

TITLE: A transition from neo-capitalist approach towards sustainable capitalist approach: a systematic qualitative review of the new institutional research

Authors

Anna John

D1 Michael Young Building
Business School
Faculty of Business and Law
Open University
Milton Keynes MK76AA
Email: anna.john@open.ac.uk

Wilhelm Johan Coetsee

Liverpool Business School
Faculty of Business and Law
Liverpool John Moores University
Merseyside Liverpool L3 5YG
Email: w.j.coetsee@ljmu.ac.uk

Patrick Flood

Business School
Dublin City University
Dublin – Ireland
Email: Patrick.flood@dcu.ie

Abstract

In this study, we aspire to contribute to the central themes of the Annual British Academy of Management Conference 2023: institutional engendering of sustainability and sustainability-driven change in organisations. We are particularly interested in adding value to discussions on emerging strategic perspectives of the sustainability phenomenon in the Strategy SIG of the BAM Community. With this in mind, we aim at developing a better understanding of the new institutionalist perspective of a rising phenomenon—strategic transitions of organisations from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainable capitalist approaches.

Introduction

In this study, we aspire to contribute to the central themes of the Annual British Academy of Management Conference: institutional engendering of sustainability and sustainability-driven change in organisations. We are particularly interested in adding value to discussions on emerging strategic perspectives of the sustainability phenomenon in the Strategy SIG of the BAM Community. With this in mind, we aim at developing a better understanding of the new institutionalist perspective of a rising phenomenon—strategic transitions of organisations from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainable capitalist approaches.

These transitions suggest that organisations shift away from neo-capitalistic priorities such as short-term profit maximization and satisfaction of shareholders to sustainability priorities such as achieving a delicate balance among 3P (people, profit, and planet) (John, Coetsee and Flood 2022). Nowadays, practitioners view decisions about such transitions as complex and having ambiguous implications as they rely on various assumptions about the role of contextual and temporal factors, potential outcome and value considerations, and mechanisms enabling these decisions (Stefes and Hager, 2020; Meckling and Hughes, 2018; Fischer and Newig 2016; Andrews-Speed 2016). To date, the new institutional literatures offer multiple views with some rather fragmented advice on how practitioners could tackle possible transitions from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainability approaches (Lockwood, Kuzemko, Mitchell and Hoggett 2017). Therefore, our motivation is to integrate these fragmented literatures, with an objective to offer a more coherent advice for organisations aspiring to move towards sustainability approaches.

Arguably, sustainable capitalism has now reached its turning point when it is impossible to ignore its strategic role for organisations (Murrey 2022). These recent dynamics suggest that it is the right timing for developing a more nuanced understanding of how organisations can transition from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainable approaches. Indeed, until recently, many organisations have continued to cling more closely towards a well-established neo-capitalist approach—the one where profit maximization and satisfaction of shareholders are primary objectives (Murrey 2022). However, this trend has started to change recently suggesting that organisations can no longer disregard pro-sustainability institutionalisation—the formation of pressures, processes and mechanisms which jointly lead to the development of sustainability-driven institutions including sustainability-focused media and social networks, legislation and regulatory frameworks, professional standards, and organisations and alliances promoting sustainability (Murrey 2022). In response to such institutionalisation, many organisations have made a half-way move on the sustainability continuum by engaging in greenwashing and philanthropic practices (John, Flood and Coetsee, 2022). We have also witnessed some more extreme responses such as Patagonia, a fashion firm, being given away in a philanthropic gesture by its owner, to its employees to further stimulate employees to fight a climate change (Leggett, 2022).

Our synthesis suggests that this institutional change has been triggered by the growing power of activist social movements. We argue that such activists may be perceived of as a unique force which stimulates pro-sustainability synergies. With this in mind, we coin activists to be institutional catalysts. Our contribution in this paper comes from exploring the idea of activists as catalysts of a paradigmatic shift, or a mindset change, forcing organisations to consider transitioning to a sustainable capitalist approach to strategies. By this, we address a key research question exploring how institutional catalysts such as activists enable synergies among forces, processes and mechanisms pertaining to pro-sustainability transitions. Drawing on this, our synthesis proposes a new institutional catalyst perspective for further research into strategic transitions towards sustainable capitalist approaches.

An additional remark should be made about positioning of this review. Theoretically, it builds upon prominent studies developing a new institutional perspective (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; North, 1992; Thelen, 1999; Arrow, 1995; Jensen and Meckling, 1976; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Greenwood et al., 2017). Regarding the existing review work, our synthesis does not overlap with any previously developed reviews; however, it may be seen as a complementary work adding value to the following studies (Risi *et al.*, 2022; Munck *et al.*, 2014). For instance, it continues their discussion about responses of organisations to institutionalisation of sustainability practices. To this end, our review may be conceived of as a bridge to the future research into an emerging issue of institutional influence of organisations and their capacity to shape institutions to their benefit.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. First, we discuss a research design including a process of data collection, an approach to data analysis, and a theoretical synthesis. Second, we discuss the theoretical findings of our synthesis. The final section of the paper focuses on conclusions presenting our theoretical contributions to the new institutionalist perspective of transitions from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainability approaches to strategy.

Research design

Methodological approach

We adopt a systematic qualitative review approach in this paper. Drawing on recommendations of Breslin and Gatrell (2023), we begin theorising in our literature review with a miner strategy—the one where prior research is analysed to assign studies to broader theoretical domains—and then proceed with a prospector strategy—the one where the suggested domains are synthesized to set up a new research perspective or a new domain.

Also, the systematic nature of a review implies that it can be performed in a rigorous way by adhering to the principles of transparency, inclusivity, explanatory and heuristic. Using procedures from Denyer and Tranfield (2009) and Denyer *et al.* (2008), we adhere to the rigour principles by following a series of clearly defined steps. These are described in the next section—dealing with research process.

Research process

The research process comprised three steps. In the first step, we created ontological, theoretical, temporal, and quality boundaries of our review sample and performed a literature search based on keywords reflecting these boundaries. Ontologically, our interest was on the phenomenon of transitions from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainable capitalist approaches. We considered such transitions from a strategic management perspective. Theoretically, our inquiry is limited to the new institutional research.

Temporally, we investigated studies published from 1987 onwards. We chose year 1987 as the starting point for two reasons. First, that was the year when a term sustainable development was used for the first time. Second, by that time, new institutional systems had started to emerge. For example, many former colonies in Africa and Asia had become independent states and had begun their institutional development in the new capacity. Also, by that time, a new institutional order had started to emerge in the Central and Eastern European space.

Regarding the quality boundaries, our focus was on studies with greater methodological rigour, research impact and citations. To achieve this objective, we sampled studies based on the three criteria: (1) being published in peer-reviewed journals ranking 2* and above in the AJG 2021 journal rankings of the Chartered Association of Business Schools, (2) being published in journals with an impact factor above 1 in Thomson Reuters Journal Citations Rankings 2022 and (3) being published in

sources included into Q1 (top 25%) and Q2 (25-50%) percentiles in citations in Scopus database presenting peer-reviewed research.

We further performed literature searches in the Scopus database. We used the following keywords and their combinations to source papers for our sample: capitalism, neo-capitalist, sustainable, sustainability, strategic management, institutional theory, and new institutionalism. The search generated 1123 publications. Having used the review boundaries, we scanned titles and abstracts of these publications and sampled 82 studies relevant for our review. So far, we have examined 67 publications, with 15 more studies are yet to be explored. Lists of the selected journals, articles and books may be presented upon request.

In the second step, we adopted a miner strategy (Breslin and Gatrell 2023) to perform analyses of studies selected for the review. That was the stage where we assigned studies to domains, with each having a distinctive theoretical perspective. We further explored each of the suggested domains by using a within domain analysis. Then, a cross-domain analysis is performed to compare the domains and examine possible theoretical contradictions and complementarities which might affect further theorising in the area.

In the third step, we adopted a prospector strategy (Breslin and Gatrell 2023) by performing a theoretical synthesis the suggested domains to propose a new domain—institutional catalyst—for the new institutional research into transitions from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainability approaches. The new domain is expected to complement prior research by resolving some of its questions.

Within domain analysis

In this section, we take a close look at the domains—*isomorphism*, *agency*, *path dependence* and *social movements*—we have found to be the key literature streams in the new institutional research into transitions from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainability approaches to strategy. Our analysis centres on the key features pertaining to each domain.

Isomorphism

Ontologically, the *isomorphism* domain focuses on isomorphic pressures introduced by the new institutional theory. It suggests that organisations move to sustainability approaches by responding to coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures in their respective institutional fields. For instance, they respond to coercive pressures by obeying law and regulations enforcing sustainability practices. Likewise, they react to normative pressures taking form of pro-sustainability norms and standards set by various social actors such as professional groups, media, and activists. Finally, they act in response to mimetic pressures such as best sustainability practices of leading organisations.

This domain makes several assumptions which cut across the value issue, context and temporal perspective, strategy, and mechanisms. Regarding the value issue, this centres on legitimacy. That is, by responding to pro-sustainability pressures organisations achieve their desired outcome—legitimacy, or appropriateness—which guarantees their existence and continuity in the institutional field. Also, this domain assumes that organisations' change decisions are made in a context where new institutions are in place and they serve as an 'iron cage', or constraints shaping legitimate ways of working. These conditions are characterised by an institutional determinism where organisations have no control over institutional processes. Instead, they passively respond to new institutional pressures and follow an adaptive strategy whereby they conform to the newly established institutional arrangements (Dorobantu et al., 2017).

These assumptions determine an overarching hypothesis of the domain. This states that, aiming to achieve legitimacy, organisations change by following isomorphic mechanisms whereby they become gradually more homogeneous, or increasingly similar to each other, in their sustainability approaches. In sum, organisations do not challenge the new institutional context. They passively accept it and adapt to it. In this process of institutional adaptation, their strategic mindsets begin to converge revealing a legitimate way to achieving sustainability.

Path Dependency

Drawing on historical institutionalism (Thelen, 1999), this domain considers transitions from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainability approaches as processes unfolding as sequences of path disruptions (rapid changes) and path developments (stability), an idea similar to the notion of punctuated equilibrium. In this domain, path disruptions take form of critical junctures—turning points, or periods of rapid changes, when organisations adopt a future path, be it a decision to proceed with a neo-capitalist approach or a decision to move towards a sustainability approach. For instance, critical junctures of sustainable strategies of building organisations took form of policy decisions on housing in Saudi Arabia (Al Mulhim et al., 2022) and low carbon emissions in Canada (Sorensen and Brenner, 2021).

A path disruption period is followed by a period of stability, or path development (Thelen, 1999). That is, having moved to a new path at a critical juncture, an organisation finds itself on a new historical trajectory. This trajectory makes the adopted path irreversible, hence path dependency is created. For instance, Unilever's recent commitment to sustainability is deeply engrained into its historical development (John, Coetsee and Flood 2022). In fact, the company emerged as a business with sustainability at the core of its mission. Since then, it remained locked on a path leading it towards being a more sustainable organisation, sometimes even at the expense of its financial performance (Naidu and Kerber, 2022).

The path dependency research makes assumptions about the value issue, context, strategy, and mechanisms. Its value issue places an emphasis on legacy, or corporate heritage, of organisations. Therefore, transitions to sustainability in this domain are explained as processes motivated by legacy-related priorities such as corporate reputation, corporate identity, and corporate brand image.

The domain explores contexts undergoing disruptions which shake the existing institutional order and therefore shape decisions about possible pro-sustainability moves. Temporally, such contexts may be found during a wave, or a series of waves, of pro-sustainability institutionalisation. The domain assumes institutional determinism where organisations have no control over institutionalisation. They do not challenge the emerging institutional trends. Instead, they passively conform to them by adopting one of the emerging institutional pathways; hence the strategic emphasis on adapting to the changing conditions (Dorobantu et al., 2017).

These assumptions suggest an overarching hypothesis of the domain. It posits that, aiming at developing their corporate sustainability legacy, organisations evolve by navigating along emerging critical junctures—turning points uncovering possible irreversible paths on a neo-capitalist-sustainability continuum. Inherent to this legacy-driven change process is equifinality, or convergence of strategic intentions among companies (ends) which they achieve via heterogeneous pathways (means), with each being a product of a unique historical development.

Agency

This domain refers to a rational choice institutional perspective (Jensen and Meckling, 1976; Knight, 1992; Arrow, 1995) and benefits from advances in the institutional entrepreneurship literature to

explore the role of agency forces driving transitions of organisations from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainable approaches. In its studies, agency forces are agents, or actors, influencing an organisation's strategic approach needed to adapt to the changing 'rules of game', or formal and informal institutional arrangements about ways of working (Woolthuis et al., 2013; Dean and McMullen (2007). Agents may be exogenous or endogenous to an organisation and have a triple role influencing the organisation's institutional field: disruption of old institutions, creation of new institutions and maintenance of existing institutions (Risi *et al.*, 2023). To date, the agency domain has centred largely on how agents maintain emerging pro-sustainability institutions. This view of agency differs somewhat from the classic agency view.

The agency domain makes several assumptions about value, structural and temporal context, strategy, and mechanisms underlying the pro-sustainability moves of organisations. Regarding the value of moves towards sustainable approaches, this comes from the notion of economic rationality, or more specifically, efficiency of conforming to emerging rules of game prioritising sustainability. In other words, organisations may incur transaction costs and therefore suffer from inefficiency if they do not adapt to the growing pro-sustainability institutions. That is, the need to achieve higher economic efficiency makes it impossible for organisations to disregard the newly formed rules of game. For example, this may be in the cases of green investing and cheaper funds being made available to green companies.

The agency domain makes two contextual assumptions. Temporally, change making decisions in organisations take place during an increasing pro-sustainability institutionalisation, or when new institutions started to emerge. They have not reached the maturity stage; however, some key rules of game have already formed; hence a possibility of convergence in decisions of organisations to commit to sustainable approaches.

As pro-sustainability institutionalisation gains pace, the structural context becomes less uncertain for organisations adopting the emerging rules of game (Garud, Hardy and Maguire 2007; North, 1992). However, organisations may find themselves in the conditions of uncertainty and therefore incur transaction costs if they choose not to conform to, and deviate from, the newly established rules of game (Garud, Hardy and Maguire 2007; North, 1992). By contrast, the institutional conformity helps organisations to reduce uncertainty and lessen potential inefficiencies (North, 1992).

The agency research assumes that, in its contextual conditions, strategies are designed to help organisations to adapt to the changing institutions (Dorobantu et al., 2017). The adaptive strategies are enabled by means of enforcement mechanisms—those which lead to further strengthening of the new institutional system. Indeed, as they react to the agency-driven institutionalisation, organisations start adopting the emerging rules of game and, by doing so, they contribute to the enforcement of the new institutional system.

These assumptions support an overarching hypothesis of the domain. This states that, aiming to achieve efficiency, organisations change in response to agency forces by adopting 'rules of game' underlying the growing institutionalisation of sustainability. In this hypothesis, the agency research has devoted greater attention to the fact that, as organisations adopt the same rules of game, their strategic priorities begin to converge on sustainability and any deviation from sustainability principles may cause inefficiency. Therefore, inherent in this domain has been an emphasis on the converging cycle of the sustainability-driven institutionalisation.

Social movements

This domain refers to social movement theory to explore how social collective forces shape decisions of organisation to transition from neo-capitalist to sustainability approaches to strategy (Schneiberg and Lounsbury 2008). Initially, social movements were seen as exogenous forces, those which form and exist beyond an organisation's boundaries (Jennings and Zandbergen, 1995). However, more recently, this view has changed suggesting that social movements may also be endogenous, or form and exist within an organisation. Also, some studies have proposed a possibility of internalising social movements in Unilever and Patagonia (John, Coetsee and Flood, 2022; Carberry *et al.* 2019).

This domain makes several assumptions. First, the value of moving to sustainability approaches lies in the survival of organisations. Its structural context is characterised by an increased activity of social movements (Carberry, 2019). Temporally, this domain looks farther back in time. Therefore, its temporal context suggests that a change making decision takes place when new institutions are about to emerge. At this stage, social movements may serve as destructive forces—those breaking away from the existing institutional arrangements (e. g. institutions underpinning a neo-capitalist approach to strategy). Alternatively, social movements may serve as constructive forces—those helping to create new institutional arrangements (e. g. institutions underpinning a sustainability approach to strategy) as additions to an existing institutional platform (e. g. institutions underpinning neo-capitalist approach to strategy).

The relational context reflects a context-organisation relation. In it, organisations play an active role in the context. These conditions may be conceived of as institutional reactance—a state where instead of passively conforming to the newly established institutions, organisations may contest, or contribute to the creation of, new institutions. Given this relational context, organisations may pursue either a contestation strategy, aimed at contesting institutional objectives of social movements, or an additive strategy, aimed at supporting institutional objectives of social movements (Dorobantu *et al.*, 2017). Both strategies are enabled by a coping mechanism—the one where organisations deliberately learn how to better manage social movements.

These assumptions suggest an overarching hypothesis in the domain. It posits that, aiming to survive, organisations change by contesting or complementing destructive paths (those set by social movements to break away from the existing institutional arrangements) or constructive paths (those set by social movements to embark on the new institutional arrangements).

The findings from the within domain analysis are presented in Table 1.

Cross domain analysis

In this section, we perform a cross-domain analysis by adapting a model developed by John, Coetsee and Flood (2022) called the 4S model. This model includes the following four criteria: span, scope, scale, and speed. The purpose of this model is to show how a sustainability strategy can be implemented.

Span: extending temporal horizons

Our review suggests that transitions from neo-capitalist to sustainability approaches may unfold as diverging and converging institutionalisation processes. During the diverging periods, organisations break away from old institutions. During the converging periods, organisations adapt to new institutions. To date, the preponderance of new institutional studies, especially, those in the isomorphism, path dependency and agency domains have focused on converging periods—those when many pro-sustainability institutions have established or started to emerge. However, the social

movement domain has extended its focus to strategies taking place during the diverging cycles, when many neo-capitalist institutions became challenged. Our review challenges this exclusive focus on diverging and converging phases of pro-sustainability institutionalisation. We suggest that the need to address processes happens between diverging and converging periods of institutional systems. By this, we propose to explore a phase of liminality—a state when the existing institutions prove to be futile but new ones have not yet developed. Therefore, we suggest exploring institutional liminality as a way of extending the temporal horizons in the new institutional research into transitions from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainable capitalist approaches.

Scope: extending to new contexts

The structural context of the four domains reflects mainly partial institutional changes. This implies that, at any given period, there are no substantial institutional voids and that organisations do not experience considerable institutional disruptions. In other words, there is an assumption of a relative institutional continuity. The post-pandemic literature in strategic management suggests that this may not always be the case and that some large-scale disruptions may undermine the whole institutional system. With this in mind, we encourage research into pro-sustainability changes in the conditions of large-scale disturbances to institutional systems.

Scale: extending organisational boundaries

By and large, the new institutional research places a greater emphasis on the institutional exogeneity, an idea that institutions are beyond boundaries of organisations. For example, the isomorphism domain considers isomorphic pressures for sustainability as external to organisations. Likewise, the path dependency domain views critical junctures as turning points triggered by events beyond organisations' control. Additionally, the agency domain conceives of agents as external forces. Although it does not reject a possibility of endogeneity of social movements, the social movement domain does not fully explain how organisations could internalise social collective forces given their size and the need to coordinate them within an organisation. We propose addressing this problem by developing a new research domain which could explain the institutional internalisation process.

Speed: extending control over pace

The new institutional domain de-emphasizes the control over pace of institutionalisation. Drawing on historical institutionalism, the path dependency domain devotes greater attention to the timing of institutional processes. However, it does not explain how organisations could manage the pace of pro-sustainability institutionalisation. For example, it is not clear how they could influence the acceleration or deceleration of institutional changes and by this manage the pace of their own transition. This is an additional vast area to be addressed in a new research domain.

Theoretical synthesis: a new domain proposal

Based on our findings from the 4S Cross-Domain Analysis, we propose a new research domain which might help to address the emerging agenda in the new institutional research into transitions from neo-capitalist to sustainability approaches to strategy. We coin this domain Institutional Catalyst. This domain is expected to focus on institutional catalysts—accelerators or decelerators of mechanisms whereby processes lead to certain outcomes in a particular institutional context (Table 1).

The institutional catalyst domain may have the following assumption for the future theorising. The value issue centres on synergies of legitimacy, legacy, efficiency leading to resilience. Its structural context is characterised by liminality—the state where old institutional arrangements no longer work, and the new ones have not been created yet. The relational context will reflect institutional influence—the conditions where organisations are proactive in relation to the context and may shape

it to their benefit. As for the temporal context, pro-sustainability actions take place under the conditions of liminality, or when the existing institutions prove to be futile, and the new institutions have not started to emerge yet. In this context, organisations may pursue transformative strategies which might re-shape much of the institutional arrangements to their benefit (Dorobantu et al., 2017). These strategies are enabled by an internalisation mechanism whereby organisations bring in catalysts (e. g. activists, individuals, collectives, processes).

These assumptions suggest an overarching hypothesis of the domain. This states that, aiming to achieve pro-sustainability synergies (legitimacy*legacy*efficiency), organisations change by internalising institutional catalysts

Conclusions

The new domain—institutional catalyst—requires further theoretical development. In this, it may benefit from intensive and extensive theorisation. Regarding the intensive theorisation, it may build upon the most recent developments and synthesis of the existing new institutional perspectives— isomorphism, agency, path dependency and social movements. References to areas beyond the research into sustainable approaches to strategy may be particularly useful in this case.

Regarding the extensive theorisation, this may benefit from cross-theory integration. Specifically, its major phenomenon—internalisation dynamics—may be explained by using the new institutional perspective in conjunction with other theoretical perspectives. For instance, it might draw on resource-based view and dynamic capabilities view to explore capabilities underpinning internalisation processes. This may be useful for developing a better understanding of how organisations make sense of potential institutional catalysts and seize opportunities to internalize them.

This paper is work in progress and, due to word count limit, we could not include all the methodological developments. For example, we have a list of studies and their sources. This list may be presented upon request.

Table 1: Synthesis of new institutional domains explaining an organisation's transition from neo-capitalist approaches to sustainable capitalist approaches

Elements of theorising	Isomorphism*	Path dependency*	Agency*	Social movements*	Institutional Catalyst**
Ontological bases	Isomorphic mechanisms, with an emphasis on new institutional theory	Processes shaped by critical junctures and path dependency, with an emphasis on historical institutionalism	Agency forces, with an emphasis on rational choice institutionalism	External social collective forces, with an emphasis on social movement theory	Catalysts—accelerators or decelerators of mechanisms whereby processes lead to certain outcomes in a particular institutional context
Hypothesis	Aiming to achieve legitimacy, organisations change by following isomorphic mechanisms whereby they become more homogeneous	Aiming at developing their corporate legacy, organisations change by navigating along emerging critical junctures—turning points uncovering possible irreversible paths	Aiming to achieve efficiency, organisations change in response to agency forces by adopting 'rules of game' pertaining to their institutional context	Aiming to survive, organisations change by contesting or complementing destructive paths (those set by social movements to break away from the existing institutional arrangements) or constructive paths (those set by social movements to embark on the new institutional arrangements)	Aiming to achieve pro-sustainability synergies (legitimacy*efficiency*uncertainty reduction), organisations change by internalising institutional catalysts
Looking back (critique)	It criticises the emphasis on heterogeneity	It criticises the emphasis on absolute homogeneity	It criticises the emphasis on absolute homogeneity	It criticises the emphasis on absolute institutional determinism and homogeneity	It criticizes the emphasis on exogeneity and collective nature of institutional forces
Looking forward (improvements)	It seeks to explain how by responding to isomorphic pressures organisations achieve greater legitimacy and become more homogeneous	It seeks to explain how heterogenous non-linear paths lead to homogeneity among organisations	It seeks to explain how institutional agents contribute to greater efficiency and homogeneity among organisations	It seeks to explain how collective movements help to diffuse alternative institutional arrangements among organisations	It seeks to explain how exogenous and endogenous institutional catalysts jointly lead to pro-sustainability synergies
Structural Context	Context is like an 'iron cage', or a set of constraints shaping legitimate ways of working	Context is characterised by disruptions, or critical junctures	Context is defined by uncertainty	Context is characterised by an increased activity of social movements	Context is characterised by liminality—the state where old institutional arrangements no longer work, and the new ones have not been created yet.

Elements of theorising	Isomorphism*	Path dependency*	Agency*	Social movements*	Institutional Catalyst**
Relational Context	Institutional Determinism: organisations are passive in relation to the context	Institutional Determinism: organisations are passive in relation to the context	Institutional Determinism: organisations are passive in relation to the context	Institutional Reaction: organisations are active in relation to the context	Institutional Influence: organisations are proactive in relation to the context
Temporal Context	Change making decisions in an organisation happen at the mature stage of pro-sustainability institutionalisation, or when many of the new institutions are already in place	Change making decisions in an organisation take place during a new wave of pro-sustainability institutionalisation, or when new and/or additional institutions have started to emerge	Change making decisions in an organisation take place during an increasing pro-sustainability institutionalisation, or when new institutions have started to emerge	Change making decisions in an organisation take place when new institutions are about to emerge	Change making decisions in an organisation take place when the existing institutions prove to be futile, and the new institutions have not started to emerge yet
Strategy	*Adaptive strategies	*Adaptive strategies	*Adaptive strategies	*Additive strategies *Contestation strategies	*Transformative strategies
Mechanisms	Defence mechanism: isomorphism	Defence mechanism: feedback	Defence mechanism: enforcement	Coping mechanism	Internalisation mechanism
Outcome	Legitimacy	Legacy	Efficiency	Survival	Resilience
Examples	Bansal and Pendyala (2023), Adams et al. (2022),	Talib et al. (2022), Cui (2022), Ba and Galik (2023),	Woolthuis et al., (2013), Dean and McMullen (2007)	Peng, S., Jia, F., & Doherty, B. (2022)	A proposed research domain

*These domains come from prior research. **This is a new domain suggested in our review.

References

- Adams, D., Donovan, J., & Topple, C. (2022). Sustainability in large food and beverage companies and their supply chains: An investigation into key drivers and barriers affecting sustainability strategies. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.
- Al Mulhim, K. A. M., Swapnan, M. S. H., & Khan, S. (2022). Critical junctures in sustainable social housing policy development in Saudi Arabia: a review. *Sustainability*, 14(5), 2979-85.
- Andrews-Speed, P. (2016). Applying institutional theory to the low-carbon energy transition. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 13, 216-225.
- Arrow, K. J. (1995). *Returns to scale, information and economic growth* (pp. 11-18). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Ba, Y., & Galik, C. S. (2023). Historical industrial transitions influence local sustainability planning, capability, and performance. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 46, 100690.
- Bansal, M., & Pendyala, S. S. (2023). Institutionalization of firm's commitment to CSR—a mimetic isomorphism perspective. *Asian Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-22.
- Breslin, D., & Gatrell, C. (2023). Theorizing through literature reviews: The miner-pro prospector continuum. *Organizational Research Methods*, 26(1), 139-167.
- Carberry, E. J., Bharati, P., Levy, D. L., & Chaudhury, A. (2019). Social movements as catalysts for corporate social innovation: Environmental activism and the adoption of green information systems. *Business & Society*, 58(5), 1083-1127.
- Cui, X. (2022). Paradigm shift and prospects of China's earthquake emergency management policies: Analysis of historical institutionalism. *Emergency Management Science and Technology*, 2(1), 1-13.
- Dean, T. J., & McMullen, J. S. (2007). Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action. *Journal of business venturing*, 22(1), 50-76.
- Denyer, D. and Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In Buchanan, D. and Bryman, A. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods*. London: Sage, pp. 671–689.
- Denyer, D., Tranfield, D. and Ernst Van Aken, J. (2008). Developing design propositions through research synthesis. *Organization Studies*, 29:3, 393-414.
- DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, P. (1983) The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American sociological review*, pp 147-160.
- Dorobantu, S., Kaul, A., & Zelner, B. (2017). Nonmarket strategy research through the lens of new institutional economics: An integrative review and future directions. *Strategic management journal*, 38(1), 114-140.
- Fischer, L. B., & Newig, J. (2016). Importance of actors and agency in sustainability transitions: A systematic exploration of the literature. *Sustainability*, 8(5), 476.

Garud, R., Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2007). Institutional entrepreneurship as embedded agency: An introduction to the special issue. *Organization studies*, 28(7), 957-969.

Greenwood, R., Meyer, R. E., Lawrence, T. B., & Oliver, C. (2017). The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism. *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 1-928.

Jennings, P. D., & Zandbergen, P. A. (1995). Ecologically sustainable organizations: An institutional approach. *Academy of management review*, 20(4), 1015-1052.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behaviour, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of financial economics*, 3(4), 305-360.

John, A., Coetsee, J., & Flood, P.C. (2022). Understanding the mechanisms of sustainable capitalism: The 4S model. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility* (Early Access).

Knight, J. (1992). *Institutions and social conflict*. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-511-52817-0. OCLC 1127523562

Lockwood, M., Kuzemko, C., Mitchell, C., & Hoggett, R. (2017). Historical institutionalism and the politics of sustainable energy transitions: A research agenda. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 35(2), 312-333.

Meckling, J., & Hughes, L. (2018). Global interdependence in clean energy transitions. *Business and Politics*, 20(4), 467-491.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.

Munck af Rosenschöld, J., Rozema, J. G., & Frye-Levine, L. A. (2014). Institutional inertia and climate change: a review of the new institutionalist literature. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 5(5), 639-648.

Murrey, C. (2022) 2023 Trends – business face sustainability challenge. Raconteur, December, Accessed on 7th March, Available from: [2023 trends – businesses face sustainability challenge - Raconteur](#)

Naidu, R. and Kerber, R. (2022) Unilever under pressure to show sustainability focus is good for business, 9th February, *Reuters*; Accessed on: 7th March 2023; Available from: [Unilever under pressure to show sustainability focus is good for business | Reuters](#)

North, D. C. (1992). *Transaction costs, institutions, and economic performance*, San Francisco, CA: ICS Press.

Peng, S., Jia, F., & Doherty, B. (2022). The role of NGOs in sustainable supply chain management: a social movement perspective. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 27(3), 383-408.

Risi, D., Vigneau, L., Bohn, S. & Wickert, C. (2023) Institutional theory-based research on corporate social responsibility: Bringing values back in. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25, 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12299>

Schneiberg, M., & Lounsbury, M. (2008). Social movements and institutional analysis. *The handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 648-670.

Sorensen, A., & Brenner, A. K. (2021). Cities, Urban Property Systems, and Sustainability Transitions: Contested Processes of Institutional Change and the Regulation of Urban Property Development. *Sustainability*, 13(15), 8429-37.

Stefes, C. H., & Hager, C. (2020). Resistance to energy transitions. *Review of Policy Research*, 37(3), 286-93.

Talib, N. L., Utomo, A., Barnett, J., & Adhuri, D. S. (2022). Three centuries of marine governance in Indonesia: Path dependence impedes sustainability. *Marine Policy*, 143, 105171.

Woolthuis, R. K., Hooimeijer, F., Bossink, B., Mulder, G., & Brouwer, J. (2013). Institutional entrepreneurship in sustainable urban development: Dutch successes as inspiration for transformation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 50, 91-100.