



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Institutional complexity and sustainable supply chain management practices

Citation for published version:

Sayed, M, Hendry, L & Zorzini, M 2017, 'Institutional complexity and sustainable supply chain management practices', *Supply Chain Management*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 542-563. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-10-2016-0365>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1108/SCM-10-2016-0365](https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-10-2016-0365)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Supply Chain Management

Publisher Rights Statement:

Maysara Sayed, Linda C. Hendry, Marta Zorzini Bell, (2017) "Institutional complexity and sustainable supply chain management practices", *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 22 Issue: 6, pp.542-563, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-10-2016-0365>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





Institutional Complexity and Sustainable Supply Chain Management Practices

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Supply Chain Management: an International Journal</i> |
| Manuscript ID | SCM-10-2016-0365.R3 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original Manuscript |
| Keywords: | Sustainability, Supply-chain management, Case Studies |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Institutional Complexity and Sustainable Supply Chain Management Practices

Structured Abstract

Purpose: To empirically investigate the impact of: institutional pressures; institutional logics; and institutional complexity; on Sustainable Supply Chain Management (SSCM) practices across mixed public and private sector supply chains.

Design/methodology/approach: Multi-case study data was collected from three tiers of food and catering supply chains: the customer/consumer tier; focal public sector UK Universities; and private sector suppliers / contractors.

Findings: The findings indicate that: normative and mimetic pressures are more prevalent in focal Universities, compared to suppliers; there is typically no single dominant logic across these supply chains; and the multiplicity of institutional logics (e.g., sustainability logic versus financial logic) increases institutional complexity. Therefore, in the atypical case of homogeneity in terms of institutional pressures and logics, e.g. with a dominant sustainability logic throughout the supply chain, radical change in SSCM practices is facilitated. In contrast, in the more typical case when there is heterogeneity, with competing logics at different supply chain tiers, this limits SSCM to more incremental changes in practices.

Research limitations/implications: This study is limited to three tiers of the food and catering supply chains of UK Universities.

Practical implications: To aid in the successful implementation of SSCM, this study suggests a need for managers to develop an initial understanding of the prevailing institutional logics and pressures at different tiers of the supply chain.

Social implications: A number of the SSCM practices studied address social sustainability.

Originality/value: No previous studies have empirically investigated the impact of institutional complexity in the context of SSCM practices across supply chains, involving both mixed public and private sector organisations.

Keywords: Sustainable Supply Chain Management; Institutional Theory; Institutional Pressures; Institutional Logics; Institutional Complexity; Multi-Case

1. Introduction

Sustainability has become a key aspect of supply chain management as part of the increasing corporate social and environmental responsibilities of companies (Sarkis *et al.*, 2010). Thus the concept of Sustainable Supply Chain Management (SSCM) has emerged, as defined by Carter & Rogers (2008) as “the strategic, transparent integration and achievement of an organisation’s social, environmental, and economic goals in the systemic coordination of key inter-organisational business processes for improving the long-term economic performance of the individual company and its supply chains” (p. 368). Therefore, it can be argued that one of the main features of SSCM is that it is based on the inter-organisational field that affects and is affected by the interaction and integration between different organisations across the supply chain (Svensson, 2007; Sarkis *et al.*, 2011; Miemczyk *et al.*, 2012; Grosvold *et al.*, 2014). It is argued here that a greater understanding of these interactions between multiple tiers of supply chain actors will increase the effective implementation of SSCM practices. This paper aims to develop this understanding by using an institutional theory lens, including the constructs of institutional pressures, logics and complexity (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, Greenwood *et al.*, 2011).

In practical terms, the paper aims to aid supply chain actors who are championing the use of SSCM practices throughout their supply chains by providing a better appreciation of the prevailing institutional pressures and logics affecting the willingness of their customers and/or suppliers to implement changes. Therefore, by equipping supply chain actors with a better understanding of institutional complexity at the supply chain level, it is anticipated that they will be better able to influence change towards their SSCM goals. Such changes may focus on one particular type of sustainability (environmental, social or economic sustainability) or may attempt to address two or three aspects of sustainability simultaneously. For example, Zorzini *et al.* (2015) consider the social dimension alone and in their review of the literature indicate that this includes factors affecting worker rights and safety throughout the supply chain. In contrast, local sourcing is an example of a practice that has been argued by authors such as Oglethorpe & Heron (2013) and Czinkota *et al.* (2014) to address all three dimensions of sustainability, as it can: address environmental issues by reducing food miles; address social issues by providing employment for the local community; and address economic issues by retaining revenues within the region. This paper adopts a broad view of SSCM, as defined by Carter & Rogers (2008)

1
2
3 above and seeks to understand how institutional theory can aid in the implementation of a variety
4 of types of SSCM practices.
5
6

7 From an institutional theory perspective, few studies have explicitly studied the impact of
8 institutional logics on SSCM at the supply chain level (Miemczyk *et al.*, 2012). A key exception
9 is the work by Glover *et al.* (2014), who provide evidence for institutional isomorphism and the
10 presence of homogeneity in the form of a dominant financial logic in multiple supply chain tiers.
11 This prior study also illustrates how different organizations may experience common
12 institutional pressures, in terms of sustainability development, that the supply chain needs to
13 respond to across its tiers. However, Glover *et al.* (2014) focus on a purely commercial supply
14 chain, in which it could be argued that there is a high chance of homogeneity. In contrast,
15 heterogeneity assumptions have been proposed by Greenwood *et al.* (2011), who suggest that a
16 multiplicity of institutional logics can lead to institutional complexity, and call for more
17 empirical studies to contribute to the elaboration and further understanding of these phenomena.
18 Yet, to-date, there are no published studies that discuss institutional complexity in the context of
19 SSCM practices in diverse supply chains including public and private sector organisations, and
20 in which a multiplicity of institutional logics might be more likely to occur. Thus, this paper adds
21 to the prior literature by studying a diverse supply chain, providing important empirical evidence
22 for the concept of institutional complexity, including the investigation of the relationship
23 between logics and pressures as well as how these evolve over time. The resulting research
24 questions are as follows:
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 *RQ1: How do institutional pressures and logics vary across mixed public and private*
40 *sector supply chains, thereby affecting SSCM practices?*
41

42 *RQ2: How does a multiplicity of institutional logics and organizational attributes shape*
43 *institutional complexity, and thereby impact changes in SSCM practices within mixed*
44 *public and private sector supply chains?*
45
46
47

48 To answer these questions, a multi-case study approach has been adopted to investigate the
49 implementation of SSCM in the food and catering supply chains of UK Higher Education (HE)
50 institutions. This context was selected as it includes both public and private sector organisations
51 (universities and food suppliers respectively) with varying degrees of saliency to the general
52 public and media. Before further justifying the methodology and presenting the findings, this
53 paper first explains the theoretical background and reviews the extant literature.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2. Institutional Theory and the extant SSCM literature

Institutional theory provides a theoretical lens that aids in understanding the influences that promote similarity of the organisations' structures and gives legitimacy to organisational practices within an organisational field (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) defined the organizational field as "those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products" (p. 148). However, Wooten and Hoffman (2008) argue that the conceptualization of an organizational field is evolving "where previous definitions of the field centred around organizations with a common technology or market (i.e. SIC classification), the field began to be seen as forming around the issues that became important to the interests and objectives of a specific collective of organizations" (p. 134). Therefore, it can be argued that the supply chain can be considered to be an inter-organizational field, containing different organizations, irrespective of whether they are in the same industry or have common technology, but working together and depending on each other to continue in their businesses and achieve their objectives. This connectedness makes them face the same institutional pressures that need to be responded to not only on the organizational level in the same tiers, but across the whole supply chain. These institutional pressures are discussed below.

2.1. Institutional Pressures

According to institutional theory, the institutional isomorphism process is a means of gaining legitimacy within the organisational field, as a response to three different types of institutional pressures: coercive, normative and mimetic pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; March and Olsen, 1984). The coercive pressures are exerted from formal and informal forces that are practiced upon the organizations from other powerful organizations or entities upon which the organizations depend (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Within the sustainability context, these pressures can be in the form of sustainability rules and regulations exerted by government, requiring the implementation of specific sustainability practices (Zhu and Sarkis, 2007; Wu *et al.*, 2013). Also they can be exerted by powerful customers that put pressure upon supplier organisations to comply with specific sustainability requirements (Tate *et al.*, 2011; Moxham and

1
2
3 Kauppi, 2014). Normative pressures stem from professionalism and associated networking
4 (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). So organisations are confronted with normative pressures to be
5 perceived as legitimate among their peers within their professional community (Bhakoo and
6 Choi, 2013). Thus within a sustainability context, these pressures can be exerted by sustainable
7 trading alliances and associations and the desire of organisations to be associated with them
8 (Tate *et al.*, 2011). Also normative pressures can stem from the social obligation that
9 organisations feel towards their societies and communities to be seen to be doing the right thing
10 (March and Olsen, 1989). Mimetic pressures stem from uncertainty and results in organisations
11 attempting to model themselves on other successful organisations (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).
12 The competition between organisations in terms of sustainability practices are often sources of
13 mimetic pressures in this context (Zhu and Sarkis, 2007; Wu *et al.*, 2012).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Several studies have examined the existence of these pressures and their influence on
24 organizations to adopt SSCM practices (e.g., Zhu and Sarkis, 2007; Sarkis *et al.*, 2010; Sarkis *et al.*,
25 2011; Tate *et al.*, 2011; Wu *et al.*, 2012; Varsei *et al.*, 2014; Moxham and Kauppi, 2014;
26 Grosvold *et al.*, 2014). Some have argued that these institutional pressures could have a
27 significant influence (Zhu and Sarkis, 2007; Tate *et al.*, 2011). For example, Zhu and Sarkis
28 (2007) found that coercive and normative pressures influenced Chinese manufacturers to adopt
29 SSCM practices such as eco-design and green purchasing leading to improved environmental
30 performance. However, most prior studies concentrate on institutional pressures affecting
31 organisations within one tier of the supply chain (focal companies or suppliers) with very few
32 examples that have tried to examine multiple tiers of the supply chain in this context (e.g.,
33 Glover *et al.*, 2014).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Furthermore, it can be argued that the influence of institutional pressures in the domain of
43 SSCM could be contextual, with varying impacts of the three types of pressures (Clemens and
44 Douglas, 2006; Sarkis *et al.*, 2010; Wu *et al.*, 2012). For example, Clemens and Douglas (2006)
45 found that the relationship between the external institutional pressures for the adoption of
46 voluntary green initiatives is weaker or non-existent when the firms have internal superior
47 resources (e.g., extensive environmental documentation and effective environmental training)
48 associated with their environmental strategies. Similarly, Sarkis *et al.* (2010) found in their
49 studies of automotive companies that an effective response to institutional pressures needs the
50 development of intangible knowledge capacities; whereas without training to acquire these
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 capacities, the institutional pressures may go unheeded. In addition, the significance of particular
4 pressures can be affected by other factors associated with the implementation of SSCM, such as
5 organisational support, social capital and government involvement (Wu *et al.*, 2012). Thus, it can
6 be argued that the response to institutional pressures regarding SSCM practices can vary
7 according to different factors that are related to the organisations themselves, which could
8 include the readiness of organisations and how they perceive or interpret these pressures. This
9 supports the idea of heterogeneity as an alternative to isomorphism in the implementation of
10 SSCM practices (Hoffman, 2001), which is also in need of further study on multiple supply
11 chain levels rather than only the one tier level (Sarkis *et al.*, 2011).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 *2.2. Institutional Logics and Heterogeneity*

22 Heterogeneity has begun to be acknowledged by institutional theorists as a result of different
23 responses from organisations to the institutional pressures (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996;
24 Hoffman, 2001; Bunduchi *et al.*, 2008; Greenwood *et al.*, 2010; Bhakoo and Choi, 2013). The
25 prior literature uses the concept of ‘institutional logics’ to understand the reasons for this
26 heterogeneity (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008). Thornton (2004) defined institutional logics as
27 “assumptions and values, usually implicit, about how to interpret organizational reality, what
28 constitutes appropriate behaviour, and how to succeed” (p. 70). Therefore, “rather than positing
29 homogeneity and isomorphism in organizational fields, the institutional logics approach views
30 any context as potentially influenced by contending logics of different societal sectors”
31 (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Since the term was introduced by Alford and Friedland (1985), an increasing number of
41 studies have discussed institutional logics in different contexts (e.g., Thornton and Ocasio, 1999;
42 Thornton and Ocasio, 2008; Besharov and Smith, 2014). The previous studies have shown the
43 possible dynamics of institutional logics in terms of their evolution over time (e.g., Thornton and
44 Ocasio, 1999) and also in terms of the contradictions and competition between the different
45 logics at any one point in time (Greenwood *et al.*, 2011; Besharov and Smith, 2014). For
46 example, Thornton and Ocasio (1999) investigated shifting logics in the Higher Education
47 Publishing Industry from an editorial logic to a market logic. Greenwood *et al.* (2010)
48 investigated how multiple logics, such as regional state logic, family logic and market logic,
49 require different responses thereby creating complex institutional contexts for organisations.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Similarly, in the context of SSCM, it can be argued that the need to encourage organisations to
4 think more sustainably is creating a new logic that tries to replace, compete with or complement
5 other dominant logics such as market and financial logics. However, to date the institutional
6 logic concept is not often included in the SSCM literature that uses institutional theory. Key
7 examples of exceptions to this are discussed below.
8
9

10
11
12 Within the institutional logics literature, there are very few studies that have investigated
13 supply chain management in general (e.g. Gawer and Phillips, 2013) or SSCM in particular (e.g.,
14 Heiskanen, 2002; Glover *et al.*, 2014). For example, Gawer and Phillips (2013) studied the
15 dramatic shift in institutional logic of the Intel Corporation's supply chain, within the computer
16 industry, from traditional supply chain logic dominated by computer assemblers to a new
17 platform logic. Within the context of SSCM, Heiskanen (2002) has studied the life cycle
18 approach (LCA) as an emerging institutional logic that influences the way environmental
19 problems, and responsibility for them, are conceptualized using data from wholesale-retail
20 purchasers. On a supply chain level, Glover *et al.* (2014) studied institutional logic across the
21 dairy supply chain exploring different stakeholder views including producers, primary producer
22 suppliers, transporters, processors, retailers, and consumers of dairy products. They found that
23 financial logic (reducing cost and maximising profit) is dominant throughout this commercial
24 supply chain which suggests difficulties and challenges in complementing this logic with
25 sustainability practices. More studies are needed at the supply chain level to further understand
26 and investigate the role of current institutional logics in facilitating or hindering the
27 implementation of sustainability. In particular, more diverse supply chains need to be studied
28 rather than simple commercial supply chains – for example, including actors in different
29 industries (including manufacturing and services industries), which have different purposes (for
30 profit and non-profit companies).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *2.3. Institutional Complexity*

49 Finally, as well as considering institutional pressures, and institutional logics, there is also a need
50 to consider 'institutional complexity' (Greenwood *et al.*, 2011; Greenwood *et al.*, 2010;
51 Besharov and Smith, 2014). Greenwood *et al.* (2011) argue that organizations face institutional
52 complexity as a result of having multiple, and conflicting, institutional logics. They suggest that
53 this complexity creates challenges and tensions for two reasons in particular. Firstly, it is not
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 fixed, but it is dynamically shaped through the continuous evolving of the institutional logics.
4
5 Secondly, the position of the organization within the field (e.g., central or peripheral) determines
6
7 its saliency to institutional complexity; and the organization's characteristics (e.g., structure,
8
9 ownership, governance and identity) determine its sensitivity to certain logics. Therefore,
10
11 organizations could have different responses to the institutional complexity within the
12
13 organizational field. To the best of our knowledge, no prior studies have discussed institutional
14
15 complexity in the context of SSCM.
16
17

18
19 In conclusion, most of the prior SSCM literature that has used institutional theory focused
20
21 on the influence of institutional pressures, without utilising the constructs of institutional logics
22
23 and institutional complexity. Therefore, the previous research does not develop a sufficiently
24
25 deep understanding of how organisations perceive and interact with these pressures and what
26
27 causes heterogeneity or isomorphism thereby influencing SSCM practices. Furthermore, most
28
29 prior studies concentrate, predominantly, on the firm level (focal companies or suppliers) or
30
31 buyer-supplier dyadic relationships, with very few examples that examine sustainability at three
32
33 or more supply chain tiers. This paper addresses these gaps by considering the impact of
34
35 institutional pressures, logics and complexity on SSCM at multiple tiers of the supply chain.
36
37

36 **3. Research Framework and Methodology**

37
38 Given the dearth of prior research that has considered institutional complexity in the SSCM
39
40 context, exploratory research is needed to enable theory building. Therefore, a multi-case study
41
42 approach was adopted, as this is argued to be an appropriate method for exploratory research that
43
44 aims to be theory-generating and/or theory-elaborating (Voss, 2009; Ketokivi & Choi, 2014),
45
46 further, it also facilitates the collection of rich and profound data to better understand the issues
47
48 being explored (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Yin, 2009). An abductive approach (Saunders *et*
49
50 *al.*, 2016) was adopted for the research, using some prior constructs developed from the extant
51
52 literature on institutional theory, but also allowing other issues to emerge inductively from the
53
54 data, as further discussed in the data analysis section below. In choosing the cases, three tiers
55
56 have been included to provide a supply chain perspective: the focal organisations' tier; first
57
58 supplier tier; and the customer tier. This study has dual units of analysis, where: the
59
60 organisations within each tier are considered to be the unit of analysis for identifying the

1
2
3 prevailing institutional pressures and institutional logics; while the supply chain as an inter-
4 organisational field is the unit of analysis for understanding institutional complexity.
5
6
7

8 9 *3.1. Case Selection and Data Collection*

10 Food and catering supply chains of 5 UK HE institutions have been selected for this research as
11 these supply chains contain both public sector universities and private sector suppliers. Whilst
12 there is also a research gap to study institutional complexity in a SSCM context in all types of
13 supply chains, this diverse supply chain was selected as it was felt that it would be more likely to
14 bring light to conflicting pressures/logics given potential differences in organisational objectives.
15 Thus this context is argued to have greater potential for developing understanding of the
16 implications of a multiplicity of institutional logics within the inter-organisational field. The
17 selection of the cases follows theoretical sampling principles, whereby each additional case
18 either predicts similar results (a literal replication); or produces contrary results but for
19 predictable reasons (a theoretical replication) (Eisenhardt, 1989, Voss, 2009, Yin, 2009). For
20 example, 5 public sector UK universities have been chosen for literal replication; whilst the
21 study includes a mixture of small local suppliers; larger national suppliers and catering
22 contractors for theoretical replication. For the customer tier, this research focused on students as
23 they represent the majority of food consumers. By interviewing student representatives within
24 the students' union, this study aims to understand the perspective of both: students who are
25 actively engaged with sustainability initiatives; and the vast majority of students who are not
26 members of active sustainability groups. Finally, two food purchasing consortiums in the HE
27 sector have been interviewed to provide a broader perspective given their work with many
28 different universities.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The data collection process was completed in three phases; with preliminary data analysis
45 conducted after each of the first two phases (Miles *et al.*, 2014, Voss, 2009). Data collection
46 ceased when it was felt that the saturation level had been achieved, i.e., when no more
47 significantly new data was being collected (Eisenhardt, 1989). In total, 33 semi-structured face-
48 to-face interviews were conducted. Table 1 provides details of each interviewee and organisation
49 included in the study, including the length of each interview; and Figure 1 illustrates the
50 relationship between the supply chain actors.
51
52
53
54
55

56 [Take in Table 1 and Figure 1]
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For each tier of the supply chains under this study, the interviewees have been chosen
4 carefully to be the most knowledgeable individuals who can talk about food and catering
5 sustainability initiatives/practices in their organisations/entities. For the focal companies
6 (universities) tier, the interviewees have been chosen mainly from procurement departments who
7 deals with the food supply chain and its sustainability initiatives/practices (as in the cases: FHE1,
8 FHE2, FHE3, FHE4 and FHE5). For local and small suppliers, managing directors were
9 interviewed where possible as they are most familiar with their small businesses (as in the cases:
10 LS1, LS2, LS3, LS5). Where this was not possible for some local suppliers and both of the big
11 national suppliers, sales representatives were interviewed given that they manage the relationship
12 with the focal organisations selected. These interviewees were both familiar with their
13 customers' requirements and expectations towards sustainability issues and at the same time they
14 are quite familiar with sustainability practices within their own businesses given their role in
15 'selling' this competence to the customers (as in the cases: LS4, LS6, LS7, NS1, NS). Finally,
16 for the customer tier, student union representative(s) were interviewed in each university as they
17 were felt to be able to best reflect the overall perspective of students, given their experience in
18 working with different types of students. This was deemed better than interviewing only a few
19 student consumers and having an in-complete picture about the overall students' perspective.
20 Therefore student representatives employed in the student unions of the five universities were
21 chosen, who are specifically responsible for sustainability projects/initiatives with the students.
22 These interviewees provided evidence of both: the student union's perspective, as an entity; and
23 the student consumers' perspectives (as in the cases C1, C2, C3, C4, C5).

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 In order to ensure the research quality, construct validity, external validity, internal validity
41 and reliability measurements as relevant to a case study approach have been fulfilled (Yin,
42 2009). To ensure construct validity, other secondary data and documents have also been
43 collected for triangulation purposes with the interview data. Secondary data sources include: the
44 organisations websites; published sustainability reports; and documents provided by the
45 interviewees such as suppliers' assessments questionnaires and protocols, sustainability policies
46 and action plans. In addition, at least two respondents have been interviewed in each focal
47 university. To ensure external validity, multiple cases have been chosen by replication logic, as
48 discussed above. To ensure internal validity, pattern matching of the data has been used through
49 cross-case analysis. To ensure reliability, the same rigorous process of data collection has been
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 used with all cases and respondents. This process consists of four stages. Firstly, a set of
4 questions was prepared for each group of interviewees – the questions used for the focal
5 organisations are included in the Appendix in Table A1, which also illustrates how the questions
6 are linked to the main constructs under investigation. Secondly, the interview questions were
7 sent to the relevant interviewees in advance; along with a summary of the research objectives
8 and a consent form - clarifying the rights of both participants and researchers. Thirdly, the
9 interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim, leading to a total of 298 pages of interview
10 data. Finally, the transcripts were sent to the interviewees for validation and authenticity
11 checking.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 *3.2. Data Analysis*

22 Data coding and analysis were guided by the three main constructs of institutional theory used in
23 this study, as defined in Table 2 below and summarised as: institutional pressures (identifying
24 normative, coercive and mimetic pressures as well as evaluating their strength); institutional
25 logics (identifying the main institutional logics embedded in the data and evaluating their
26 strength) and institutional complexity (through identifying the impact of the multiplicity of
27 institutional pressures and logics; and the homogeneity and heterogeneity process). The codes
28 used are presented in Table 3, and include both the constructs identified in the extant institutional
29 theory literature discussed above and themes identified from the data which are used as sub-
30 codes. Thus the first order codes and the second order codes associated with the institutional
31 pressures are all from the extant literature, whilst the remaining second order codes and all of the
32 third order codes emerge from the data. In terms of institutional complexity, the codes
33 demonstrate the manner in which it was qualitatively assessed by first identifying conflicting
34 logics i.e. between sustainability logic and financial logic or between sustainability logic and
35 time logic. Having established the presence of conflicting logics, the challenges associated with a
36 particular conflict were then assessed, followed by the resultant strategies to overcome those
37 challenges and the outcomes in terms of the impact on changes towards SSCM goals.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Given that some of the codes emerged from the data, the full set of codes was circulated
52 between two of the researchers for confirmation, with any initial disagreements resolved through
53 discussion. In addition, the relative strengths of the prevailing pressures and logics were
54 independently assessed by two of the researchers before discussion to agree minor discrepancies
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in judgement. Due to the supply chain perspective used, the within-case and cross-case analysis
4 process has been structured as suggested by Bhakoo and Choi (2013). This process starts with
5 traditional within-case analysis, considering each case in each tier in turn; and then searches for
6 patterns at two levels of cross-case analysis: within-tier analysis; and cross-tier analysis. Data
7 analysis and coding were facilitated by the NVIVO software.
8
9

10
11 [Take in Tables 2 and 3]
12
13

14 15 16 **4. Findings: Single Tier Analysis of Institutional Pressures and Logics** 17

18 The findings for the single tier analysis (referred to as within-tier analysis by Bhakoo and Choi,
19 2013) include the institutional pressures and institutional logics at each level of the supply chain
20 studied, as discussed below. These findings are summarised in Tables 4 and 5, with Table 6
21 providing definitions of the institutional logics identified in the data. Whilst Tables 4 and 5 only
22 provide sample quotes for some of the organisations included in the study, this evidence is
23 confirmed by the other organisations unless otherwise indicated in the right hand columns of
24 Tables 4 and 5, and in the discussion below.
25
26
27
28
29

30 [Take in Tables 4, 5 and 6]
31
32
33

34 *4.1. Institutional Pressures: Focal Universities* 35

36 As shown in Table 4, the strong pressures impacting the SSCM practices of the focal universities
37 are normative and mimetic. In terms of normative pressures, they stem from: 'ethical
38 obligations' that the universities feel towards society due to a perceived expectation to be good
39 role models; or from membership of purchasing consortiums/alliances, which influences
40 appropriate norms for the procurement profession in HE institutions. In terms of mimetic
41 pressures, the universities model themselves on best practice in the field to gain a high rank in
42 the universities' sustainability league tables (i.e., the Green League Table). As confirmed by
43 interviewees from all the universities under study, the competition in the Green League Table
44 has become a strong pressure.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 However, the findings have not suggested strong governmental coercive pressures upon
53 universities regarding their food and catering SSCM practices. This may be because UK
54 universities are independent legal entities and are only partially funded by government. It may
55 also be due to the university policies and practices being much more advanced than the minimum
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 regulations implemented by government, *“I don’t think that government tells us what we do, I*
4 *think in some ways certainly university catering is ahead of the game when it comes to*
5 *sustainability”* (FHE2-I1). In addition, there is conflicting evidence in terms of the coercive
6 pressures received from students, with some interviewees claiming that sustainability practices
7 are driven by students: *“We are much more engaged with it because students are engaged with*
8 *it”* (FHE2-I1), whilst others stated: *“... it always looks like they are very pro sustainability. But*
9 *in actuality, I haven't seen that here ... ”* (FHE5-I2). Given that the former interviewees tended to
10 be referring to sustainability activist groups rather than the student body as a whole, it is
11 concluded that this pressure is not strong. Therefore, overall, it is concluded that the coercive
12 pressures are relatively weak for this tier in the supply chain, and that normative and mimetic
13 pressures are the main drivers behind SSCM food and catering initiatives.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 4.2. Institutional Pressures: Suppliers

25 For all three supplier types included in this study (local small suppliers; catering contractors; and
26 national suppliers), the data suggests that the coercive pressures from their customers are the
27 main pressures behind the implementation of sustainability practices, as evidenced by the sample
28 quotes in Table 4. For the local suppliers, these coercive pressures stem from their dependency
29 on these big customers, given that they represent a large proportion of the suppliers’ business.
30 This has been confirmed by 6 out of 7 of the local small suppliers in this study. For example,
31 LS3 explained: *“our most recent initiative that really we joined and it’s really a process of*
32 *jumping through the hoops would be the Red Tractor initiative, so we’ve signed up for that and I*
33 *would say that was largely driven by the requirements of the University, the University is the*
34 *only person that we deal with that has that requirement and we’ve been able to get Red Tractor*
35 *accreditation, so we’ve invested a lot of time and money in achieving that”*. Thus our data
36 suggests that local small suppliers are mainly driven by the pressures of their customers,
37 especially bigger customers, which require sustainability accreditations.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The exception is LS5, which is more driven by normative pressures such as concerns about
50 the environment and professionalism identity. This supplier is a co-operative of local and organic
51 suppliers that aims to prove the commercial viability of sustainable food, thereby enhancing the
52 concept of organic and local food. So from the outset, its mission was sustainability related
53 rather than being a purely commercial venture. Also in certain industries, such as the coffee
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 industry, there are norms and trends that are felt as normative pressures (e.g. fair trade and
4 rainforest alliance coffee). For example, as explained by LS6 (i.e., coffee supplier) “*they [our*
5 *main wholesalers] must follow the trend in the market ... that is how the market has changed and*
6 *that's how it has developed ... probably 10 years ago it was quite driving towards Fairtrade and*
7 *ethically traded, that now is rolled into quality, and that seems to be the market norm now*”.

8
9
10
11
12 With regards to both catering contractors, the coercive pressures that stem from the
13 contract agreements are strong. These contracts stipulate penalties, ultimately including the right
14 of the university to terminate the contract, if the catering contractors fail to achieve their agreed
15 sustainability targets. However, before signing these contracts, mimetic pressures play a greater
16 role especially with big contractors. These mimetic pressures stem from the competition between
17 contractors to win university contracts, as explained for example by Con1 “*I think the reason for*
18 *that is that some clients in universities, schools and colleges won't even think to do any business*
19 *with anybody unless they have the accreditations and they have the potential to do things*
20 *correctly. ... we want to be the best at the end of the day*”. With regards to national suppliers, the
21 findings suggest that there is no direct significant coercive influence from the universities.
22 Instead, mimetic pressures are prevailing, which stem from competition for higher market shares.
23 As explained by NS1-II “*We want to be the best and most forward thinking above everybody*
24 *else ... for me when I am going out and trying to gain new business that is a key thing that I*
25 *discuss, it's not about price, it's about services and our green accreditation ...*”.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Interestingly, the findings suggest that governmental coercive pressures are not perceived
38 as strong pressures behind the implementation of sustainability practices and initiatives within
39 the supplier tier. Although there is some legislation related to energy, waste, recycling and
40 packaging, pressure from this legislation is not perceived to be as strong as the other pressures
41 discussed above. Con1 explained the reason for this: “*In actuality there is no pressure from the*
42 *government. My personal view is that the government aren't particularly interested in improving*
43 *sustainability, but they wanna tick the box, so it is more of a tick box exercise*”. Furthermore,
44 other suppliers, especially local small suppliers, do not perceive any pressures from government,
45 as mentioned for example by LS1 “*There are no current pressures from government. The council*
46 *inspectors that are employed by the government visit the business once a month on average and*
47 *only inspect aspects related to quality. So the pressures are very little*”.

4.3. Institutional Pressures: Customers

In terms of institutional pressures at the customer tier of the supply chain, the findings suggest that there are no strong normative, mimetic or coercive pressures that are relevant to this group. For example, as stated by C1, *“Not really, other than enthusiasm, there is no real pressure out there; I think the pressure is from us upon the university to change a few things”*. It can therefore be concluded that the Student Union groups are self-motivated groups, who exert pressure to act in a sustainable manner on other members of the supply chain. However, the evidence suggests that there is a medium level of normative pressure for the Student Union, for example as stated by C4: *“And then there is a social norm for it. For example if something is perceived as the standard and if the conscience is raised about these issues, people start shifting their behaviours”*.

4.4. Institutional Logics: Focal Universities

In terms of universities, the data suggests that sustainability logic has become stronger than purely financial logic in recent years. This is evidenced, for example, through claims that there has been a recent shift in emphasis from costs to sustainability in the universities' strategies, for example, FHE4-I1 stated: *“before, our emphasis was more about the cost than concern about where they get their food from, but in the last five or six years the emphasis has been changed and sustainability is much stronger”*. These strategies are implemented by giving procurement specialists more freedom to consider sustainable sourcing options without necessarily using price as the key decision-making criterion, as explained by several interviewees including FHE2-I2, FHE4-I1, FHE1-I2. For example: *“For sure cost is there in the sustainable procurement but it is not always the final marker, we look at everything else where it is important to be sustainable. So yes if it costs more, it costs more”* (FHE4-I1). This has also been confirmed by some suppliers (e.g., LS6, LS4, LS3, and LS1). For example, the manager of LS6 stated that *“I have dealt with other customers, which are much more price-driven, whereas the University seems to be more on quality along with sustainability”*.

However, financial logic still overrides sustainability logic in some instances, as the University needs to find some way to offset the cost of more expensive sustainable sourcing options in order to remain commercially viable: *“Cost is considered one of the main challenges because everything in the budget is very tight, this is something that we can afford, but generally*

1
2
3
4 *I have to offset it somewhere else, or try and find a way that makes it work cheaper” (FHE2-I2).*
5
6 If offsetting the costs is not possible, then the principle of customer affordability becomes
7 important, as explained by FHE2-I1 *“we don’t do it at any cost because we can’t ... whilst*
8 *catering is subsidised to a certain degree, it would be wrong if everything was organic at the*
9 *expense of us having to charge students a lot of money for whatever they are buying, so yes it*
10 *should be a balance really”.*
11
12
13

14 15 16 4.5. Institutional Logics: Suppliers

17
18 With the majority of suppliers under study, the data suggests that financial logic dominates their
19 thinking regarding sustainability practices. The business or commercial motive behind this
20 financial logic takes different forms such as responding to customers’ requirements as explained
21 by LS3 *“The University is a very important part of our business and really one of the drivers of*
22 *our business at the moment ... we may not have pursued the Red Tractor if it wasn’t driven by*
23 *the customer really”.* Another business-related motive is to reduce costs, such as by saving
24 energy, recycling and reducing waste, as explained by LS7 *“the reason why we would look to*
25 *save energy would be ... primarily to save money, because it is like any business, it is very good*
26 *to save the environment but if you end up paying too much without income, it is difficult for us”.*
27
28 Therefore, several suppliers indicated that they will only implement sustainability practices if
29 this leads to increased profits or reduced costs, as for example mentioned by LS2: *“well, it’s*
30 *[sustainability] always there, it’s always relevant, but ultimately it has to make business sense for*
31 *what we are doing. If it is making business sense then we will pursue it, ... if it costs money to do*
32 *it or there is no return on our investment, there’s no sense in looking at it”.* This was confirmed
33
34 by the majority of suppliers as further evidenced in Table 5.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 In comparison to the strong evidence for financial logic amongst suppliers, the evidence
46 for sustainability logic is weak overall, as only one of the suppliers studied indicated that this is
47 their dominant logic, LS5 – the co-operative of local and organic suppliers: *“I think*
48 *sustainability is extremely important because the objective of the organisation is to prove that*
49 *there is a suitable food system that can be localised and is not supposed to be based on Brazil”.*
50
51 In this exception, the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) is crucial, given their aim to prove that social
52
53 and environmental sustainability is commercially viable.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.6. Institutional Logics: Customers

In terms of the sustainability groups in the students' unions, it is not surprising that the findings confirm that sustainability logic dominates their thinking, given that sustainability is their *raison d'être*. It can therefore be argued that this sustainability logic is much stronger in these customer representative groups than in the university overall. As for example stated by C1 *"So the main goal of (our group) is to make the campus more green and get students and staff practically involved in that as well"*. Thus, they are mainly funded and evaluated according to their sustainability agenda, which is not the case for any other tier of the supply chain being studied.

For the student body as a group of consumers, the data suggests that financial and time logic are dominant in their thinking and interaction with sustainability initiatives, as illustrated in Table 5. Due to their restricted budgets, a main concern for students is how much certain initiatives or practices will cost them: *"I think in general most of the students would be quite price aware, so they would care about price. I think that is important. Some of the people think that the canteen is too expensive for example and even other markets around the University they like them but they can't go there because it is too expensive. So I think price is important"* (C2). The other important logic that dominates students' thinking is time, as there are many things that compete for their time (e.g., lectures, course-work, exams and socialising): *"Students are focusing on getting through their studies, probably have jobs and have their social life. So it's been a challenge to fully engage with the campus community and students' population and not just talk to the people who are already sensitised and educated about sustainability"* (C1). Whilst there are some enthusiastic students, the majority are not strongly influenced by sustainability logic: *"there is always a keen group of students around who want to grow their own food, but then we have to think about how to reach out to students who don't want to get their fingers dirty down at the allotment ..."*(C1).

5. Findings: Supply Chain Analysis of Complexity

As discussed above and summarised in Table 7 the data suggests that the dominant institutional pressures differ according to supply chain tier and that there are multiple logics within the supply chain under study, with overriding/dominant logics for each tier. Further evidence of the existence of conflicting logics is also provided in the sample quotes in Table 8, which lists the main sources of conflicting logics in the left hand column and sample quotes to provide evidence

1
2
3 for these sources of conflict in the right hand column. This multiplicity of logics and their
4 different degrees of compatibility with each other and with SSCM as an institutional demand
5 increases the degree of institutional complexity in the supply chain (Greenwood *et al.*, 2011).
6 This complexity results in challenges in both the upstream and downstream parts of the supply
7 chain which need a response by supply chain actors. The data suggests that the universities are
8 the most salient actors in terms of responding to these challenges due to their position as focal
9 organisations within the supply chain and their characteristics, (including size, governance,
10 purpose, salience to the media and general public). This saliency puts more pressure and
11 responsibility on the university to solve and respond to the challenges caused by complexity in
12 both the upstream and downstream supply chain. Thus the universities can be argued to be
13 “*pressure/challenge absorbers*” within the supply chain under study. This saliency towards
14 institutional complexity is conceptually illustrated in Figure 2 before being explained further
15 below.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 [Take in Tables 7 and 8, and Figure 2]
27

28 Figure 2 shows the three main actors of the supply chain under study, Universities (as focal
29 organisations), suppliers and customers (student consumers and students union), as well as the
30 dominant logic for each of them, in the middle three rectangles. As discussed above, institutional
31 complexity occurs due to the interaction between multiple competing institutional logics, which
32 are illustrated in Figure 2 by the two star bursts within the supply chain. The two middle arrows
33 represent the institutional pressures that are practiced by customers on the universities and also
34 the pressures the universities have on suppliers. Although, the direction of pressures are towards
35 the upstream supply chain, these pressures come back in the form of challenges from both
36 directions towards the universities as they are the most salient supply chain actor to the
37 institutional complexity. The two arrows at the top represent this. The top funnel indicates how
38 the universities absorb these challenges from both sides of the supply chain, the customers and
39 the suppliers. The bottom funnel explains how the universities try to deal with these challenges
40 by introducing different relieving strategies, reactive and proactive strategies, to diffuse
41 sustainability along the supply chain. Evidence from the data to support this illustration is further
42 discussed below by first focusing on upstream institutional complexity, followed by a discussion
43 of the downstream.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5.1. Upstream Institutional Complexity

In terms of upstream institutional complexity, the challenges stem from the conflict between the university's sustainability pressures and the financial logic of suppliers. They may be expressed in the form of deliberate resistance, which tends to occur more with catering contractors, national and international suppliers; or undeliberate resistance, which is generally the case with the small and medium suppliers due to their low sustainability capabilities.

As an example of the findings in support of deliberate resistance, FHE5-I2 argued that: *"with all the catering companies that I have worked with, at the end of the day they look after their own pocket and their own company and all of that"*. Thus there can be cost-related resistance from contractors to implement additional sustainability requirements introduced by the university after signing the contract. Similarly, for the larger national suppliers, the data suggests that financial logic takes priority when it conflicts with sustainability practices; and in this case the university has very little influence especially when it deals with suppliers individually (outside the purchasing consortium's framework). This is explained for example by FHE3-I2: *"... with the larger national suppliers we have not got that influence as much. I think that's a pro again for working with local rather than national suppliers"*. Thus, the university has to find a way to overcome this type of resistance when working with contractors and national/international suppliers.

In contrast, an example of undeliberate resistance from the smaller local suppliers can stem from a lack of sustainability documentation as needed for auditing processes / sustainability certificates, as explained for example by FHE1-I2: *"we had one who was very slow at coming through with the information as they didn't have it to hand"*. In addition, it may be that having the sustainability documentation does not make financial sense to these suppliers. As LS3, which sources from a local farm, stated: *"we can trace that chain and that's really good in terms of food miles because the farm is six miles away, the slaughterhouse is 2 miles away and then back to the shop, so it's really nice. Interestingly it's not Red Tractor because this farm is assured but the slaughterhouse isn't because it is small so they don't pay and don't need to and it's not part of its commercial DNA ..., so the Red Tractor route breaks down although it's a wonderful, traceable and provable small supply chain"*. However, a key sustainability initiative evidenced in the findings is the use of local small and medium suppliers, as confirmed by all five universities and both purchasing consortiums. Therefore, the university has to face these

1
2
3 challenges (in addition to other general challenges of local sourcing such as availability, volume,
4 higher prices and supplier delivery capabilities) if they want to continue with this initiative and
5 encourage their suppliers to diffuse sustainability initiatives across the upstream part of the
6 supply chain.
7
8
9

10
11 As a result of the universities' saliency in responding to the challenges caused by
12 institutional complexity in the upstream supply chain, and their perceived responsibility for the
13 implementation of SSCM, the universities use different strategies to alleviate these
14 pressures/challenges, referred to hereafter as "*pressure/challenge relieving strategies*". These
15 can be categorised into two main groups: *reactive strategies* and *proactive strategies*.
16
17
18

19
20 In terms of reactive strategies, the evidence suggests that these tend to take the form of
21 trade-offs between one sustainability initiative against another. For example, the university could
22 trade-off ensuring that all suppliers have sustainability certificates and good systems for
23 sustainability documentation to continue to use small local suppliers. The opposite may also
24 occur, when Universities depend more on national and multinational suppliers than local
25 suppliers to gain the associated advantages. In the latter case the universities may then try to gain
26 the best of both worlds by influencing its national suppliers to source from local suppliers further
27 upstream. For example, FHE5 has attempted to influence its contractor Con2 to use more local
28 suppliers, but the evidence suggests that Con2 continues to mostly source from global suppliers
29 as it is a multinational company that buys in bulk as a group.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 In terms of proactive strategies, two key examples are: working collaboratively with
39 suppliers; and joining consortiums/alliances. The former can help to reduce the conflict between
40 the financial logic of suppliers and the university sustainability requirements. As explained for
41 example by FHE5-I2 "*when you are trying to achieve all these things, it is always important to*
42 *ensure that they [caterers] fully appreciate the benefits of doing these things. ... that it is gonna*
43 *hopefully increase their business*". The latter can reduce the challenges for individual
44 universities and increase collective influence upon suppliers. As explained for example by
45 FHE2-I1: "*using the purchasing consortium is a great help, because it's for them to ensure that*
46 *our suppliers are delivering in the best way possible, whether that's in the type of vehicles that*
47 *they use or the food that they are supplying, The purchasing consortium has also engaged*
48 *with MSC (Marine Stewardship Council) to allow us to get the accreditation much more easily*".
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5.2. Downstream Institutional Complexity

Within the downstream supply chain, the institutional complexity is mainly caused by the tension between university logics (sustainability logic and financial logic) and student logics (strong sustainability logic for the SU and financial/time logics for student consumers). Thus there can be barriers for SU sustainability initiatives, which could be financial: *“so whenever we get [financial] pressure, it often back-fires straight to the university, because they are our funders, we have dabbled with trying to self-fund in the past, but that’s not something that I am particularly interested in any more, it is not really gonna work”* (C1); logistical barriers such as space: *“[there are] conflicting priorities on space”* (C1); or even bureaucracy barriers: *“the challenges are that everything takes a very long time in the university to happen, massive bureaucracy to even suggest something should be changed”* (C2). Thus, whilst ultimately there is a considerable degree of compatibility between the university’s & SU’s sustainability logic, there are also challenges that the University has responsibility to solve.

In terms of student consumers, the main challenges are affordability and engagement, due to the conflict between student financial and time logics and the university’s sustainability logic. The affordability challenge has been confirmed by students’ representatives: *“I think the concern for me right now is that students will always come back to the economic argument and say well, I would love to buy more local and sustainable food but it is more expensive, or I would love to buy more organic food and support organic farms but it is more expensive. So I think the challenge for the university is actually making the local and sustainable food options ... more affordable”* (C1). Similarly, the evidence suggests there is a need for Universities to encourage students to engage with sustainability initiatives due to conflicting time logic: *“there are a lot of competing demands on the time of students ... to have vast numbers of students coming down to the eco hub, giving up even just two hours once a year, is quite a tall order these days.”* (C1). Thus there is a challenge for the university to address these two issues, as it experiences this complexity more than other supply chain parties.

As for the upstream supply chain, the response to these downstream institutional complexity challenges can be reactive or proactive. In terms of reactive strategies, the university can transfer the challenge back to the customers. For example: *“local companies tend to charge more, and we do try to negotiate on price, asking for a reduction ... if they can, good. If they can’t, then sometimes we just accept it and pass the price onto the customer”* (FHE1-I2).

1
2
3 However the data suggest that the universities don't often use this type of strategy. There is more
4 evidence that the University uses proactive strategies to overcome these challenges. These
5 strategies are mainly focused on more open communication channels with the SU sustainability
6 groups to encourage early engagement of student consumers in sustainability initiatives to attain
7 higher levels of understanding and commitment towards these initiatives. For example: "*One of*
8 *the projects that we are working on at the moment is to remove Styrofoam containers from*
9 *campus use and looking at a reusable sandwich box and a token scheme to implement that and in*
10 *the next few weeks or months we will engage with different elements. You know, we've got*
11 *meetings with the student union ..., so almost it will become a campaign by the students so the*
12 *students are forcing the change, ... and the campaign gathers momentum, ... which is good for*
13 *us*" (FHE3-I1).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 5.3. The Impact of Institutional Complexity on SSCM

25 The findings suggest that the presence of institutional complexity in the supply chain can have a
26 direct impact on the types of SSCM practices that can be implemented. In particular, the
27 evidence illustrates that competing multiple logics at different tiers of the supply chain can limit
28 progress towards SSCM to *incremental change*, with *radical change* only occurring where there
29 is an absence of institutional complexity. Here we define incremental change as a minor change
30 that impacts only a part of the supply chain; whilst a radical change leads to a truly sustainable
31 solution that impacts many different supply chain tiers, and may even have a positive spill over
32 effect for other supply chains. To illustrate this, two examples of radical change and one example
33 of incremental change from the data are described in turn below.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In terms of radical change, a key example is the case of the 'LS5-FHE2-C2-Student
43 Consumers' supply chain, in which the use of this particular supplier is in itself argued to be a
44 radical change in SSCM practices. As explained above, LS5 is a local organic growers' co-
45 operative that aims to advocate local organic produce through proving its commercial viability.
46 LS5, as an exception from the majority of suppliers in this study, shares the same perception of
47 pressures (normative pressures) and embedded logic (sustainability logic) with FHE2 (the focal
48 organisation). As stated by LS5: "*FHE2 is a participant member in the co-op and the principle*
49 *purchaser sits on the committee of the co-op ... so they [FHE2] share the same agenda ... and*
50 *the communication is exceptionally good and it happens on a very regular scheduled basis as*
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 well as informally ...". Taking a buyer's perspective, FHE2-I2 stated: "our biggest sustainability
4 initiative is working with LS5, they grow local organic food and everything is within 50 miles
5 from [our city] ... we buy as much produce as we can from them". This initiative also is highly
6 compatible with the agenda of the SU of FHE2, as expressed by C2: "we've also got a food co-
7 op [LS5] that does a lot of work around here and brings fresh food and vegetables and sells veg
8 boxes locally sourced", thereby impacting student consumption This encouraged the SU of
9 FHE2 to put more pressure on the university to imitate this initiative in other areas of
10 procurement, as explained by C2: "So this year we managed to get the university to start using
11 the workers' rights consortium when they are getting their garments, so all the way up the supply
12 chain of the University garments, they are now fully tested that they have good working
13 conditions and they pay a fair rate". Thus, as can be seen from this example, radical change is
14 taking place throughout this supply chain, not just within one tier of the chain, and this influence
15 extends to other supply chains including garment procurement.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Another example of radical change on the supply chain level is the case of 'Con1-FHE4-
27 C4-Student Consumers' in the area of local sourcing. As stated by Con1, a British (national)
28 contractor: "the core values of our business are that: we buy local; we buy seasonal; and we buy
29 British produce to support the local economy and farmers". Thus, there is compatibility between
30 pressures perceived and the embedded logic between Con1 and its university customers
31 especially in the area of local sourcing. This has encouraged Con1 to develop its supply chain
32 structure from a centralisation structure to a decentralisation structure, thereby also impacting
33 many other supply chains in which Con1 is involved. As explained by Con1: "this decentralised
34 structure allows you to use small suppliers which allow you to have less road miles; it allows
35 you to support the local economy, support local infrastructure and all of that good sustainability
36 stuff". Thus this decentralisation structure provides a competitive advantage, as it has around
37 2500 small local suppliers who are scattered around their contracting locations across the
38 country, with different sourcing options for each main type of product at each location. This
39 allows their chefs to create more appealing menus with local food options for their consumers.
40 This also matches the agenda of FHE4's SU with regards to local sourcing.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 In terms of incremental change, the use of water fountains around the campus of FHE4 is a
54 typical example. Though water fountains had previously been available around the campus,
55 providing drinking water for students, over time the university had removed them. So the only
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 drinking water available was through the purchase of plastic water bottles. However, the students
4 started to complain, indicating that they preferred water fountains as these reduced the costs of
5 buying plastic bottles of water (financial logic) as well as saving time in going to buy those
6 bottles from the catering outlets between their lectures (time logic). So *“once they started to*
7 *complain and started campaigning, then suddenly the university said wait we may start to do*
8 *something about this ... the students I think are the most powerful thing that we have, but they*
9 *have to come together to do that to make it happen”* (FHE4-I2). And indeed, the university
10 started to re-operate the old water fountains and build new ones. Here, the financial and time
11 logics of students complemented the sustainability logic of the university which facilitated the
12 change in the upstream level of the supply chain. However, this is argued to be incremental
13 change and not radical because it was not further diffused in the upstream supply chain. The
14 university couldn't convince their contractor to completely remove plastic water bottles as they
15 are considered to be one of their most important income generators. So, in this case, the financial
16 logic of the contractor conflicts with the sustainability logic of the university, which makes the
17 sustainability development more incremental in nature.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **6. Discussion**

33
34 In comparison to the prior literature, this paper makes three key contributions, as follows:

- 35 • In terms of institutional pressures, it: identifies mimetic pressures as being relevant at the
36 focal university tier; and suggests only weak governmental pressures on focal companies
37 and suppliers;
- 38 • It suggests a mutual relationship between institutional pressures and logics;
- 39 • It provides much needed additional empirical evidence related to institutional complexity
40 by: suggesting a multiplicity of logics across the supply chain rather than a dominant
41 financial logic; suggesting that the relative importance of institutional logics can change
42 over time; and that the level of complexity impacts the extent to which changes in the drive
43 towards SSCM are either radical or incremental.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Each of these contributions is discussed in turn below, in sections 6.1 to 6.3 respectively, leading
53 to the development of three propositions that expand the prior literature on institutional theory.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

6.1. *New findings related to Institutional Pressures*

Firstly, no prior studies have identified mimetic pressures affecting the SSCM practices of universities. In contrast, prior studies focus on strong normative pressures for the focal universities (Clarke and Kouri 2009; Disterheft *et al.*, 2012). For example, the latter found social and environmental awareness/ responsibilities to be the most important driver to implement EMS in European universities. Whilst Table 4 above shows that this study also found strong normative pressures, it adds to the literature by identifying that mimetic pressures also occur due to the influence of the Green League Table and the sharing of best practices within the purchasing consortiums.

Interestingly, in this study the findings suggest very weak governmental pressures on both focal companies and suppliers, despite the existence of governmental regulations and guidelines in this context. This is in contrast to previous studies, where governmental coercive pressures have been shown to play an important role in diffusing SSCM practices (e.g., Zhu and Sarkis, 2007; Wu *et al.*, 2012). As discussed above, this may be due to: governmental standards lagging behind the universities' sustainability policies; the high level of autonomy and independence of university management from governmental interference; and the lack of governmental resources and infrastructure to diffuse and monitor sustainability practices. However, this finding could also indicate the evolution of SSCM to become a more central concern of supply chain actors, thereby making the interaction between them and the societal and market pressures sufficient drivers for sustainable development.

6.2. *A Mutual relationship between Institutional Pressures and Logics*

A second key contribution from this study is that it sheds light on the nature of the relationship between the institutional pressures and institutional logics. The extant literature has studied the shifting of institutional logics, concluding that consistent and continuous institutional pressures contribute in strengthening one institutional logic over another or creating new institutional logics (Thornton and Ocasio 1999; Reay and Hinings, 2005). However the prior literature does not suggest that existing institutional logics influence the manner in which specific institutional pressures are perceived, especially when different institutional pressures are at play. As shown in Table 7, there is some indication that the perception of the pressures may be influenced by the prevailing logics, at least in the short term. It can be argued that a current overriding

1
2
3 sustainability logic in the universities, SUs and a few exceptional suppliers makes them perceive
4 normative and mimetic pressures to be stronger than coercive pressures, i.e. it can be argued that
5 the sustainability logic makes them much more forward thinking in their practices, thereby going
6 beyond compliance with the minimum requirements as imposed by coercive pressures from
7 external parties. In contrast, in the case of the majority of suppliers where financial logic is
8 overriding, the perception of coercive pressures outweighs the perception of other normative
9 pressures. From these indicators the following proposition can be formed:

10
11
12
13
14
15 *Proposition 1: There is a mutual relationship between the institutional pressures and*
16 *institutional logics. While the institutional pressures can influence changes in the institutional*
17 *logics in the long run, embedded institutional logics can influence the perception of institutional*
18 *pressures and their strengths in the short run.*
19
20
21
22
23

24 6.3. Empirical Evidence related to Institutional Complexity

25 A third key contribution of this study is the additional empirical evidence related to the
26 theoretical concepts surrounding institutional complexity as developed by Greenwood *et al.*
27 (2011). In particular, this study suggests a multiplicity of institutional logics across the supply
28 chain. This is in contrast to prior research which has focused on empirical evidence for
29 homogeneity/isomorphism, as demonstrated by Glover *et al.* (2014) who concluded that financial
30 logic was dominant at every tier. This may be due to the inclusion of public and private sector
31 organisations in this study, whilst Glover *et al.* (2014) looked at a purely commercial supply
32 chain. Also in terms of consumers, this study has shown how a special type of supply chain
33 consumer (i.e., students) contributes to the multiplicity of institutional logics and how different
34 logics can exist within the consumers' tier as well. Arguably, all this can increase the
35 institutional complexity within the context of SSCM.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 In addition, the findings above add to the extant literature which called for further research
47 into the “dynamic patterns of complexity” (Greenwood *et al.*, 2011) by suggesting that the
48 relative importance of competing logics can become more or less prevalent over time. For
49 example, some strategies can increase the cost of implementing sustainability across the supply
50 chain, e.g. local buying may result in higher prices. This in turn can stimulate a greater focus on
51 the financial logic of the university when the costs became unacceptably high. Thus, whilst
52 responses to sustainability challenges can reduce complexity, they can also increase it.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, this study illustrates that the extent to which homogeneity and heterogeneity
4 assumptions are applicable at the supply chain level impacts the potential to achieve radical or
5 incremental change towards SSCM. This can be illustrated given that both homogeneity/
6 isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) and heterogeneity (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996;
7 Hoffman, 2001) assumptions are empirically supported at the supply chain level as conceptually
8 illustrated in Figure 3 below.
9
10
11
12

13
14 [Take in Figure 3]

15
16 As can be seen on the left hand side of Figure 3, when there is homogeneity in pressures
17 perceived and embedded logic, this can be argued to lead to a more homogenous response in
18 terms of the SSCM practices implemented. When this homogenous response is due to a
19 prevailing sustainability logic across the supply chain, this will lead to a more radical change in
20 SSCM implementation. This is illustrated by the examples of radical change given in section 5.3
21 above, in which there is evidence of homogeneity across the 'LS5-FHE2-C2-Student
22 Consumers' and the 'Con1-FHE4-C4-Student Consumers' supply chains. This has led to
23 sustainable practices across the food supply chain through substantial use of local suppliers; and
24 has also meant that SSCM practices have been extended into other supply chains, such as
25 garment procurement. Therefore it is argued that the data in this study adds to the extant
26 literature by suggesting the following proposition:
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 *Proposition 2: Where sustainability logic prevails at the supply chain level, with supply chain*
36 *actors most concerned with normative and mimetic pressures, institutional isomorphism/*
37 *homogeneity will lead to radical changes in the drive towards SSCM.*
38
39

40
41 In contrast, and as shown in the right-hand side of Figure 3, institutional theory also has the
42 ability to explain heterogeneity (Bunduchi *et al.*, 2008), which is also found in this study. The
43 heterogeneous response appears when the organisations respond to institutional pressures
44 through superficial conformity (Meyer and Rowan, 1977) or through resistance to the
45 institutional demand (Hoffman, 2001). As discussed in the previous literature the embedded
46 institutional logics in the organisations influence their response to different institutional
47 demands, given that this heterogeneity occurs when there is incompatibility between the
48 prevailing logic and specific institutional demand (Greenwood *et al.*, 2010; Greenwood *et al.*,
49 2011). Also as mentioned in the literature review above there are various impacts of different
50 institutional pressures on the response of the organisations (Clemens and Douglas, 2006; Sarkis
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

et al., 2010; Wu *et al.*, 2012). Therefore, it can be expected that different perceptions of the contending institutional pressures can result in different responses. This study adds to this extant literature by providing empirical evidence that this heterogeneity leads to more incremental changes at the supply chain level, as presented in the right side of Figure 3. As explained in section 5 of the findings above, the data suggests the existence of this heterogeneity between the universities and their suppliers and customers through their deliberate and undeliberate resistance to sustainability practices when they conflict with their prevailing logics (financial logic and time logic). However the strategies that the universities implements, as the most salient actor, to tackle the challenges caused by this complexity help to drive SSCM implementation at the supply chain level, albeit in a more incremental manner. This leads to the following proposition:

Proposition 3: Where there is a multiplicity of institutional logics in the supply chain field, with supply chain actors responding in different ways to institutional pressures, institutional heterogeneity will lead to incremental changes in the drive towards SSCM.

7. Conclusion

This study contributes to the literature, firstly, by illustrating that the institutional pressures related to SSCM can differ across the different tiers of the supply chain. In particular, it is noted that whilst suppliers experience strong coercive pressures, there is a lack of perceived coercive pressures in the university and consumer tiers of the supply chain. The data suggests that this is due to the organisational attributes of this supply chain - for example the Universities experience more of an ethical obligation and tend to be ahead of government requirements. Secondly, this study suggests that the presence of particular institutional logics lead to differing perceptions of the institutional pressures. This adds understanding to the prior literature, which tends to lack clarity in discussing the relationship between institutional logics and pressures. Thirdly, this paper provides empirical evidence, thereby increasing understanding, of the concept of institutional complexity (Greenwood *et al.*, 2011) in the context of SSCM involving multiple supply chain tiers. This complexity is due in particular to: the multiplicity of logics found across the supply chain; the way that the pressures and logics evolve over time; and the level of saliency associated with position in this inter-organisational field. Thus it is concluded that homogeneity and heterogeneity assumptions are both supported within the supply chain, and these phenomena need to be understood before diffusing SSCM practices across the tiers. In this study, the

1
2
3 University is the supply chain member that tends to absorb the challenges that arise from the
4 institutional complexity in the context of SSCM and that seeks to find strategies to overcome
5 these challenges.
6
7
8
9

10 *7.1. Managerial Implications*

11 This study can aid procurement practitioners in focal organisations to better understand the
12 reasons for different responses from supply chain actors in different tiers when they try to
13 introduce SSCM initiatives. In particular, the findings illustrate the key role that the
14 underpinning institutional logics play in SSCM implementation across the supply chain.
15 Therefore, where there is resistance to new SSCM practices, this is likely to be as a result of
16 conflict in the underlying institutional logics at the supply chain level. Thus, in the short run, the
17 focal organisation is unlikely to be successful in making radical SSCM changes and it may be
18 more realistic to first attempt to influence the institutional logics. This could be achieved, for
19 example, by training programmes run by external bodies such as the purchasing consortiums. In
20 contrast, where there is compatibility of institutional logics across the supply chain, the focal
21 organisation should focus its efforts towards its desired radical changes in SSCM practices. This
22 leads to the conclusion that a better understanding of institutional complexity will lead to better
23 designs for SSCM programs that are not only compatible with the focal organisations'
24 institutional logics, but also with the institutional logics in other tiers, thereby aiming to avoid a
25 heterogeneous response that negatively impacts SSCM implementation.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 From a customer's perspective, the findings suggest that the introduction of the Green
40 League Table for Universities (as established by the Student's Union) has become a strong
41 mimetic pressure. Thus, the findings suggest that pressures from customers that encourage
42 competition on a range of sustainability criteria can have a positive impact on SSCM practices.
43 This implies that customer groups in other contexts may also be able to exert a similar level of
44 influence through the creation of similar league tables.
45
46
47
48

49 The managerial implications for the suppliers depend on the institutional logics of those
50 suppliers – i.e. on the contextual factors related to the institutional environment. For those with a
51 dominant sustainability logic, such as LS5, the research suggests that they will need to identify
52 customers who already share the same logic or whom they can influence in order to readily
53 diffuse SSCM practices across the supply chain. For those that are resistant to new SSCM
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practices and have a dominant financial logic, it will be important for them to seek win-win
4 solutions that allow them to go some way towards implementing the changes their customers
5 require, but without compromising their financial sustainability.
6
7
8
9

10 *7.2. Limitations and Future Research*

11 A limitation of this study is its focus on food supply chains. Other product supply chains may
12 provide further insight into institutional complexity within SSCM. For example, it could be
13 expected that suppliers of other products that have a more direct and significant impact on the
14 environment (e.g. chemical products suppliers) have more compatible institutional logics with
15 focal organisation's institutional logics, which in turn reduces institutional complexity. In
16 addition, the research is limited in the extent to which it captures the student consumer
17 viewpoint, given that this viewpoint is currently based on the opinions of student union
18 representatives. It will be particularly important for future research to investigate whether the
19 student union representatives have been able to adequately represent the views of student
20 consumers. For example, direct interviews with a wide variety of student consumers may be
21 needed and/or a survey of a large number of students. Also this study is limited to the inclusion
22 of three tiers of the supply chain. To address this limitation, future research could include more
23 tiers, ideally from the upmost upstream end to the furthest downstream tier thereby including end
24 consumers, to provide a more comprehensive description of institutional complexity at the
25 supply chain level within the context of SSCM. Lastly, future research could further investigate
26 the three propositions that have been developed in the discussion section above.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Appendix**

43 Table A1 below lists the interview questions used for the focal Universities, and illustrates how
44 these questions were used to investigate the three main constructs of Institutional Pressures,
45 Institutional Logics and Institutional Complexity. Similar questions were used for the supplier
46 and customer tiers of the supply chain, though modified slightly as appropriate to the tier.
47
48
49
50

51 [Take in Table A1]
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Alford, R. R. & Friedland, R. 1985. *Powers of Theory: Capitalism, the State, and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Besharov, M. L. & Smith, W. K. 2014. Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39, 364-381.
- Bhakoo, V. & Choi, T. 2013. The iron cage exposed: Institutional pressures and heterogeneity across the healthcare supply chain. *Journal of Operations Management*, 31, 432-449.
- Bunduchi, R., Graham, I., Smart, A. & Williams, R. 2008. Homogeneity and heterogeneity in information technology private standard settings – the institutional account. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 20, 389-407.
- Carter, C.R. & Rogers, D.S. 2008. A framework of sustainable supply chain management: moving toward new theory. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 38, 360-387.
- Clarke, A. & Kouri, R. 2009. Choosing an appropriate university or college environmental management system. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 17, 971-984.
- Clemens, B. & Douglas, T. J. 2006. Does coercion drive firms to adopt ‘voluntary’ green initiatives? Relationships among coercion, superior firm resources, and voluntary green initiatives. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 483-491.
- Czinkota, M., Kaufmann, H. R. & Basile, G. 2014. The relationship between legitimacy, reputation, sustainability and branding for companies and their supply chains. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43, 91-101.
- DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W. W. 1983. The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Disterheft, A., Ferreira Da Silva Caeiro, S. S., Ramos, M. R. & De Miranda Azeiteiro, U. M. 2012. Environmental Management Systems (EMS) implementation processes and practices in European higher education institutions – Top-down versus participatory approaches. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 31, 80-90.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building Theories from Case Study Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14, 532-550.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. & Graebner, M.E. 2007. Theory building from cases: opportunities and challenges *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 25-32.
- Gawer, A. & Phillips, N. 2013. Institutional Work as Logics Shift: The Case of Intel’s Transformation to Platform Leader. *Organization Studies*, 34, 1035-1071.
- Glover, J. L., Champion, D., Daniels, K. J. & Dainty, A. J. D. 2014. An Institutional Theory perspective on sustainable practices across the dairy supply chain. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 152, 102-111.
- Greenwood, R. & Hinings, C. R. 1996. Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21, 1022-1054.
- Greenwood, R., Díaz, A. M., Li, S. X. & Lorente, J. C. 2010. The Multiplicity of Institutional Logics and the Heterogeneity of Organizational Responses. *Organization Science*, 21, 521-539.
- Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R. & Lounsbury, M. 2011. Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 317-371.

- 1
2
3
4 Grosvold, J., Hoejmose, S. U. & Roehrich, J. K. 2014. Squaring the circle: Management,
5 measurement and performance of sustainability in supply chains. *Supply Chain Management:
6 An International Journal*, 19, 292-305.
- 7 Heiskanen, E. 2002. The institutional logic of life cycle thinking. *Journal of Cleaner Production*,
8 10, 427-437.
- 9 Hoffman, A. J. 2001. Linking Organizational and Field-Level Analyses: The Diffusion of
10 Corporate Environmental Practice. *Organization & Environment*, 14, 133-156.
- 11 Ketokivi, M. & Choi, T. 2014. Renaissance of case research as a scientific method. *Journal of
12 Operations Management*, 32, 232-240.
- 13 March, J. & Olsen, J. 1984. The New Institutionalism: Organisational Factors in Political Life.
14 *American Political Science Review*, 78: 738 –49.
- 15 Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and
16 Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- 17 Miemczyk, J., Johnsen, T. E. & Macquet, M. 2012. Sustainable purchasing and supply
18 management: a structured literature review of definitions and measures at the dyad, chain and
19 network levels. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 17, 478-496.
- 20 Moxham, C. & Kauppi, K. 2014. Using organisational theories to further our understanding of
21 socially sustainable supply chains: The case of fair trade. *Supply Chain Management: An
22 International Journal*, 19, 413-420.
- 23 Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. & Saldaña, J. 2014. *Qualitative data analysis: a methods
24 sourcebook*, Los Angeles, Calif., SAGE Publications Inc.
- 25 Oglethorpe, D. & Heron, G. 2013. Testing the theory of constraints in UK local food supply
26 chains. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 33, 1346-1367.
- 27 Reay, T. & Hinings, C. R. 2005. The Recomposition of an Organizational Field: Health Care in
28 Alberta. *Organization Studies*, 26, 351-384.
- 29 Sarkis, J., Gonzalez-Torre, P. & Adenso-Diaz, B. 2010. Stakeholder pressure and the adoption of
30 environmental practices: The mediating effect of training. *Journal of Operations
31 Management*, 28, 163-176.
- 32 Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q. & Lai, K.-H. 2011. An organizational theoretic review of green supply chain
33 management literature. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 130, 1-15.
- 34 Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. 2016. *Research methods for business students*, Harlow,
35 Pearson Education.
- 36 Svensson, G. 2007. Aspects of sustainable supply chain management (SSCM): conceptual
37 framework and empirical example. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 12,
38 262-266.
- 39 Tate, W.L., Dooley, K.J. & Ellram, L.M. 2011. Transaction Cost and Institutional Drivers of
40 Supplier Adoption of Environmental Practices. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 32, 6-16.
- 41 Thornton, P.H., & Ocasio, W. 1999. Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power
42 in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–
43 1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 801–843.
- 44 Thornton, P.H. 2004. *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in
45 higher education publishing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- 46 Thornton, P.H., & Ocasio, W. 2008. Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin,
47 & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 99–129).
48 London: Sage.
- 49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Varsei, M., Soosay, C., Fahimnia, B. & Sarkis, J. 2014. Framing sustainability performance of
4 supply chains with multidimensional indicators. *Supply Chain Management: An International*
5 *Journal*, 19, 242-257.
- 6
7 Voss, C. 2009. Case Research in Operations Management. In: Karlsson, C. (ed.) *Researching*
8 *Operations Management*. 1st ed ed. New York: Routledge.
- 9
10 Wooten, M. & Hoffman, A. 2008. Organizational fields: Past, present and future. In R.
11 Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of*
12 *organizational institutionalism* (pp. 1–46). London: Sage.
- 13
14 Wu, G.-C., Ding, J.-H. & Chen, P.-S. 2012. The effects of GSCM drivers and institutional
15 pressures on GSCM practices in Taiwan's textile and apparel industry. *International Journal*
16 *of Production Economics*, 135, 618-636.
- 17
18 Wu, T., Daniel, E. M., Hinton, M. & Quintas, P. 2013. Isomorphic mechanisms in manufacturing
19 supply chains: a comparison of indigenous Chinese firms and foreign-owned MNCs. *Supply*
20 *Chain Management: An International Journal*, 18, 161-177.
- 21
22 Yin, R.K. 2009. *Case study research: design and methods*, Los Angeles, Calif., Sage
23 Publications.
- 24
25 Zhu, Q. & Sarkis, J. 2007. The moderating effects of institutional pressures on emergent green
26 supply chain practices and performance. *International Journal of Production Research*, 45,
27 4333-4355.
- 28
29 Zorzini, M., Hendry, L. C., Huq, F. A. & Stevenson, M. 2015. Socially responsible sourcing:
30 reviewing the literature and its use of theory. *International Journal of Operations &*
31 *Production Management*, 35, 60-109.
- 32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: Food and Catering Supply Chains of the five HE Institutions under study




Figure 2- Institutional Complexity in the UK HE Food and Catering Supply Chain




Figure 3: The impact of Homogeneity/ Heterogeneity on SSCM

Table 1: Organisation and Interviewee Details

| Nature of the Business | Product and Services | Position in the Supply Chain | Position of Interviewee | Number of Interviews | Length of Interviews | Reference Mnemonic |
|---|---|--|---|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| University | Higher Education Services (In-House Catering) | Focal Organisation | Procurement Manager | 1 | 1hr | FHE1-I1 |
| | | | Food Operations Manager | 1 | 1.5hr | FHE1-I2 |
| | | | Executive Head Chef | 1 | 1.75hr | FHE1-I3 |
| | | | Project Team Leader | 2 | 2hr | FHE1-I4 |
| University | Higher Education Services (In-House Catering) | Focal Organisation | Head of Hospitality & Events | 1 | 1hr | FHE2-I1 |
| | | | Executive Head Chef | 1 | 1hr | FHE2-I2 |
| University | Higher Education Services (In-House Catering) | Focal Organisation | Catering Services Manager | 1 | 1hr | FHE3-I1 |
| | | | Conference Officer | 1 | 0.5hr | FHE3-I2 |
| University | Higher Education Services (Outsourced Catering) | Focal Organisation | Procurement Officer | 1 | 1.25hr | FHE4-I1 |
| | | | Head of Catering and Conferences Services | 1 | 1hr | FHE4-I2 |
| University | Higher Education Services (Outsourced Catering) | Focal Organisation | Procurement Category Manager | 1 | 1.75hr | FHE5-I1 |
| | | | Environmental Officer | 1 | 1hr | FHE5-I2 |
| Food and Catering Consortium | Procurement Professional Services, Suppliers Frameworks | Liaison between universities and suppliers | Chief Operating Officer | 1 | 1.5hr | PC1 |
| Food and Catering Consortium | Procurement Professional Services, Suppliers Frameworks | Liaison between universities and suppliers | Specialist Adviser | 1 | 1.5hr | PC2 |
| Food and Catering Contractor | Food and Catering Services | Contractor/Supplier | Head of Sustainability Business | 1 | 1hr | Con1 |
| Catering and Facilities Management Contractor | Catering and Facilities Management Services | Contractor/Supplier | Contract Director | 1 | 1hr | Con2 |
| Fruit and Veg Wholesaler | Fruit, Vegetables, Prepared Vegetables, Milk | Tier 1 Local Supplier | Managing Director | 1 | 1hr | LS1 |
| Cheese and butters Manufacturer | Cheese, Butter, Contract Packing | Tier 1 Local Supplier | Managing Director | 1 | 0.75hr | LS2 |
| Meat and Poultry Wholesaler | Fresh Meat, Poultry, Game | Tier 1 Local Supplier | Managing Director | 1 | 1.5hr | LS3 |
| Food Grocery Wholesaler | Fruits, Vegetables, Bakery, Other | Tier 1 Local Supplier | Sales Office Supervisor | 1 | 1hr | LS4 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|-----------|----------------|--------|
| | food grocery | | | | | |
| Local Organic Growers Co-operative | Organic Vegetables and Eggs | Tier 1 Local Supplier | Co-op Worker | 1 | 1hr | LS5 |
| Food Grocery Wholesaler | Bakery, Dairy, Cheeses, Other food grocery | Tier 1 National Supplier | Sales Executive | 1 | 1.75hr | NS2 |
| Coffee Roasters and Wholesaler | Coffee, Tea, Coffee Machines, Coffee service training | Tier 1 Local Supplier | Wholesaler Manager | 1 | 1hr | LS6 |
| Meat and Poultry Wholesaler | Fresh meat, Poultry, Associated Products | Tier 1 Local Supplier | Sales Director | 1 | 1hr | LS7 |
| Food Wholesaler | Full range of frozen, grocery, chilled, wines, non-food equipment | Tier 1 National Supplier | Sector Development Manager | 1 | 1hr | NS1-I1 |
| | | | Business Manager | 1 | 0.75hr | NS1-I2 |
| Students' Representative | Running Student Sustainability Projects | Customer | Student Union Green [FHE1] Co-ordinator | 1 | 1.5hr | C1 |
| Students' Representative | Running Student Sustainability Projects | Customer | Student Union Environmental and Ethics Group Co-ordinator | 1 | 0.75hr | C2 |
| Students' Representative | Running Student Sustainability Projects | Customer | Student Union Green Ladder Project Manager | 1 | 1hr | C3 |
| Students' Representative | Running Student Sustainability Projects | Customer | Student Union Sustainability Hub Manager | 1 | 1hr | C4 |
| Students' Representative | Running Student Sustainability Projects | Customer | Student Union Green Challenge Project Lead | 1 | 0.75hr | C5-I1 |
| Students' Representative | Involved in a Student Sustainability Project | Customer | Student 'Street Food Market' Project Team Member | 1 | 0.75hr | C5-I2 |
| Totals | | | | 33 | 36.75hr | |

Table 2: Definitions of Key Institutional Theory Constructs

| Constructs | Definition | Source |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Institutional Pressures | “Mechanisms through which institutional isomorphic change occurs, each with its own antecedents”. | DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p:150) |
| Institutional Logic | “Assumptions and values, usually implicit, about how to interpret organizational reality, what constitutes appropriate behaviour, and how to succeed”. | Thornton (2004, p: 70) |
| Institutional Complexity | The metaphorical position the organisations find themselves in “whenever they confront incompatible prescriptions from multiple institutional logics”. | Greenwood <i>et al.</i> (2011, p:317) |

Table 3: Codes used for Data Analysis in NVIVO

| First-Level Codes | Second-Level Codes | Third-Level Codes |
|--|--|---|
| Institutional Pressures | Coercive Pressures | Legal Obligation |
| | | Customers' Requirements |
| | Normative Pressures | Ethical Obligation |
| | | Internal Corporate Social Responsibility |
| | | Professionalism Identity |
| | | Industry Norms |
| | Mimetic Pressures | Green League Table |
| | | Consortium Platform |
| | | Best Practices |
| | | Competition |
| Institutional Logics | Sustainability-Logic | n/a |
| | Financial-Logic | n/a |
| | Time-Logic | n/a |
| Institutional Complexity | Institutional Logic Conflicts (Causes) | Sustainability Logic versus Financial Logic |
| | | Sustainability Logic versus Time Logic |
| | Challenges (Symptoms) | Buyer Resistance |
| | | Contractor Resistance |
| | | Availability |
| | | Clients Resistance |
| | | Contradictory Needs |
| | | Cost and Affordability |
| | | Customer Sluggishness |
| | | Marketing & Communications |
| | | Local Buying & Consortium |
| | | Local Suppliers Capabilities |
| | Logistics Capabilities | |
| | Managing Complexity | Reactive Strategies |
| | | Proactive Strategies |
| | Outcomes | Radical Sustainability Development |
| Incremental Sustainability Development | | |

Table 4: Key Institutional Pressures across the Supply Chain

| Supply Chain Tier | Institutional Pressures | Sources of Pressures | Sample Quotes | Cases perceiving this pressure |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Focal Companies (Universities) | Normative | Stem from ethical obligations, internal sustainability policies, and professionalism identity and industry norms | <p><i>"The university as an organisation has to be seen to be practicing what it preaches and people expect a lot from the university in terms of leading the way on green initiatives and moving towards sustainability." (FHE1-I4)</i></p> <p><i>"It is strong pressure to pursue the professionalism trends." (FHE4-I2)</i></p> | FHE1, FHE2, FHE3, FHE4, FHE5 |
| | Mimetic | Stem from Green League Table competition and sharing the best practices within the purchasing consortiums | <p><i>"The one thing that we view helps drive stuff here at the university, and this has been a very fortunate thing for us, is that one of the university's four strategic KPIs happens to be our performance on the people and planet or in other words the universities league." (FHE5-I2)</i></p> | FHE1, FHE2, FHE3, FHE4, FHE5 |
| Suppliers | Coercive | Stem from customers' requirements | <p><i>"Our most recent initiative that really we joined up, and it's really a process of jumping through the hoops, would be the Red Tractor initiative, so we've signed up for that and I would say that was largely driven by the requirements of the University, the University is only the person that we deal with that has that requirement." (LS3-FHE1)</i></p> <p><i>"It's driven by customers, it's what they want, it's about ticking that box for the university as well, because they [the university] are driven by these environmental things - what they do towards saving carbon footprint, where they get their products from, what company they are using, to tick that box" (NS1-I1)</i></p> <p><i>"Yes definitely it [sustainability] is growing in importance. I think the reason for that is</i></p> | LS1, LS2, LS3, LS4, LS6, LS7, NS1, NS2, Con1, Con 2 |

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

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---|--|----------------|
| | | | <i>that some clients in universities, schools and colleges won't even think to do any business with anybody unless they have the accreditations and they have the potential to do things correctly ... It is driven by our clients" (Con2)</i> | |
| Customers (Students' Union) | Normative | Stem from ethical obligation and behaviours and norms changes | <i>"... there is a social norm for it. For example if something is perceived as the standard and if the conscience is raised about these issues, people start shifting their behaviours." (C1)</i> | C1, C3, C4, C5 |

Table 5: Key Institutional Logics across the Supply Chain

| Supply Chain Tier | Institutional Logics | Sample Quotes | Cases with this prevailing logic |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Focal Companies (Universities) | Sustainability Logic | <i>"Before, our emphasis was more about the cost than concern about where they get their food from, but in the last five or six years the emphasis has been changed and sustainability is much stronger." (FHE4-I1)</i> | FHE1, FHE2, FHE3, FHE4, FHE5 |
| | Financial Logic | <i>"We use the policy [attached] as a guide line, but also it has got to be commercially viable, we don't do it at any cost because we can't because we would be questioned on that, because whilst catering is subsidised to a certain degree, it would be wrong if everything was organic at the expense of us having to charge students a lot of money for whatever they are buying, so yes it should be a balance really". (FHE2-I1)</i> | FHE1, FHE2, FHE3, FHE4, FHE5 |
| Suppliers | Financial Logic | <i>"Well, it's [sustainability] always there, it's always relevant, but ultimately it has to make business sense for what we are doing. If it is making business sense then we will pursue it, if it costs money to do it or there is no return on our investment, there's no sense in looking at it." (LS2)</i> | LS1, LS2, LS3, LS4, LS6, LS7, N1, N2, Con1, Con2 |
| Customers (Students' Union) | Sustainability Logic | <i>"Our main idea is to engage [FHE5's] students with sustainability - environmental, social and economic initiatives. We help students to start their own sustainability projects and we opened that up for staff and academics as well in the second year of the project". (C5)</i> | C1, C2, C3, C4, C5 |
| Student Consumers | Financial Logic | <i>"We have a convenience store and whenever we try to put for example organic eggs or free range students complain because they want the choice to have a lower price. So the price is really what matter to students." (C4)</i> | C1, C2, C3, C4, C5 |
| | Time Logic | <i>"I think the key problem we have is that there are a lot of competing demands on the time of students. There are a lot of things they need to do, course works, assignments, dissertations, going out socialising, etc. etc., clubs and societies and there are so many of them!" (C1)</i> | C1, C2, C3, C4, C5 |

Table 6: Definitions of the Institutional Logics Identified

| Institutional Logics | Definition |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Sustainability Logic | <i>Aiming at the Triple Bottom Line – with a balanced attitude towards environmental, social and economic sustainability</i> |
| Financial Logic | <i>Main focus on profitability, and only concerned with sustainability if it leads to greater sales or reduced costs. From a customers' perspective, main concern with affordability of purchases</i> |
| Time Logic | <i>Concern regarding extra time needed to engage with particular initiatives e.g. to engage with the planting and growing of crops for consumption in the Edible Campus initiatives used in FHE1 and FHE5</i> |

Table 7: Cross-tier analysis of Institutional Pressures and Logics in the UK HE food and catering supply chain

| | Supply Chain Tier | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| | Supplier | Focal Universities | Customers (SU) | Student Consumers |
| Pressures: | | | | |
| Normative | Weak (but exceptions) | Strong | Medium | n/a |
| Mimetic | Weak (but exceptions) | Strong | Weak | n/a |
| Coercive | Strong | Weak | Weak | n/a |
| Logics: | | | | |
| Sustainability Logic | Weak (but exceptions) | Strong | Strong | Weak (but exceptions) |
| Financial Logic | Very Strong | Medium | Weak | Strong |
| Time Logic | n/a | n/a | Weak | Strong |

Table 8: Institutional Complexity – evidence of conflicting institutional logics

| Institutional Logics Conflicts (Institutional Complexity Causes) | Sample Quotes |
|--|---|
| Upstream Supply Chain: Suppliers' Financial Logic vs Universities' Sustainability Logic | <p><i>"But I think that's difficult when I can't come up with those benefits well enough. I'll give you an example in the case of bottles of water. One of our objectives is always to eliminate plastic water bottles on this campus, it's a huge challenge because it is difficult to argue the case with caterers because it's like one of their biggest profit makers. So it's hard when they just automatically turn off and don't want to know and they don't want to even participate in thoughts or any kind of creative thinking about what we can do to maybe supplement that income in another way. So it is like playing politics really, influencing people and making them see the benefits of things. (FHE4-I2)</i></p> <p><i>"With all the catering companies that I have worked with, at the end of the day they look after their own pocket and their own company and all of that". (FHE5-I2)</i></p> <p><i>"And sometimes it can be quite difficult, especially with small artisan producers, they don't have the invoicing structure, they are not quite as slick as maybe the big companies are, so that can be quite a challenge as well (especially in terms of applying for accreditations), they might just have hand written invoices". (FHE2-I1)</i></p> |
| Downstream Supply Chain: Student Union's Sustainability Logic vs University's Financial Logic Student Consumers' Financial Logic vs University's/Student Union's Sustainability Logic | <p><i>"Also the challenge is when the budget comes and people, departments or areas don't have money to do something different. So if you have only paper plates but you wanna go to reusable then you have to think that I have to buy a dishwasher and then I gonna have extra time to wash and I want to put a system in place that people don't steal the cutlery and dishes. So at the end of the day you calculate the short term cost of things and not having a full cost. But on the other hand that area has to pay for their waste, so for example if they can save in the garbage that might offset some of the cost. So a thing like full cost accounting is needed". (C4)</i></p> <p><i>"Another challenge would be obviously to convince the University that this is a core project that they want to invest in and give away that space, because we want to do it outside the building but it will be still within the University properties". (C5-I2)</i></p> <p><i>"Conflicting priorities on space, although a good compromise has been found. We have got 100 British native fruit trees on campus right now, we would like to have 1000 in 10 years' time. There is no reason why universities shouldn't be world leaders in showing that actually the urban design should include edible landscaping within it. People can go and pick the fruit for free, but in the future plan it could be supplied to the university in 5-10 years' time." (C1)</i></p> <p><i>"I think the concern for me right now is that students will always come back to the economic argument and say well, I would love to buy more local and sustainable food but it is more expensive, or I would love to buy more organic food and support organic farms but it is more expensive. So I think the challenge for the university is actually making the local and sustainable food options that are coming on board through university catering more affordable". (C1)</i></p> <p><i>"And we also ask questions about [whether customers are] ...prepared to pay a premium for Fairtrade produce and organic produce? The majority of them say not. So it's a difficult one. I think it is important that we do take on board the green agenda and promote it, but we also have got to be mindful that people can't afford it. So there is a need to have some alternatives". (FHE4-I2)</i></p> <p><i>"There is a demand for it [fair trade and organic], they want it, but they don't want to pay for it, so you have to say hold on a minute, there is a cost to it, so it's getting that across and finding a way round it". (FHE2-I2)</i></p> |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Student Consumers' Time Logic vs University's/Student Union's Sustainability Logic</p> | <p><i>"So they [the students] can get quite vocal but when it comes down to actually turning that into action, it's quite difficult, they love to complain but they don't want to step up and try to do a bit more on that". (FHE5-I2)</i></p> <p><i>"I think the key problem we have is that there are a lot of competing demands on the time of students. There are a lot of things they need to do, course works, assignments, dissertations, going out socialising, etc. etc., clubs and societies and there are so many of them!" (C1)</i></p> |
|---|---|

Table A1: Interview questions for the focal organisations, and their links to the main constructs

| Interview Questions | Constructs Measured | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| | Institutional Pressures | Institutional Logics | Institutional Complexity |
| <u>Questions for Implementation of Current Sustainability Initiatives:</u> | | | |
| 1- What are the current sustainability initiatives (environmental & social initiatives) that you are implementing in the food and catering procurement section? | | | |
| 2- Why have these initiatives been selected? | √ | √ | |
| 3- What are the main pressures and drivers behind having a sustainable food and catering service? | √ | | |
| 4- Did you experience any resistance or difficulty from your buyers towards implementation of these initiatives? If yes, how did you deal with it? | | | √ |
| 5- Do you have any principles/guidelines/criteria to use when making difficult decisions on which supplier to use? (e.g. choosing between a green/expensive supplier and a cheaper less sustainable alternative)? If not, do you think that some guidelines would be useful? | | | √ |
| 6- What is the impact of these sustainable initiatives on financial performance of the university/procurement department in the short-term/long-term? Would you please give us some numerical examples? | | | √ |
| 7- What are the enablers that help in the implementation of your sustainability agenda? | | √ | √ |
| 8- What are the challenges or barriers that hinder the implementation or success of your sustainability agenda? | | √ | √ |
| 9- Who are your stakeholders in relation to your procurement function? | √ | √ | √ |
| 10- Did you experience any pressure from your stakeholders to implement the current sustainable initiatives including dealing with or selecting sustainable suppliers? And how did you satisfy your stakeholders by these initiatives? And how do you communicate these initiatives to your stakeholders? | √ | | |

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------|
| <p>11- Have you been offered any kind of incentives or fund from your stakeholders to implement the current sustainable initiatives or to develop your suppliers to be sustainable?</p> <p>12- Are there any governmental regulations or pressures that you try to satisfy or meet by implementing these current initiatives (e.g., Government Buying Standards (GBS))?</p> <p>13- Do you have/plan to have any recognized certification in relation to sustainability performance (e.g. ISO 14001; Green League Table)? If yes, why do you see it as being important? If not, why do you think it is not important?</p> <p>14- Do you think that the increasing trend for using sustainability initiatives in many areas in the HE sector has a role for driving you to implement these current sustainable procurement initiatives? If so, what specific trends have influenced you?</p> <p>15- Do you set or plan to set any other organizations as benchmarks for your sustainability practices? If yes, are they in the HE sector or other sectors and how do you find this useful? If no, why not?</p> | <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> | <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> | |
| <p><u>Questions for Relationship with suppliers:</u></p> <p>1- Would you please give us an overview about your suppliers (their numbers, categories, sizes, locations ... etc)?</p> <p>2- What is the nature of the contract with the suppliers included in the framework?</p> <p>3- How is sustainability being incorporated into selecting your suppliers as well as into tenders' events? And what are the tools being used in that (e.g. Self-assessment questionnaire, visiting suppliers' factories, etc)?</p> <p>4- How do you define local sourcing practices? And what is the percentage of local suppliers in your total number of suppliers?</p> <p>5- What are the sustainability (environmental, social and economic) and business advantages of using local suppliers?</p> <p>6- What are the challenges of using local suppliers?</p> <p>7- What do you think about the total cost of local suppliers (including prices,</p> | <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> | <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> | <p>√</p> <p>√</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| transportations ... etc) comparing to other big-national suppliers? | | | |
| 8- Did you experience any resistance from your suppliers regarding these sustainable initiatives? If yes, how did you deal with it? | | | √ |
| 9- Do you feel a sense of accountability for your suppliers' environmental and social practices? And if yes, why? And how is this accountability extended to multiple tiers across the existing supply chain? | | √ | √ |
| 10- Do you have influence upon your suppliers regarding their sustainability practices? And if yes, what is the degree and the extent of this influence across the supply chain? And how do you exert influence? | √ | | |
| 11- To what extent do you communicate and share information with your suppliers regarding your sustainability initiative? And do you think that this is considered an important factor in the successful implementation of sustainability initiatives? And is there any difference in this between local suppliers and big-national suppliers? | | √ | √ |
| 12- Do you employ any kind of supplier development or collaboration (e.g. training courses, consultancy support) regarding sustainability practices? If yes, can you give us examples and explain their benefits? If no, do you think it will be useful to start such programs? And is there any difference in this between local suppliers and big-national suppliers? | | √ | √ |
| 13- How do you continuously monitor your suppliers' sustainability practices? What are the difficulties, if there are any, that you face in monitoring them? | | | √ |
| 14- Are there any other ways in which you motivate your suppliers to continue to be sustainable? | | | √ |