

Overview	
<p>Institutional theory answers the question: Why do organizations tend to look so similar (i.e., exhibit isomorphism)? The degree of isomorphism in an organizational field is positively related to the degree of (1) coercive, (2) mimetic, and (3) normative pressures in the field.</p>	
Application to Implementation Science	
<p>Jensen, T. B., Kjærgaard, A., & Svejvig, P. (2009). Using institutional theory with sensemaking theory: a case study of information system implementation in healthcare. <i>Journal of Information Technology</i>, 24(4), 343-353.</p> <p>Nilsen, P., Ståhl, C., Roback, K., & Cairney, P. (2013). Never the twain shall meet? -a comparison of implementation science and policy implementation research. <i>Implementation Science</i>, 8(1), 63.</p> <p>Novotná, G., Dobbins, M., & Henderson, J. (2012). Institutionalization of evidence-informed practices in healthcare settings. <i>Implementation Science</i>, 7(1), 112.</p>	
Constructs	
Isomorphism	Similar organizational structures and processes (dependent variable)
Coercive pressures	"Formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organizations function" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p.150)
Mimetic pressures	Influences encouraging organizations to model the behavior of other organizations in their field
Normative pressures	Influences derived from members of an occupation or profession (e.g., physicians) defining the conditions and methods of work
Professionalization	Claims on knowledge among professional groups
Propositions	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The degree of isomorphism in an organizational field is positively related to the degree of (1) coercive, (2) mimetic, and (3) normative pressures in that field. 2. Coercive pressures are greater to the extent that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizations in a field transact with agencies of the state (or depend on public financing). • Organizations in a field are dependent upon a single (or several similar) source of support for vital resources. 3. Mimetic pressures are greater when an organizational field has high levels of uncertainty (e.g., evidence for what is effective is limited, technologies are poorly understood, goals are ambiguous, etc.). 4. Normative processes are greater in organizations with higher levels of professionalization. 	
Potential Relevance to Implementation Science	
<p>Implementation strategies should take advantage of existing or potential coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures on the focal organization.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coercive pressures may be augmented by specifying how an intervention can assist an organization in meeting regulatory, reimbursing, or accrediting body requirements. 2. Coercive pressures may be augmented by negotiating with centralized sources of vital support (payers, suppliers). 3. Coercive pressures may be augmented by changing the policy governing reimbursement, formularies, accreditation, etc. 4. Coercive and mimetic pressures may be leveraged by creating a system to publicly recognize organizations that fully implement an intervention 	

5. Mimetic pressures may be augmented by partnering with opinion leading organizations to be early **adopters** and serve as models for other organizations in the field.
6. Mimetic pressures may be augmented by aligning with existing ways of improving practice that have already **diffused** (e.g., the Improvement Model, Lean, Six Sigma, etc.).
7. Normative pressures may be augmented by partnering with professional associations to support implementation.
8. Normative pressures may be augmented by strategies that increase the alignment (real or perceived) between EBI usage and professional identity/role.

Criticisms and/or bounds on the theory

Dolan, P., & Connolly, J. (2018). Beyond logic and norms: a figurational critique of institutional theory in organisation studies. *Cambio*, 7(14), 139-149.

Suddaby, R. (2010). Challenges for institutional theory. *Journal of management inquiry*, 19(1), 14-20.

References

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

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>

Heugens, P. P. M. A. R., & Lander, M. W. (2009). Structure! agency! (and other quarrels): A meta-analysis of institutional theories of organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(1), 61–85.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2009.36461835>

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2778293>

Scott, W. R. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* (G. Ritzer, ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Zucker, L. G. (1987). Institutional Theories of Organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13, 443–464. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2083256>

Type: Theory (grand, mid-range), perspective, model, etc.

- Mid-range theory