

CHAPTER 8

Institutional Theory

John C. Lammers and Mattea A. Garcia

This chapter contends that the institutional perspective holds tremendous promise for scholars of organizational communication. At its heart, institutional theory seeks to explain the “the elaboration of rules and requirements to which organizations must conform if they are to receive support and legitimacy” (Scott & Meyer, 1983, p. 140). The strength of this perspective today may flow from the fact that the world is awash in rules and requirements in every sector, industry, and nation-state.

However, we think a case must be made for the relevance of institutional theory to organizational communication. After all, organizational communication frequently focuses on the communicative behavior of individuals in groups and organizations or, more specifically, their “language and social interaction that promote coordinated action toward a common goal” (Eisenberg, 2009, p. 700). It seems appropriate, therefore, to treat the larger institutional landscape as outside and beyond the purview of organizational communication. The reason for the distance between status quo organizational communication and institutionalism probably lies in their roots: the former in practical matters of post-WWII social psychology, the latter in 19th- and early 20th-century sociology. But institutionalism today has

grown beyond its sociological field of origin¹, and the vines of organizational communication are also creeping beyond their early managerial concerns. The interpenetration of organizational communication and institutionalism is far from complete, however. Indeed, we believe the opportunities for these fields to inform each other are very exciting. The chapter aims to document the reach of institutional theory into organizational communication and to provide examples of organizational communication scholarship that have special relevance for institutionalism.

Definition and Characteristics

As with many organizational concepts, institutions have been defined in multiple ways (Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008; Scott, 2001). This chapter draws from Lammers and Barbour’s (2006) definition of institutions as “constellations of established practices guided by enduring, formalized, rational beliefs that transcend particular organizations and situations” (p. 357). This definition points to a number of key characteristics that scholars draw on to develop institutional theory and situate it as an area of study. First, institutions are enduring

social phenomena—they persist across time and space, particularly in comparison to the organizations and conventions observable in any given period (*fixity* is the term used by Giddens, 1984, p. 69). Second, institutions take on lives of their own that have social meaning beyond strict functional requirements (Selznick, 1949). Third, institutions organize social life across and through organizations (Lammers & Garcia, 2009). Fourth, institutions are manifest in a broad range of social phenomena, including “cultural-cognitive, normative, and regulative elements” (Scott, 2001, p. 48). Fifth, institutions take on a subtlety, because they are “more-or-less taken-for-granted repetitive social behavior(s) that [are] underpinned by normative systems and cognitive understandings that give meaning to social exchange and thus enable self-reproducing social order” (Greenwood et al., 2008, p. 5). Sixth, drawing on Commons’s (1934) “working rules” (p. 79), institutions reflect a rational purpose that guides behaviors toward certain ends. Perhaps a useful distillation of these characteristics is that institutions are composed of established patterns of communication and conduct that transcend specific organizations.

Though the taken-for-granted features of institutions make them difficult to define, scholars have offered various examples. Weber (1968) identified the church and the state as dominant institutions in the 19th century. In the 18th through the 20th centuries, the family, markets, and political structures (such as representative democracy) arose as institutions (Berger, Berger, & Kellner, 1973; Gehlen, 1988). The idea that a single organization or agency of the government could become institutionalized took root in the 20th century, as documented by Selznick (1949, 1957). Abbott (1988) observed that professions are institutionalized occupations—a topic we pursue in some detail below. Jepperson (1991) identified social objects such as marriage, wage labor, the corporation, and voting as contemporary institutions. Today, when an agency (for example, a government), a practice (for example, racial or gender discrimination), or an organization (for

example, the long-lived corporation) becomes institutionalized, we mean that it has become an established and taken-for-granted pattern of practices and communication. Institutional theory aims to explain how these patterns arise and to demonstrate their effects on organizations.

The literature in institutional theory is voluminous and multilayered. Although we cannot review all the literature in this area, we can identify broad philosophical features that make institutional theory distinct and note its compatibility with organizational communication research. We then turn to a discussion of older and newer strands of institutional theory and research. We consider institutionalization as a process that begins with the establishment of institutional patterns across organizational fields. We review three fundamental concepts related to this process: legitimacy, the rational myth, and isomorphism. We then explore four areas of institutional scholarship that share intellectual ground with organizational communication: institutional logics, entrepreneurship, institutional work, and deinstitutionalization. We then turn to the intersections of institutionalism and communication: institutional rhetoric, discourse, and messages. To highlight the possibility of future collaborations between institutionalists and organizational communication scholars, we consider the case of professions. We close this chapter with comments about methods, limitations, and future possibilities for institutional organizational communication.

Distinctive Features of Institutional Theory

Several detailed summaries of institutional theory are readily available (Greenwood et al., 2008; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). To provide a concise description of institutionalism, we summarize institutional theory in terms of four interrelated constructs: functionalism and limited rationality, external environments, attenuated consciousness, and the symbolic life of organizations. Tolbert

and Zucker (1996) observed that the development of institutionalism in the late 1970s was a reaction to the unsatisfying results of research following functionalist assumptions about organizations. Functional analysis assumed that "components of a system must be integrated for the system to survive" (p. 176), that changes in one component necessitated changes in other components, and that change would occur when the dysfunctions of structural arrangements outweighed their functionality. A number of theorists argued that functional rationality had its limits (e.g., Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972; March & Simon, 1958). Much of institutional theory and research concerned the unintended consequences of action in organizations (Merton, 1936). This thread of antirationalism connected institutional theorists across the decades (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, 1991; Drori, 2008; Merton, 1936; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Selznick, 1949, 1957). A hallmark of institutionalism historically, then, was that organized actors' intentions were shaped and even thwarted by their institutional environments. Institutionalists thus began and have continued with a view of rationality as situated (Drori, 2008; see also Kuhn, 2005; Trethewey & Ashcraft, 2004).

This discussion leads to a second fundamental construct in institutionalism: the role of the *external* environment of organizations. As Tolbert and Zucker (1996) observed, institutionalism developed at the same time that other approaches were also taking environments seriously, including population ecology (Hannan & Freeman, 1977) and resource dependency (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Institutional studies focus on the boundary between authority in the organization and legitimacy bestowed by the institutional environment (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Selznick, 1949). This distinction reaches beyond a micro-macro issue or even an interconnected view of organizations. The insight of institutionalism is that organizations and organizing are transcended by *institutionalized* ideas, beliefs, rules, and messages (Lammers, 2011; Lammers & Barbour, 2006; Lammers & Garcia, 2009). Thus with the recognition of a preexisting institutional environment,

an institutional perspective complements the root metaphor of communication as constitutive of organizations (McPhee & Zaug, 2000).

The third fundamental construct, *attenuated consciousness*, focuses on the degree to which actors are conscious of institutional conditions. This concern is an empirical question and is at least as problematic for institutional researchers as it is for critical scholars (Deetz & Kersten, 1983; Mumby, 1988). This is because institutions are part of the taken-for-granted conditions on which organizing occurs. As Zucker (1983) said, "The taken for granted quality of institutions... implies that participants are not conscious of their central values" (p. 5). Thus the fixed routines that define institutions lead to an attenuation of consciousness such that institutions operate less as visible objects and more as unacknowledged trellises upon which organizing occurs and organizations grow.

Finally, institutionalism emphasizes the symbolic role of formal organizational structures in contrast to informal interactions and specific local or technical interests (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). For example, *legitimacy* is viewed as social acceptance that results from adhering to regulative and normative organizational policies as well as cognitive norms and expectations (Deephouse & Carter, 2005, p. 332). The current interest in corporate social responsibility (CSR) is viewed by many scholars working from an institutional perspective as an example of what Meyer and Rowan (1977) referred to as "ceremonial activities" (p. 355) that are undertaken to assure access to perceived legitimacy (Bertels & Peloza, 2008; Levis, 2006; Truscott, Bartlett, & Tywoniak, 2009; Winn, MacDonald, & Zietsma, 2008). From an institutional view, organizations in their very structures communicate symbolically with their environments, absorbing information from the environment and signaling their conformity to established norms and values.

These features of institutionalism (namely, limited rationality, external forces, attenuated consciousness, and symbolism) are familiar territory for organizational communication researchers.

Organizational communication scholarship is quite at home in casting rationality as situated (e.g., Meisenbach, Remke, Buzzanell, & Liu, 2008) or problematic (Mumby & Stohl, 1996). Moreover, the concepts, constructs, and arguments of institutional theory offer avenues for research that incorporate cross-organizational variables, such as professional and trade associations, rules and regulations, and market forces. Also, actors' uneven awareness of institutional forces, such as the specifications of standard contract language in health insurance or procurement protocols in government spending policies, creates new opportunities for communication scholars to explore the limits and dynamics of conscious action. Finally, studying the symbolic life of organizations as it is manifested in texts and discourse is a well-established focus of organizational communication scholarship (Cooren, 2000; Cooren, Taylor, & Van Every, 2006). In the next section, we examine the specific concepts that form the institutionalists' armament. Even though institutional scholars share fundamental constructs, the development of the field has not been straightforward. In particular, an older form of institutionalism focused more on specific organizations than on environments.

Old Institutionalism

Weber (1968), typically the earliest scholar to whom institutionalists refer, defined institutions as "involuntary associations," thereby emphasizing an element of control in institutionalized life (p. 52). In the United States, however, Selznick (1949) set forth a sociology of institutions with his observation that "the important thing about organizations is that though they are tools each nevertheless has a life of its own. . . . [T]hey universally resist complete control" (p. 10). Selznick referred to this resistance as "recalcitrance" (p. 10) and noted later that organizational practices could become "infused with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand" (1957, p. 17).

One might see the institutional perspective as a focus on larger, distant, or abstract social

structures. Selznick, however, was not interested in abstractions. Similar to many organizational communication scholars today, he was interested in actual organizations and communities and deeply concerned about democratic action. His best-known book, *TVA and the Grass Roots* (1949) was a study of a New Deal-era U.S. federal agency designed to maximize citizen participation at the local level.² The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) was the federal agency created to develop hydroelectricity in the Tennessee River Valley to improve the living standards of the surrounding farming communities. Selznick found that, as with other New Deal social experiments, the actual result of the TVA was not what was planned. He observed a special case of unintended consequences in the development of the TVA: *cooptation*. He defined *cooptation* as "the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence" (p. 13). As he noted, "Cooptation tells us something about the process by which an institutional environment impinges itself upon an organization and effects changes in its leadership, structure, or policy" (p. 13; emphasis added).

Although cooptation certainly seems to be a powerful mechanism, it has been studied fairly rarely in organizational communication research (for exceptions, see Brimeyer, Eaker, & Clair, 2004; Golden, 2009; Stohl & Coombs, 1988). Stohl and Coombs (1988) used the concept to describe the development of quality circles in U.S. industry and found that training manuals for quality circles advanced managerial interests over workers' interests.

Through Selznick's (1949) analysis of the TVA, and later, the Bolshevik revolution (1952) and administrative theory (1957), he influenced organizational scholarship of the 1950s (Dalton, 1959; Gouldner, 1954) and laid the ground work for later (new) institutional analyses: "(1) seek the underlying implications of the official doctrine . . . ; (2) avoid restriction to the formal structure of the organization . . . ; and (3) observe

the interaction of the agency with other institutions in its area of operation" (1949, p. 11). Whereas Selznick focused on a particular organization and its institutional environment, later scholarship placed greater emphasis on the environment rather than a focal organization (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991, pp. 11–15).

A notable exception, and one of interest for organizational communication scholars, is Kraatz and Block's (2008) concern with institutional pluralism, which grows directly out of Selznick's concern with the institutional environment. Kraatz and Block (2008) defined *institutional pluralism* as "the situation faced by an organization that operates within multiple institutional spheres" (p. 243). In this situation, the organization answers to multiple regulatory agencies and follows multiple sets of norms, values, or legal requirements. Kraatz and Block suggested that organizational legitimacy "requires symbolic conformity with cultural norms and expectations" (p. 245). Pluralism, they argued, challenges the idea of organizational stability and makes organizational change less surprising (p. 257). Organizations will have "multiple, institutionally derived identities" (p. 243). Examples of these types of organizations include hospitals, universities, and multinational firms. This type of analysis—examining the multiple entities that constrain or shape an organization—represents an opportunity for communication scholars who are concerned with organizational identities, organizational change, and symbolic transactions.

New Institutionalism

For about 20 years, Selznick's type of analysis lay fallow. It was not until 1977 with the publication of Meyer and Rowan's article on formal organizational structure as myth and ceremony that organizational scholars picked up institutional analysis again. Meyer and Rowan (1977) noted that organizational environments were actually "littered" (p. 345) with values in excess

of technical requirements. By then, Selznick's work was called *old institutionalism* and the later analyses were *new institutionalism* (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). Powell and DiMaggio (1991) saw the new institutionalism as focusing on the symbolic role of formal structure (rather than on the informal organization), and they treated the organization as constituted by the environment in which it was embedded. New institutionalism, they argued, focused on the "homogeneity of organizations" and the "stability of institutional components" (p. 14). Moreover, DiMaggio and Powell viewed the unreflective activity in organizations as evidence for a critique of a utilitarian view of organizations. Organizations receive (perhaps unwittingly) classifications, routines, scripts, and schema, which function as key forms of cognition. Beginning in the late 1970s and continuing to the present day, institutional scholars (mostly in business schools) have developed a range of concepts through which the institutionalization process may be explored. We contend that these ideas map well onto the interpretive (Putnam & Pacanowsky, 1983), constitutive (McPhee & Zaug, 2000), and the Montréal school (Cooren, 2000; Cooren et al., 2006) approaches to organizational communication. In the following sections, we begin with institutionalization and end with deinstitutionalization; in between, we review three concepts used in institutional analysis with particular relevance for organizational communication scholarship: institutional logics, entrepreneurship, and work.

Institutionalization. Meyer and Rowan (1977) described institutionalization as the process by which "social processes, obligations, or actualities come to take on a rule-like status in social thought and action" (p. 342). From their perspective, this process is driven as much by external forces as functional requirements or internal organizational rationality. Their core contribution was communicative; that is, organizations absorb policies and structures to signal to their environments that they are

legitimate; *legitimacy*, in turn, serves as a symbolic resource for organizations.

Tolbert and Zucker (1996) hypothesized a series of processes by which organizational practices may become institutionalized or develop *habitualized actions* (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). The processes, which can occur simultaneously and independently in different settings, include innovation, habituation, objectification, and sedimentation. Tolbert and Zucker did not theorize about innovation, instead noting that it is a "largely independent activity" (1996, p. 181).³ Indeed, innovation might be best understood in contrast to institutionalization, as it may occur as individual organizations seek to solve problems outside established conduct. In contrast, an important aspect of the second process, *habituation*, is that routine actions take on lives independent of actors and can be classified and typified (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996, p. 180). This observation leads to the third process of institutionalization, *objectification*. Organizational structures that are habituated and objectified may be said to be "semi-institutionalized" (p. 183), while full institutionalization requires historical continuity or sedimentation (p. 184). It is worth noting that innovation, habituation, objectification, and sedimentation are essentially communicative processes. Deetz (1992, p. 126) used *sedimentation* with reference to *institutionalization* in essentially the same sense. Kuhn (2005) applied this model to the adoption of interpretive scholarship within the field of organizational communication. Tolbert and Zucker's (1996) framework offers communication scholars an opportunity to unpack the communicative features that underlie the processes of innovation, habituation, objectification, and sedimentation. In addition to understanding the processes by which practices come to be institutionalized, scholars are concerned with *why* these practices become institutionalized. Meyer and Rowan (1977) contributed insights here by guiding scholars to explore the quest for legitimacy.

Legitimacy and the Rational Myth. Meyer and Rowan (1977) argued that the appearance of

legitimacy is an important resource for organizations, particularly in highly regulated environments. They recognized that the structure of organizations is derived not only from the functional requirements of production but also from the external symbolic pressures *perceived* as legitimate, that is, "the extent to which the array of established cultural accounts provide explanations for [an organization's] existence, function, and jurisdiction, and lack or deny alternatives" (Meyer & Scott, 1983, p. 201). Moreover, Meyer and Rowan (1977) suggested that an organization uses rational myths (untestable means-ends statements such as "This organization engages in affirmative-action hiring policies.") to signal its legitimacy. These activities involve the efforts of managers and leaders to persuade workers about the adoption of practices congruent with externally established norms (Deephouse & Carter, 2005).

Several studies in organizational communication illustrate this thread, including O'Connor and Shumate (2010) and Barbour and Lammers (2007). Lammers (2003) argued that the high salaries paid to CEOs reflected established standards of legitimacy that operated in the absence of any evidence for a high correlation between firm performance and CEO salaries. In other words, symbolic, not functional, requirements explained these remuneration practices. Similarly, Zorn, Flanagan, and Shoham (2011) studied the roles of efficiency (functional) and legitimacy (symbolic) goals in the adoption of information technology among nonprofit organizations. They suggested that "efficient use of ICTs [information and communication technologies] may be spurred by institutional isomorphic pressures if organizations have the autonomy (i.e., leadership) and resources (i.e., knowledge and size) to find workable structures to make use of ICTs" (p. 24). These findings explain the ways that certain practices come to be institutionalized and show how these practices are embedded in or influenced by widespread social norms. Thus in the area of legitimacy, organizational scholars should consider the influence of institutional pressures.

including hiring practices, wage and benefit practices, and performance evaluations on workplace policies and communication technology decisions. Another institutional insight is that such practices are commonly shared across organizations and industries and may therefore be field specific.

Fields and Isomorphism. Organizational fields consist of "those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: [including] key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148). Organizations that make up a field are similar in structural and symbolic ways and share similar motivations for gaining legitimacy. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) drew heavily on sources and themes familiar to organizational communication scholars in developing the theory of institutional fields:

The process of institutional definition, or "structuration," consists of four parts: an increase in the extent of interaction among organizations in the field; the emergence of sharply defined interorganizational structures of domination and patterns of coalition; an increase in the information load with which organizations in a field must contend; and the development of a mutual awareness among participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise. (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148)

In brief, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) observed that organizations in established fields were becoming more similar, referring to this as *isomorphism*: "a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (p. 150). They argued that competition alone could not explain isomorphism but that coercive, mimetic, and normative institutional

pressures were at work. *Coercive pressures* are those that involve the influence of more powerful organizations. *Mimetic pressures* lead organizations to imitate others perceived as successful. *Normative pressures* are those associated with practices shared across organizations via trade and professional associations (pp. 150–154). These "mechanisms through which institutional isomorphic change occurs" (p. 150) have vastly influenced organizational studies (see Davis & Marquis, 2005; Green, Babb, & Alpaslan, 2008; Scott, 2001) and remain rich soil for scholars to till, especially by unpacking the processes in which these practices are adopted.

Organizational communication scholarship has participated in the development of these ideas. For example, Berteotti and Seibold (1994) observed isomorphic forces at work in the development of a hospice team. The hospice team "experienced coercive isomorphic processes as it tried to implement a team approach to health care within the context and [the] constraints of hierarchically structured organizations" (p. 127). They also found that the team "had to struggle to avoid modeling itself on non-hospice organizations," and "that normative pressures played a role as the members tried to create organizational norms to define the conditions" (p. 127) of their work. Sheets (2007) argued that scholars should look for signs of isomorphism in the public communication rather than the structures of these companies. She proposed an examination of major oil firms' responses to the Kyoto protocol. Similarly, O'Connor and Shumate (2010) found evidence of mimicry in the CSR statements of Fortune 500 companies. They noted that imitation is "one way corporations reduce the uncertainty of crafting messages for stakeholders" (p. 534).

Despite the uptake of the isomorphic concepts, the central thrust of the DiMaggio and Powell (1983) article—how *fields* are structured (with an emphasis on fields instead of individual organizations)—has yet to be tapped by organizational communication scholars. Yet it is clear that communicative processes are at work in the

structuration of fields and that these processes have consequences for organizational members. By emphasizing the broader structures within which organizations operate, institutional scholars have observed that fields not only constrain the appearance of organizations but also shape members' cognitions and perceptions. In other words, *what makes sense* to organizational members is, in part, a function of institutional logics.

Institutional Logics. Both institutionalization and deinstitutionalization involve alterations in underlying ways of doing business or making sense of work. These ways can be thought of as *logics*. Institutional logics are "[sets] of material practices and symbolic constructions—which constitute [an institutional order's] organizing principles and which [are] available to organizations and individuals" (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 248). These *logics*, or guiding principles, can "constrain and enable the potential agency of actors" (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005, p. 37). For example, in the case of DDT disuse, Maguire and Hardy (2009) found that actors, via the creation of discourses that endured over time, had to change the underlying logics of an institution to exert agency and disrupt the prevailing practice.

Of particular interest to communication scholars is that "the interests, identities, values, and assumptions of individuals and organizations are embedded in institutional logics" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 103). Logics make certain ways of thinking and communicating possible or unlikely. Institutional logics "provide individuals with vocabularies of motives and with a sense of self" (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 251). While these authors do not refer specifically to Mills (1940), they note that vocabularies of motives are analyzable and institutionally specific.

In this vein, Lammers (2011) argued that actors know institutional logics via institutional messages (discussed further below). A communicative perspective suggests examining institutional messages to reveal underlying logics and the ways that actors transmit and take up logics.

Regulatory agencies and industry standards transmit logics through written rules and regulations, and individuals may communicate logics via everyday talk or through the creation of texts. A communicative approach to logics would also explore the rhetorical strategies employed to establish certain views or how organizations respond to external pressures. Logics constrain which actions are taken and what actions are even available. To understand how institutional logics may change, scholars often focus on entrepreneurs.

Institutional Entrepreneurship. DiMaggio (1988) asserted that "new institutions arise... when organized actors with sufficient resources (institutional entrepreneurs) see in them an opportunity to realize interests that they value highly" (p. 14). Maguire, Hardy, and Lawrence (2004) defined institutional entrepreneurship as the "activities of actors who have an interest in particular institutional arrangements and who leverage resources to create new institutions or to transform existing ones" (p. 657). Research on institutional entrepreneurship considers what types of actors can become entrepreneurs, what field conditions are necessary to allow for change, and the "role of interpretive struggles" and "patterned actions" used to change a field (Hardy & Maguire, 2008, p. 199). Entrepreneurs negotiate and shape boundaries, mobilize resources, and construct logics to create change.

Institutional entrepreneurship strikes at the heart of a classical problem in organizational studies: embedded agency. How do actors change institutions if those very institutions limit their actions and rationality? Seo and Creed (2002) advanced a "dialectical framework" that identified "institutional contradictions and human praxis as the key mechanisms linking institutional embeddedness and institutional change" (p. 223). They proposed that the conditions for change include contradictions or "inconsistencies" and a "partially autonomous social actor situated in a contradictory social world" (p. 230). Beckert (1999) argued that an entrepreneur is

able to "take a reflective position towards institutionalized practices and can envision" alternatives (p. 786). Hardy and Maguire (2008) suggested that entrepreneurs could be individuals, organizations, professions, or networks. For example, Wijen and Ansari (2007) explored the possibility of "collective institutional entrepreneurship" (p. 1079). They studied state-level actors who developed global climate policies. Even though entrepreneurs may not have a great deal of power, they may hold positions that provide access to other institutional fields and thus other practices (Hardy & Maguire, 2008, p. 201). These actors must "dislodge existing practices (in the case of mature fields), introduce new ones, and then ensure that [the new practices] become widely adopted and taken for granted" (p. 206).

Battilana, Leca, and Boxenbaum (2009) claimed that entrepreneurs craft rhetorical arguments that embody institutional logics and align with "the values and interests of potential allies" (p. 82). Entrepreneurial actors are reflexive about existing logics and develop strategies—for example, texts of recurring patterns to influence existing discourses (Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004). Such texts support or reject current institutional logics. Entrepreneurs reframe current problems and offer alternative ideas, as in the case of the Stockholm Convention, when a discursive struggle ensued over the difference between *precaution* and *sound science* (Maguire & Hardy, 2006). Zilber (2007) found that while crisis narratives in a high-tech industry in Israel reinforced the institutional order, counter stories called for change. These stories influenced how other actors understood the institutional order. In another study, Zilber (2002) found that powerful individuals at a rape crisis center controlled institutional meanings "by offering one official account" (p. 237). The struggle over meanings influenced power dynamics and, subsequently, the center's services.

Organizational communication scholars can contribute to research in this area by exploring the narratives, discursive struggles, and textual patterns of institutional entrepreneurship. With

the fieldwide forces of isomorphism on the one hand and the individualistic implications of entrepreneurship on the other, institutionalists may appear to have limited room for agency, but an emerging area known as *institutional work* suggests that institutions are constructed, reconstructed, and changed in an ongoing way.

Institutional Work. Institutional work is an alternative approach to understanding agency and institutions. The term refers to the "purposive action of individuals and organizations aimed at creating, maintaining, and disrupting institutions" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 215). Even though institutional entrepreneurship and institutional work share an emphasis on the roles of actors in creating or changing institutions, Lawrence, Suddaby, and Leca (2009) criticized the scholarship on institutional entrepreneurship, arguing that it "[overemphasized] the rational and 'heroic' dimension . . . while ignoring the fact that all actors, even entrepreneurs, are embedded in an institutionally defined context" (p. 5).

An institutional work perspective treats institutions as the products of specific actions, created by a "wide range of actors, both those with the resources and skills to act as entrepreneurs and those whose role is supportive or facilitative of the entrepreneur's endeavors" (p. 217). While institutional studies often "accentuate the role of collective actors" (p. 5), institutional work also considers the role of individual organizational actors in providing a "middle ground of agency" (p. 6). Unlike Tolbert and Zucker's (1996) view of institutionalization in which habitualized actions and processes take on lives independent of actors, institutional work accounts for the "awareness, skill, and reflexivity of individual and collective actors" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 219).

Lawrence et al. (2009) argued that "institutional work highlights the intentional actions taken in relation to institutions" (p. 1). Studies on institutional work recognize that all practices occur within "sets of institutionalized rules" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 220) but also

that actors can make intentional efforts to affect institutions. For example, Zietsma and Lawrence (2010) examined how the British Columbia coastal forest industry engaged in types of institutional work to maintain or change existing practices. During periods of stability, institutional work was aimed at maintenance, and during conflict cycles, institutional work included disrupting organizational and industry practices.

The creation and dissemination of texts, narratives, definitions, and other forms of discourse can also be seen as institutional work. Sahlin and Wedlin (2008) argued that ideas, in particular, are "actively transferred and translated in a context of other ideas, actors, traditions, and institutions" (p. 229). For example, actors engage in defining or constructing "rule systems that confer status or identity, define boundaries of membership or create status hierarchies within a field" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 222). These rule systems are communicated formally and informally in a variety of ways. In studies of professions, for example, individuals not only create professional associations and educational requirements to establish membership, they also develop a unique jargon to accompany membership. For example, Garcia (2011) found in her study of librarians that individuals engaged in strategic rhetorical constructions of their profession and individual professional identities. The aforementioned studies of institutional logics, entrepreneurship, and work focus on the creation, change, disruption, or maintenance of institutions. We now turn to the concept of deinstitutionalization.

Deinstitutionalization. Institutional stability requires organizational actors to accept a taken-for-granted legitimacy about certain practices, but deinstitutionalization reflects "a discontinuity in the willingness or ability of organizations to take for granted and continually re-create an institutionalized organizational activity" (Oliver, 1992, p. 564). Political, functional, and social pressures, aggravated by inertia and entropy, can lead to the dissipation or rejection of a practice.

The established or institutionalized practice then "erodes or discontinues" (p. 564).

Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) argued that the literature on deinstitutionalization makes room for the possibility that individuals can strategically act to destroy institutions. They borrow from the sociology of practice, which "[focuses] on the situated actions of individuals and groups as they cope with and attempt to respond to the demands of their everyday lives" (p. 218). For example, Maguire and Hardy (2009) found that through the creation, distribution, and consumption of texts of practices, discourses drive the process of deinstitutionalization. They examined texts that problematized current practices associated with DDT use and argued that "individual acts of translation . . . can change discourse" and thus the underlying logics of an institution (p. 149). The idea of deinstitutionalization challenges the idea that practices, once institutionalized, are nigh impossible to alter and instead draws attention to the conditions under which they can be altered or rejected. More broadly, the literature on new institutionalism focuses on how practices and rules come to be taken for granted, altered, or disrupted and the relationship between structure and agency. Organizational communication scholars can contribute to this research by exploring the role of discourse, the creation and circulation of texts, and the communicative strategies actors use to disrupt institutional practices. We turn now to areas of scholarship that organizational communication and institutional studies already share conceptual terrain.

Conceptual Territory Shared by Institutionalism and Communication

The last few years have revealed a turn toward rhetorical and discourse analysis in organization and institutional studies (Green et al., 2008; Hardy, 2011; Phillips et al., 2004; Powell & Colyvas, 2008) and a similar turn among rhetorical and discourse scholars toward institutional analysis (Cheney,

1991; Finet, 2001; Ford, 2003; Hartelius & Browning, 2008; Hoffman & Ford, 2010; Jablonski, 1989; Keranen, 2007; Lynch, 2005; Schwarze, 2003; Sproule, 1988). In particular, institutional scholars have called for considering the role of language in studies on institutionalization. Phillips et al. (2004), for example, criticized the institutional literature for focusing more on social behaviors and structural arrangements than on the discursive elements of social interaction that contribute to institutionalization. In the following section, we show how scholarship in institutional rhetoric, institutional discourse, and institutional messages explicitly or implicitly use institutional concepts and ideas.

Institutional Rhetoric

A focus on rhetoric allows scholars to account simultaneously for the structural elements of institutions and the discursive actions of individual and organizational interactions. Hartelius and Browning (2008) argued that rhetoric serves as a "theoretical lens" as well as "a framework for understanding the role of narrative and rational organizational discourses" (p. 33). Rhetorical analysis of texts produced by actors in institutional environments has led to useful discoveries about the role of language in circulating ideas (Sahlin & Wedlin, 2008), persuading actors to subscribe to new logics or altering current practices or beliefs.

A number of studies in communication have employed the idea of institutional rhetoric (see, for example, Cheney, 1991; Finet, 2001; Ford, 2003; Hartelius & Browning, 2008; Hoffman & Ford, 2010; Jablonski, 1989; Keranen, 2007; Lynch, 2005; Schwarze, 2003). For Sproule (1988), a new type of rhetorical criticism was necessary to account for "institutions, ideologies, media, and audiences" (p. 477). He argued that a "new managerial rhetoric" arose as a way of accounting for the spokespersons of "whole industries" (p. 460), the media as an institution composed of professionals in the "impersonal institutional voice of

corporate suasion" (p. 469), and mass audiences. In this rhetorical approach, the institution is an entity that speaks for itself and, by proxy, for its members. For example, Jablonski (1989) and Cheney (1991) examined the rhetoric of the Catholic Church. In both cases, the Church was seen as an institution that rhetorically managed multiple identities and responded to the pressures of a broader socio-political context, including external and internal audiences. While not explicitly drawing from institutional theory, these studies nonetheless make a contribution to our understanding of how institutions work.

Finet (2001) proposed a view of institutional rhetoric that involved the "collective expression [of organizations] intended to influence the larger social normative climate" (p. 274). This approach to organizational rhetoric reveals the "embeddedness of organizations" and the "reciprocal influences" of organizations and their environments (p. 270). An expanding literature has also focused on the rhetoric of CSR (Battilana et al., 2009; see May, Cheney, & Roper, 2007). Schwarze (2003) argued that "a rhetoric of CSR must have an interorganizational focus" (p. 625). In this view, he comes very close to the institutional approach. Organizational and institutional research in CSR includes both rhetorical and discourse analysis. We argue that examining institutional rhetoric allows scholars to explore the strategic collective expressions of organizations as they seek legitimacy in their institutional environments.

In addition to CSR statements, scholars have also studied texts of rules and practices that become institutionalized. For example, Keranen (2007) analyzed the institutionalization of resuscitation, demonstrating that code status worksheets (patients' end-of-life documents) served as part of a system of rules that influenced the taken-for-granted status of resuscitation. Green et al. (2008) examined the corporate control rhetoric of board members, arguing that it "shapes the institutional logics of control and thus legitimizes the dominant stakeholder group in the institutional field" (p. 41). Suddaby and

Greenwood (2005) used transcripts from commission hearings. Examining classical categories of rhetoric (e.g., *logos*), they suggested that "rhetorical strategy is a significant tool by which shifts in a dominant logic can be achieved" (p. 41). In these examples, rhetoric is a tool used by organizational actors to influence logics, and its analysis can account for institutionalization or institutional change.

Rhetorical scholars have much to offer institutional studies. For example, Lawrence and Suddaby's (2006) typology of institutional work lends itself to a communication perspective. The authors describe types of institutional work (e.g., advocacy and theorizing), which are specifically communicative in nature and could be analyzed from a rhetorical perspective. Additionally, evidence of institutional work is found in the texts and conversations that occur in and around organizations. In sum, reframing existing scholarship on organizational rhetoric as explicitly institutional offers rich avenues and new directions for future studies of institutional rhetoric.

Institutional Discourse

Rhetoric and *discourse* are sometimes used interchangeably or indiscriminately, but it is useful to distinguish them for conducting institutional analysis (see Fairhurst & Putnam, Chapter 11). Citing Burke (1969) and Mills (1940), Castello and Lozano (2011) observed that rhetorical analysis "focuses on persuasive texts fostering a specific response to social change," while discourse analysis "examines texts without supposing how recipients of their messages will be influenced" (p. 4). Grant, Hardy, Oswick, and Putnam (2004) included rhetoric as a "domain" of organizational discourse (p. 3). Cheney, Christensen, Conrad, and Lair (2004) suggested that a rhetorical approach is concerned primarily with the strategic dimensions of discourse. At the institutional level, discourses reflect shared management philosophies, procedures, and published texts as well as

conversations. Grant, Keenoy, and Oswick (2001) argued that discourse analysis examines "meta-discourses . . . which congregate to form dominant paradigms, institutional practices, and collective social perspectives" (p. 11).

Discourse analysis offers a way to get at institutional logics (reflected in institutional work) and even institutional entrepreneurship. For example, Kuhn (2006) studied attorneys and government officials and suggested that these officials drew discursive resources from the social practices around them. Similarly, studies of institutional dialogue show how talk in institutionalized settings—for example, among professionals in health care organizations—contributes to a range of concerns, such as identity, roles, and constraints on behavior (see Grant et al., 2004, p. 11). As Grant et al. (2004) noted, scholars can focus on the "socially situated aspects of everyday talk" (p. 3; see also Drew & Heritage, 1992). Certainly, the institutional context is an important influence on everyday talk, the management of identities, and the performance of organizational tasks.

These issues surface in both organizational and institutional discourse research. For example, Clair (1993) studied the discourse of sexual harassment at large universities. She used *institutional discourse* to refer to relatively established discourses in a large organization, and she did not distinguish the organizational from the institutional arena. However, her work echoes issues related to institutional logics. In particular, the dominant discourses revealed underlying logics that were reflected in established practices and rules. More recent research has identified institutional discourse as a level of analysis. For example, O'Connor and Shumate (2010) studied CSR statements of Fortune 500 companies and found that at both the institutional and economic industry levels of analysis, corporations gave primacy in their CSR discourse to their "ethical and philanthropic responsibilities over their legal and economic responsibilities" (p. 547). As noted earlier, the mimicry found in CSR statements illustrates corporations' attempts to reduce uncertainty and to gain legitimacy.

For practices to change, however, discourse about those practices must also change. Hardy and Maguire (2010) found that less powerful actors influenced change because "field-configuring events," such as the Stockholm Convention, "generate multiple discursive spaces that are governed by different rules and understandings regarding text production" (p. 1365). This analysis of discourse and discursive spaces explains the conditions necessary for embedded agents, *entrepreneurs*, to engage in processes that might lead to change. Institutional discourse attends to the symbolic ways that actors attempt to influence the institutional arrangements around them.

Institutional Messages⁴

A third area in which institutional and organizational communication scholars share interests is in the identification and analysis of institutional messages, "collations of thoughts that are intentional, enduring, have a wide reach, and encumber organizational participants to engage in certain behaviors or to take performative responses" (Lammers, 2011, p. 154). In contrast to discourse or rhetorical analysis, a focus on messages is reductionist rather than holistic, positing that relatively discrete components of communication play a role in the persistence and development of institutions. The analysis of messages offers clues to several institutional issues, such as the institution-organization interface, the question of how institutions endure, and how institutional logics are transmitted.

Institutional messages can be observed at interactional, organizational, and institutional levels of analysis. An important feature of institutional messages is that they can take the form of an implicit command, obligating receivers to engage in some form of action (Lammers, 2011, p. 162). Institutional messages communicate logics, or the "means by which ends are achieved" (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 256), as persons draw upon and incorporate them in their speech and established interactions. Such

interactions are characterized by an obligatory asymmetry; that is, the disembodied institution speaks for itself, and the rules are followed. At the organizational level, institutional messages aim to align the organization's core values and interests with those of its environment. Such messages are conveyed both to internal (as in the case of policies to which all employees must adhere) and external audiences (as in the case of an organization conveying to a funding agency that its practices are consistent with the agency's aims and goals). As institution-level phenomena, institutional messages project a rational feature of modernity; namely, they are spread across specific organizations and interaction moments through educational practices, consultants, and interagency and interorganizational agreements and are enforced with rules and sanctions.

The variety of settings and levels at which institutional messages may be observed and analyzed led Lammers (2011) to suggest that institutional messages could be understood in four ways: establishment, reach, incumbency, and intentionality. *Established* messages are unequivocal, are sent or exchanged frequently, and are thus enduring. The *reach* of messages refers to the size and number of audiences in which the message may be received. *Incumbency* refers to the duty—implicated in the message itself—of the respondent to heed and comply with the message. Finally, institutional messages can be characterized by their *intentionality*; the message may be varyingly congruent with the conscious, stated purposes of the members of the field in which it is exchanged.

Institutional messages also figure prominently in McPhee and Zaug's (2000, 2009) influential articulation of the communicative constitution of organizations. Of their four message flows, *institutional positioning* bears directly on the recognition that communication constitutes organization when actors recognize the extraorganizational, preexisting constraints on the actions and resources at their disposal (McPhee & Zaug, 2009). The

importance and complexity of institutional positioning was described in Browning, Greene, Sitkin, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld's (2009) description of a United States Air Force maintenance and repair unit's effort to coordinate its activities with external agency rules.

Sahlin and Wedlin (2008) reviewed a concept related to messages in their discussion of the circulation of ideas in institutional fields. Summarizing research in the field of Scandinavian institutionalism, they observed that although organizations embrace ideas for ceremonial and symbolic purposes (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), they also adopt policies, practices, and routines that influence functional activities as well. They noted that organizations adopted ideas because of normative forces ("appropriateness and fashion," p. 222) through imitation and identification processes. One shortcoming of these observations is that the researchers tended to anthropomorphize organizations. Nonetheless, this research and others in this vein have developed a robust set of concepts (including translation, editing, flows, prototypes, and templates) to describe the processes by which ideas spread across fields.

The notion of institutional messages holds considerable promise for organizational communication researchers who work with institutional ideas (Barley, 2011; Hardy, 2011; Suddaby, 2011). However, the concept may be overly deterministic in its emphasis on enduring social structures (Hardy, 2011; Suddaby, 2011). Hardy argued that such messages are in fact the creations of individuals and that institutions gain their power and force through the communicative behavior of individuals. In addition, Barley (2011) pointed out that institutional messages may be vague or ambiguous by design; that is, laws and other policies are often worded imprecisely to allow for a range of interpretations. For organizational communication researchers, research on institutional messages offers the opportunity for scholars to participate in these debates by addressing the structure/agency relationship, the issue of ambiguity, and the types and varieties of institutional messages.

The Special Case of Professions

The concepts reviewed in this chapter can also be used to study communication and the professions in new ways. Abbott (1988) referred to professions as "institutionalized occupations," (p. 323; see also Douglas, 1986). As Lammers and Garcia (2009) pointed out, the profession is part of the (external) institutional environment of work, because professionals bring norms and rules with them into the organizations where they work. Scott (2008) argued that professions are cultural-cognitive, normative, and regulative agents of institutionalization (pp. 224–226). As such, they do much to shape organizations and organizational communication. The concepts generated by institutionalists over the last 50 years can offer organizational communication scholars approaches for studying the professions.

Specifically, conceptual tools such as cooptation, rational myths, institutional fields and logics, and institutional work are available to communication scholars to aid in understanding how professions shape organizational life. An institutionally infused study of communication between professionals and managers is likely to find examples of institutionalized *cooptation*. For example, associate attorneys in large law firms may be understood as coopted by the managing partners of their firms, and physicians may be seen as coopted by the managers of hospitals. The rise of the professions historically (for example, Starr, 1982) and contemporarily (for example, Cheney, Lair, Ritz, & Kendall, 2010) provide accounts of *legitimacy* as part of the adoption of *rational myths* or ways that work should be accomplished. Professionals are also the designers of stable practices and knowledge domains and thus influence the development of recognizable *institutional fields* organized by underlying *institutional logics* (Douglas, 1986; Scott, 2008). The effort to professionalize various fields is an example of *institutional work*, notably characterized as *institutional entrepreneurship*. Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) argue that having professional status is something occupants struggle for control

over. Individual or collective struggles to gain professional status represent efforts to institutionalize occupational practices.

Just as the rise of a profession may be understood as a process of *institutionalization*, the demise of a profession may be seen as *deinstitutionalization*. Both of these concepts, as well as the ongoing maintenance or re-creation of professional autonomy and control, provide examples of institutional *rhetoric* and *discourse*. And the presence and dominance of a profession may be recognized by the strength of *institutional messages*, such as "Is there a doctor in the house?" Employing these conceptual tools of communication and institutionalism can advance knowledge about the role of the profession in organizational practices.

Communication scholars have begun to recognize professionals as unique organizational members who play institutional roles (e.g., Cheney & Ashcraft, 2007; Cheney et al., 2010, pp. 123-158; Lammers & Garcia, 2009; Real & Putnam, 2005; Trethewey, 2001). Cheney et al. (2010), in an examination of ethics at work, considered the influence of professionalism on careers and organizations and recognized professions as institutions that organize knowledge in society (p. 129). More commonly, communication researchers have viewed professionalism as a special identity project. Trethewey (2001) considered issues of gender and identity for professional women, and Ashcraft (2005) and Real and Putnam (2005) explored pilots' discourse regarding defense of their profession. Heaton and Taylor (2002) explored how knowledge communities find a "collective identity in professional associations" (p. 212). Although only a few of these scholars explicitly relied on institutional theory, these studies demonstrated how particular occupations served as institutionalized communication. As Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) argued, professionalization is a "rhetorical process" in which identity and status are "constantly negotiated through discursive activity" (p. 165). Their argument points to important connections between communication and professionalization as forms of institutionalization.

A few scholars explicitly relied on institutional theory to explore the relationship between communication and professions. Lammers and Garcia (2009) found that the profession served as an extraorganizational force that influenced veterinarians' work experiences, including their decision making and communication. Barbour and Lammers (2007) also argued that institutional beliefs mediated physicians' responses to managed health care. Further, Barbour (2010) urged scholars to focus on the day-to-day conversations in health care organizations to examine how institutions "control and constrain talk ... [and how] actors appropriate institutions to their own ends" (p. 450). Dunn and Jones (2010) analyzed medical education and found that the logics of care and science in medical education competed and changed over time. They argued that as logics are thrown "out of balance," the profession becomes "vulnerable to threats from interprofessional rivals, intraprofessional groups, and external invaders like managed care" (p. 140). Communication scholars, then, can examine the creation, maintenance, and change of institutions by following professions and professionals through these processes. This brief overview of the profession serves as evidence of a particularly rich area of mutually informed research in institutional and organizational communication studies.

Conclusion

This chapter has aimed to encourage organizational communication scholars to employ institutional analyses. To this end, we underscore the mutually enriching compatibilities of the institutional perspective, particularly its emphases on limits to rationality, external forces on organizations, socially constructed consciousness, and symbolism as well as its prevailing ideas in organizational communication. We have also pointed to the concepts of legitimacy and rational myth, isomorphism, institutional fields, institutional logics, institutional entrepreneurship, and institutional work

as available for organizational communication scholarship. Rhetorical and discourse analysis are already examining how institutions rise, persist, or decline. In this conclusion, we draw attention to methodological considerations and limitations of the institutional approach as organizational communication scholars look to institutional theory as a framework for future studies.

Methodological Considerations

Institutional theory does not privilege a particular methodology, but the task of investigating institutions strongly calls for certain methodological moves and empirical foci. First, studies must adopt diachronic methods (see Barley & Tolbert, 1997). Institutions cannot be captured effectively with the single-point observations that organizational communication studies often employ. Another key feature of institutions is that they transcend individual organizations. This characteristic requires scholars to observe populations, fields, industries, or interorganizational relationships rather than single organizations. In this respect, O'Connor and Shumate's (2010) study of web-based CSR statements is a good example. A third and related point is that an institutional perspective emphasizes external influences on organizations, suggesting that institutionally informed studies should include external sources of information and influence. Fourth, the institutional perspective focuses on rules, norms, and laws more than on interpersonal interactions. With its roots in interaction, organizational communication scholars have typically bypassed archival sources as the basis of meaning in organizations. Few studies focus on the role of contracts and regulations in explaining organizational communication. Geist and Hardesty's (1992) study of hospital workers' reactions to the adoption of a federal Medicare reimbursement scheme, known as *diagnosis related groups*, provides a notable exception.

Limitations of the Institutional Approach

Institutional approaches are often criticized as theoretically imperialistic; that is, they purport to encompass and explain everything about organizations. Thus all external forces are commonly seen as institutional, and all behavior in organizations is held to be a manifestation of institutional forces. Also, institutions in contemporary industrial and postindustrial societies may actually represent a particular type of cultural development. Hence, it is difficult to distinguish analytically between the external cultural environments of organizations and their institutional environments. We also observe that the institutional approach has a tendency to elude straightforward specification and operationalization of terms, including concepts such as *institution* and *rational myth*. And yet this is where organizational communication, with its careful attention to interaction, discourse, persuasion, audience, interpretation, and messages, is able to inform institutional theory.

The institutional perspective is one of the dominant theoretical paradigms in organization studies today (Palmer, Biggart, & Dick, 2008). Under its aegis, a wide range of organizational studies have been and continue to be published. Many of these projects have strong implications for organizational communication, especially in studying how individuals exercise agency while embedded in institutions. As Battilana et al. (2009) observe, "It seems important to develop finer-grained analyses that will account for the actions and values of all of the agents involved in the process of shaping institutions" (p. 95).

Another area ripe for investigation is the use of network analysis to demonstrate the endurance of established institutional patterns (see Pentland, 1999). The current interest in nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations also offers organizational communication researchers an opportunity to examine institutional change and persistence (Doerfl, Lai, Chewning, 2010; Taylor & Doerfl, 2011). Communication studies

of orga
Lewis, C
organiz
institut
In add
theory-
need to
Both le
constru
for un
strong
focusec
can m
tional
manife
fertile
nicatio
tutions

Refs

Abbott
or
U
Ashcra
O
tl
ci
Q
Barboi
t
C
Barbo
ii
e
s
2
Barley
t
Barley
c
Battil

of organizational change (Lewis, 2007; see also Lewis, Chapter 20) have tended to dwell on intra-organizational issues but have begun to consider institutional forces as well (Lewis, 2011, p. 210). In addition, the core concepts of institutional theory—in particular, legitimacy and logics—need to be unpacked in terms of communication. Both legitimacy and logics are communicatively constructed and implicated in scholars' concerns for uncertainty, identity, and power. With a strong tradition of carefully designed and closely focused research, organizational communication can make a substantial contribution to institutional theory and research. In its most recent manifestations, institutional theory offers a fertile field for reframing organizational communication scholarship and for showing how institutions are communicatively constituted.

References

- Abbott, A. (1988). *The systems of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ashcraft, K. L. (2005). Resistance through consent? Occupational identity, organizational form, and the maintenance of masculinity among commercial airline pilots. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 67–90.
- Barbour, J. B. (2010). On the institutional moorings of talk in health care organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(3), 449–456.
- Barbour, J. B., & Lammers, J. C. (2007). Health care institutions, communication, and physicians' experience of managed care: A multilevel analysis. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(2), 201–231.
- Barley, S. R. (2011). Signifying institutions. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(1), 200–206.
- Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, 18(1), 93–117.
- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *Annals of the Academy of Management*, 3(1), 65–107.
- Beckert, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change: The roles of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 20(5), 777–799.
- Berger, P., Berger, B., & Kellner, H. (1973). *The homeless mind: Modernization and consciousness*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Bertels, S., & Pelozo, J. (2008). Running just to stand still? Managing CSR reputation in an era of ratcheting expectations. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 11(1), 56–73.
- Berteotti, C. R., & Seibold, D. R. (1994). Coordination and role-definition problems in health-care teams: A hospice case study. In L. R. Frey (Ed.), *Group communication in context: Studies of natural groups* (pp. 107–131). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brimeyer, T. M., Eaker, A. V., & Clair, R. P. (2004). Rhetorical strategies in union organizing: A case of labor versus management. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18(1), 45–75.
- Browning, L., Greene, R., Sitkin, S., Sutcliffe, K., & Obstfeld, D. (2009). Constitutive complexity: Military entrepreneurs and the synthetic character of communication flows. In A. Nicotera & L. Putnam (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 89–116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Castello, I., & Lozano, J. M. (2011). Searching for new forms of legitimacy through corporate responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(1), 11–29.
- Cheney, G. (1991). *Rhetoric in an organizational society: Managing multiple identities*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Cheney, G., & Ashcraft, K. L. (2007). Considering "the professional" in communication studies: Implications for theory and research within and beyond the boundaries of organizational communication. *Communication Theory*, 17(2), 146–175.
- Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Conrad, C., & Lair, D. J. (2004). Corporate rhetoric as organizational discourse. In D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Osrick, & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse* (pp. 79–103). London, England: SAGE.

- Cheney, G., Lair, D. J., Ritz, D., & Kendall, B. E. (2010). *Just a job? Communication, ethics, and professional life*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Clair, R. P. (1993). The bureaucratization, commodification, and privatization of sexual harassment through institutional discourse: A study of the Big Ten universities. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 7(2), 123-157.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-25.
- Commons, J. R. (1934). *Institutional economics: Its place in political economy*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Cooren, F. (2000). *The organizing property of communication*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Cooren, F., Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (Eds.). (2006). *Communication as organizing: Empirical and theoretical explorations in the dynamic of text and conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dalton, M. (1959). *Men who manage*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. (2005). Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 332-343.
- Deephouse, D. L., & Carter, S. M. (2005). An examination of differences between organizational legitimacy and organizational reputation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2), 329-360.
- Deetz, S. A. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Deetz, S. A., & Kersten, A. (1983). Critical models of interpretive research. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 147-171). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment* (pp. 3-22). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organization fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Douglas, M. (1986). *How institutions think*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Doerfel, M. L., Lai, C., & Chewning, L. V. (2010). The evolutionary role of interorganizational communication: Modeling social capital in disaster contexts. *Human Communication Research*, 36(2), 125-162.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Drori, G. S. (2008). Institutionalism and globalization studies. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 449-472). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education 1967-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(1), 114-149.
- Eisenberg, E. (2009). Organizational communication theories. In S. Littlejohn & K. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theories* (vol. 2, pp. 700-705). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Finet, D. (2001). Sociopolitical environments and issues. In F. M. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 270-290). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ford, D. J. (2003). *Prism analysis of the debate over the American Medical Association's Health Access America Plan*. Proceedings of the 2004 Alta Conference on Argumentation, National Communication Association, Washington, DC.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232-263). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Garcia, M. A. (2011). *Ask a librarian: The profession, professional identities, and constitutive rhetoric of librarians* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL.
- Gehlen, A. (1988). *Man, his nature and place in the world*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. (Originally published as *Der Mensch: seine Natur und seine Stellung in der Welt*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Verlag, 1966).
- Geist, P., & Hardesty, M. (1992). *Negotiating the crisis: DRGs and the transformation of hospitals*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Golden, A. G. (2009). Employee families and organizations as mutually enacted environments: A sense-making approach to work-life interrelationships. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22(3), 385-415.
- Gouldner, A. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Grant, D., Hardy, C., Oswick, C., & Putnam, L. (Eds.). (2004). *The SAGE handbook of organizational discourse*. London, England: SAGE.
- Grant, D., Keenoy, T., & Oswick, C. (2001). Organizational discourse: Key contributions and challenges. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 31(3), 5-24.
- Green, S. E., Jr., Babb, M., & Alpaslan, C. M. (2008). Institutional field dynamics and the competition between institutional logics: The role of rhetoric in the evolving control of the modern corporation. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22(1), 40-73.
- Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., & Suddaby, R. (2008). Introduction. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 929-964.
- Hardy, C. (2011). How institutions communicate; or how does communicating institutionalize? *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(1), 191-199.
- Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2008). Institutional entrepreneurship. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 198-217). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2010). Discourse, field-configuring events, and change in organizations and institutional fields: Narratives of DDT and the Stockholm Convention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1365-1392.
- Hartelius, E. J., & Browning, L. D. (2008). The application of rhetorical theory in managerial research: A literature review. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22(1), 13-39.
- Heaton, L., & Taylor, J. (2002). Knowledge management and professional work: A communication perspective on the knowledge-based organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16(2), 210-236.
- Hoffman, M. E., & Ford, D. J. (2010). *Organizational rhetoric: Situations and strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Iablonski, C. J. (1989). "Aggiornamento" and the American Catholic bishops: A rhetoric of institutional continuity and change. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 75(4), 416-432.
- Jepperson, R. L. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. In W. W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 143-163). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Keranen, L. (2007). "Cause someday we all die": Rhetoric, agency, and the case of the "patient" preferences worksheet. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 93(2), 179-210.
- Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kuhn, T. (2005). The institutionalization of Alta in organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 18(4), 618-627.
- Kuhn, T. (2006). A "demented work ethic" and a "lifestyle firm": Discourse, identity, and workplace time commitments. *Organization Studies*, 27(9), 1339-1358.
- Lammers, J. C. (2003). An institutional perspective on communicating corporate responsibility. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16(4), 618-624.
- Lammers, J. C. (2011). How institutions communicate: Institutional messages, institutional logics, and organizational communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(1), 154-182.
- Lammers, J. C., & Barbour, J. B. (2006). An institutional theory of organizational communication. *Communication Theory*, 16(3), 356-377.
- Lammers, J. C., & Garcia, M. A. (2009). Exploring the concept of "profession" for organizational communication research: Institutional influences in a veterinary organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22(3), 357-384.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy,

- T. B. Lawrence, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed.). London, England: SAGE.
- Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2009). Introduction: Theorizing and studying institutional work. In T. B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies or organizations* (pp. 1-27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Levis, J. (2006). Adoption of corporate social responsibility codes by multinational companies. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 17(1), 50-55.
- Lewis, L. K. (2007). An organizational stakeholder model of change implementation communication. *Communication Theory*, 17(2), 176-204.
- Lewis, L. K. (2011). *Organizational change: Creating change through strategic communication*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lynch, J. (2005). Rhetoric and the failure of the Catholic church's pastoral letter on homosexuality. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 8(3), 383-404.
- Maguire, S., & Hardy, C. (2006). The emergence of new global institutions: A discursive perspective. *Organization Studies*, 27(1), 7-29.
- Maguire, S., & Hardy, C. (2009). Discourse and deinstitutionalization: The decline of DDT. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(1), 148-178.
- Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 654-679.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- May, S., Cheney, G. and Roper, L. eds (2007) *The debate over corporate social responsibility*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2000). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. *The Electronic Journal of Communication*, 10(1/2).
- McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2009). The communicative constitution of organization: A framework for explanation. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 21-48). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Meisenbach, R., Remke, R., Buzzanell, P. M., & Liu, M. (2008). "They allowed": Pentadic mapping of women's maternity leave discourse as organizational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 75(1), 1-24.
- Merton, R. K. (1936). The unanticipated consequences of purposive social action. *American Sociological Review*, 1(6), 894-904.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1983). Centralization and legitimacy problems of local government. In J. W. Meyer & W. R. Scott (Eds.), *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp. 199-215). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Mills, C. (1940). Situated actions and vocabularies of motive. *American Sociological Review*, 5(6), 904-913.
- Mumby, D. K. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Mumby, D. K., & Stohl, C. (1996). Disciplining organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10(1), 50-72.
- O'Connor, A., & Shumate, M. (2010). Corporate social responsibility communication: An economic industry and institutional level of analysis of corporate social responsibility communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(4), 529-551.
- Oliver, C. (1992). The antecedents of deinstitutionalization. *Organization Studies*, 13(4), 563-588.
- Palmer, D., Biggart, N., & Dick, B. (2008). Is the new institutionalism a theory? In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 739-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Pentland, B. T. (1999). Organizations as networks of action. In J. Baum & B. McKelvey (Eds.), *Variations in organization science: In honor of Donald T. Campbell* (pp. 237-253). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 635-652.
- Powell, W. W., & Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Microfoundations of institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 276-298). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Powe

Putn

Real,

Rog

Sahl

Schv

Scot

Scot

Scor

Selv

Selv

Sel

Sec

She

Sp

- Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.). (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Putnam, L. L., & Pacanowsky, M. E. (Eds.). (1983). *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Real, K., & Putnam, L. (2005). Ironies in the discursive struggle of pilots defending the profession. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 91-119.
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovation*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sahlin, K., & Wedlin, L. (2008). Circulating ideas: Imitation, translation, editing. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 218-242). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Schwarze, S. (2003). Corporate-state irresponsibility, critical publicity, and asbestos exposure in Libby, Montana. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16(4), 625-632.
- Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). Lords of the dance: Professionals as institutional agents. *Organization Studies*, 29(2), 219-238.
- Scott, W. R., & Meyer, J. W. (1983). The organization of societal sectors. In J. W. Meyer & W. R. Scott (Eds.), *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp. 129-153). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grass roots: A study in the sociology of formal organization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Selznick, P. (1952). *The organizational weapon: A study of Bolshevik strategy and tactics*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson & Company.
- Seo, M. G., & Creed, W. E. D. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 222-247.
- Sheets, P. (2007). *Five distinct companies or one 'big oil'? A test of institutional isomorphism in oil communications* (Unpublished manuscript). University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Sproule, J. M. (1988). The new managerial rhetoric and the old criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 74(4), 468-486.
- Starr, P. (1982). *The social transformation of American medicine*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Stohl, C., & Coombs, W. T. (1988). Cooperation or cooptation: An analysis of quality circle training manuals. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 2(1), 63-89.
- Suddaby, R. (2011). How communication institutionalizes: A response to Lammers. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(1), 183-190.
- Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 35-67.
- Taylor, M., & Doerfel, M. L. (2011). Evolving network roles in international aid efforts: Evidence from Croatia's post-war transition. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 22(2), p. 311-334.
- Thornton, P., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 99-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structures of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(1), 22-39.
- Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1996). "The institutionalization of institutional theory." In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 175-190). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Trethewey, A. (2001). Reproducing and resisting the master narrative of decline: Midlife professional women's experiences of aging. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15(2), 183-226.
- Trethewey, A., & Ashcraft, K. L. (2004). Practicing disorganization: The development of applied perspectives on living with tension. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 32(2), 81-88.
- Truscott, R. A., Bartlett, J. L., & Tywoniak, S. (2009). The reputation of the corporate social responsibility industry in Australia. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 17(2), 84-91.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1906-1924.)
- Wijen, F., & Ansari, S. (2007). Overcoming inaction through collective institutional entrepreneurship: Insights from regime theory. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1079-1100.

- Winn, M. I., MacDonald, P., & Zietsma, C. (2008). The dynamic tension between collective and competitive reputation management strategies. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 11(1), 35-55.
- Zietsma, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2010). Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field: The interplay of boundary work and practice work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(2), 189-221.
- Zilber, T. B. (2002). Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meanings, and actors: The case of a rape crisis center in Israel. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 234-254.
- Zilber, T. B. (2007). Stories and the discursive dynamics of institutional entrepreneurship: The case of Israeli high-tech after the bubble. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1035-1054.
- Zorn, T. E., Flanagin, A. J., & Shoham, M. (2011). Institutional and non-institutional influences on information and communication technology adoption and use among nonprofit organizations. *Human Communication Research*, 37(1), 1-33.
- Zucker, L. G. (1983). Organizations as institutions. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Advances in organizational theory and research* (vol. 2, pp. 1-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Notes

1. It bears mentioning that institutional theory is by far the most invoked approach in organization studies today. Google returns about 342,000 sites in a search for *institutional theory*, and Google Scholar lists 32,100 citations on the same search. A topic search in the ISI Web of Knowledge renders 9,213 citations.
2. Throughout *TVA and the Grassroots*, Selznick quite explicitly embraces the values of democratic action at the local level and includes a discussion of local disenfranchisement of Black farmers and colleges in the region.
3. In an example of the disciplinary distance between institutionalists and other scholars, Tolbert and Zucker (1983, 1996), in their discussion of diffusion, make no mention of Rogers (1962).
4. This section draws upon and summarizes material in Lammers (2011).