

Exploration and Integration of Institutional Isomorphism Factors and Role of Social Media to Creating Public Value

Mustafa Abdullah Hasan (Corresponding author)

Azman Hashim International Business School

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

E-mail: Mustafa1983@graduat.utm.com

Shathees Baskaran

Azman Hashim International Business School

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Level 10, Menara Razak, Jalan Sultan Yahya Petra, 54100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Received: March 30, 2022 Accepted: May 18, 2022 Published: May 29, 2022

doi:10.5296/bms.v13i1.19686 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/bms.v13i1.19686>

Abstract

Creating public value has attracted much attention from the government sector due to worldwide rising well-being. While creating public value has become more relevant for public managers and policymakers, it has not been adopted in developing countries instead of developed countries. Therefore, the policymakers represent the government, and public managers must demonstrate a commitment toward individuals to ensure their public value aligns with the new public administration movement. Despite the absence of a strategic plan for creating public value, individuals increasingly call for improved well-being by increasing pressure on institutions or using social media to achieve these demands, especially in countries with a democratic system. Because of this, a newly coined theoretical framework to adopt public value creation (APVC) was developed based on the traditional model of public value creation by enhancing a new institutional theory in line with the role of social media. It is based on research that shows how public value theory, new institutional theory, and social media's mediating effects create public value. It also extends the current literature on public

management and strategic management. The paper provides new insights into public administration for public value creation in developing countries.

Keywords: public value, strategic management, public management, new institutional theory, isomorphism, social media

1. Introduction

The new public administration movement beyond traditional public administration (TPA) and new public management (NPM), Bryson and Crosby (2014) highlighted the new movement as a response to the challenges of a networked multi-sector, no-one-wholly-in-charge world and the shortcomings of TPA approaches. In NPM, the values beyond effectiveness and efficiency-and, especially democratic values, were prominent. Citizens, corporations, and non-profit organizations all have an essential role in solving public problems, but the government has a specific duty to be a guardian of public value. The public value creation argument remains under development to be embedded as a stable construct in public management. Even it has evolved significantly from the 1980s and formalization in the 1990s. Throughout the 2000s, public value creation drew considerable attention, being adopted, extended, and contested by a diverse spectrum of scholars and experts to present More's strategic triangle as one of the strategic management progress analytic tools to create a public value (O'Flynn, 2021; Bracci et al., 2019; Alford & Greve, 2017; J. Bryson et al., 2016; J. M. Bryson & Crosby, 2014; Benington & Moore, 2011). Most public value research has been carried out in developed countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and the Netherlands, while the developing countries remain far behind (Sami et al., 2018). Also, The concept of "public value" should be accepted into a broader debate, which will allow it to interact with other concepts and thus become a more applicable and robust plank of public management (Brown et al., 2021).

The susceptibility of organizations responding to institutional pressures raises essential questions for the new public administration in the public sector. The government and non-government organizations exert coercive pressure, which obliges firms to enforce various environmental regulations and standards (Latif et al., 2020). According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983,1991), the isomorphic institutional pressure argues that organizations are subject to three types of pressures; coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures, that shape their characteristics, specifically relevant for the adoption of management in the organizations. Governmental organizations are more vulnerable to all three types of institutional forces than other organizations in different sectors (Frumkin and Galaskiewicz, 2004). At the same time, the new institutional theory (isomorphic institutional pressure) needs to be presented through the study of public strategic management processes (George, 2017).

The public sphere's health, well-being, and vitality are critical components of public value. It becomes clear that the interaction between communication media and the operation of the public sphere will be an autonomous and potentially volatile force in the future (Parker et al., 2018). New Public Governance and Open Government paradigms suggest that Public value

isn't created by the government alone. It also involves the collaboration between public entities, the private sector, civil society, and citizens (Maciuliene, 2018). Hence, social media, through judging public values and raising public awareness of public institutions, may influence the government, public managers, and politicians to adopt public value creation to bring well-being to society (Meynhardt & Andreas, 2019; Chen et al., 2018; Parker et al., 2018).

These contrasting findings indicate that there is still no conclusive evidence in understanding the impact of social media and institution theory on government policy to adopt a public value creation. However, there is a call to invoke several additional challenges for research and action in Moore's theory (Bryson et al., 2016; Cresswell et al., 2015; Bryson & Crosby, 2014). Therefore, regardless of the association, this area has generated considerable conceptual and empirical interest since there is still quite a lot that is still unknown about this phenomenon (O'Flynn, 2021; Linda and Thomson, 2020; Irfan et al., 2019; Sami et al., 2018; Scherer et al., 2015; Bryson and Crosby, 2014).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Underpinnings

2.1.1 Public Value Theory

The primary concern of traditional public administration is efficiency. In contrast, efficiency and effectiveness are the central concerns of new public management values beyond efficiency and effectiveness are pursued, debated, challenged, and evaluated in the emerging approach (Bryson & Crosby, 2014). Therefore, the emerging process reemphasizes and brings value-related matters of prior eras that are always present but not predominant (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015; Rosenbloom & McCurdy, 2006). Public managers' primary responsibility is to decide how state organizations can execute government policy to maximize target achievement in effectively minimizing costs. In this regard, public value theory aims to achieve goals effectively through administrative mechanisms that involve people in an ongoing conversation with officials and experts. It seeks to initiate a discussion between administrators and people about the principles that should guide public endeavors. It aims to understand the trade-offs between economic performance and organizational types (Turkel & Turkel, 2016). Bryson and Crosby (2014) compare the perspectives of government and public administration's key objectives. Firstly, the key objectives of traditional public administration are "political provided goals, the implementation managed by public servants and monitoring is done via bureaucratic and elected officials' oversight." Second, the key objectives of new public management are "politically provided goals; the inputs and outputs in a way that ensures economy and responsiveness to consumers managed by managers." The last is the emerging approach to public administration "create public value so that what the public most cares about is addressed effectively and what is good for the public is put in place."

In this context, the scholars clarify the meaning of value, public value, public values, and the public sphere; Barry Bozeman was one of the most critical voices in the field of public value, focusing on the policy or societal level, Bozeman (2007) highlighted "A society's public values are those providing normative consensus about: (1) the rights, benefits, and prerogatives to which citizens should (and should not) be entitled; (2) the obligations of citizens to society, the state, and one another; and (3) the principles on which governments and policies should be based." Whereas Bozeman focuses on the policy or societal level, Mark Moore, another critical voice in the past study, focuses on public managers responsible for creating public value CPV. Mark Moore develops a framework for evaluating the importance of public sector organizations (Mark H Moore, 2013; Benington & Moore, 2011). Two points underpin Moore's strategy. Firstly, value is embedded in an individual's preferences and perceptions. Secondly, the public sector meets two fundamental needs of individuals: it offers products and services that the market cannot provide, and it protects and clarifies citizen rights and obligations (Turkel & Turkel, 2016). Moore's definition of public value is vaguer than Bozeman's, and it highlights reasonably specific public values: efficiency, effectiveness, socially and politically sanctioned desired outcomes, procedural justice, and substantive justice. Like Bozeman, Moore's definition of public value can encompass input, process, output, and outcomes measures (Bryson & Crosby, 2014)

From other predicatives, Meynhardt (2009, 206) defines the public value as a necessary but far-less well-known approach that believes public value is constructed out of "values characterizing the relationship between an individual and 'society,' defining the quality of the relationship." According to Bryson and Crosby (2014), When compared to Bozeman and Moore, Meynhardt's approach is non-prescriptive, based on psychology, and emphasizes the interpenetration of public and private sectors powerfully than either of them. Unlike the other two authors, there are no organizations or supra-individual processes engaged in public value generation (Meynhardt 2009). In contrast to Bozeman and Moore, Meynhardt regards public value as something that can be measured against the dimensions outlined. Along with Mark Moore's (1995) "creation of public value" and Timo Meynhardt's (2009) "public value approaches," Johan Benington (2011) highlighted the "Public Sphere" or "Realm" that extends well beyond the realm of public values and the process of establishing public value. According to Benington (2011) defines the public sphere as "a democratic space" that includes the "web of values, places, organizations, rules, knowledge, and other cultural resources held in common by people through their everyday commitments and behaviors, and held in trust by the government and public institutions," in other words it can influence the political action. Therefore, Bryson and Crosby (2014) can link the different standards in public value literature; specifically, Moore's highlighted on different strands in the public value literature clearly can be connected. Specifically, Moore's managerially focused idea of creating public value involves producing what the public values or is suitable for the public, the merits of which can be assessed against a set of more specific public values. These can include Bozeman's and others' societal or policy-focused public value criteria, Meynhardt's psycho-logically focused criteria, Benington's idea of enhancing the public sphere, and other

important values in the public administration field and literature. All mayors should be considered when assessing value creation in specific instances.

2.1.2 New Institutional Theory

According to the new institutional theory (isomorphic institutional pressure), the institutions influence individuals and organizations, generating social pressures and limitations and imposing limits on what is tolerated and not (Kessler et al., 2013; Davidsson et al., 2006). DiMaggio and Powell (1983,1991) established a new institutional theory that offers insights into the use of administrative technologies by the public sector in the examination of change and reform processes by public institutions. They argue that organizations are subject to three pressures; coercive, mimetic, and normative, which shape their characteristics, specifically relevant for adopting management.

Coercive Pressures result "from both informal and formal pressures exerted on organizations through other organizations upon which they are dependent" (DiMaggio, 1998). Governmental and regulatory agencies apply coercive pressure due to the state's laws, regulations, and accountability requirements (George, 2017). External factors such as government and non-governmental organizations exert coercive leverage, forcing the organizations to implement different environmental regulations and standards. It can shape the organizations' ecological protection and legislative mandates and deal with multifactor complexities such as internal behaviors (Wang et al., 2021; Latif et al., 2020). Also, it impacts the quality and environmental management (Khalil, 2021; Yang & Kang, 2019). On the other hand, the parliament institution is exposed to various pressures (Moe & Caldwell, 2015).

According to March et al. (1979), as cited in George (2017) and Bui (2019), the mimetic pressure came about when "organizational technology is poorly understood" Powell and DiMaggio (1991) as cited in Wijethilake et al. (2017), "where priorities are unclear or where the world is causing symbolic confusion." Furthermore, Powell and DiMaggio (1991) highlighted that "organizations may model themselves on other organizations," which arises from seeking to copy and emulate their more successful peers. The mimetic pressure "represents demands towards the imitation of other organizations to cope with uncertainty" (Davidsson et al., 2006). Therefore, mimetic pressure arises when uncertainty forces organizations to be 'best practice' to engage in a competition seeking higher performance.

Normative pressures are the third source of isomorphic organizational change is normative and stem primarily from professionalization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Larson (1977) and Collins (1979), as cited in DiMaggio and Powell (1983), the normative pressures interpret professionalization as the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of their work, to control "the production of producers." According to Powell and DiMaggio, it's set cognitive foundations and legitimacy for occupational autonomy" (Bui, 2019; George, 2017; Davidsson et al., 2006). Poister (2005), as cited in George (2017), highlighted that policymakers and public managers should participate in public strategic management processes. Hence, Powell and DiMaggio (1991) found that the

"professionalization" acquired via formal education, experience, training, or membership in professional organizations, can subsequently impact the applied strategic management process (Bui, 2019; George, 2017; Poister et al., 2010).

In particular, the new institutional theory offers insights into the use of administrative technologies by the public sector in examining change and reform processes by public institutions. According to Lowndes and Wilson, this theory is particularly useful to the public sector (George, 2017). This view is reliable with the conclusions of many analyses of public sector structural pressures, which are "coercive pressures" that have examined the implications of organizational strategies on the output, especially the total effect of these forces, which constrains organizational innovation outcomes (Johanson et al., 2019; Bui, 2019; George, 2017; Elbanna et al., 2016; Johnsen, 2016). Likewise, "mimetic pressures" in the public sector need more study on the efforts of "link consultancy involvement" to the adoption of specific characteristics (attitudes such as consensus and conflict) and its effect on strategic management processes or directly on the outcomes of these processes (George, 2017). Also, Jarzabkowski et al. (2013), as cited in George (2017), that a little investigation is made on the impact of the "professionalization" of public managers as "normative pressures" through their formal education and training on characteristics and outcomes of public strategic management. According to George (2017), institutional determinants (i.e., coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures) and their impact on public strategic management processes are less cited as only six empirical articles address the topic. Despite the wealth of literature available in the field, there is a lack of knowledge of isomorphic institutional pressure.

2.2 Strategic Management in Public Sector

Strategic management can be defined as action-oriented management to realize long-term goals based on a thorough analysis and assessment of options, situations, and resources (Klassen et al., 2017; Joyce, 2015). Also, Mulgan (2009) described public strategy as "the systematic use by public authorities of public resources and powers to achieve public objectives." The organization in the public sector at all levels of the country, federal or national, regional (state or provincial), and local (municipal or county), must provide citizens with services to ensure an improved standard of living. The improvement of the performance of the organizations is linked to the existence of the strategies (Cicho et al., 2017; Elbanna et al., 2016). as a result, to achieve these public institution goals with transparency to their constituency, these institutions need to be more effective, think and act strategically through adopting strategic management practices (Wauters, 2019; Höglund et al., 2018; Tamimi, 2018; Höglund & Svärdesten, 2015).

Adopting strategic management practices in the public sector cannot be identical to that in the private sector. The organization in the public sector tends to become relatively centralized, focused on operative matters, and fixated on short-term measurements (Wauters, 2019; Höglund & Svärdesten, 2015; Johnsen, 2015; Joyce, 2015). The argument on that strategic planning offers a collection of principles, processes, and tools that can help organizations in

the public sector cope with the recent drastic changes in their environments. As two early advocates of government strategic planning say, "Strategic planning is a disciplined attempt to generate fundamental decisions within constitutional limits that form the essence and course of governmental operations" (Bryson et al., 2018; George et al., 2018; Hansen & Ferlie, 2016; Bryson et al., 2007; Olsen et al., 1982).

The emphasis on action, assessment of a broad and diversified collection of stakeholders, attention to external possibilities and threats, internal strengths and weaknesses, and actual or potential competitors distinguishes strategic planning from more traditional planning (Bryson et al., 2007; Bryson & Roering, 1987). However, that does not mean that all approaches to what could be called strategic planning in the corporate style (i.e., strategic planning approaches built in the private sector) equally apply to the government sector. Therefore, these organizations must move from strategic planning towards strategic management, including a holistic approach and more effective linkage of strategies and performance metrics. There is an increasing need and scope for considering specific public sector characters for strategy work and strategic management (Höglund et al., 2018; Wajdi Abushabab, 2017).

Mark Moore (1995) highlights strategic management as judgment and poise through looking far away into a complex, varying environment to accurately judge what is valuable and feasible for an organization's goal. Also, it has to do with positioning the organization in that environment to pursue and exploit opportunities through sustained effort and adapt and respond quickly when environmental conditions change unexpectedly. Therefore, Mark Moore suggests there is one way that public managers can begin to cope with the obstacles that face them to adopt strategic management success, by developing an analytic framework (strategic triangle) that brings the problems and opportunities of managing in the public sector because of creating public value.

2.3 Public Value Creation

Developed countries are working on creating public value, while the developing countries don't give enough attention to it (Sami et al., 2018). The importance of public value is to bring well-being to society, and this can be one of the reasons for the growth of public sector services in developed countries. Hence, Mark Moor's identical conceptual framework focused on external support, internal capacity, and desirable or valuable strategic goals to create public value. Moore's conception studies the political context of strategic management in the public sector. Through focuses on the political dimension of creating public value and the role of officials in improving procedures for creating value (Alford & Greve, 2017; Johnsen, 2016; Joyce, 2015; Bryson, 2004). The core idea is that public managers should concentrate on "creating public value" entrusted to them. Those assets include public funds raised through taxation for public benefit. But they typically involve the state's authority to regulate private actors' activities to prevent harm to the public benefit or to force them to contribute to the broader public good. Also, through motivating preexisting citizens' "public spirit" to contribute their fair share or duty to joint efforts to create public value, public

managers need to have "restless, value-seeking imaginations" by looking for opportunities to do this and how to take advantage of those opportunities (Mark H. Moore, 2021; Benington & Moore, 2011; Mark H. Moore, 1997).

Strategic triangle Implementation differs from one organization according to its direction, e.g., its vision, mission, and priorities (Wauters, 2019; Joyce, 2015). The core argument behind the strategic triangle is that public managers must establish a fit among the triangle's three points to uncover and exploit value creation opportunities in the public sector. According to Mark Moore (2021), *"This is an entrepreneurial style of management that is possible in the public sector only if one fully understands and acts under the important processes of democratic legitimation and public accountability."* While the officials in the state administration (public managers) spend most of their time dealing with emergency events without thinking about strategic issues, many complain that they do not have time and political support for strategic reasoning (Wauters, 2019). Hence, this put the public manager under pressure to be entrepreneurial to create public value.

2.4 Institutional Pressure

The institutions influence individuals and organizations, generating social pressures and limitations and imposing limits on what is tolerated and what is not (Davidsson et al., 2006; Kessler et al., 2013). Powell and DiMaggio (1991) established an isomorphic institutional pressure that offers insights into the use of administrative technologies by the public sector in the examination of change and reform processes by public institutions. Powell and DiMaggio (1991), as cited in Wijethilake et al. (2017), suggested that for organizations to achieve legitimacy, they should strive to be isomorphic, following the familiar institutional context. Three mechanisms were proposed for organizations to be isomorphic by complying with the standard institutional environment to attain legitimacy and propose. Three types of pressures are specifically relevant for adopting management instruments: coercive, mimetic, and normative (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991).

Institutional isomorphism is similarly a key driver of public strategic management practices; it could be an opportunity rather than a constraint (Suykens et al., 2020; Gunarathne & Lee, 2019; George, 2017; Poister et al., 2010). Also, Raj et al. (2020) that institutional pressure influences sustainability adoption in the public sector and that institutional pressure varies between developing and developed economies. Therefore, the policymakers and public managers should consult concedes to these pressures when it comes to drawing the economies policy. Institutional isomorphism has not been considered in understanding its impact on public managers and policy makers to adopt the creation of public value through their institutions. However, in the public sector, the knowledge is still limited when it comes to examining the institutional pressures, especially when it comes to adopting strategic management practices as a strategic triangle for Mark Moore's to creating public value.

2.4.1 Coercive Pressure

The coercive pressures (CP) in public institutions come from political influences and legitimacy problems that the government exerts on its affiliated institutions. It results from both informal and formal pressures exerted on organizations through other organizations upon which they are dependent (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Also, coercive pressures come from governmental and regulatory agency requirements imposed by the state due to laws, regulations, and accountability (George, 2017; George et al., 2012). External factors such as government and non-governmental and legislative mandates exert coercive leverage on organizations, forcing the organizations to implement different environmental regulations and standards (Wang et al., 2021; Latif et al., 2020). In other words, it is the pressure exerted by the government on its affiliated institutions by issuing legislation and political orientations to achieve the best performance. According to Oliver (1991), as cited in Wijethilake et al. (2017), the organizational lack of compliance with coercion will cause negative impacts.

According to Vos and Voets (2021), the CP exerted by the central government to improve the characteristics is forcing these municipalities to adopt strategies to improve their performance. It plays a significant role in an organization's long-term growth (Bouckennooghe, 2012) and compels an organization to enhance its performance (George et al., 2018; Hage, 1999). Also, CP impacts the organizations' quality assurance and environmental management (Khalil, 2021; Yang & Kang, 2019). Otherwise, if a public organization wants to create public value, it must deal with four essential factors: authorizing environment, values, strategy, and operational capability (Chohan et al., 2017; Meynhardt et al., 2017; Moore, 1997). In the last decade, various studies have determined the effect of institutional pressure on the organization. At the same time, more knowledge needs to be reported in the literature on the impact of institutional pressures on creating public value. The CP may come from legislation and citizen participation on public institutions to create public value in the public sector, such as the legislative regulations that forced public institutions to adopt and formulate a strategic triangle to create public value. Public sectors in democratic societies that experience higher coercive pressures are more likely to adopt public value creation. Therefore, it assumes that the higher coercive pressures might generate positivity and influence the public manager to adopt strategies “strategic triangle” for public value creation. On this ground, the following propositions are offered:

Proposition 1: There is a significant relationship between coercive pressures and public value creation.

2.4.2 Mimetic Pressure

According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), “organizations tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field that they perceive to be more legitimate or successful.” It’s “represents demands towards the imitation of other organizations to cope with uncertainty” (Davidsson et al., 2006). Therefore, mimetic pressure MP arises when uncertainty in the environment forces organizations to adopt the ‘best practice’ so the organization engages in a

competition seeking higher performance (Latif et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2007). The argument on whether mimetic pressure MP has an impact is still ongoing. The public sector is influenced by mimetic pressures (Florentina, 2016). According to Hillebrand et al. (2011), as cited in Pillay et al. (2016), mimetic pressure is more likely to have negative consequences. Also, without normative and coercive support, MP was ineffective in local government service efficiency changes (Keerasuntonpong & Cordery 2016). Generally, the Institutions that respond to MP are often concerned with desires for external legitimacy at the benefit of recognizing the importance, implications, or consequences of these activities. Conversely, according to Ansari et al. (2010), as cited in Pillay et al. (2016), mimetic pressure institutions are likely to be more efficient as they understand the fit between social context and institutional goals. It impacts organizations to adopt better strategies (Gunarathne & Lee, 2019).

According to George et al. (2018), mimetic pressure positively impacts public sector performance by forcing the organizations to model themselves on other organizations when confronted with uncertainty. The organizations tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field to adopt creating public value. Indeed, evidence from the public sector indicates that public organizations are impacted in their decision to adopt specific performance management techniques by the behavior of similar agencies (George et al., 2018). Despite the wealth of literature available in the field, there is a lack of study on mimetic pressures in the public sector (Wang et al., 2021). Furthermore, the public organization should focus on the authorizing environment and operational capability to create public value (Chohan et al., 2017; Meynhardt et al., 2017; Moore, 1997). Public sectors in democratic societies that experience higher mimetic pressures are more likely to adopt public value creation. This study argues that mimetic pressures might generate government institution positivity through modeling themselves between others to adopt a strategy “strategic triangle” to create public value. On this ground, the following propositions are offered:

Proposition 2: There is a significant relationship between mimetic pressures and public value creation.

2.4.3 Normative Pressure

According to Larson (1977), as cited in Dimaggio and Powell (1983), the normative pressure NP "stems principally from professionalization," which is "the collective struggle of the occupation representatives to define working conditions and practices, control the output of producers, and set cognitive foundations and legitimacy for occupational autonomy." NP influences the public institution's ability to attain its strategic practices (Raj et al., 2020; Bui, 2019; George, 2017; Martínez-ferrero & García-Sánchez, 2017; Wijethilake et al., 2017). Likewise, NP influences the environmental strategies at the external integration stage (Latif et al., 2020; Gunarathne and Lee, 2019). In addition, NP affects the performance quality of local government services (Yang & Kang, 2019; George et al., 2018; Keerasuntonpong & Cordery, 2016). The public strategic management processes involve both decision-makers (e.g.,

elected officials) and public administrators (e.g., heads of administration) who will be responsible for adopting a better strategic approach to the organization's benefit Poister (2005), as cited in (George, 2017).

Normative pressures apply to collective beliefs that lead to the conformity of institutional environments through thought and deed within institutional settings (Florentina, 2016). Likewise, NP arises from values, expectations, norms, and standards within the organization's culture (Latif et al., 2020; Abdulaziz et al., 2017). According to George (2017), normative pressures "participated professionalization" is acquired via awareness, formal education, experience, training, and membership of the managers. Hence, several studies have investigated the effectiveness of normative pressure in the public sector (George, 2017).

The normative pressures impact organization performance, while organization performance is linked to public value (Meynhardt et al., 2017). Likewise, there is a relationship between environmental impacts and creating public value (Bracci et al., 2019; Meynhardt et al., 2017; Aladalah et al., 2016; Ćwiklicki, 2016; Benington & Moore, 2010; Moore, 1995). as well as there is a relationship between normative pressure and organizational capacity (Barman & MacIndoe, 2015). On the other hand, organizational capacity and environmental threats are the main two factors that create public value in public organizations. In democratic societies that experience higher normative pressures, the public sector is more likely to adopt public value creation. This study assumes that higher normative pressures might generate positivity and influence government institutions to adopt a "strategic triangle" as an analyzing tool for public value creation. On this ground, the following propositions are offered:

Proposition 3: There is a significant relationship between normative pressures and public value creation.

2.5 Role of Social Media as Mediator

Social media is an essential tool in boosting public participation. It provides a chance for the government to create a relationship with individuals through a bidirectional exchange of information through a varied communication process (Irfan et al., 2019). Public and private institutions, besides citizens, use social media for organizational efficiency, raising democratic ideals, communication of political philosophies, verification of societal morals, acceptance of institutional ethics, and enhancement of public welfare, all of which are public values (Parker et al., 2018; Monshipouri, 2017; Nabatchi, 2012). Several studies have investigated social media along with the public value in contexts of equity, ecosystem services, social justice, social policies, civil liberties, raising public awareness, transparency, political participation, co-production, public education, and judging public values (Chen et al., 2018; Parker et al., 2018; Tunez-Lopez & Costa-Sanchez, 2018; Loader et al., 2014; Gerbaudo, 2012). According to Parker et al. (2018), the role of social media in judging public values through several types of communication among social media users: antagonistic, critical, affirming, action-oriented, and indoctrinating. Subsequently, the public value will either change to become entrenched or emerge through coalescence, divergence, or

emergence as a new one. Likewise, value awareness should influence public value creation. The level of value awareness reflects the configuration of a higher-order relevance system, integrating multiple value categories (Meynhardt and Andreas, 2019; Chen et al., 2018).

The government involves a social media environment where the government and the public can discuss, create, execute, and monitor public services and provide ideas to address public service challenges (Scherer et al., 2015). The government should communicate with citizens to ensure that the public is served (Grube, 2017). In addition to its importance in providing the basis for better public value integration into planning processes (Dunkel, 2015). Moreover, public value is not created just by the government; it is developed through collaboration between public organizations, the commercial sector, civil society, and individuals, and social media facilitates their interaction. In this context, Maciuliene (2018) found that social media positively impacts public value creation. On this basis, social media can be considered positively related to adopting a public value creation strategy.

The content and feelings displayed in daily social media micro-communications may affect the emotional states of others. A recent study on social media found that people are more prone to acquire positive or negative emotions if over-expressed in their social network (Ferrara & Yang, 2015). However, such experiments are unethical because they entail significant content alteration with unknown effects on the persons involved. In contrast, the negativity bias is a theoretical concept from psychology that indicates that human beings, in general, tend to react more strongly to adverse events, experiences, or information than to positive or neutral ones, even when all other factors are kept constant (George, Baekgaard, et al., 2018). Through this interaction through social media, it is possible to increase accountability for government organizations to adopt the concept of public value. The organizations' responses to accountability pressures from different constituents (Treem, 2015). They respond online to social media commentary while enacting changes to their practices that recalibrate risk, redeploy resources, and redefine service (Karunakaran et al., 2021). Through judging public values in public institutions, social media can influence the government, public managers, and politicians to adopt public value creation to bring well-being to society (Meynhardt & Andreas, 2019; Chen et al., 2018; Parker et al., 2018). While coercive pressures result "from informal and formal pressures exerted on organizations through other organizations upon which they are dependent" (DiMaggio, 1998). Also, governmental and regulatory agencies apply coercive pressure due to the state's laws, regulations, and accountability requirements (George, 2017). Therefore, social media's accountability pressures from different constituents impact the public organizations to create public value. On this ground, the following propositions are offered:

Proposition 4a: There is a mediating effect of the role of social media on the relationship between coercive pressure and public value creation.

Organizations use mimetic isomorphism to respond to social media issues (Hussainali, 2017). Organizations seek to use social media to influence their stakeholders' perceptions (Hanna et al., 2011). In numerous instances, it has been demonstrated that social media has resulted in a

power shift away from organizations and toward customers and other stakeholders, creating uncertainty for and even posing risks to businesses (Berthon et al., 2012; Fournier & Avery, 2011; Hanna et al., 2011; Kietzmann et al., 2011). While stakeholders have traditionally used the internet to access, read, and watch information, they are increasingly turning to platforms (blogs, social networking sites) to create, share, and discuss content. Through social media, individuals are even taking an active role in the organization process by co-creating product designs and other marketing material (Hanna et al., 2011). Kietzmann et al. (2011) call this the "social media phenomenon", which gives stakeholders the chance to affect an organization's values, reputation, and even survival. Stakeholders, through social media, can act on an organization's practices. Therefore, the public manager needs to consider how to cope with concerns and issues raised by media, as this is increasingly happening due to social media's role. Hence, the individual can voice criticisms of corporate practices and create awareness (Den Hond & De Bakker, 2007).

Social media enables the creation of 'issue networks'- a web of relationships that connects people through interests (Diani, 2000). Social media can influence an organization's reputation; through social media, individuals, as stakeholders, can determine what issues are important and how they should be perceived. Based on this, action others' perceptions can change managers' behavior regarding current and future issues (Westermann-Behaylo et al., 2014). The public manager forms a new approach reference to rebuild the interpretation of the issue and re-evaluated by the public to the motives of the activists, reaching strategic goals. Hence, the public managers respond to SM Issues through compromising and changing practices to avoid any more reputational losses (Westermann-Behaylo et al., 2014). The network issues grow exponentially on social media, so the social media activists frame these issues to their advantage; therefore, the government needs to respond to them (Hussainali, 2017). In this regard, the organizations legitimate their decisions based on prior decisions made by organizations that have been in a similar case (Brouthers et al., 2005; Dimaggio & Powell, 1983). Hence, an organization confronted with a social media issue will respond in a mimetic way to other organizations (Hussainali, 2017). On this ground, the following propositions are offered

Proposition 4b: There is a mediating effect of the role of social media on the relationship between mimetic pressure and public value creation.

Kietzmann et al. (2011) highlighted that Social Media Phenomenon that gives stakeholders the chance to affect the organization's values, reputation, and even survival could act on an organization's practices through social media. The media plays an essential role in increasing public awareness and collecting views, information, and attitudes toward specific issues (Dwivedi & Pandey, 2013). At the same time, the normative pressure is acquired via awareness, formal education, experience, training, and membership of the managers (Powell and DiMaggio, 1991). On the other hand, Social media enables the creation of 'issue networks'- a web of relationships that connects people through interests (Diani, 2000). According to (Westermann-Behaylo et al., 2014), issues move through stages more rapidly on

social media, creating a conflict more easily because awareness can be completed in a short time. When an organization operates in an unstable environment, it imitates other organizations to reduce uncertainty (Lai et al., 2006). Merchant and Lurie (2020) discovered that as social media has grown in popularity, various ways for communicating and spreading information and news have been more accessible to the public. Hence, social media's role inflows the public sector behavioral change across national countries by raising awareness of various issues arising or rooted in society (Abuhashesh et al., 2021). Therefore, an individual's awareness rises by social media impacts the public organizations to adopt creating public value. On this ground, the following propositions are offered

Proposition 4c: There is a mediating effect of the role of social media on the relationship between normative pressure and public value creation.

2.6 Conceptual Framework

As explorers looking for different ways to create public value, the general managers introduced the public value creation concept within the framework of the strategic triangle, consisting of the value to be produced, the authorizing environment, and the productive capabilities (Moore, 1995). Likewise, Alford and Greve (2017) concluded that organizations cannot improve their strategic direction on their own, based on theories alone, but should work with stakeholders and citizens in democratic processes to achieve the organization's goals. Moor's strategic triangle is a framework for aligning three distinct but interdependent processes necessary for creating public value: defining public value, authorization, and building operational capacity (Benington & Moore, 2011). On the other hand, institutions influence individuals and organizations, generating social pressures and limitations and imposing limits on what is tolerated and not (Kessler et al., 2013; Davidsson et al., 2006). Moor presents three types of pressures specifically relevant to adopting management instruments: coercive pressures, mimetic pressures, and normative pressures (Lawrence & Shadnam, 2008; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). Furthermore, Vos and Voets, (2021) found that the pressures exerted by the central government to improve the characteristics of the provided services are forcing these municipalities to adopt strategies to improve their performance.

In addition to the institutional pressure, a contribution to the creation of public value was reported in the literature by raising public awareness through social media (Chen et al., 2018). Likewise, Meynhardt and Andreas (2019) highlighted that value awareness should influence public value creation. In this sense, the level of value awareness reflects the configuration of a higher-order relevance system, integrating multiple value categories. On the other hand, government involves a social media environment where the government and the public can discuss, create, execute, and monitor public services and provide ideas to address public service challenges (Scherer et al., 2015). Therefore, social media mediate the relationship between institutional pressure and creating public value by increasing accountability, judging values, raising public awareness, and imitating other organizations. It can influence the government, public managers, and politicians to create public value to benefit society. In this context, the following conceptual framework is proposed for this research:




Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

3. Further Research Directions

Understanding the essential processes of democratic legitimation and public accountability of public value in the public sector is considered an entrepreneurial management style (Mark Moore, 2021). *Entrepreneurial management in the public sector is less known than in the private sector* (Demircioglu, 2021). future research needs to resolve the theoretical and technical problems associated with the more general theory of public value creation (Bryson et al., 2016; Cresswell et al., 2015; Bryson & Crosby, 2014). To achieve this through the contributions from other disciplines and fields incorporated with new institutional theory to understand how these pressures influence managers, politicians, and political leadership. The media is a relatively undeveloped area of research that will be addressed in this study to influence developing countries to create public value. Hence, the interest in public value theory and concepts has been growing steadily but has not been matched by experiential research. In other words, there are many calls for empirical research on this subject, and this paper is an attempt to contribute to this call. In addition, much of the work in this area is still limited to the function of political power in the generation of public value and how politicians seek and obtain authorization from citizens (Bryson et al., 2016). (Linda & Thomson, 2020), According to Bryson et al. (2017), the participants were limited to include only politicians, central officers, and top managers. On the other hand, the pressures in a democratic society on politicians, central officers, and top managers need more exploration to give complete knowledge about creating public value. Therefore, further research on the strategic triangle that adds a degree of complexity in line with the work of J. Bryson et al., (2016) is encouraged.

The institutional theory is a meaningful tool for understanding why and how venture ideas change over time. In other words, the isomorphic institutional pressure influences individuals and organizations, generating social pressures and limitations and imposing limits on what is tolerated and not (Kessler et al., 2013; Davidsson et al., 2006). According to Linda and

Thomson (2020), they conclude to include more stakeholders, such as the media, citizens, private companies, public managers at different organizational levels, and other employees to understand the complexity of value creation. Hence, the impact of institutional pressure differs in developed and developing economies countries. Accordingly, policymakers can use diverse forces to promote sustainability in public procurement according to their setting and the procurement category. According to George (2017), a systematic literature review on the impact of institutional factors (coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures) on public strategic management processes found there is less cited as only six empirical articles address this topic. However, knowledge is still limited when it comes to examining the institutional pressures in the public sector when it comes to adopting strategic management practices; this area requires further exploration.

Parker et al. (2018) concluded needs further investigation on “to what extent do various features across specific social media platforms contribute to how public values are adjudicated, resulting in different social media platforms being more or less influential in shaping public values.” Also, “How do citizens use social media to craft various meanings for an array of public values to wrest control of policy narratives from established political and media institutions and thus influence public opinion about policy issues.” As a result, as social media and its applications evolve, so must the approaches used to comprehend their broader implications in shaping public value creation.

4. Conclusion

This paper represents the development of the traditional model of public value creation by enhancing a new institutional theory in line with the role of social media. By assimilation of the public value concept, developed countries need to meet the increasing pressures from various sectors to adopt this concept. This new theoretical framework, called the ACPV (adoption creation of public value) developed to assist the public intuitions in responding holistically to adopting the CPV. This study maintains that it should be viewed through the lens of recognizing when public value is created (Brown et al., 2021) and should also be concerned with adopting the public value by focusing on the importance of coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures. It could be argued that more pressures in conjunction with social media roles may constitute a decision-maker who makes wiser decisions about the environment and the social and economic well-being of staff and the local community, thereby producing a comprehensive and holistic strategy to adopt public value creation. More importantly, this paper contributes to new public management theory and extends the literature on institutional theory and the sociological theory of isomorphism by integrating multi-discipline theories to develop the new concept of ACPV in developing countries.

References

Abdulaziz, N., Senik, R., Yau, F. S., San, O., & Attan, H. (2017). Influence of Institutional Pressures on the Adoption of Green Initiatives. *Journal of Economics and Management*, 11, 939-967. <http://www.econ.upm.edu.my/ijem>

- Abuhashesh, M. Y., Al-Dmour, H., Masa'deh, R., Salman, A., Al-Dmour, R., Boguszewicz-Kreft, M., & AlAmaireh, Q. N. (2021). The Role of Social Media in Raising Public Health Awareness during the Pandemic COVID-19: An International. *MDPI*, 8(80), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics8040080>
- Aladalah, M., Cheung, Y., & Lee, V. C. S. (2016). Delivering Public Value: Synergistic Integration via Gov 2.0. *49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences Delivering*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2016.376>
- Alford, J., & Greve, C. (2017). administrative sciences Strategy in the Public and Private Sectors: Similarities, Differences, and Changes. *Administrative Sciences*, 35(Hood 1991), 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci7040035>
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G., Law, J., & Walker, R. (2012). *Strategic Management and Public Service Performance*. <https://strategic-management-public-service-performance/dp/0230252427>
- Ansari, S. M., Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, Z. J. (2010). Made to fit: How practices vary as they diffuse. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(1), 67-92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2010.45577876>
- Barman, E., & MacIndoe, H. (2015). Institutional Pressures and Organizational Capacity: The Case of Outcome Measurement. *Wiley and JSTOR*, 27(1), 70-93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41330914>
- Benington, J. (2011). From private choice to public value. *Public Value: Theory and Practice*, 31-51. https://10.0.3.239/978-0-230-36431-8_2
- Benington, J., & Moore, M. H. (2010). Public Value in Complex and Changing Times. In *Public value: Theory and practice* (pp. 1-25). Macmillan International Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-36431-8_1
- Benington, J., & Moore, M. H. (2011). *Public value: Theory and practice*. Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke.
- Berthon, P. R., Pitt, L. F., Plangger, K., & Shapiro, D. (2012). Marketing meets Web 2.0, social media, and creative consumers: Implications for international marketing strategy. *Business Horizons*, 55(3), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2012.01.007>
- Bouckennooghe, D. (2012). The role of organizational politics, contextual resources, and formal communication on change recipients' commitment to change: A multilevel study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21(September 2014), 37-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2011.591573>
- Bozeman, B. (2007). *Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism* (Beryl A. Radin (ed.)). Georgetown University Press.
- Bracci, E., Papi, L., & Bigoni, M. (2019). Public value and public sector accounting research: a structured literature review. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*,

31(1), 103-136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAFM-07-2018-0077>

Brouthers, L. E., O'Donnell, E., & Hadjimarcou, J. (2005). Generic product strategies for emerging market exports into triad nation markets: A mimetic isomorphism approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(1), 225-245. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/bla/jomstd/v42y2005i1p225-245.html>

Brown, P. R., Cherney, L., Warner, S., Brown, P. R., Cherney, L., Understanding, S. W., Brown, P. R., Cherney, L., & Warner, S. (2021). Understanding Public Value-Why Does It Matter? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 44(10), 803-807. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2021.1929558>

Bryson, J. M. (2004). *Strategic planning for public and non-profit organizations* (3rd ed). Jossey-Bass. www.josseybass.com

Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (2014). Public Value Governance: Moving beyond Traditional Public Administration and the New Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4), 445-456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238>.Public

Bryson, J. M., & Roering, W. D. (1987). Applying private-sector strategic planning in the public sector. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 53(1), 9-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944368708976631>

Bryson, J. M., & Roering, W. D. (2007). Sector Applying Private-Sector Strategic Planning in the Public Sector. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, May 2013, 37-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944368708976631>

Bryson, J. M., Edwards, L. H., & Slyke, D. M. Van. (2018). Getting strategic about strategic planning research. *Public Management Review*, 20(3), 317-339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285111>

Bryson, J., Sancino, A., Benington, J., & Sørensen, E. (2016). Towards a multi-actor theory of public value co-creation. *Public Management Review*, 9037(August). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1192164>

Bui, M. A. C. (2019). *The influence of strategic orientation and strategic human resource management on organizational innovation at non-profit organizations: a realist synthesis* [University of Maryland Global Campus]. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/eb7a3b968905f7f33875d184e02f4280/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

Chen, C., Wang, Y., & Jia, J. (2018). Public perceptions of ecosystem services and preferences for design scenarios of the flooded bank along the Three Gorges Reservoir: implications for sustainable management of novel ecosystems. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2018.06.009>

Chohan, U. W., Jacobs, K., & Chohan, U. W. (2017). Public Value in Politics : A Legislative

- Budget Office Approach. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 00(00), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2016.1242612>
- Cicho, S., Cz, P., Knop, U., & Cz, P. (2017). The concept of strategic management in public administration. *Administracja i Zarządzanie*, 41.
- Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society* New York Academic Press.
- Cresswell, A. M., Cook, M., & Helbig, N. (2015). Putting Public Value To Work. *Public Value and Public Administration*, 204. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41687984>
- Ćwiklicki, M. (2016). Comparison of public value measurement frameworks. *Zarządzanie Publiczne, January*. <https://doi.org/10.15678/ZP.2016.35.1.02>
- Davidsson, P., Erik, H., & Magnus, K. (2006). Institutional Forces: The Invisible Hand That Shapes Venture Ideas? *International Small Business Journal*, 24, 115-131. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au>
- Demircioglu, M. A. (2021). Entrepreneurship in public organizations : the role of leadership behavior. *Small Business Economics*, 57, 1107-1123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00328-w%0AEntrepreneurship>
- Den Hond, F., & De Bakker, F. G. A. (2007). Ideologically motivated activism: How activist groups influence corporate social change activities. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 901–924. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159341>
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). *The new public service: Serving, not steering*. Routledge.
- Diani, M. (2000). Social movement networks are virtual and real. *Information, Communication & Society*, 3(3), 386-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180051033333>
- DiMaggio, P. (1998). The new institutionalisms: avenues of collaboration. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics (JITE)/Zeitschrift Für Die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, 154(4), 696-705. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40752104>
- Dimaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(June), 147-160. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Dunkel, A. (2015). Visualizing the perceived environment using crowdsourced photo geodata. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 142, 173-186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.02.022>
- Dwivedi, P. K., & Pandey, I. (2013). Role of media in social awareness. *International Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 1(August), 67-70. <https://mgesjournals.com/hssr/article/view/hssr1110>
- Elbanna, S., Andrews, R., & Pollanen, R. (2016). Strategic planning and implementation

- success in public service organizations : Evidence from Canada. *Public Management Review*, August 2019, 1-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1051576>
- Ferrara, E., & Yang, Z. (2015). Measuring emotional contagion in social media. *PloS One*, 10(11). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0142390>
- Florentina, C. (2016). The role of institutional pressures in developing countries. Implications for IFRS. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, XXIII(2), 27-40. <https://www.ectap.ro/the-role-of-institutional-pressures-in-developing-countries-implications-for-ifrs-catalina-florentina-pricope/a1179/>
- Fournier, S., & Avery, J. (2011). The uninvited brand. *Business Horizons*, 54(3), 193-207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.001>
- Frumkin, P., & Galaskiewicz, J. (2004). Institutional Isomorphism and Public Sector Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14(3), 283-307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muh028>
- George, B. (2017). Unraveling the determinants of strategic planning effectiveness in public organizations. *Bestuurskunde*, 26(3), 67-68. <https://doi.org/10.5553/bk/092733872017026003007>
- George, B., Baekgaard, M., Decramer, A., Audenaert, M., & Goeminne, S. (2018). Institutional isomorphism, negativity bias and performance information used by politicians: A survey experiment. *Wiley Public Administration*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12390>
- George, B., Desmidt, S., Cools, E., & Prinzie, A. (2018). Cognitive styles, user acceptance and commitment to strategic plans in public organizations: an empirical analysis. *Public Management Review*, 20(3), 340-359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285112>
- Gerbaudo, P. (2012). *Tweets and the Streets: Social media and contemporary activism*. Pluto Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt183pdzs>
- Grube, D. C. (2017). Rules, prudence, and public value: public servants and social media in comparative perspective. *Government and Opposition*, 52(1), 75-99.
- Gunarathne, N., & Lee, K. (2019). Institutional pressures and corporate environmental management maturity. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 30(1), 157-175. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-02-2018-0041>
- Hage, J. T. (1999). Organizational Innovation and Organizational Change. In *Annual Review of Sociology* (pp. 597-622). <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.597>
- Hanna, R., Rohm, A., & Crittenden, V. L. (2011). We're all connected: The power of the social media ecosystem. *Business Horizons*, 54(3), 265-273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.007>
- Hansen, J. R., & Ferlie, E. (2016). Applying Strategic Management Theories in Public Sector

Organizations Developing a typology. *Public Management Review*, 18(1), 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.957339>

Hillebrand, B., Nijholt, J. J., & Nijssen, E. J. (2011). Exploring CRM effectiveness: an institutional theory perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(4), 592-608.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0248-3>

Höglund, L. M. H., & Svärdsten, F. (2015). Strategic Management in Public Sector - Challenges in Theory and Practice. *Nordic Academy of Management Conference, November*.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284730974%0AStrategic>

Höglund, L., Caicedo, M. H., Mårtensson, M., & Svärdsten, F. (2018). Strategic Management in the Public Sector: How Tools Enable and Constrain Strategy Making. *International Public Management Journal*, 21(5), 822-849. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2018.1427161>

Hussainali, Z. (2017). *Mimetic isomorphism on social media: how organizations use mimetic forces to cope with social media issues* [Universiteit Van Amsterdam].
<https://5dok.net/document/6zkldj4y-mimetic-isomorphism-social-organizations-mimetic-forces-social-issues.html>

Irfan, A., Rasli, A., Sulaiman, Z., Sami, A., & Qureshi, M. I. (2019). The Influence of Social Media on Public Value: A Systematic Review of Past Decade. *Journal of Public Value and Administration Insights*, 2(1), 2-7. <https://doi.org/10.31580/jpvai.v2i1.481>

Jarzabkowski, P., Giulletti, M., Oliveira, B., & Amoo, N. (2013). “We Don’t Need No Education”-Or Do We? Management Education and Alumni Adoption of Strategy Tools. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 22(1), 4-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492612460588>

Johanson, J., Johnsen, Å., Pekkola, E., & Stephen, A. (2019). Administrative Sciences Strategic Management in Finnish and Norwegian Government Agencies. *Administrative Sciences*, 9(80).
<https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3387/9/4/80>

Johnsen, A. (2015). Strategic Management Thinking and Practice in the Public Sector: A Strategic Planning for All Seasons? *Financial Accountability & Management*, 31(0130), 243-268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.12077>

Johnsen, A. ge. (2016). Strategic Planning and Management in Local Government in Norway: Status after Three Decades. *Nordic Political Science Association, January*.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.12077>

Joyce, P. (2015). *Strategic Management in the public sector*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/doi.org/10.4324/9781315740355>

Karunakaran, A., Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2021). Crowd-Based Accountability: Examining How Social Media Commentary Reconfigures Organizational Accountability. *Organization Science*. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1546>

Keerasuntonpong, P., & Cordery, C. (2016). How might normative and mimetic pressures

improve local government service performance reporting? *Avaaz, Accounting and Finance How*, September 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12252>

Kessler, E. H., Bartunek, J. M., Hitt, M., Huff, A. S., Lawrence, P. R., Pfeffer, J., & Whetten, D. A. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Management Theory* (E. H. Kessler (ed.); 1st ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/encyclopedia-of-management-theory/book235986>

Khalil, M. (2021). Responsiveness to quality assurance implementation : an institutional theory perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*© EmeraldPublishingLimited, 29(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-06-2020-0074>

Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I. P., & Silvestre, B. S. (2011). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business Horizons*, 54(3), 241-251. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.005>

Klassen, T. R., Cepiku, D., & Lah, T. J. (2017). *The Routledge Handbook of Global Public Policy and Administration* (1st Editio). Taylor&Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315710020>

Lai, K., Wong, C. W. Y., & Cheng, T. C. E. (2006). Institutional isomorphism and the adoption of information technology for the supply chain management. *Computers in Industry*, 57(1), 93-98. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2005.05.002>

Larson, M. S. (1977). *The sise of professionalism: a Sociological Analysis*. Los Angeles: University of Califórnia Press.

Latif, B., Mahmood, Z., San, O. T., & Said, R. M. (2020). Coercive, Normative, and Mimetic Pressures as Drivers of Environmental Management Accounting Adoption. *Sustainability Journal*. <https://www.mdpi.com/journal/sustainability>

Lawrence, T. B., & Shadnam, M. (2008). Institutional Theory. *The International Encyclopedia OfCommunication*© 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., First Edit. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405186407.wbieci035>

Liang, H., Saraf, N., & Hu, Q. (2007). Assimilation of Enterprise Systems : The Effect of Institutional Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(1), 59-87. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25148781>

Linda, H., & Thomson, K. (2020). Strategic management, management control practices and public value creation: the strategic triangle in the Swedish public sector. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-11-2019-4284>

Loader, B. D., Vromen, A., & Xenos, M. A. (2014). The networked young citizen: social media, political participation, and civic engagement. In *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(2), 143-150. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.871571>

Maciuliene, M. (2018). Mapping Digital Co-Creation for Urban Communities and Public

Places. *Systems*, 6(14). <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems6020014>

March, J. G., Olsen, J. P., & Christensen, S. (1979). *Ambiguity and choice in organizations*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.

Martínez-ferrero, J., & García-Sánchez, I. M. (2017). Coercive, normative, and mimetic isomorphism as determinants of the voluntary assurance of sustainability reports. *International Business Review*, 26(1), 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2016.05.009>

Merchant, R. M., & Lurie, N. (2020). Social media and emergency preparedness in response to novel coronavirus. *Jama*, 323(20), 2011-2012. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.4469>

Meynhardt, T. (2009). Public value inside: What is public value creation? *Intl Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3-4), 192-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690902732632>

Meynhardt, T., & Andreas, F. (2019). Value Recognizing how and for whom value is truly. In *More value awareness for more (public) value* (Issue May, pp. 23-39). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315163437-2>

Meynhardt, T., Brieger, S. A., Strathoff, P., Anderer, S., Bäro, A., Hermann, C., Neumann, P., & Bartholomes, S. (2017). Public Value Performance: What Does It Mean to Create Value in the Public Sector? In R. V. René Andeßner, Dorothea Greiling (Ed.), *Public Sector Management in a Globalized World* (Issue September, pp. 135-160). Springer Gabler. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-16112-5>

Moe, T., & Caldwell, M. (2015). The Institutional Foundations of Democratic Government : A Comparison of Presidential and Parliamentary Systems. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics (JITE)*, May 1994. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40753031>

Monshipouri, M. (2017). Human rights in the digital age: Opportunities and constraints. *Public Integrity*, 19(2), 123-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2016.1230690>

Moore, M. (1995). Strategic Management in the Public Sector: A Definition and a Characterization of the Intellectual Challenge. *The 3rd Annual Research Conference of the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives (IARCA)*. <https://tinyurl.com/y83c6lf5>

Moore, M. H. (1997). *politics and the new public management seminar presented to the organization for economic development*.

Moore, M. H. (2013). *Recognizing public value*. Harvard University Press. <https://ash.harvard.edu/publications/recognizing-public-value>

Moore, M. H. (2021). Creating public value: the core idea of strategic management in government 1. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 6(1), 1-2. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2021.v6i1.219> Intern.

Mulgan, G. (2010). The art of public strategy: Mobilizing power and knowledge for the

common good. *Public Administration*, 88(2), 588-603.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2010.01837_3.x

Nabatchi, T. (2012). Putting the “public” back in public values research: Designing participation to identify and respond to values. *Public Administration Review*, 72(5), 699-708.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41687984>

O’Flynn, J. (2021). Where to for Public Value? Taking Stock and Moving On. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2021.1884696>

Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145-179. <https://doi.org/10.1.1.468.3856>

Parker, M. A., Bozeman, B., Parker, M. A., & Bozeman, B. (2018). Social Media as a Public Values Sphere. *Public Integrity*, 0(0), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2017.1420351>

Pillay, S., Reddy, P. S., & Morgan, D. (2016). Institutional isomorphism and whistle-blowing intentions in public sector institutions. *Public Management Review*, 9037(May).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1178322>

Poister, T. H. (2005). Strategic planning and management in state departments of transportation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 28(13-14), 1035-1056.

Poister, T. H., Pitts, D. W., & Edwards, L. H. (2010). Strategic Management Research in the Public Sector: A Review, Synthesis, and Future Directions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(5), 522-545. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010370617>

Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. (1991). *The New institutionalism in organizational analysis*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393344>

Raj, A., Agrahari, A., & Srivastava, S. K. (2020). Do pressures foster sustainable public procurement? An empirical investigation comparing developed and developing economies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 266, 122055. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122055>

Rosenbloom, D. H., & McCurdy, H. E. (2006). *Revisiting Waldo’s administrative state: Constancy and change in public administration*. Georgetown University Press.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt2tt7f2>

Sami, A., Jusoh, A., Nor, K., Irfan, A., & Qureshi, M. I. (2018). Systematic Review of Public Value. *Journal of Public Value and Administration Insights*, 1(1), 1-6.
<https://doi.org/10.31580/jpavi.v1i1.136>

Scherer, S., Wimmer, M. A., & Strykowski, S. (2015). Social government: A concept supporting communities in co-creation and co-production of public services. *Proceedings of the 16th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research*, 204-209.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/2757401.2757417>

Treem, J. W. (2015). Social media as technologies of accountability: Explaining resistance to

implementation within organizations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(1), 53-74.

Tunez-Lopez, M., & Costa-Sanchez, C. (2018). European Public Broadcasters interaction and social media Policy to Public value management. *Prisma Social*, 22, 61-90.

Turkel, E., & Turkel, G. (2016). Review of Public Administration and Management Public Value Theory : Reconciling Public Interests, Administrative Autonomy, and Efficiency. *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.4172/2315-7844.1000189>

Vos, D., & Voets, J. (2021). Explaining municipalities'(alternative) service delivery modes over time. The importance of coercive pressures. *Local Government Studies*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2020.1869546>

W.Powell, paul J. D. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>

Wajdi Abushabab, R. A. (2017). Strategic Management Practices: An Investigation of Public Sector Organizations in the Kingdom of Bahrain. *Information Management and Business Review (ISSN, 9(3)*, 47-60.

Wang, Y. M., Ahmad, W., Arshad, M., Yin, H. L., Ahmed, B., & Ali, Z. (2021). Impact of Coordination , Psychological Safety , and Job Security on Employees ' Performance : The Moderating Role of Coercive Pressure. *Sustainability Journal*. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.3390/su13063175>

Wauters, B. (2019). Strategic management in the public sector and public policy-making : friend or foe ? In *European Commission* (Issue April).

Westermann-Behaylo, M., Berman, S. L., & Van Buren, H. J. (2014). The influence of institutional logic on corporate responsibility toward employees. *Business & Society*, 53(5), 714-746. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650313476934>

Wijethilake, C., Munir, R., & Appuhami, R. (2017). Strategic responses to institutional pressures for sustainability: The role of management control systems. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 30(8), 1677-1710. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-07-2015-2144>

Yang, M., & Kang, M. (2019). An integrated framework of mimetic pressures, quality and environmental management, and firm performances. *Production Planning & Control*, 0(0), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2019.1681533>

Copyright

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).