and power, achieve win-win situation</td>
<td>Increase coordination, predictability</td>
<td>Increase efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of legitimacy pursuits</td>
<td>Working unions</td>
<td>Administrative system</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social partners</td>
<td>Rechtsstaat</td>
<td>Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary associated role identities</td>
<td>Staff council</td>
<td>Civil servants</td>
<td>Prison manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Key characteristics of the 'corporatism logic', 'bureaucracy logic', and 'managerialism logic'

5.2.7 Characteristics of the constellation of manager-level logics

Comparing all six logics at the manager level which prison managers experience, Figure 5 illustrates that the 'logic of managerialism' (40.80%) is the dominant one. In contrast, the 'logic of punishment' (6.87%), the 'logic of discipline' (8.20%), and the 'logic of corporatism' (6.65%) seem to be less important. With a remarkable difference between the 'managerialism logic', and the second most prevalent logic on this level, the 'logic of resocialization' (21.51%) – which is followed by the 'logic of bureaucracy' (15.96%).

![Figure 5: Constellation of manager-level logics](image-url)
I separate the logics into two groups. First, I refer to the logics dealing with the ‘what’-question: ‘what is the purpose of a prison?’ to ‘purpose logics’ (including ‘punishment logic’, ‘discipline logic’, and ‘resocialization logic’; see Figure 6). Second, I refer to the logics addressing ‘how’ the purposes of a prison should be achieved as ‘governance logics’ (including ‘bureaucracy logic’, ‘managerialism logic’, and the ‘corporatism logic’; see Figure 7).

**Figure 6: Frequencies of the ‘purpose logics’**

![Purpose Logics Graph]

**Figure 7: Frequencies of the ‘governance logics’**

![Governance Logics Graph]

Despite the separation into two groups, the two diagrams show similar results to before. The order of the logics has not changed; however, there is a slight difference according to their priority. Like before, the ‘managerialism logic’ (64.34%) is the most dominant one. But separating the logics into two groups further shows that the ‘resocialization logic’ shifts more into focus (58.79%).
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Again located much more on the periphery is the ‘logic of bureaucracy’ (25.17%). In contrast to the overall diagram, the ‘logic of discipline’ (22.42%), and the ‘logic of punishment’ (18.79%) are much closer to the ‘bureaucracy logic’ now, whereas the ‘logic of corporatism’ (10.49%) seems to be a ‘stand-alone’ logic. The dominance of the ‘managerial logic’ can be explained by the fact that the interviews focused on management questions in order to get a better understanding of what good and successful prison management means.

In a next step, I analyzed the data in order to gain deeper insight into which actor groups are connected to each of the six manager-level logics. Table 16 summarizes the five most important actors for each logic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporatism</th>
<th>Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Managerialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff council</td>
<td>28.26%</td>
<td>Inmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison manager</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officer</td>
<td>9.42%</td>
<td>Prison staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>Inmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>Professional service staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resocialization</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmate</td>
<td>51.85%</td>
<td>Inmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison staff</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>State/Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service staff</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
<td>Prison staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
<td>Professional service staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Five most important actors for each manager-level logic

Within the ‘corporatism logic’, the most frequently mentioned actor is the staff council (28.26%), followed by the prison managers (13.04%), prison officers (9.42%), the Federal Ministry of Justice (8.70%), and management (including all actors in leadership positions, excluding the prison managers themselves) (7.97%). Not surprisingly, these are all actors involved in staff recruiting processes. The staff council and the prison managers have to agree on a prison officer for a new position (often in a management position). If they cannot agree, the Federal Ministry of Justice will become involved in the process. The ‘logic of bureaucracy’ is closely connected to prison managers (15.73%) and prison staff (14.98%). One explanation is that the ‘logic of bureaucracy’ still dominates the decision making process concerning staff agendas, as prison managers do not have the power to act against the staff plan. Accordingly, (certain parts of) prison staff basically
manifest the 'bureaucracy logic' in the organization. Furthermore, this logic also includes inmates (10.49%). One reason for this could be that in a prison, the administration and coordination of inmates is clearly given. But also the first authority (7.78%) is connected to the 'bureaucracy logic'. This includes the Directorate for Penal Services as the next highest authority and gives an example of the hierarchical and bureaucratic embeddedness of a prison. The 'logic of managerialism' includes only internal stakeholders, which can be divided into the two biggest groups: inmates (20.47%) and staff in a broader sense, including management (12.01%), prison staff (11.68%), prison officers (11.51%), and professional service staff (such as social workers) (11.00%). This emphasizes the results of my interviews, as staff agendas and managing inmates are key functions of a prison manager.

Taking a closer look at the other three logics, it is remarkable that in all three cases inmates are the most common actors. One explanation could be that all theee logics focus on the purpose of a prison, and therefore the main actor must be the inmates. The 'logic of resocialization', however, is also related to courts (8.52%) who decide, for example, if inmates qualify for release on probation; as well as being related to professional service staff (5.93%), who help to prepare inmates for the time after their release. The 'logic of discipline' also includes prison officers (12.03%), professional service staff (7.52%), and the general public (6.77%). An explanation could be that prison officers and professional service staff are responsible for providing inmates with a daily routine and ensuring security, which is demanded by the general public. Finally, the 'logic of punishment' has, besides the inmates (50.00%), a second main actor category, namely the general public (17.19%). One reason for this is that the general public desires justice and punishment of the inmates. All other actors, such as the state/administration (4.69%) as well as prison staff (3.13%), professional service staff (3.13%), the Federal Minister of Justice (3.13%), inmates’ families (3.13%), as well as the media (3.13%) have a less prominent role.

5.3 Comparing field-level and manager-level logics

Having identified which institutional logics are found at the manager level, I now turn to my next sub-question: “What is their relationship to field-level logics? What is the degree of overlap, and how do they differ?” In essence, this comparison highlights how institutional pluralism at the field level is experienced – and translated into management level meaning structures – by prison managers. In order to achieve a valid comparison, I did not consider the historical field-level data, but focused exclusively on the discourse between 2000 and 2015 (which includes the articles from Profil during that time). Comparing the field-level analysis with the manager-level analysis, the overall picture highlights some major differences between these two levels. The following table gives a brief overview, which I explain in more detail afterwards. These differences can be
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summarized in terms of four aspects: (a) the number of logics constituting the constellation at each level; (b) the distribution of frequencies between logics at each level; (c) the scope and diversity of the vocabulary of the various logics at each level; and (d) the relevant actors at each level. *Table 17* provides a brief overview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field level</th>
<th>Manager level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of logics</strong></td>
<td>4 logics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most frequent logic</strong></td>
<td>discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Slight differences in the building blocks of the logics of discipline and resocialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td>Number of actors mentioned and the way inmates are categorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 17: Overview of similarities and differences between the field level and the manager level*

The most remarkable difference between the levels is the number of logics. Whereas at the field level only four logics (‘punishment’, ‘resocialization’, ‘discipline’, and ‘managerialism’) appear, at the manager level six logics (in addition, ‘bureaucracy’ and ‘corporatism’) are in play. This finding is, at first sight, rather counterintuitive as it could be expected that not all of the logics prevalent at the field level would be experienced, or that they would matter at the manager level. However, my findings suggest that managers actually perceive *more* logics as relevant in their daily work than those that are discussed at the field level. One explanation for this is that the questions dealing with the ‘how’ of management tasks in a prison are not an issue that generates a lot of attention in the general public. Rather, the media focuses on stories that affect the broader public, such as safety and justice. This also explains why the ‘managerialism logic’, although present in the media discourse, was by far the least frequent one. *Figure 8* provides an overview of the six logics at the field level as well as at the manager level, comparing the articles from *Profil* in the 2000s with the eight interviews.
In contrasting the six logics, the results show that there is not only a difference in the number, but also a noteworthy difference in the prioritization between the two levels. Whereas in the media analysis the ‘logic of discipline’ (40.54%) is the most frequent logic – as the public is primarily concerned with issues of safety and security. In the interview data, the ‘logic of managerialism’ (40.80%) is the most salient one, since it addresses the main issues of running a prison. Focusing on only the ‘purpose logics’, the most frequent logic is the ‘resocialization logic’ (21.51%), suggesting that prison managers primarily view ‘resocialization’ instead of ‘punishment’ or ‘discipline’ as their main task.

At both levels of analysis there is a substantial gap between the most frequent logic and the others. At the field level, the ‘punishment logic’ (24.32%) and the ‘resocialization logic’ (24.32%) are equally frequent, while ‘discipline’ in the sense of ensuring public safety is clearly the dominant logic (40.54%) in the media discourse. Finally, as mentioned before, the ‘managerialism logic’ (10.81%) is the weakest one, considering that the other two ‘governance logics’ (‘corporatism’ and ‘bureaucracy’) did not appear at all in the media discourse.

At the manager level, the ‘resocialization logic’ is the second most frequent, followed by the ‘bureaucracy logic’ (15.96%). The ‘logic of discipline’ (8.20%) is slightly more frequent than the ‘logic of punishment’ (6.78%). The marginalized character of the punishment logic, however, does not necessarily mean that punishment has disappeared from the penal system. Rather, it could point to a high degree of institutionalization (since prisons are, per se, centrally engaged in punishment), and high degrees of taken-for-grantedness are often characterized by a lack of explicit discussion (e.g., Green, 2004).
The third main difference between the two levels is the scope and diversity of the vocabularies (e.g., Loewenstein et al., 2012) instantiating the logics – expressed as the variety of building blocks reconstructed from the discourse (see Table 18 contrasting the building blocks identified at the two levels).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Resocialization</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Managerialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>field level</td>
<td>Manager level</td>
<td>field level</td>
<td>Manager level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>Management control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Staff management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Power to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>Management by objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resocialization</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>Routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Building blocks of field-level and manager-level logics

As described in the methods section (chapter 4.2.2), the coding process was cyclical and involved constant comparison of codes within as well as across levels. The differences in building blocks between the field level and the manager level, accordingly, are the result of constant comparison between codes. Not all logics exhibit differences with regard to their vocabulary between levels. The ‘punishment logic’ consist of the same single building block at both levels. However, the other three logics (‘discipline’, ‘resocialization’, and ‘managerialism’) exhibit slight variations. The ‘logic of discipline’ was also rather homogenous in terms of vocabulary between the two levels of analysis. At the manager level, I only identified one additional building block, ‘routine’, as prison managers highlighted that structures are important in order to keep safety and security in prisons high. The ‘managerialism logic’ was not only more frequent, it also encompassed more building blocks at the manager level than at the field level. The code ‘organizational development’ was used when prison managers talked about changes and improvements within the penal system; and ‘decision making’ when they highlighted how important it was to make daily decisions. The biggest difference in vocabulary, however, existed between the instantiations of the ‘resocialization logic’. In the interviews (manager level), I noticed much more nuances in the wording used when prison managers described their duties resocializing inmates. I identified a broader range of building blocks, including ‘guide’, ‘perspective’, and ‘maintain’. In the media discourse, there was a much more general and
undifferentiated understanding of resocialization, and, consequently, I coded those phrases simply with 'resocialization'.

Finally, there was also a slight difference with regard to the actors mentioned in the interviews (manager level) and compared to the media discourse (field level). Again, I distinguished between internal actors and external actors. Table 19 provides an overview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal actors - Interviews</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Internal actors - Media discourse</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>26.83%</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>20.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate as prisoner</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>Inmate as prisoner</td>
<td>13.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate as human being</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>Inmate as human being</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate as offender</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>Inmate as offender</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate as part of society</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>Inmate as part of society</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate as victim</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Inmate as victim</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate as victim of the justice system</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Inmate as victim of the justice system</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison manager</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
<td>Prison manager</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational unit</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>Organizational unit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison staff</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
<td>Prison staff</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officer</td>
<td>7.72%</td>
<td>Prison officer</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service staff</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
<td>Professional service staff</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 814 (63.49%)  
n= 732 (39.57%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External actors - Interviews</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>External actors - Media discourse</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care facility</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>Care facility</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First authority</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>First authority</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>Federal Minister of Justice</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National politician</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>National politician</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local politician</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>Local politician</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Administration</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>State/Administration</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff council</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>Staff council</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights organization</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>Human rights organization</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>Local public</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalized group</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>Marginalized group</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates' families</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>Inmates' families</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies employing inmates</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>Companies employing inmates</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other environment</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>Other environment</td>
<td>6.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Victims organization</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian cooperation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Romanian cooperation</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 468 (36.51%)  
n= 1,118 (60.43%)

Table 19: Comparison of actors in interviews and the media discourse

It is remarkable that the relation between internal and external actors in the interviews is reversed in comparison to the media discourse. In the interviews, the internal actors encompassed 63.49%; whereas in the media discourse they only comprised 39.57%. This means
that interviewees referred more to internal stakeholders whereas the media more to external ones. At both levels, the internal actors are clustered into inmates, prison managers, management (including middle management like chief of the prison officers), organizational units (e.g., commercial department), prison staff (in general), prison officers, and professional service staff (e.g., social workers). As inmates are the most frequently mentioned actor at both levels (manager level 26.83%; field level 20.43%), I divide the group of inmates into six different subgroups, namely inmates as prisoners, as human beings, as offenders, as part of society, as victims, and as victims of the justice system, depending which role-identity they have been assigned by the media or by the interviewees. For example, inmates as human beings encompasses words like the people, boys or humans in prison, inmates as victims means that the inmate appears as a victim during his prison time, e.g., in a rape case; and inmates as victims of the justice system are people who have been guiltless in prison. The results show that prison managers talked about ‘inmates as prisoners’ as often as the media; however, they categorized inmates as ‘human beings’ much more frequently, which hardly happened in the media. In contrast, the media specified inmates as victims or victims of the justice system – whereas prison managers did not. This could mean that prison managers have a slightly different understanding of inmates as is transported in the media. Furthermore, at both levels, prison officers are the second most frequent actor. In contrast to the media discourse, prison managers also talked about organizational units. In general, it seems that management is not a big issue at all in the media discourse compared to the interviews.

In terms of the external stakeholders (see also Table 19 for an detailed overview), the following actors have been mentioned at the field level as well as at the manager level: prosecutors, lawyers, courts, care facilities, first authority (meaning the Directorate for Penal Services), the Federal Ministry of Justice, the Federal Minister of Justice, politics (on national level and local level), the state and administration, the staff council, human rights organizations, the public (general public, local public, marginalized groups within society), inmates’ families, the media, and other actors in the external environment. Again, at the field level, additional actors are mentioned: victims, victims’ organizations, Romanian cooperation, the church, and experts, whereas additional external stakeholders noted by prison managers are restricted to companies where inmates work.

As Table 19 above shows, it is remarkable that prosecutors, courts, lawyers, and politicians (national and local) are hardly important in the interviews; however, those actors are often mentioned in the media discourse. In contrast, prison managers talked more about the state and administration as well as society. Finally, care facilities, and the first authority seem to be equally important. In general the external environment is more pluralistic and encompasses a broader range on different stakeholders in the media. It can therefore be assumed that actors in the field
appearing in the media discourse are in some circumstances not the most important actors for prison managers.

Summing up, the results show that although the ‘Austrian prison world’ exhibits several similarities from the perspectives of the media discourse and prison managers, there are also some differences. First, the number of logics varies. Second, there is a substantial difference with regard to which logics appear how often. At the field level, the ‘discipline logic’ is the most frequent one, whereas at the manager level it is the ‘logic of managerialism’. Third, there are also slight variations in the vocabularies and building blocks associated with each logic. With the exception of the ‘punishment logic’, all logics at the manager level exhibit nuances and a more diverse and elaborate vocabulary. Fourth, there is also a difference in the actors mentioned at both levels. In the interviews, there is a stronger focus on management, whereas in the media discourse, the focus is more on external stakeholders.

5.4 **Relationships within the two types of manager-level logics**

The prevalent logics in the constellation have an impact on how prison managers act. As mentioned before, the existence of institutional logics per se does not lead to institutional complexity (e.g., Greenwood et al., 2011) – because institutional logics can co-exist peacefully (Goodrick & Reay, 2011). In the following section, I focus on whether and how the six manager logics are connected. I distinguish again between the ‘logics of purpose’ and the ‘logics of governance’. I begin by analyzing the logics dealing with the purpose of prisons. This leads to three possible variations: (1) Punishment versus resocialization, (2) discipline versus resocialization, and (3) discipline versus punishment.

**Punishment versus resocialization**

Electronic tagging is an example of how the ‘punishment logic’ might clash with the ‘resocialization logic’. Both can co-exist as long as potential contradictions are not realized. But as soon as the public perceives that justice is not served, and that people are not adequately punished for their crimes, the ‘logic of punishment’ becomes dominant and supersedes ‘resocialization’, as was the case with the former president of an Austrian soccer club. In such cases, reactions by prison management are guided exclusively by the ‘punishment logic’. For example, when offenders abuse electronic tagging (e.g., not being at home at a certain point of time), they have to go back to prison – making the resocialization process harder as they are pulled out of their social structures.
Discipline versus resocialization

The public is not only a main proponent of punishment, but also of discipline – especially if it relates to safety issues outside prisons. As stated before, for the public, prisons are a place where management, as a proxy for the state, must have everything under control. This is simply not possible nowadays, because there is a tradeoff: either prison managers try to have everything under control (which would mean that people are locked away the whole time) or prison managers prepare inmates for outside and relax detention regimes, for instance through day paroles as an important way to reintegrate inmates back to society. However, in such cases prison managers cannot guarantee that there are no escapes or smuggling.

Discipline versus punishment

The ‘logic of punishment’ and ‘the logic of discipline’ are normally not in a conflict. Instead these two logics support each other. One interviewee said:

“We have to respond to demands from the public. For the public it is important that they [inmates] are locked away. What is happening inside prisons is – to be honest – not important for the public. The only thing that matters is that the safety outside can be guaranteed. While the public will care a lot if an inmate escapes […], they do not care a lot whether someone is released” (I6).

This quote shows that in order to maintain safety outside prisons, punishing people (in the sense of locking them away) is an appreciated option. This is similar to safety and security aspects inside prisons. If prisons are understaffed, inmates are locked in their cells to prevent incidents from happening.

I analyzed the ‘governance logics’ as a next step. These include again three possible variations: (1) Corporatism versus managerialism, (2) managerialism versus bureaucracy, and (3) bureaucracy versus corporatism.

Corporatism versus managerialism

One important insight from the interviews was the strong impact of the staff council on staff management in prisons. The council is often criticized for not only pursuing the staff council agenda, but also trying to influence prison politics. I refer to two examples which I mentioned earlier. The first example is the case of the working hours of prison officers. Instead of implementing a two-shift operation – which is common in prisons in several countries – employees in Austrian prisons have only one shift from 7am to 3pm. Innovative ideas for change are often blocked by the strong influence of the staff council.
Another big issue is staff recruiting. The staff council has substantial power and can overrule the decisions or suggestions of a prison manager. The staff council tries to fill the most important positions with their own people, which is often not in the interest of the prison managers. If the staff council and prison manager cannot arrive at an agreement, the decision rests on the Federal Minister of Justice. However, he/she often decides in favor of the staff council. This is problematic as prison managers, nevertheless, are responsible for the work people do – even though they do not have the power to choose the people they want.

Managerialism versus bureaucracy

Conflict between the ‘managerialism logic’ and the ‘bureaucracy logic’ is quite common in traditional organizations in Austria. In most cases the ‘bureaucratic logic is firmly established and there is a perceived need to bring more ‘managerialism’ into the organization. It is often claimed that prisons are organizations with frozen structures, which makes it harder to implement innovations. According to the interviews, most prison managers are open to innovations, with only a few prison managers that prefer to fulfill their job in a very bureaucratic way. However, as the ‘logic of bureaucracy’ is based on the law and a long tradition, it is not that easy for the ‘managerial logic’ to take hold.

A typical example is the staff plan which makes flexible decisions concerning staff agendas nearly impossible. As mentioned before, this plan says exactly who has to do what and therefore people are stuck in specific positions. Modern tools of personnel development, such as job rotation, are almost impossible to implement. This has two negative consequences: first, prison officers can only change positions if a position becomes vacant – so they cannot develop themselves further in the organization. Second, prison managers have to work with the people they have, which makes it challenging to motivate these people.

Bureaucracy versus corporatism

Similar to the ‘punishment logic’ and the ‘discipline logic’, the ‘logic of bureaucracy’ and the ‘logic of corporatism’ are not in direct conflict with each other. Both can co-exist without contradiction. One reason could be that they do not have any clear overlaps. ‘Bureaucracy’ stresses the inflexibility of the staff plan and that everything has to be done according to rules. This does not conflict with the understanding of ‘corporatism’, which might prevent the two-shift model from being implemented. Both logics are, for the most part, in favor of prison officers, if prison managers aim to change the system.
Summing up, within each type, there are conflicting as well as supporting relationships between specific logics. Within the ‘governance logics’, ‘punishment’ and ‘resocialization’ as well as ‘discipline’ and ‘resocialization’ are in conflict, whereas ‘punishment’ and ‘discipline’ support each other. Within the ‘purpose logics’ there is a conflict between ‘managerialism’ and ‘bureaucracy’ as well as between ‘managerialism’ and ‘corporatism’. However, ‘corporatism’ and ‘bureaucracy’ are aligned with each other.

5.5 Metaphors in use

As outlined earlier, metaphors are a way to make sense of complex situations (e.g., Cornelissen et al., 2008) and to reduce complexity in general (e.g., Höllerer, Jancsary, & Grafström, 2014). In my conceptual framework, I have elaborated why it is useful to think of metaphors as rhetorical strategies of materializing, and potentially counteracting, institutional pluralism. One of my sub-questions, asked whether there are patterns in the relationships between the logics invoked and the metaphors used, and how such patterns can be characterized. I analyzed which metaphors were used to simply enact individual logics and which metaphors helped to de-problematize institutional pluralism. First, I provided insights about the prevalent metaphors and their source domains in my eight interviews. Then I highlighted how often the source domains appeared throughout the interviews, and showed the five most frequent ones for each interview. Subsequently, I linked the source domains to each of the six manager-level logics in order to show the five most frequent source domains connected to each of the logics. Finally, I changed my lens and provided insights about how each of the source domains spread across the ‘purpose logics’ and the ‘governance logics’.

5.5.1 Outlining the range of metaphors in use

In addition to the identification of building blocks as a basis for the reconstruction of logics, I analyzed the interviews for metaphors in use. First, I coded all interviews for living metaphors in a broader sense (i.e., also including analogies). Then I clustered them according to their domain of origin and, consequently, identified 16 broader source domains from which metaphors stemmed, and 57 sub-domains into which the broader domains could be broken down. Such sub-domains emphasize the different nuances within a source domain. For instance, the first source domain is called ‘Prison as family’ and comprises several sub-domains. One such sub-domain encompasses metaphors expressing an attitude of care or protection. It includes expressions such
as 'to live in the house' and 'family of the penal system'. A different sub-domain is 'Prison as family' which stresses constraints or a kind of punishment by comprising metaphors like 'never been a beloved child' or 'to be grounded'. Table 20 provides an overview of all domains and sub-domains found in the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source domain</th>
<th>Sub-domains</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison as family</td>
<td>Care and protection</td>
<td>To live in a house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial coordination</td>
<td>Family of the penal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constraint and punishment</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never been a beloved child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be grounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as deprivation</td>
<td>Deprivation of freedom</td>
<td>To be put in chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deprivation of resources</td>
<td>Behind bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deprivation of humanity</td>
<td>Bread and water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be penned up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Branded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as organism</td>
<td>Posture and stability</td>
<td>To put on firm legs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensory equipment</td>
<td>To have a good posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremities/Limbs</td>
<td>To have a good eye for something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal organs</td>
<td>The best heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>A foot in the door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evolution/Development</td>
<td>The executive heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sickness/Deformity</td>
<td>Big steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental apparatus</td>
<td>Deformed agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impeded movement</td>
<td>To rack one's brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inertia</td>
<td>Prison in one's head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To stumble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To topple over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To sit on something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as cuisine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sandwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hot potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crème de la crème</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as art</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Shifting picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>Play a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>Rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Set of instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as kingdom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Throne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chieftain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as biotope</td>
<td>Flux</td>
<td>Fluid organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body of water</td>
<td>No stone left standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergence</td>
<td>Breaking the cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth and sustenance</td>
<td>Overflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>To sink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beehive</td>
<td>To emerge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>To crystallize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web</td>
<td>Grow to be up to the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize the fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prison landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honeycomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aptsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 It is necessary to note that the categorization of metaphors was conducted according to their German expression, which can often not be translated literally into English. It is therefore difficult to provide good examples that refer to the same source domains in both languages.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison as building</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Close-meshed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison as place of spirituality</td>
<td>Rituals/Superstition, Religion</td>
<td>Knock on wood, Daily morning ritual, No paradise, Ten commandments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as machine</td>
<td>Information technology, Hindrance, Automation, Room for maneuver, Maintenance, Navigation, Adhesion, Destruction, Pressure</td>
<td>Hardware, Reinstall the system, Switched off, To brake, Runs automatically, Freedom of movement, Filter, To rail, To steer/direct, Not tear up, Putty that holds something together, Shambles, Damaged structure, Built-up pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as science</td>
<td>Levitation, Balance</td>
<td>To hang in suspense, Pendular movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as game</td>
<td>Player roles, Entertainment, Competition, Game performance</td>
<td>Key role, Player, Hobby horse, To play the game, Loser and winner, Reverse of the medal, To run out the clock, To set the bar high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as battleground</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Incoming attacks, A heavy bomber, At the front, Infiltrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as business</td>
<td>Doing business, Revenue and costs, Marketing, Hotel industry, Shipping industry</td>
<td>To know one’s business, Daily business, Rare and expensive good, Appreciate the value, The price of something, Marketable as human product, To lodge at public expense, Heaved, On board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as community (mainly analogies)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Population census, Small scale society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison as public sector organization (mainly analogies)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>School administration, Like the police in the prison, Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Overview of source domains and sub-domains

5.5.2 Frequencies and descriptive statistics of metaphors in use

To identify the most common metaphors used by prison managers talking about their job, I compared the frequencies of all source domains across the eight interviews. The results show a very heterogeneous picture. Whereas some metaphors are very dominant, others gain only minor popularity. The top six source domains are: ‘Prison as organism’ (16.93%), ‘prison as machine’ (15.74%), ‘prison as game’ (10.16%), ‘prison as family’ (9.36%) and ‘prison as biotope’ as well as
‘prison as business’ (8.76%) – which represent 69.72% of the total amount of metaphors. On the contrary, the four smallest one are: ‘Prison as public sector organization’, ‘prison as science’ (1.99%), ‘prison as cuisine’ (1.39%), and ‘prisons as community’ (1.00%). All of the latter source domains only contain one sub-domain and consequently include only few metaphorical expressions. Figure 9 summarizes the frequencies of all source domains.

Figure 9: Frequencies of source domains

These results were further scrutinized by analyzing each interview separately. Table 21 shows the five most frequently used source domains for each interview as well as those source domains that were not used by each interviewee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>I3</th>
<th>I4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>26.98%</td>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15.87%</td>
<td>Organism</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biotope</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organism</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>Kingdom</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>Biotope</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This table shows, for example, that ‘prisons as machine’ is the only source domain which appears amongst the top five in all eight interviews. Furthermore, despite ‘prison as organism’ and ‘prisons as biotope’ having been used by all interviewees, they are only in the most frequently used source domains in seven interviews (missing in the top five: ‘prison as organism’ in I8; ‘prison as biotope’ in I5). Also ‘prison as family’ and ‘prison as game’ are in the top five in five interviews. In both cases, they were not used at all in one interview (‘prison as family’: missing in the top five: I2/I7; not used at all: I3); ‘prison as game’ (missing in the top five: I1/I7; not used at all: I5). Finally, in four out of the eight interviews ‘prison as battleground’ and ‘prison as business’ were in the top five and were, like ‘prison as organism’ and ‘prison as biotope’, used in all interviews (missing in the top five: ‘prison as battleground’ (I1/I2/I4/I6); ‘prison as business’ (I3/I4/I6/I7).

In contrast, ‘prison as place of spirituality’ was not mentioned at all in five of the interviews; ‘prison as community’ was not a relevant source domain in four of the interviews, and ‘prison as deprivation’, ‘prison as cuisine’, and ‘prison as public service organization’ were not used in three of the interviews. It is also noteworthy that two interviewees used all of the metaphors. These two interviews were the longest in duration and both interviewees had slightly different backgrounds compared to the others. In total, however, the use of metaphors is similar enough across the interviews to contend that there is a substantial level of shared language use; and, further, that metaphorical expressions are not simply a result of the idiosyncratic preferences of individual prison managers.

### 5.5.3 Intersections between logics and metaphors

In order to answer my sub-question about the relationship between logics and metaphors, I analyzed which logics co-occurred with which source domains. Again, I focused only on the five
most frequently used source domains for each manager-level logic and highlighted which of the
source domains did not link to any particular logic. In this part, I aim to understand which source
domains each logic encompassed. Specifically, I investigated how the totality (100%) of
metaphorical expressions connected to each logic spread over the different source domains. First,
I started by analyzing the ‘governance logics’, i.e., the ‘corporatism logic’, ‘bureaucracy logic’, and
‘managerialism logic’. Table 22 provides the percentages for each source domain across the
‘governance logics’. Please note that the top five source domains do not cover 100% of
metaphorical expressions but, in the case of each logic, make up more than half of the metaphors
used (~75% for the ‘corporatism logic’, ~69% for the ‘bureaucracy logic’, and ~61% for the
‘managerialism logic’). As seen in the table, the ‘managerialism logic’ is the most diverse in terms
of source domains, since it comprises all of them to some degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporation</th>
<th>Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Managerialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.57%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>17.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organism</td>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>Organism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>15.05%</td>
<td>13.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotopes</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>Biotopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>13.98%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game</td>
<td>Kingdom</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>13.98%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom</td>
<td>Biotopes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of metaphors: 51</td>
<td>Total amount of metaphors: 93</td>
<td>Total amount of metaphors: 246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Frequently used and absent source domains for each manager-level logic – Part 1

The results show that the ‘logic of corporatism’ and the ‘logic of bureaucracy’ are almost identical
in terms of their use of metaphors. They consist of the same five source domains, but the
prioritization is slightly different. Whereas ‘prison as machine’ (21.57%) is the most dominant
source domain in the ‘corporatism logic’, for the ‘logic of bureaucracy’ it is ‘prison as game’
(16.13%) followed by ‘prison as machine’ (15.05%). The subcategories of machine highlight, for
both logics, that processes are slowed down, that there is a selection process, external pressure,
danger, and destruction, whereas ‘prison as game’ demonstrates in this context power and being
a playmaker. This is similar to the source domain ‘prison as kingdom’ – reinforcing the earlier
finding that both logics indicate power and power relations. In addition, ‘prison as biotope’ depicts
prisons as places with restrictions, constraints that are disconnected, and isolation – similar to
‘prison as organism’, which highlights, for these two logics, inertia. Likewise, ‘prison as machine’,
‘prison as biotope’, and ‘prison as organism’ refer to obstacles and more negatively connotation
associated with the two logics. Comparing the ‘logic of corporatism’ and the ‘logic of bureaucracy’ to the ‘managerialism logic’, the main distinction is that instead of ‘prison as kingdom’, the fifth main source domain is ‘prison as family’ (8.54%), implying care and protection in the sense of the manager being the ‘head of the family’. Accordingly, all three ‘governance logics’ utilize very similar source domains; however, they still differ in their sub-domains which transmit different meanings. For example, similar to the ‘corporatism logic’, the source domain ‘prison as machine’ (17.89%) is the most frequently used one in the ‘managerialism logic’. However, in this case it highlights not only restrictions and external pressure, but also how to handle situations (such as efficiency, routine, room for maneuver, control, and protection). The ‘prison as game’ (13.01%) source domain highlights entertainment, competition as a requirement for success, and coaching and ambitious attitudes. ‘Prison as organism’ (13.41%) stresses, in the context of managerialism, performance and trust. Finally, ‘prison as biotope’ (8.54%) evokes change, connecting with others, and mature processes.

In general, the ‘managerialism logic’ is the only one of the six manager-level logics that includes all 16 source domains, which can be traced back to the fact that it encompasses 246 metaphorical expressions. In contrast, ‘bureaucracy’ only consists of 93 metaphors, and ‘corporatism’ only 51 metaphors. As Table 22 shows, ‘prisons as place of spirituality’ and ‘prison as community’ are not part of the ‘corporatism logic’ and the ‘bureaucracy logic’. In addition, ‘prison as art’ was not mentioned in connection to the ‘bureaucracy logic’ and ‘prison as science’ and ‘prison as public sector organization’ are not part of the ‘corporatism logic’.

In the second stage, I compared the three logics related to the purpose of a prison (‘purpose logics’), namely the ‘resocialization logic’, ‘punishment logic’, and ‘discipline logic’ in order to identify the most common source domains for each. Table 23 summarizes the frequencies and the absence of source domains for each of these manager-level logics. Again, for each logic, the top five source domains cover the majority of metaphorical expressions used (~72% for the ‘resocialization logic’, ~86% for the ‘punishment logic’, and ~84% for the ‘discipline logic’). These percentages suggest that metaphor use within the ‘purpose logics’ is focused on a small number of dominant metaphors compared to those of the ‘governance logics’. Table 23 further reveals a higher number of source domains not used with regard to the ‘purpose logics’ compared to the ‘governance logics’, which means that the diversity of source domains is lower.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resocialization</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organism</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
<td>Organism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>Battleground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount of metaphors:</strong> 90</td>
<td><strong>Total amount of metaphors:</strong> 28</td>
<td><strong>Total amount of metaphors:</strong> 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Cuisine</th>
<th>Deprivation</th>
<th>Cuisine</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of spirituality</td>
<td>Kingdom</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biotope</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Frequently used and absent source domains for each manager-level logic – Part 2

Similar to the ‘governance logics’, the total amount of metaphors used in relation to a specific logic is heterogeneous. ‘Resocialization’ encompasses a total of 90 metaphors, ‘punishment’ only 28 metaphors (and is therefore – compared to all manager-level logics, the logic with the fewest metaphors), and ‘discipline’ only 43 metaphors. The overall picture shows that all three logics include ‘prison as organism’ (‘resocialization’: 22.22%; ‘punishment’: 17.86%; ‘discipline’: 16.28%), ‘prison as machine’ (‘resocialization’: 14.44%; ‘punishment’: 25.00%; ‘discipline’: 23.26%), and ‘prison as business’ (‘resocialization’: 13.33%; ‘punishment’: 10.71%; ‘discipline’: 9.30%) among the five most frequently used source domains. ‘Prison as organism’ in the ‘resocialization logic’ aims at demonstrating stability (e.g., ‘put something on firm legs’), whereas in the ‘punishment logic’, it stresses internalized forms of punishment (e.g., ‘having the prison inside one’s head’). Conversely, ‘discipline’ it refers to evolution (e.g., ‘important steps of self-development’). ‘Prison as machine’ stresses routine in all three logics, and in the ‘resocialization logic’ it also contains a design component (‘to install’ something new). ‘Prison as business’ compares the daily business of punishment with the hotel business; and luxury in the ‘resocialization logic’. It is in general noteworthy that the ‘resocialization’ and ‘discipline’ logics link mostly to the same five frequently used source domains. Furthermore, both logics make use of ‘prison as game’ (‘recozialization’: 13.33%; ‘discipline’: 6.98%) and ‘prison as family’ (‘resocialization’: 8.89%; ‘discipline’: 6.98%). ‘Prison as game’ conveys more of a coaching attitude, whereas ‘prison as family’, again, evokes care and protection. In addition, the ‘discipline logic’ also includes ‘prison as battleground’ (20.93%). Like in the armed forces, another total institution, discipline and order are important attributes. While the ‘logic of punishment’ includes ‘prison as battleground’ (10.71%) amongst the most used source domains, it also links to two more, namely ‘prison as deprivation’ (10.71%) and ‘prison as art’ (10.71%). ‘Prison as deprivation’ stresses different forms of restriction and constraint,
whereas ‘prison as art’ illustrates, for example, that it is important to have a sense of the ‘whole picture’; and to have a set of instruments ready to solve problems.

Table 23 further shows that ‘prison as cuisine’ and ‘prison as community’ do not appear in the ‘logic of discipline’ and the ‘logic of punishment’, ‘prison as science’ and ‘prison as a public sector organization’ are not an element of the ‘resocialization logic’ and ‘punishment logic’, ‘prison as art’ is not included in the ‘resocialization logic’ and the ‘discipline logic’. All other source domains, such as ‘prison as deprivation’, ‘prison as place of spirituality’, ‘prison as kingdom’, ‘prison as biotope’, and ‘prison as building’ are missing from only one of the three ‘purposes logics’.

To conclude, my analysis showed that among the manager-level logics, there were three source domains that could be characterized as ‘generalist’, since they linked to all or most logics. This includes ‘prison as organism’ and ‘prison as machine’, which are used across all the logics; but also, ‘prison as game’, which links to five of them. Other source domains are relevant only for a selected set of logics. ‘Prison as family’ was among the five most frequently used source domains in three of the six manger-level logics – two of them from the ‘purpose logics’ (logics of ‘resocialization’ and ‘discipline’) and one from the ‘governance logics’ (‘managerialism logic’). ‘Prison as biotope’ featured among the top five within all three of the ‘governance logics’. In contrast, ‘prison as business’ only linked to two of the ‘purpose logics’, namely the ‘resocialization logic’ and the ‘punishment logic’. Finally, some of the source appear as highly specialized and only appeared among the top five in one of the logics. For instance, ‘prison as art’, ‘prison as deprivation’, and ‘prison as battleground’ were among the top five in the ‘punishment logic’. This finding suggests a certain differentiation in the ‘reach’ of source domains, as well as in the scope of their usefulness in conveying matters of purpose and governance. It is striking that the generalist metaphors are also the ones that were discussed extensively in the management literature (i.e., ‘organism’ and ‘machine’). I will outline potential implications of these findings in more detail in my discussion.

5.5.4 Metaphors and the enactment of institutional pluralism

In this dissertation, I sought to analyze whether and how metaphors were used to deal with institutional pluralism or even institutional complexity. More specifically, I was interested in whether certain source domains were only related to one specific manager-level logic or if they ‘mediated’ between two (conflicting) logics. This goal reversed the focus of the previous section and focused on the individual source domain. Again, I split my analyses into the two different types of manager-level logics, namely ‘governance logics’ and ‘purpose logics’.

Figure 10 provides an overview of all three ‘governance logics’ and their 16 source domains. It illustrates, for each of the 16 source domains, how strong the link is to each of the
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logics. Specifically, it shows how the use of each source domain (100% in the column) is distributed among the three logics. In this section, I aim to understand whether certain source domains are specific to only one logic, or whether they claim relevance for several logics simultaneously, which might be an indicator of mediating meaning structures between logics.

The results show that only in two out of 16 cases, a source domain links exclusively to one ‘governance logic’. These are the source domains ‘prison as place of spirituality’ and ‘prison as community’, which are exclusively related to the ‘managerialism logic’. For example, ‘prison as spirituality’ highlights routine and persistence (e.g., ‘ritual’ or ‘monastery’), which points to specific understandings of management.

A substantially larger subset of source domains has predominant relevance (linkage of over 50%) to only one logic but also links to others to a minor degree. Most of these source domains are predominantly relevant to the ‘managerialism logic’ – namely ‘prison as family’, ‘prison as organism’, ‘prison as cuisine’, ‘prison as art’, ‘prison as biotope’, ‘prison as building’, ‘prison as machine’, ‘prison as game’, ‘prison as battleground’, ‘prison as business’, and ‘prison as public sector organization’. In contrast, only ‘prison as science’ is linked primarily to the ‘bureaucracy logic’ (>50%).

A third category of source domains linked to at least two logics – at roughly the same degree. In my data, I identified two source domains referring to both the ‘bureaucracy logic’ and the ‘managerialism logic’. The first one is ‘prison as deprivation’, which frames the relationship between these two logics as one of restriction and constraint for management. The second one is ‘prison as kingdom’, which expresses power relations and hierarchy as commonalities between bureaucracy and managerialism.

Figure 11 visually maps the links between source domains and the three governance logics. Source domains that are exclusively (marked with an asterisk) or predominantly linked to one logic are displayed below that logic. Source domains connecting several logics are presented in light blue. The lightning icon symbolizes that there is a conflict between ‘managerialism’ and ‘bureaucracy’ and between ‘managerialism’ and ‘corporatism’ (see my findings in chapter 5.4).
Next, I shift the focus to the ‘purpose logics’, including the ‘logic of resocialization’, the ‘logic of discipline’, and the ‘logic of punishment’. Again, I analyzed how each of the source domains spread across the relevant logics (see Figure 12 below).

![Figure 11: Relationships between source domains and ‘governance logics’](image1)

![Figure 12: ‘Purpose logics’ and source domains](image2)

Within the category of ‘purpose logics’, five source domains linked exclusively to a specific manager-level logic, which is more than twice the amount of exclusive source domains found amongst the ‘governance logics’. This insight lends further evidence to the finding that metaphor use seems to be considerably more focused in the enactment of ‘purpose logics’ than in ‘governance logics’. The source domains ‘prison as cuisine’ and ‘prison as community’ are exclusively associated with the ‘resocialization logic’. ‘Prison as cuisine’ refers to the handling of tricky situations with inmates, while ‘prison as community’ emphasizes the challenges of reintegration. Two source domains link exclusively to the ‘logic of discipline’. ‘Prison as science’ stresses uncertainty, which can be related to the challenging task of keeping discipline high, whereas ‘prison as public sector organization’ refers to other situations where discipline is an issue (e.g., schools or the police). As mentioned above, the source domain ‘prison as art’ focuses on ‘instruments’ and exclusively links to the ‘logic of punishment’.
Furthermore, the results showed that 'prison as family', 'prison as organism', 'prison as kingdom', 'prison as biotope', 'prison as building', 'prison as game', and 'prison as business' are predominantly (linkage of over 50%) connected to the ‘logic of resocialization’. For example, ‘prison as family’ encompassed the tasks to protect and care for, but also contain, inmates. 'Prison as organism', 'prison as biotope', and 'prison as building' evoked issues of evaluation and construction as bases for development and change, whereas ‘prison as game’ suggested more supportive attitudes, like coaching. 'Prison as kingdom' was predominantly linked to the ‘resocialization logic’ and demonstrated the power relation inherent in the resocialization of inmates. However, it is noteworthy that this source domain also had considerable relevance (40%) in the ‘discipline logic’. ‘Prison as battleground’ was also linked predominantly to the ‘discipline logics’ and included military vocabulary.

Finally, three source domains linked to two or all three logics almost equally. 'Prison as deprivation' addressed the conflict between ‘the logic of resocialization’ (by expressing restrictions and constraints) and the ‘the logic of punishment’ (by expressing the idea of locking people away). The source domain ‘prison as place of spirituality’ supported the ‘logic of punishment’ and the ‘logic of discipline’, as both expressed the importance of observing the rules in a ritualistic manner. And, finally, the source domain ‘prison as machine’ was a mixture of all three logics and stressed the ‘mechanistic’ aspects of internal punishment, the resocialization process, and the maintenance of discipline and security. Again, Figure 13 visualizes these results.

Comparing all logics with all source domains, Figure 14 illustrates how frequently each source domain was linked to each manager-level logic. In this step, I did not separate the two types of
logics. Instead, I focused on all six manager-level logics in order to gain a better understanding of the distribution of source domains across the two categories of logics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>prison as...</th>
<th>family</th>
<th>deprivation</th>
<th>organism</th>
<th>cuisine</th>
<th>art</th>
<th>kingdom</th>
<th>biotope</th>
<th>building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corporatism</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bureaucracy</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managerialism</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>prison as...</th>
<th>family</th>
<th>deprivation</th>
<th>organism</th>
<th>cuisine</th>
<th>art</th>
<th>kingdom</th>
<th>biotope</th>
<th>building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resocialization</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punishment</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>prison as...</th>
<th>spirituality</th>
<th>machine</th>
<th>science</th>
<th>game</th>
<th>battleground</th>
<th>business</th>
<th>community</th>
<th>public sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corporatism</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bureaucracy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managerialism</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resocialization</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punishment</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: 'Manager-level logics' and source domains

'Managerialism' is the logic with the highest share of metaphorical expressions. The following source domains were predominantly mentioned (linkage of more than 50%) in the context of the 'managerialism logic': 'Prison as family' (which also has relevance for the 'resocialization logic'), 'prison as cuisine', 'prison as art' (which is shared primarily with the 'punishment logic'), 'prison as place of spirituality', and 'prison as public sector organization'.

While several source domains connected to all the logics to some degree, there were also a couple of 'hybrid' constellations connecting only the specific 'governance' and 'purpose' logics. 'Prison as art', for instance, has substantial relevance for both the 'managerialism logic' and the 'punishment logic'. 'Prison as place of spirituality' connects the 'managerialism logic' to both the 'discipline' and 'punishment' logics. 'Prison as science' links the 'bureaucracy' and 'managerialism' logics to the 'discipline logic', and 'prison as community' exclusively connects the 'managerialism logic' to the 'resocialization logic'. Although these source domains did not link competing logics, because there was no direct competition across types in my data, they nevertheless provide insights into specific meaning structures within the discourse, particularly with regard to slightly divergent understandings of 'management' regarding the different purposes. Managing punishment is primarily framed according to the domains of 'spirituality' and 'art', which may be seen as a way to 'soften' the harsh topic of incarceration; but, upon closer inspection, also suggests a transfer of routines and tools from these two domains. Managing discipline is related to science,
which suggests a certain regularity and clear cause-effect relations. Finally, managing resocialization is connected to 'community', which stresses the integrative character of sending inmates back into society.

In summary, I found a large variety of metaphors in my data which I clustered into 16 source domains encompassing 57 sub-domains. Some of them had a more generalist character, i.e., 'prison as organism', 'prison as machine', and 'prison as game', as they have been used in almost all interviews and link to most of the logics. Others are more specific in their scope (such as 'prison as cuisine'). Analyzing the two types of logics separately, the results show that most of the source domains link predominantly (linkage of over 50%) to one specific logic, while a much lower number of source domains (e.g., 'prison as deprivation') connect two or more logics to the same degree.
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“Finally, it has to be recognised that good prison management is dynamic. It is a
continuous process rather than something which can be achieved once and for all
and, very importantly, that it is a means to an end rather than an end in itself. [...] Prisons as organisations do not like uncertainty; they see it as destabilising and
threatening. That is why they need to be set in the context of an agreed set of
ethical values linked to clear leadership. If that is the case, the change process will
lead to better managed prisons, which are more secure, safer and more effective;
in which there is a respect for decency and humanity.” (Coyle, 2002: 98)

6.1 Discussion and Contribution

In this dissertation, I studied competing understandings of ‘good’ prison management within
Austrian discourse and how such institutional complexity manifestes in the shared narratives of
prison managers. I began by examining different underlying meanings that drive the
understanding of ‘good’ prison management at the field level and the actors in the field
championing such meanings or enacting them in their role identities. My findings are based on an
analysis of media discourse in Austria between 1970 and 2015. In the second phase of my
research, I analyzed data from eight interviews with prison managers in the Austrian penal system
and focused on the prison manager’s perspective – in order to see which field-level logics are
perceived and enacted at the manager level, and especially how the relationship between plural
logics is constructed. To date, there has been a paucity of research investigating the relationship
between institutional logics at different levels of analysis. As such, my findings contribute to the
emerging literature on the cross-level effects of institutional logics and their micro-foundations
(e.g., Colyvas & Powell, 2008; Thornton et al., 2012).

In this research study, I also investigated how logics and their relationships are
instantiated in the rhetoric of prison managers – particularly the use of metaphors – and what this
reveals about the role of metaphors in the enactment of pluralistic institutional logics. Early (e.g.,
Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Luckmann, 2006) and more recent (e.g., Cornelissen et al., 2015;
Schoeneborn, 2011) work has stressed the crucial role of communication and language in the
construction and maintenance of institutions and institutional logics. However, the specific role
of metaphorical language in enacting pluralistic constellations of logics has not received
systematic scientific treatment.

In what follows, I first summarize and outline the contributions and implications of my
findings with regard to the constellation of logics at the field level, its implications at the manager
level, and the complexity perceived and enacted by prison managers. I then present the conceptual
implications of the study’s insights on metaphors and institutional pluralism.
6.1.1 The constellation of logics at the field level

To address the first part of my research question, I studied newspaper articles from five different media outlets in Austria. I analyzed articles on Austrian prisons (management) published in Profil from 1970 to 2015 to identify the constellation of logics prevalent in Austrian media discourse; and, to reconstruct the dynamics and changes within this constellation of logics over time. To supplement this analysis, I examined articles published in 2004, 2009, and 2014 from four other media outlets: Die Presse, Falter, Kurier, and Kronen Zeitung. This supplementary analysis was useful in detecting additional nuances in recent media discourse. The underlying purpose was to identify the central topics covered in the last ten years – and to compare these results with data from the interviews. This comparison not only provided important insights into how the penal system and its management evolved, but also shed light on the different perspectives on recent changes.

I reconstructed four distinct logics at the level of the field. Building upon McPherson and Sauder (2013) and Toubiana (2014), I identified and articulated the 'logic of punishment' and the 'logic of resocialization' – which permeated media discourse. Additionally, I found that a 'logic of discipline' – relating to issues of safety and security – was clearly evident in the discourse. Finally, traces of the 'managerialism logic' also emerged from the discourse. The 'logic of punishment' is primarily represented and supported by the general public, whereas the 'logic of resocialization' is mainly enacted by social workers, prison officers, and prison managers. The 'logic of discipline' has two different primary manifestations, one internal (safety and security of inmates and prison staff) and the other external (safety of the public). The main proponents are the general public for the external dimension and prisons staff in a broader sense (meaning all the people working in the prison, including their staff council) for the internal dimension. Additionally, the 'logic of discipline' also encompasses the aspect of control (i.e., supervising, restricting, and guiding the behavior of inmates), which is a prerequisite for both internal and external aspects of safety. Finally, the 'logic of managerialism', which is mostly associated with prison managers, introduces internal aspects of managing prisons. The four logics exhibited distinct dynamic trajectories over the decades. My findings illustrate that the 'logic of discipline' was largely dominant throughout the period of investigation – which can be explained by the fact that two of its main proponents, namely the general public and the staff council, are strongly represented in the media discourse. The second most frequent logic was the 'logic of punishment' – with the exception of the 1980s, where it was more frequent than the 'logic of discipline'. The data show that since the 1980s, there has been a decrease in its salience. The 'logic of resocialization', in contrast, increased in salience over time. Only in the 1990s, there was a minimal decrease in newspaper articles emphasizing this logic. Finally, the 'managerialism logic' which plays a more subordinate role at the field level, seems to have slightly increased in its media presence over the last 30 years.
Furthermore, the results show that over the years four topics have been particularly relevant in Austrian media discourse. Three of them strongly correspond to the logics identified, i.e., punishment, resocialization, safety and control. A fourth topic, humanity and humane imprisonment was equally dominant and cut across the three logics. Since the media is both itself a speaker in the public discourse, and also allow others to gain voice in the public arena (e.g., Meyer, 2004), my data allowed me to capture who was given voice by the media in the context of the particular logics. This addresses the first sub-question of my thesis regarding the relevant actors in the field. Former inmates and current inmates as well as the Federal Ministry of Justice emphasized the ‘punishment logic’. While (former) inmates provided insights about prison life in Austria and stressed its negative aspects, the Federal Ministry of Justice focused more on stating its position on the issue of punishment. In contrast, prison managers voiced their perspectives with regard to the logics of ‘resocialization’ and ‘discipline’. Specifically, my findings show that managers either stressed the importance of resocialization or commented upon incidences related safety and security issues, like the relationship between day paroles and escapes. My findings also showed that – beside prison managers – inmates, the staff council, and experts were dominant speakers with respect to the ‘logic of discipline’. Discipline is a main issue for these actors, although their positions on the issue may vary. These results were confirmed when I examined how frequently internal as well as external speakers appeared in the media discourse. As Table 11 shows, the dominant speakers are prisons managers, followed by the Federal Ministry of Justice, inmates, and experts. In my analysis, I also focused on the actors most frequently mentioned in the newspaper articles (Die Presse, Falter, Kurier, and Kronen Zeitung) from 2000 to 2015. I found that inmates as well as the Federal Ministry of Justice were the five most frequently referenced. Prison officers, courts, and the Federal Minister of Justice were also frequently mentioned.

6.1.2 Comparing the field-level constellation to the manager-level constellation

In order to answer the second part of my research question on how this complexity is manifested in the shared narratives of prison managers, I started with the following sub-question:

(2) Which logics can be found at the manager level? What is their relationship to field-level logics? What is the degree of overlap, and how do they differ?

In this stage of the analysis, I shifted my attention from the field level to the manager level. As noted earlier, I use the term manager level, because I am analyzing one specific group in the organization, namely prison managers. Similar to the field level, I identified three logics that underlie distinct understandings of the societal purpose of prisons (e.g., Cressey, 1968): a ‘punishment logic’, a ‘resocialization logic’, and a ‘discipline logic’. However, in addition to the ‘managerialism logic’ – which was also present at the field level – I identified two more logics that
focus on governance issues, namely the ‘bureaucracy logic’ and the ‘corporatism logic’. Bureaucracy is characterized as being rule-oriented. Its emphasis lies on efficiency and in the fulfilment of public duties in a well-structured way. It is built on the rationality of the law. In contrast, managerialism has a more future-oriented perspective. It is characterized as being goal-oriented and involves taking risks and focusing on opportunities – making it rather entrepreneurial. Corporatism, at its core, relates to balancing different needs and interests from a political standpoint. Its emphasis is on representing and negotiating the interests of members.

With regard to my first sub-question, all logics that I found at the field level are also enacted at the manager level. However, the constellation of logics at the manager level is more differentiated and complex than the field-level constellation – because it includes two additional logics relating to the governance values and norms of prisons. My analysis of the six manager-level logics shows that ‘managerialism’ is the dominant logic, followed by the ‘logic of resocialization’. Somewhat surprisingly, the constellation of logics at the manager level is not a ‘selection’ or subset of the constellation at the field level, but rather the other way around. The likely explanation for this finding is that the media sphere is not a perfect approximation of field-level discourse, but rather represents a set of ‘discourse strands’ (e.g., Jäger & Maier, 2016) that are themselves incomplete. Accordingly, while prison managers perceive and draw on all logics represented in the media sphere, some logics that are of particular relevance to the governance of prisons might be discussed in other discourse strands at the field level.

What is most remarkable about the differences between the field and manager levels is that the manager-level constellation not only comprises more logics, but it also seems that the additional logics are different in kind. Although the ‘managerialism logic’ shows faint traces at the field level, the crucial distinction between ‘types’ of logics only emerged in the systematic comparison between the two levels of analysis; and is therefore a central contribution of my study to literature on cross-level effects (e.g., Smets et al., 2015; Thornton et al., 2012). While ‘punishment’, ‘resocialization’, and ‘discipline’ all refer to broad societal functions of prisons, ‘managerialism’, ‘bureaucracy’, and ‘corporatism’ revolve around issues of governance. In a way, this seems to correspond to a distinction that Pache and Santos (2010) make with regard to different forms of institutional complexity: that logics may be in conflict with each other regarding both their ‘means’ (i.e., prescribed actions and practices) and their ‘ends’ (i.e., prescribed goals and values). At first pass, it would seem that the logics of ‘punishment’, ‘resocialization’, and ‘discipline’ focus on ‘ends’ (what?), while the logics of ‘managerialism’, ‘bureaucracy’, and ‘corporatism’ focus on ‘means’ (how?). However, upon closer inspection, the former set of logics also prescribes specific means (e.g., day paroles for resocialization, or plans of imprisonment for discipline), while the latter also prescribe certain ends (e.g., legality for bureaucracy or effectiveness for managerialism).
Still, the impression remains that the three ‘governance logics’ that appear primarily at the manager level are different from the other three with regard to their ‘substance’ (e.g., Friedland, 2009). First, they differ with regard to the content of what they claim jurisdiction over. As mentioned, ‘punishment’, ‘resocialization’, and ‘discipline’ all concern the societal purposes and functions of prisons. Therefore, I cluster them under the term ‘purpose logics’. They are more directly related to the domain of the penal system. ‘Managerialism’, ‘bureaucracy’, and ‘corporatism’, on the other hand, concern different understandings of governing organizations. Consequently, I label them ‘governance logics’. In a way, my findings echo Liebling’s (2004 quoted in English, 2013) differentiation of ‘punishment credo’, ‘care credo’, and ‘management credo’ in the discourse on prisons. English (2013) differentiates the first two credos (defining ‘what matters’) from the latter (defining ‘how to achieve it’) based on the fact that the management credo does not seem to correspond with any specific value base. Not only do the logics I identify differ in terms of their jurisdictional domains, their scope also varies. While ‘purpose logics’ may only claim jurisdiction in the field of the penal system (and, maybe, similar fields), the ‘governance logics’ a claim much broader jurisdiction, and are potentially relevant for a variety of different formal organizations.

Second, there are structural differences between the two sets of logics. In my findings, I identified tensions and contradictions between logics within a certain type, but not across the two types (see also my discussion of the relationships between logics below). This insight may relate to Raynard’s (2016) concept of ‘jurisdictional overlap’. The relationship between ‘purpose logics’ and ‘governance logics’ does not generate heightened experiences of institutional complexity because they differ in what they regulate. Logics that do not conflict or generate contradictions across types reinforces the analytical distinction between the sets of logics in my data.

Third, and finally, the two sets of logics also differ with regard to their metaphorical enactment. Specifically, I find that, ‘governance logics’ are expressed with a greater variety of metaphors than ‘purpose logics’. If metaphors are a way of framing the unknown in terms of the familiar, and of resolving complexity (e.g., Genter & Bowdle, 2002; Powell & Colyvas, 2008), then the more substantive use of metaphors for ‘governance logics’ indicates that they are perceived as more problematic than ‘purpose logics’; or, at the very least, that prison managers are somewhat lacking proper vocabulary to talk about issues of governance, which they remedy by frequent recourse to common metaphors.

By differentiating between different ‘types’ of logics within a single field, this study contributes to, and extends, existing research on the constellations of institutional logics (e.g., Goodrick & Reay, 2011). My findings clearly relate to Goodrick and Reay’s (2011: 403) third type of constellation in which “one logic exercises moderate influence and others show some, but less influence”. As my study shows, this was the case in all constellations over time, as there was never
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one logic which clearly dominated over the others; instead there was always one more frequently
invoked logic, which was contrasted and/or complemented by less frequent ones. My study also
confirms Goodrick and Reay’s (2011) contention that in some cases, there are tensions between
the logics in a constellation, while at other times there are more cooperative and supportive
relations. I extend their insights by suggesting that some constellations of logics that influence
behavior at any one point in time can be further distinguished into different ‘types’ of logics that
are not related to each other. Consequently, I argue that not only do constellations of logics exist
at different levels, but also that there are different types of logics within a constellation.

6.1.3 Perceived complexity – Relationships between manager level logics

My next sub-question is directed at understanding how logics are related to each other at the
manager level.

(3) How is the relationship between logics experienced at the manager level? Do
these logics peacefully co-exist or can tensions be identified?

To answer this question, I again build upon conceptual work that describes potential relationships
between logics along different dimensions. Besharov and Smith (2014) characterize complex
institutional environments according to the degree of ‘logic compatibility’ (i.e., the degree to
which multiple logics espouse contradictory means and ends) and ‘logic centrality’ (i.e., the degree
to which logics can be fitted into a hierarchy of relevance within an organization). They describe
different positions in the matrix constituted by these two dimensions and conclude that
complexity is most problematic when logics are both highly incompatible and no hierarchy
between them can be established. Consequently, they identify four types of logic multiplicity:
‘contested’ (centrality is high; compatibility is low) meaning that there exists an extensive conflict
in an organization, ‘aligned’ (centrality and compatibility are high) having minimal conflict,
‘estranged’ (centrality and compatibility are low) meaning that there is a moderate conflict, and
‘dominant’ (centrality is low and compatibility is high) i.e., that no conflict exists. Raynard (2016)
also emphasizes logic incompatibility and logic prioritization at the level of the field and further
adds jurisdictional overlap as a criterion for institutional complexity. Such conceptual
classifications of institutional complexity serve as an excellent basis for empirical research, and
therefore inform the interpretation of my empirical findings.

In my study, I find different forms of relationships. The least tension and complexity exists
– as already outlined above – between the ‘governance logics’ and ‘purpose logics’. According to
Raynard's (2016: 6) typology, this is a case of ‘segregated’ complexity, wherein “even though the
prescriptive demands of the logics may be incompatible and their prioritization in the field
unsettled, the possibility of contestation and the jostling of interests are modest”. Furthermore,
there is no jurisdictional overlap. Within each set of logics, there is a different dynamic. From the institutional logics research discussed in my literature review, Lounsbury’s (2007) work on mutual funds in two different locations (Boston and New York) is an example of regionally ‘segregated’ complexity.

A situation of ‘aligned’ complexity occurs when there is a jurisdictional overlap between logics, an unsettled prioritization of logics, and a perceived compatibility between the logics. Battilana and Dorado (2010) provide an example of the successful blending of two logics while Lee and Lounsbury (2015) discuss how two logics with a similar value basis may amplify each other. In my empirical case, aligned complexity characterizes the relationship between the ‘bureaucracy logic’ and the ‘corporatism logic’; and the relationship between the ‘discipline logic’ and the ‘punishment logic’. In such relationships, “contestations between field-level constituencies can be constructive” (Raynard, 2016: 13). The interests of the broader public to see criminals punished aligned with the interest of prison staff to ensure a high level of safety in prisons. Similarly, the interest of the staff council to participate in recruiting matters aligned with the interest of the government to secure compliance with the law and guarantee proper bureaucratic procedures. However, both are in stark contrast to the interests of management to enhance their flexibility and decision making power.

A third type of complexity found in my case when the logics overlapped in their jurisdictions; were incompatible, and yet, there was a clear – if not always ‘official’ – prioritization in practice. Such a relationship, on the one hand, characterizes both ‘discipline’ versus ‘resocialization’ and ‘punishment’ versus ‘resocialization’. As explained in detail in my empirical findings, whenever ‘resocialization’ is in direct conflict with either ‘discipline’ (e.g., in the case of incidents during day parole) or ‘punishment’ (e.g., in the case of electronic tagging being perceived as too ‘soft’), it is subordinated. While there is no official ‘rule’ delineating such a prioritization, the existence of strong pressure groups (i.e., the broader public and politicians) advocating ‘punishment’ and ‘discipline’, and the lack of such a group for ‘resocialization’ implicitly define such a prioritization. Similarly, ‘managerialism’ is generally subordinated to both ‘corporatism’ and ‘bureaucracy’. In the case of corporatism, convention has led staff councils to have more voice in the Federal Ministry of Justice than prison managers. In the case of bureaucracy, rules of staffing and budgets are mandated by law, which constitutes a clear prioritization over managerial rationalities and needs. These examples are similar to Raynard’s (2016: 10) conceptualization of ‘restrained’ complexity, in which “competing demands are worked out at a higher level, either by negotiation between field-level actors and/or by dominant actors enforcing compliance”. Similar constellations of logics exist in Meyer and Höllerer’s (2010a) study of shareholder value in Austria, in which a ‘temporary truce’ at the field level emerged; likewise in Thornton and Ocasio’s work (1999) on the higher education publishing industry.
Summing up, my findings on the relationships between institutional logics at the same level of analysis (i.e., their constellation at the manager level) and across levels (i.e., between the field and the manager level) contribute to organization research and public management in various ways. First, whereas the conflict between 'managerialism and 'bureaucracy' can also be found in public management literature, my data show that 'corporatism' also has an important impact on management issues. Second, I further advance scientific insights on institutional plurality in contemporary prison management. Particularly, I add to the literature on institutional pluralism and institutional complexity (Greenwood et al., 2011; Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a; Raynard, 2016) by deepening the understanding of different forms of institutional complexity, as well as illustrating that logics not only exist at different levels, but that there are different types of logics within a level. As an extension of current literature on prison management, I contrast research on prisons as "total institutions" with an account that understands prisons as institutionally‐complex organizations embedded in pluralistic environments (see also Toubiana, 2014).

6.1.4 The role of metaphors in the enactment of plural institutional logics

My final sub-question examines the role of metaphors in the enactment of pluralistic institutional logics at the manager level.

(4) What is the relationship between logics that are invoked and the metaphors used? Which metaphors are used to simply enact specific logics, and which metaphors help manage institutional pluralism?

As noted in the discussion of the findings on cross-level differences, prison managers use a more restricted set of metaphors when they talk about the purposes and tasks of a prison ('purpose logics'); and a more differentiated set when they talk about 'how' they conduct their work ('governance logics'). One explanation, based on existing theory, could be that prison managers are more familiar with the vocabulary related to their tasks and duties (i.e., the vocabulary needed to rhetorically invoke the 'purpose logics'). However, for them, it is more complicated to talk about how they do it, because they see themselves as professionals more than as managers. Yet, there is an alternative explanation with slightly different implications. Since Morgan's (1986) highly influential book 'Images of Organization', the use of metaphors for managerial issues has diffused broadly. Prison managers' use of particular metaphors in talking about their management tasks, in consequence, could be due to socialization into the use of management 'jargon', which is full of metaphors. Conversely, 'Images of the Penal Purpose' have yet to be established, which might make prison managers more hesitant to talk about this part of their work in metaphorical terms, since no 'readymade' metaphors exist. In fact, both possibilities play together nicely in explaining the lesser prevalence of metaphors for 'purpose logics': Prison managers are more familiar with
technical vocabulary, and readymade metaphors do not exist. The higher prevalence of metaphors in the enactment of ‘governance logics’ could either be due to the broad diffusion of managerial metaphors, or the unease of prison managers regarding management vocabulary.

Further analysis on the prevalence of particular source domains provides additional information about metaphor use. My findings show that there is a set of source domains with a more ‘generalist’ character. Specifically, ‘prison as machine’ and ‘prison as organism’ are within the top five most frequently used source domains for all six manager-level logics. Both source domains have been mentioned by Morgan (1986). This supports the second explanation above, which states that these logics have been well established for talking about management and organization. Interestingly, these two source domains have – beside ‘prison as biotope’ – the most sub-domains and are therefore very broad in their meaning. Despite being invoked in the context of all six logics in the constellation, ‘prison as organism’ and ‘prison as machine’ are both more prevalent in the enactment of ‘governance logics’ – specifically the ‘managerialism logic’. In addition to the ‘generalist’ source domains, there are also more specific source domains in the data. For instance, it is noteworthy that the source domains ‘prison of biotope’ and ‘prison as kingdom’ were more frequently in the top five source domains of the ‘governance logics’, whereas ‘prison as business’ and ‘prison as battleground’ appeared more often in the top five source domains of the ‘purpose logics’. One contribution of this study to the literature on metaphors and institutional logics, accordingly, is the insight that the use of particular source domains varies across logics, and that some source domains have greater ‘reach’ in terms of the logics they enact. A first proposition extracted from the data could be that the reach of source domains increases as they become more established in a certain discourse.

A second core finding concerns the function of metaphors in manifesting institutional pluralism. While rhetorical approaches to institutions have stressed the importance of rhetorical strategies, such as frames (e.g., Meyer & Höllerer, 2010a; Cornelissen & Werner, 2014), legitimation strategies (e.g., Lefsrud & Meyer, 2012; Vaara & Tienari, 2008), and bridging devices (e.g., Höllerer, Jancsary, Meyer, & Vettori, 2013; Meyer & Höllerer, 2016), metaphors have, so far, not been substantially linked to the institutional logics literature. This is surprising given that studies have shown that metaphors may make the unknown less threatening and catalyze action through mobilization (e.g., Sillince & Barker, 2012). Further, metaphors may support narratives that enable particular courses of action (e.g., Cornelissen, 2012). In sum, there is strong indication that metaphors should be important vehicles for materializing institutional logics and translating them into practice.

The specific focus on metaphors in this thesis was in terms of their role in enacting pluralistic institutional contexts and influencing the relationships between logics. Insights in this regard show that metaphors can be found to play a role in four different ways: (a) specifying
individual logics, (b) negatively framing the dominant logic in a conflicting pair, (c) reinforcing synergies between logics, and (d) interweaving unrelated logics.

First, metaphors can predominantly link to one logic only. In fact, most source domains in my empirical data fall into this category. I theorize that such source domains specify individual logics by connecting them to a certain source domain and therefore either make them more easily comprehensible or ‘bend’ them to fit more specific values – giving them a particular ‘touch’. For instance, the ‘managerialism logic’ is frequently enacted with metaphors from the source domains ‘family’, ‘place of spirituality’, and ‘cuisine’. This creates an image of ‘managerialism’ that is distinctly different from the ‘standard’ variant found in profit-driven enterprises, – and, further, brings elements of familiarity, nurturing, and higher values to the forefront. In a way, this finding relates to Meyer and Höllerer’s (2016) concept of ‘intra-institutional’ complexity, which describes situations in which different models of organizing capitalism in market economies clash. The source domains used in the enactment of any institutional sphere and its respective logic, accordingly, may further identify the specific ‘variant’ of the logic. Intra-institutional complexity may therefore be characterized on the rhetorical level by the use of different source domains within the same institutional sphere. Further studies could examine whether such internal differentiation of logics through metaphors may also enable practice variation (e.g., Lounsbury, 2001, 2007) within the same logic, and thereby contribute to research on potential sources of variation in institutional theory.

Second, metaphors may connect two conflicting logics within a constellation. In my empirical data, two source domains (‘prison as deprivation’ and ‘prison as kingdom’) were found to link the conflicting ‘bureaucracy’ and ‘managerialism’ logics. Similarly, ‘prison as deprivation’ links the ‘resocialization logic’ and the ‘logic of punishment’. The literature on metaphors suggests that such source domains may have a bridging function if the logics at play are incompatible. They do so by reconciling logics through perceived similarities at a higher level of abstraction. Interestingly, however, the metaphors used in my data do not appear to reconcile contradictory logics, as originally expected. Rather, they aim to de-legitimize the more central or prioritized logic, and therefore can be said to have a framing function. In the terminology of Gamson (1992; see also Meyer, 2004), I found that metaphors were partially used to convey ‘injustices’ as part of collective action frames. For instance, the metaphors linking ‘resocialization’ to ‘punishment’ reflected exaggerated images of ‘medieval’ forms of incarceration (e.g., ‘bread and water’; ‘put somebody in irons’, ‘behind bars’). In these cases, metaphors constituted a form of ‘linguistic resistance’ against logics prioritized in the prison’s environment by de-legitimating them as ‘outdated’ and ‘unjust’. This seems to be a way for prison managers to rhetorically cope with the fact that the logic they deem as more crucial to their identity (‘resocialization’) is commonly subjugated to the one that society demands (‘punishment’).
Third, source domains may link either compatible or unrelated logics. In terms of compatible logics, for instance, ‘prison as spirituality’ combines the ‘logic of discipline’ and the ‘logic of punishment’. Source domains linking compatible logics stress similarities and synergies. In my empirical case, spirituality is reflected in compliance with rules (e.g., reference to the Ten Commandments), the consequences of misconduct (e.g., expulsion from Paradise), and invoking other total institutions (e.g., monasteries) – which supports both the rationalities of discipline and punishment. In this way, metaphors may reinforce synergies between compatible logics by tying them to similar values and/or practices.

Fourth, and finally, my findings show that source domains also link logics across the two different types of ‘governance’ and ‘purpose’ logics. Since these two types of logics have no jurisdictional overlap and can therefore be regarded as ‘segregated’ (see above), metaphors can play them against each other, mediate between them, or reinforce their synergies. I therefore theorize that source domains linking unrelated logics create novel meanings by interweaving them. This is related to Cornelissen’s (2005) assertion that the application of a source domain to a target domain enables more than just comparisons, but may create additional meanings that are not originally inherent in either domain. In my empirical data, for instance, ‘prison as science’ links the ‘bureaucracy’ and ‘managerialism’ logics to the ‘discipline’ logic. ‘Prison as science’ integrates management, bureaucratic structure, and the disciplining of inmates in fundamental relations of cause and effect – implying that successful management and regulation of discipline require dealing with uncertainties and subtle balances (sub-domains of ‘levitation’ and ‘balance’). In such cases, the source domains used define not so much the logics themselves (such as in the first three roles described above), but rather their relationships. This suggests that new meaning emerges at the interfaces when actors have to integrate unrelated logics and use metaphors to create specific relationships.

Summing up, this study has shown that the role of metaphors with regard to the enactment of institutional logics goes far beyond providing a central ‘root’ metaphor for each institutional order (e.g., Thornton et al., 2012). Instead, insights into the role of metaphors in the interaction between logics contributes to ongoing discussions on metaphors as a tool for sense-making and complexity reduction (e.g., Cornelissen, 2012; Cornelissen, Holt, & Zundel, 2011).

6.2 Limitations and avenues for future research

This dissertation has limitations that should be noted. First, as the focus of the study is on prison management in general and not on the specific characteristics of individual prisons, it remains open if there is a difference between the three types (involuntary forensic placement, correctional facilities, and regional court prisons) of Austrian prisons concerning the relevance of particular
Discussion, Contribution, and Limitations

logics, and also the degree of complexity involved. Although prison managers stressed that there is a difference in how to manage each type, my sample was too small to systematically distinguish between them. Therefore, it would be interesting to enlarge the sample in future research and see whether there is a difference between these three types of prisons.

Second, and along similar lines, it would be interesting to expand the investigation at the field level and include more speakers and genres. While media discourse is a good approximation of public discourse (e.g., Gamson, 1992; Meyer, 2004), there are other genres in which field-level actors discuss issues. For instance, websites (e.g., Powell & Oberg, 2017; Powell, Oberg, Korff, & Kloos, forthcoming) are increasingly popular and relevant arenas in which issues are publicly discussed and presented. As mentioned in my discussion, the reason that management issues have played only a marginal role at the field level in my empirical case may be due to the choice of media. Future research could look specifically at media in which management issues are discussed at the field level and compare them to my findings at the manager level. Additionally, the public communication of NGOs and NPOs relevant to the penal system could be analyzed more systematically, as their accounts may be ‘filtered’ in the media. This might provide additional details about the ‘purpose logics’ at the field level.

Third, I only focused on the prison manager’s perspective. It would be interesting to broaden the research question and include other internal stakeholders and their perspectives. This would allow for comparisons between the self- and public-image, but also to distinguish between different professions or even inmates in prison regarding their understanding of ‘good’ prison management.

Fourth, my analysis focused on the discursive and rhetorical level, and primarily examined verbal (i.e., written and spoken) text. Recent literature in institutional theory has suggested that verbal language is only part of the whole picture, and that communication increasingly happens in a multimodal way (i.e., combining different forms of expression like visual and verbal ones; e.g., Jones, Meyer, Jancsary, & Höllerer, 2017; Meyer, Höllerer, Jancsary, & van Leeuwen, 2013). It would be interesting to include visuals (both physical and mental ones), in the sense of visual metaphors, and compare the data. Going beyond the rhetorical level, future research may also integrate interactional aspects of dealing with multiple logics. For instance, it would be interesting to see how the conflict between ‘managerialism’ and ‘corporatism’ logics plays out in direct interactions between prison managers and the staff council. Which metaphors do they invoke in their conversations? How do they ensure mutual understanding? Related to this, studies could also investigate how the conflict between different logics materializes in certain practices (e.g., Smets et al., 2015) and artifacts (e.g., Jones, Boxenbaum, & Anthony, 2013).
6.3 Concluding Remarks

In this dissertation, I provide insights into the Austrian prison world from an institutional perspective. Despite being an ‘ancient’ institution, media coverage shows that the issues around how to manage prisons are more topical than ever. As prisons are embedded in a pluralistic environment, prison managers have to deal with a wide range of needs and values and therefore need to balance a variety of institutional logics. This dissertation sought to deep insights into different aspects of institutional pluralism within and around prisons. As a first theoretical contribution, I ‘unpacked’ the relationship between logics at different levels of analysis and showed how logics at the field level and manager level were related. Second, I extended insights into the relationships between logics by showing that multiple types of logics can co-exist at the same level of analysis, which enriches discussions about different types of institutional complexity. Finally, I showed how metaphors as rhetorical devices have differentiated effects on enacting and handling particular relationships between logics. Practically, by highlighting the institutional complexity involved in managing prisons my findings help to identify implications for the planning and realization of change management efforts and broader reforms within the penal system. A focus on meaning is, thus, not only interesting for the sociology of organizations, but also relevant for practitioners who need to find adequate starting points for future reforms.
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Appendix

Table I: HIGHLY RELEVANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Die Presse</th>
<th>Falter</th>
<th>Kronen Zeitung</th>
<th>Kurier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: RELEVANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Die Presse</th>
<th>Falter</th>
<th>Kronen Zeitung</th>
<th>Kurier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: IRRELEVANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Die Presse</th>
<th>Falter</th>
<th>Kronen Zeitung</th>
<th>Kurier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV: PROFIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>highly relevant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>