

# University of Cincinnati

Date: 8/27/2019

I, Florine Postell, hereby submit this original work as part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Communication.

It is entitled:

**The Role of the Institutional Entrepreneur in Academic Protocol**

Student's name: **Florine Postell**

This work and its defense approved by:

Committee chair: Gail Fairhurst, Ph.D.

Committee member: Zhuo Ban, Ph.D.

Committee member: John Lynch, Ph.D.



36352



# **The Role of an Institutional Entrepreneur in Academic Protocol**

A thesis submitted to the  
Graduate School  
of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts  
2019

In the Department of Communication  
of the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences

by

Florine Postell  
B.S. Texas Tech University  
1986

Committee Chair: Gail Fairhurst, Ph.D.

Committee Members: Zhou Ban, Ph.D. & John Lynch, Ph.D.

ProQuest Number:27911357

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 27911357

Published by ProQuest LLC (2020). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All Rights Reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

## Abstract

In this study, protocol roles at academic institutions are explored, particularly how they are created and by whom. The research is guided by a growing trend among universities and colleges to incorporate protocol roles into the organization in order to help elevate their ceremonies, events, and overall reputation. This is an interesting development as the 21<sup>st</sup> century academic institution is turning attention on ways to leverage access to global thinkers and resources.

There are two theories driving this study. The first is institutional theory, providing insight into how change is practiced in an institution and by whom. Key concepts that are used to explore this study are: the institutional entrepreneur, institutional work, and stages of institutionalization. Research indicates that anyone inside the institution who has an interest in establishing protocol can be an institutional entrepreneur. This study examines behaviors associated with creating a protocol role through the stages of institutionalization.

The second theory used to explore this topic is the communicative constitution of organizations, or CCO. This is a useful perspective for examining how organizations perform and discursively communicate. The presence and use of authoritative texts are analyzed to identify how, if at all, changes are communicated by an institutional entrepreneur.

Using qualitative research methods, data from interviews are analyzed to find out ‘what is happening’ with regards to authoritative texts and stages of institutionalization. This iterative analytical approach seeks insight into how an institutional entrepreneur moves an innovative idea, such as creating a protocol role on campus, to a taken-for-granted practice.

**Keywords:** institutional entrepreneur, stages of institutionalization, CCO, authoritative text, protocol, academia

blank page

## Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks goes to the following, who helped me achieve this life-long goal of earning a master's degree.

Thanks to my advisor, Dr. Gail Fairhurst, who worked hard to keep me *out of the weeds* and focused. I learned about disciplined research and that it doesn't come easy! Your advice and guidance was always on the mark and made this a very enriching experience for me.

My committee members from the department of Communication, Dr. Zhou Ban and Dr. John Lynch, who challenged my thinking and writing, with both gentleness and directness.

The PDI-POA organization for permitting me the opportunity to study the fascinating field of protocol, and the members who provided much detail about their professional experiences at their institutions.

And finally, the support and understanding from my husband and family made this experience all the more rewarding. It really WAS worth it!

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Methods.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Findings.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Chapter 5: Discussion.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Limitations.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Appendix C.....</b>	<b>130</b>



## Chapter 1 Introduction

Imagine you are attending a commencement ceremony at the local university and the speaker is none other than a military general of the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe the small college in your area has invited the public to attend a special lecture presented by a former president of a foreign country. And it isn't too far-fetched that academic institutions host royalty, Nobel laureates, multi-day summits, and even the president of the United States. Each of these once-in-a-lifetime events frequently occurs on campuses all around the world, evidenced by YouTube videos capturing these memorable moments. What does it take for an academic institution to open its campus to high-level events? How does it prepare for all the planning with government advisors and professional protocol personnel representing the interests of the invited guests? What do these protocol professionals do? And do academic institutions need them?

### *Background*

Protocol is rooted in ancient civil societies, evidenced in both Western and Eastern civilizations. It is derived from the Greek word 'protokollon', meaning 'first glue', and refers to the method of identifying official, authenticated communication (McCaffree, Innis & Sand, 2013; Satow, 1957; French, 2010). There are a variety of definitions available to help understand the context of protocol in contemporary society. There is the diplomatic perspective, which Ann Beard, founder of Protocol Diplomacy International – Protocol Officers Association, uses. She says, “diplomatic protocol uses internationally accepted codes of conduct and courtesies...to build trust, strengthen relationships, and facilitate decision making between world leaders in global matters that affect us all ([www.protocolinternational.org](http://www.protocolinternational.org)).”

This definition relies heavily on the diplomatic heritage that was first codified in 1815 at the Vienna Convention of Diplomatic Relations. The rules of diplomatic engagement were updated twice in the 20<sup>th</sup> century when the United Nations led the effort to bring nascent nation states into the community of nations. It hosted two diplomatic conventions, again in Vienna: the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. These historic gatherings are identified as the milestone moments that point to operationalizing protocol rules and applying them universally in modern society.

Ambassador Mary Mel French performed protocol duties as Chief of Protocol for the United States under President Bill Clinton. She used diplomatic and ceremonial protocols at both the Department of State and the White House, and on foreign travels. She wrote a book introducing key concepts of official protocol that can be used in the real world. Her definition of protocol focuses less on rules. French states, “protocol is about the establishment and maintenance of relationships, and it provides a framework for order whether between family members, friends, business associates, or world leaders” (French, 2010, p. xv). This definition frames order as foundational to relationship building. Rules create order but must be shared and mutually practiced to be effective.

Take for example the legacies of Emily Post who codified etiquette or Terri Morrison and Wayne Conaway who improved access to cross-cultural communication knowledge with their seminal book “Kiss, Bow, or Shake Hands.” Emphasis on relationships draws attention to a personal level, where the focus is on individuals from their cultural reference and their particular preferences. French’s definition helps frame protocol as a more personal application of prescribed social customs and graces addressed to ensure that an individual or group feels

comfortable and safe. This definition makes protocol more accessible to everyone, and in turn holds everyone accountable to maintain the prescribed orders.

For the purposes of this study, a broader definition of protocol is applied, one developed by McCaffree, Innis and Sand (2013), which addresses the practice of protocol as a system which can be applied to individuals and groups, beyond diplomacy and ceremony. According to McCaffree et al (2013), protocol “is the recognized system of official, business and social usage” (p. 1). It is a skill set that can be learned and is rooted in communication and its material forms such as gifts, correspondence, non-human actors, and gestures. The practice and application of protocol can be achieved no matter your position or level of authority. Everyone is entitled to receive some level of courtesies, and everyone is accountable to practice the rules of protocol engagement. This definition allows more flexibility to adapt various codes of conduct as needed for different situations. It applies to diplomacy and ceremonies, as well as other institutional systems where protocol and order live, such as the Olympics or the military.

Surprisingly, academic institutions are creating protocol positions or assigning protocol responsibilities that are communicating an institutional commitment to engage at a more global level. To demonstrate this point, the professional organization Protocol Diplomacy International-Protocol Officers Association ([www.protocolinternational.org](http://www.protocolinternational.org)) has seen an upward trend in its membership from academic institutions. In an organization with roughly 300 members who represent the fields of military, government, business, and public sector, those affiliated with Academia have grown from 21 members in 2012 to over 70 in 2018 (PDI, 2018). This shift speaks to this research topic. Why are academic institutions formalizing the role of protocol in their organizations? Who is making the decision to create protocol roles? What communication

texts and tools are being used to articulate and institutionalize the protocol function on campuses, and what is the process by which they attain authority?

### *Thesis Overview*

This research study is designed to gain understanding about the role of protocol at academic institutions. It applies communication theory and institutional theory to investigate why and how protocol is adopted into academic institutions. Very little research has been produced about protocol conducted outside the diplomacy corpus, and none identified in the field of communication. The field of protocol is a useful case study because, by its very nature it is heavily dependent upon communicative tools that build relationships through written correspondence, face-to-face interactions, and intentionally created spaces where forms of business and social encounters can be conducted respectfully, successfully, safely, and distraction free.

This study uses institutional theory as a theoretical base to map how protocol becomes 'authored' into existence at academic institutions. To accomplish this, the concept of an institutional entrepreneur is used to study who within the institution can champion protocol as institutional work through the creation of new practices (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2011). This theory provides insight into the contributions of individuals as they seek to create, maintain, and even disrupt institutions (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006).

Additionally, this study adopts the stages of institutionalization as a framework to trace the work of an institutional entrepreneur (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). It is a useful methodology for analyzing institutional work from nascent ideas all the way to taken-for-granted practice. These

stages can provide insight into institutional communications that accompany institutional work conducted by actors embedded in institutions.

The framework of investigating communication is Kuhn's concept of an authoritative text and its impact on inter-organizational power (Kuhn, 2008). The distinction of concrete versus figurative texts is an intriguing research tool to draw out narratives and documents that address the presence of protocol in academic institutions. From a communicative perspective this study seeks to identify how protocol roles are not only created but how they are communicated, or 'authored,' and by whom.

Research for this study has been designed to trace organizational action by its actors using the method of interviews to conduct qualitative research. Personnel at public academic institutions provide the data set to help understand how protocol has been adopted at their university and who has helped shape the role. Using an iterative inductive approach described by Tracy (2013), the analysis of data is performed with the goal of having themes emerge that address institutional work, the role of an institutional entrepreneur, and the reliance of authoritative texts to create change at an institution.

This study has two research goals. The first is to expand the concept of institutional entrepreneur in institutional work theory. To accomplish this, I intend to unpack any evidence of an institutional entrepreneur and review effectiveness in creating the protocol function at a university. The second is to identify uses of authoritative text that may contribute to the creation of protocol roles. Research results will address contributions made from authoritative texts. This research aims to discover any emergent patterns of institutional work that support successful implementation of protocol roles at academic institutions.

This thesis is structured accordingly. Chapter Two will review the two theoretical approaches guiding the study: that of institutional theory, providing an understanding of the institutional entrepreneur and stages of institutionalization; and of communicative constitution of organizations, or CCO, focusing on the contributions of authoritative text. Chapter Three will explain how a grounded iterative approach was used to conduct interviews and a constant comparative method was used to code the collected data. In Chapter Four analyses of the research findings will be discussed. The final chapter will conclude this study with a review of implications, reflections on limitations and possibilities for future research.

## Chapter 2 Literature Review

*Academia* is an institution constituted by colleges or universities practicing the work of higher education. Each academic institution has internal organizations made up of people operating at different levels of authority and capacity, aiming to work in a coherent, integrated fashion as institutional work is performed. In this chapter, relevant theories and concepts will be reviewed to provide a framework of understanding institutional work and how it is communicatively constructed as it pertains to creating the role of protocol at an academic institution. As discussed in the background section in Chapter One, protocol is a growing area of work at universities.

The primary theory driving this study is institutional theory, which provides insight into exploring how change is practiced in an institution, how work is maintained, how work can be disrupted, and by whom. The secondary theory is the communicative constitution of organizations, or CCO, which comes from the field of organizational communication and studies how organizations discursively perform and communicate. This combined theoretical framework is used to explore the following concepts: stages of institutionalization, institutional work, institutional entrepreneur, and finally discussion of CCO and its use of authoritative texts. Before these concepts are discussed, I begin by considering the background of institutional theory and the distinctions between old and new institutionalism.

### *Institutional Theory*

Institutional theory is a meta-theory that has been studied in multiple disciplines such as sociology, psychology, communication, and management. Its theoretical space offers various approaches to understand how organizations such as universities are structured, how they

operate, and how they relate to internal as well as external influences (Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Lawrence, Suddaby & Leca, 2011; Lammers & Garcia, 2014). There are two branches of scholarship: old institutionalism and new (neo) institutionalism.

The old institutionalism scholarship addresses formalizing institutions according to a rational approach to making rules and managing structure. It originally stems from Selznick's (1949) research on the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), presenting the idea that institutions have a life of their own and create communicative patterns that extend that life. Taking this down to the level of organizations, which are part of the larger institutional structure, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) explain isomorphism to be a condition when an organization's rules or structures are taken for granted as part of the cultural system and are accepted by individuals within the organization. Isomorphism can be manifested by copying other practices, having practices imposed upon the structure, or adopting practices from external sources, which all functionally build structure that extends the life of an organization. Acceptance within the organization is a recursive and self-reinforcing process maintaining the system. While rules and structures are outcomes of work performed by individuals, the consequentiality of individual contributions to the organization is such that the legitimacy of the organization grows and the individual diminishes. In this constructed reality where the institution has a life of its own, individuals find themselves functioning and communicating in controlled environments that emphasize the rationality of the system.

Lammers and Garcia (2014) explain old institutionalism in the context of communication: "an organization becomes institutionalized when it has become an established and taken-for-granted pattern of practices and communications" (p. 196). It is in the interest of the organization to routinize (read, institutionalize) practices and communications for all actors



to guide a predictable path of work being done on behalf of the organization. This is a common theme in institutionalism: acknowledging how actors function in taken-for-granted environments, as well as rationalize within organizations (Powell & Colyvas, 2008, p. 276). This identifies, but does not address, the disconnect individuals may have with any institutional practice involving norms, values, processes, or culture that they consider problematic as they rationalize and communicate possible alternatives. Taken-for-granted environments make it harder for individuals to motivate, influence, or persuade others within the organization, and therefore, change typically happens ever so slowly and is usually generated from the top down. (Lammers & Barbour, 2006; Lammers & Garcia, 2014)

Recognizing this limit in institutional theory, Lammers and Garcia (2014) summarize the contributions made from a number of old institutional theorists: “organized actors’ intentions [are] shaped and even thwarted by their institutional environments” (p. 197). Shaping and thwarting can reveal a sense of hegemony existing in an institution. It implies that unbeknownst to the individual or the actor, institutionalism appropriates leadership to shape decisions and change in an organization. There is a sense of proprietary access residing with institutional leadership, who are predisposed to legitimacy because of their position. Access to legitimacy is key to institutionalization and to change, and within old institutionalism thought, leaders with authority and power are designated by their ascribed power to manage institutional change. The scholarship of old institutional theory backgrounds the possibilities of individuals who are not designated with legitimacy by position to effectively or rationally change their environment. If organizations do all the controlling, shape all decisions, and manage all legitimate actions, how can individual contributions affect institutions? There is a second branch of institutional theory

known as neo-institutionalism to which I now turn. This branch explores the role of individuals in institutions.

### *New Institutionalism*

Continuing the explanation of institutional theory in the context of communication, Lammers and Barbour (2006) posit that “institutions contribute to our understanding of organizational communication” (p. 364). According to Lammers and Garcia (2014), new institutional theory is a blend of disciplines of social psychology and sociology, but also recognizes that organizational communication and institutionalism have intertwined and are capable of mutually informing one another (p.195). Powell and DiMaggio (1991) are credited with an understanding that an “organization is constituted by the environment in which it [is] embedded,” with acts of legitimacy weighing greater than efficiencies as outcomes of success (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Institutional theory moves beyond the old theoretical structures of controlled work and processes, expanding the concept of legitimacy and attributing it to actions of a variety of individuals who can reflexively ascribe meaning according to their own situated experiences within the organization and with external encounters (Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Lawrence et al, 2011).

A focus of neo-institutionalism is “studying how individuals exercise agency while embedded in institutions” (Lammers & Garcia, 2014, p. 210). While individuals have a role in producing and reproducing an institution, scholarship sees this as “work” that impacts the institutional logics or accepted reasons that contribute to the good of the institution (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). It is Thornton and Ocasio (2008) who identified institutional logics as “links between individual agency and cognition

[with] socially constructed institutional practices and rule structures” (p. 101). Access to agency is shaped by independent, rational thought within institutional space and can be shared between members of the organization through established means of communication (Lammers & Garcia, 2014). Vocabulary, routines, processes, etc. are transformed into institutional logic. Practices and rules, both articulated and implied, shape institutional logics. Since institutions are socially constructed, actors can be influenced by internal and external factors that can be brought into the workspace, potentially changing the existing logics.

Still at the core is consideration for the life of the institution but differentiated now by the agency of individuals who apply sensemaking to rules, structure, and culture. Individuals become foregrounded in neo-institutional theory through the study of institutional practical action or consciousness (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991) and sensemaking through the co-production of meaning (Weick, 1995). As individuals encounter norms, values, processes, or culture in an institution such as a university, they begin to make sense of their environment and consider existing constructions of their reality as they either encounter other perspectives or draw from outside experiences. Sensemaking is never a static process as organizations are temporally and contextually fluid. Organizations are complex spaces, especially when institutional logics operate counter to others, demonstrating how individuals must make sense of contradictory worlds. In this environment, individuals can encounter communications that are ambiguous, conflicting, and perhaps even irrational when compared to established institutional practices (Powell & Colyvas, 2008). The study by Colyvas (2007) of university technology transfer programs provides an example of the challenges and opportunities that arise from ambiguity and how individuals navigate and resolve issues at the micro level within their institution.

This level of institutional theory recognizes that institutions are vulnerable to internal forces that identify problems between rules, processes and structures. Alford and Friedland (1985) argue that institutional logics are not always clean, instead they expose “contradictory practices and beliefs.” Contradictory logics can complicate a taken-for-granted environment and expose those “guiding principles which can constrain and enable the potential agency of actors” (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005, p. 37). In order to study an individual’s role through the lens of new institutionalism, it is helpful to study the interrelationships between individuals, organizations, and society. Society supplies a multitude of (ir)rational possibilities, and individuals take those examples into the organization to see what makes sense or what works in application.

Individuals do not practice sensemaking in a void, rather they engage one another through communicative acts. Phillips, Lawrence and Hardy (2004) argue that sensemaking is achieved when people collectively assign meaning and draw from dialectical sources that are external to the environment they know. While discourses are produced and reproduced in institutional settings, it is from the “making sense process” that actors identify discourses and their sources as useful, rational, or productive in the scope of their institutional work. Discourse draws from macro systems of thought and behavior anchored in time socio-historically (Foucault, 1983), while enacted at the micro level of organizations in everyday activities, routines, and processes (Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Kuhn, 2012).

People interacting, persuading, interpreting and messaging contribute to the development of rationalization within neo-institutionalism and have the possibility to extend the concept of legitimacy to the individual level (Lammers & Garcia, 2014). Phillips et al (2004) acknowledge the contributions of individuals when they define institutions as “products of discursive activity.”

It is at the level of discourse where institutional theory begins to move from a macro study to include more micro study. Actors, agents, or individuals functioning in different capacities are identifiably affecting a university through talk, symbols, and texts. Furthermore, these discursive tools help individuals communicate guiding principles, or institutional logics, and interpret actions within the institution (Lammers & Garcia, 2014). As such, Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) suggest that individuals, not just organizations, are capable of influencing institutional practices and rules through their own agency, using their own rational faculties to do so.

Following this brief introduction of institutional theory, I begin an examination of the concepts relevant to this study, specifically: stages of institutionalization, institutional work, the institutional entrepreneur, and finally CCO theory and the concept of authoritative texts. In this review, I aim to link concepts together in order to establish connectivity between institutional theory and organizational communication through CCO.

### *Stages of Institutionalization*

Stages of institutionalization provide utility within neo-institutional thought intended to introduce how ideas, which are intended to impact the institution in some way, successfully move through levels of embeddedness to be eventually taken for granted. Stages are used to demonstrate the conceptual development of practices and their levels of institutionalization. The conceptual origin of these stages resides with the seminal work of Berger and Luckmann (1967) and their social constructivist account of reality, which explains how actions and discourse, if repeated enough, becomes routinized. The institutionalization of practices, norms, and culture is recognizable when actors perform routine actions out of habit (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Lawrence et al, 2011). The more pervasive these routines, the deeper they are embedded in the

organization. This concept is often paired with that of legitimization because the more diffused the practice is within the organization, the less probability of others to question its purpose or effect, ultimately leading to the taken-for-granted status reviewed earlier under old institutionalism (Colyvas & Powell, 2006).

Within the branch of neo-institutionalism, Tolbert and Zucker (1996) developed a multi-stage model to explain how organizational practices can be traced through stages of institutionalization, which are identified as: habitualization or pre-institutionalization, objectification or semi-institutionalization, and sedimentation or full-institutionalization. For the purpose of this study I shall use the terms pre-institutionalization, semi-institutionalization, and full-institutionalization. Before describing the stages, it is prudent to acknowledge that there is a preliminary status that must occur before stages are invoked. An idea, process, or practice must be recognized as innovative before it can be traced through these stages. The concept of innovation must be incubated within some core group of people and supported before the innovative concept is released for institutional consideration (Boivin, Brummans, & Barker, 2017). Therefore, I review innovation as a functional stage within the process of institutionalization.

*Innovation.* This preliminary stage acknowledges that an idea takes shape to change existing institutional practices. It is often introduced by individuals who recognize that existing institutional work is not meeting the needs of the material and cultural foundations of an institution. Actions or practices existing in one contextual environment can be reconstituted into another environment. An individual conceptualizes the possibilities of a new approach to existing work and begins to cognitively manifest the idea into discursive activities. For the

purpose of this study, establishing an academic protocol office at a university serves as the innovative idea.

*Pre-institutionalization.* Theoretically considered the first stage, this references those actions, practices or discursive activities that are created, and then recreated to the point where they seem to work in some given circumstance of institutional work (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). These actions, practices, or habits are formed because the practice ‘makes sense’ in the given circumstance. The use of these practices or habits are used among and within a smaller shared space of individuals and is performative in the sense that it is being worked out. The work includes testing conformity to institutional logics, such as norms and culture. Explanations are formed to create adherence and acceptance. Texts at this stage would be those that “make the idea comprehensible to audiences” (Meyer et al, 2018, p. 401). Applying this concept to an academic protocol office, practices that extend ceremonial work into broader contexts on a university campus are identified during this stage. Examples of texts could be proposals, white papers, briefing documents. These protocol practices are discursively shared with others who can recognize their value and begin to produce organizational practices which generate improvements for the overall functionality of the university.

*Semi-institutionalization.* At this stage the formed habit has had enough exposure in the space of usage that it is has acquired meaning and relevancy. Those who use it have a clear understanding why it matters. The formed practice or habit has expanded from its origins and is gaining wider acceptance among people and is becoming diffused throughout the institution (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996; Meyer et al, 2018). The creation of texts or documentation of application (i.e., manuals, templates, job descriptions) takes shape to inform others of practical relevancy, establishing legitimacy of practices, becoming further institutionalized (Phillips et al,

2004). As the academic protocol function becomes further embedded in the university, protocol practices become organized across more platforms, proving that protocol is a necessarily useful tool beyond the original audience who finds value in the previous stage. Evidence of documentation (i.e., standards and policies) makes the institutional process easier to become adopted by a wider audience.

*Full-institutionalization.* The final stage of sedimentation is when the practice or activity reaches a point where it is taken for granted (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996); the sensemaking has been complete and there are no gaps in understanding why it exists. There is no need to explain the practice or activity because it has been embedded into the institutional fabric and is taken for granted by all who encounter it. This stage refers back to the concept of isomorphism, which explains how rules are accepted (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In the case of an academic protocol office, the practices are fully functioning and accepted with no concern over when or how it ever was created. The practice of protocol becomes fully produced and reproduced (Berger & Luckmann, 1967) and is part of the status quo organization at all levels of the university.

It is important to note that the institutionalization process takes time and resources in order to move ideas into practices that can be routinized, embedded, diffused, and finally taken for granted. An example is a case study regarding a Canadian professional accounting association, which identified and named the stages it went through to reconstitute professional identity (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002). The authors' study provides insight into how many years it took to impact change for an institutionalized field. The organizational discursive exchanges, often at intersections of both agreement and conflict, occurred over time. Input from



various stakeholders helped legitimize the process as their buy-in constituted agreement to the changes.

Boivin et al (2017) use this multi-stage model to study the institutionalization of CCO scholarship over a fifteen-year period. Their work categorizes CCO research into the three stages, tracing its impact and legitimacy at each stage. Their study is unique in that it applies institutional theory to CCO work, demonstrating which of several brands of CCO scholarship has become legitimized and ultimately institutionalized. These two examples explain how stages can be used to track change within institutions by following their institutional practices.

As this section has explained, tracing change is a significant undertaking within institutionalism scholarship. The following section expands on this through a review of the concept of institutional work.

### *Institutional Work*

Actors engage in the socially constructed reality of the institution (Berger & Luckmann, 1967) and their interactions form a collective identity, according to Thornton and Ocasio (2008). Their research demonstrates that there are cognitive and normative dimensions of institutional work. The work actors engage in is socially constructed; it involves sharing a common identity and the guiding principles of the logic pertinent to their organization's work (Lammers & Garcia, 2014).

Institutional work also involves agency. Agency speaks to the organized action of individuals or of a collective within an institution or organization. It recognizes their experiences and motivations and opens up space for deeper organizational contributions by individuals. It is an important feature within neo-institutionalism, and as described in the previous section,

individuals' contributions can be traced using the stages of institutionalization. If their institutional work is successful, it can impact the organization's work products.

Lawrence and Suddaby's (2006) study on institutional work provides a key concept that this study explores, which is that of change. They define institutional work as "a purposive action of individuals and organizations aimed at changing, maintaining or disrupting institutions" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 215). Individuals function rationally and cognitively to affect their environment, which evolves by application of internal and external influences. Individuals working as an agent are foregrounded as an action-oriented instrument of change or disruption to the status quo. Their actions conducted purposively and consciously can transform processes, norms, values, and even culture.

An interesting point to consider about institutional work and agency is that there are many variations of actions and agents operating in concurrent orbits within an organization. Lawrence, Suddaby and Leca (2009) remind us that "institutions influence how agents act, but [they] also can determine which collective or individual actor in a society will be considered to have agency and what agents can legitimately do" (p. 4). Therefore, just because individuals are capable of agency and action does not mean they can exercise it anytime they want. Institutions have an uncanny interest in preservation, therefore personal agendas or interests may not be considered by others to be in the best interest of the institution.

Actors interested in institutional work that aims to create change have the ability to shape their institutional logics using discursive tools and activities as they engage with others inside the organization. This engagement with others helps move sensemaking to the point of recognizing whether an idea is innovative enough to institutionalize. Situated in the realm of academic protocol, examples of institutional work would include communicative and behavioral tasks

related to ceremonial logistics, such as celebrations, milestones, and ceremonies; orchestration of high-level events on campus, such as inter-government gatherings or fundraising galas; and formal hosting by the university, such as events at the president's residence or managing the presence of invited dignitaries and delegations. To execute work in these environments requires the ability to communicate with institutional leaders and actors, both instructionally and persuasively. It also requires a perspective allowing oneself to be sensitive to differentiated cultural situations. As mentioned above, progressing through stages takes time and requires the skills to discursively rationalize the utility of new ideas and processes. Institutional entrepreneurs often supply those skills.

### *Institutional Entrepreneur*

A growing area of new institutionalism scholarship is devoted to the institutional entrepreneur. Institutional work identifies institutional entrepreneurship as an embedded agent of change (DiMaggio, 1988; Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Lawrence et al, 2009; Battalina & D'Aunno, 2009; Lammers & Garcia, 2014). Institutional entrepreneurship focuses on those innovative ideas that have transformative qualities capable of moving institutional resources in different directions. According to Lammers and Garcia (2014) "entrepreneurs negotiate and shape boundaries, mobilize resources, and construct logics to create change" (p. 202). Institutional entrepreneurs operate in the socially constructed environment of an institution and use communicative strategies to engage others, diffuse ideas, produce and reproduce messages to argue for and legitimize change (Cornelissen, Durand, Fiss, Lammers, & Vaara, 2015). The entrepreneur is an embedded agent often exposed to contradictions in institutional logics. When an institution has ambiguous or contradictory practices or communications, conditions are ripe for change. However, the institutional entrepreneur

becomes a paradoxical figure in that he or she works to change an environment that typically resists change (Battilana & D'Aunno, 2009). What might motivate an individual to take on the role of the institutional entrepreneur?

When individuals recognize opportunities that not only benefit the institution, but add some value to their current circumstance, they are often motivated by self-interest to create change. Phillips et al (2004) explain that “actors may structure their environments in ways they find advantageous” (p. 648). Other motivations might be in response to an unanticipated situation (Powell & Colyvas, 2008), which presents an opportunity for change, or the desire to “professionalize” existing institutional work, making processes more substantial and identifiable as separate from the ordinary (Lammers & Garcia, 2014).

Entrepreneurs organize their work from a “centered agency” (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008), putting themselves in proximity to resources necessary to move ideas through the stages of institutionalization. The institutional entrepreneur has the capacity to persuade, influence, or use influence within an organization. According to Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), “institutional entrepreneurship has [the] greatest potential when a relatively small peripheral or isolated actors are involved” (p. 229).

Lammers and Garcia (2014) remind us that position power is not necessarily required to be an institutional entrepreneur. Rather their position may be suitable to expose them to resources internal or external to the organization, such as access to or knowledge of practices applied to other fields, which could help facilitate envisioned change (p. 203). Actors do not necessarily have to be in positions of authority or leadership to function as an institutional entrepreneur. For individuals who are not specifically a member of the leadership team but recognize potential areas of change or transformation, they must have knowledge of the

institutional landscape and access to institutional resources that can be leveraged to move ideas forward. For example, Maguire, Hardy and Lawrence (2004) studied the role of “institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields,” using HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada as their case study. Recognizing that this field was historically well documented and supported by numerous and various data sources, their qualitative study found that “actors not occupying dominant positions in a field can nonetheless act as institutional entrepreneurs and affect its development in ways that are advantageous to them” (p. 658).

Institutional entrepreneurship can chart institutional change vis-à-vis the stages of institutionalization. For a person ascribed with leadership authority and an innovative idea, moving through the stages might happen quickly because that person has access and control of resources. As the idea is communicated and makes its way through the stages, others will exercise sensemaking as the change applies to their work. As the idea takes shape with input from others, it is supplemented by documentation which helps routinize the processes, which eventually become embedded practices.

When the role of an institutional entrepreneur is not necessarily an institutional leader with authority, I argue that the individual’s work through these stages is a more fragile path toward success if authority is absent. Even though individual agency is foregrounded in neo-institutionalism (Lawrence et al, 2011) it is necessary to exercise some level of authority with agency and be recognized for it, whether it is evidenced by acquired knowledge or experience or legitimacy. When others fail to recognize some level of authority, engaging in change can be thwarted. It is possible that a transformative idea - like creating an academic protocol role - never makes it to the pre-institutionalized level, particularly if the communication cannot be “scaled

up” by engaging like-minded individuals (Cornelissen et al, 2015) or if the motivation is shown to be more self-serving than it is beneficial for the institution.

Even with the assistance of an institutional entrepreneur, institutional change can be hard to trace, especially when institutionalized behavior, norms, and values have developed taken-for-granted practices (Phillips et al, 2004; Lammers & Garcia, 2014). What is critical to the success of the work of an institutional entrepreneur is the ability to communicate innovative ideas effectively by socially engaging others through discourse. One way to trace change is through communication practices that are already institutionalized. Organizational communication theory is a practical pathway to inform institutional theory because it studies discourse and rhetoric as an interactive process within the standpoint of organizations (Lammers & Garcia, 2014). In the next section I introduce discourse analysis from the perspective of institutional theory and move the discussion deeper into communication territory by discussing the second theory of this study: Communicative Constitution of Organizations.

### *Discourse Analysis in Institutional Theory*

Phillips et al (2004) describe discourse analysis as a “framework to understand how institutions are produced and maintained” (p. 635). They illustrate how institutionalization (the process of producing and reproducing institutions) can be constituted through the use of texts (p. 638). Actors produce, reproduce, disseminate, and consume communication through discourse in all activities: talking on the phone, emailing, creating documents, participating in meetings, and listening to others (p. 636).

To study institutional change is to study constructed discourse, not by its actions alone, but also by its texts. Phillips et al (2004) state that an action generates text, and a text generates

traces, leaving a trail of connected work. Texts are constructed to make sense of actions. They construct meaning and reality. There can be conflicting meanings and realities, and texts can likewise reflect contrary realities. Texts are the embodiment of discourse working to influence action. When actors draft “convincing texts,” they work as institutional entrepreneurs who create enduring discourse (Phillips et al, 2004, p. 648).

Through discursive activity transforming action to text, change can be traced. The tracing back speaks to sensemaking. This retrospective process can complete a narrative not fully understood by the institution nor by all actors. It takes a broader discursive space to fully understand the shift in institutional logic. While the discursive analysis framework discussed by Phillips et al (2004) focuses on the social construction of the institution through discourse, it does not go far enough in connecting to more micro communicative processes of individuals inside organizations. Cornelissen et al (2015) acknowledge the absence of micro-foundational studies in organizational discourse, so they edited a special topic forum to bring forth new scholarship addressing communicative perspectives related to institutional change. There is, however, another theoretical framework, known as communicative constitution of organizations (CCO), that can inform discourse analysis from the perspective of organizational communication that focuses on actions and interactions of individuals embedded in the organization and how they use communicative tools to shape organizations.

### *Communicative Constitution of Organizations*

Within organizational communication, the CCO approach complements a neo-institutional theoretical framework as it foregrounds communication within an organization to understand how it is constructed and how institutional work is created, maintained, or disrupted. CCO’s foundation is the study of organizations through a variety of communicative acts, such as

speeches, narratives, texts, linguistic turns, and non-human symbols, just to cite a few (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004; Kuhn, 2008; Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen, & Clark, 2011; Schoeneborn, Blaschke, Cooren, McPhee, Seidl, & Taylor, 2014). Communication is essential to how organizations are formed and sustained through discursive practices, which are the interplays between actors, even in seemingly inconsequential encounters. Communication is both an action-oriented process and a material product, producing and re-producing in either co-oriented performative or transactional episodes between actors (Cooren et al, 2011). Organizations are situated spaces where discourse among and between actors is actively constructed and grounded in action (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004). Institutionally speaking, the many discourses that happen within an organization have the potential to create, maintain, and disrupt the very space they actively engage in.

CCO scholarship has been influenced by Weick's (1969) concepts of sensemaking and organization which "is produced action by action" (Bisel, 2010, p. 125). Its beginnings can be traced to 2000, when two seminal publications were published. The first was an article entitled "The communicative constitution of organizations: a framework for explanation" by McPhee and Zaig (2000) who developed a CCO framework called the Four Flows Model. The second was a book entitled, *The emergent organization: Communication as its site and surface*, authored by Taylor and Van Every (2000), who argued that "organization can only be enacted through members' communication and sensemaking" (cited in Bisel, 2010, p. 126). Since 2000 significant scholarship has developed three schools of thought: the Montreal School of organizational communication, structuration theory's Four Flows Model, and Luhmann's Theory of Social Systems. These three theoretical pathways have taken different yet interesting perspectives about organizational communication, demonstrating how heterogenous CCO



theories have resulted from studying communicative events that constitute organizations, as well as acknowledging the role discourse and texts play in studying organizational communication (Cooren et al, 2011).

For the purpose of this research study, the Montreal School is the path I have selected to connect CCO to institutional theory as it applies to organizational communication. According to the Montreal School approach to organizational communication, it is as much about organization as it is about organizing (Weick, 1969; Biesel, 2010; Schoeneborn & Blaschke, 2014). According to Putnam and Nicotera (2010), “CCO theorists typically center on the elements and communicative processes that produce organizing and organization” such as conversations and texts (p. 160). These communicative modes can facilitate co-orientation, allowing individuals to ‘tune in’ to one another discursively as they make sense of their environment. Discursive moments can be investigated for their abilities to conceptualize, articulate, argue, agree, question, propose, decide, and conclude.

Discursive acts happen between networked people in the everyday, taken-for-granted spaces within organizations. Considering the volume of discourse produced organizationally, it is fair to say not all communication acts manifest into productive, viable, authoritative outcomes that build organization or institutionalize practices and process. According to CCO, it is not so much concerned about communicative acts being successful, but how authoritative they become. Two important and interrelated concepts in CCO theory are conversation and text, which operate together and help co-orient actors in their quest for communicating constitutively in an organization.

CCO scholarship examines the dynamic between conversation and text, where conversation is the “doing” and text is the “done” of social interaction (Taylor & Van Every,

2000). To understand conversation in the CCO tradition is to understand it as situated and coordinated interaction between actors engaging in some collective action (Kuhn, 2012; Boivin et al, 2017). There is an inherent transactional nature to conversation (a give and take) that can move along interpretive or linguistic turns as the actors make sense of their shared work (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004; Cooren et al, 2011). Text is understood to be the substance through which conversation takes shape and is seen as “patterns of interaction that transcend immediate conversations” (Putnam et al, 1996, cited in Boivin et al, 2017, p. 334; Kuhn, 2012). The two processes interacting together form what Taylor and Van Every (2000) identify as a “self-organizing loop.” The dialectic is process oriented but depends on the materiality of conversations and texts. The next section identifies the concept of the authoritative text as a key CCO material variable in understanding the conversation-text dialectic.

### *Authoritative Texts*

As indicated, there is a material focus to this conversation-text dialectic: conversations are situated and are shaped by interactions, and the texts become the substantiated form of the conversations (Cooren et al, 2011; Kuhn, 2012). Organizations and institutions thus produce texts as discursive practices, and Kuhn identifies them as authoritative texts. He defines those that gain legitimacy as authoritative texts, which are “an abstract representation of the entire organization and the connections between its activities, which portrays the relations of authority and criteria of appropriateness that become present in ongoing practice” (Kuhn, 2012, p. 553). Abstract representations (e.g., the final say at meetings or a written record) help distance authorship and open space for co-orientated action to shape text.

Kuhn describes two forms of authoritative texts: concrete and figurative. Concrete text is the least abstract and is shaped by the traceable actions of actors. It serves as a text of authority

by virtue of its authorship. Examples of concrete texts are evidenced by materiality: documents, manuals, policies, letters, memos, or non-human actors (visual text) such as logos. Figurative texts are “abstract representations of practice sites, communities, and firms,” which are taken up and repeated in organizational interaction (Kuhn, 2008, p. 1234). Examples of figurative texts include: conversations, narratives, memories, gestures, or metaphors. Where a concrete text can be written in draft form to potentially add to the institutional corpus of identity, the figurative text takes a circuitous route beginning with an abstracted idea that requires additional communication to shape into something more concrete. Both authoritative texts are formed in and through discourse, and both are authored into existence. However, the former is shaped and reshaped until it pivots into a more codified form and is therefore embodied institutionally. Many figurative texts remain abstract and, arguably, pre-institutionalized, which is insightful for this study.

As I previously noted in the section discussing the stages of institutionalization, there are many ideas inside organizations that never make it to the first stage, primarily because they have neither gained traction nor acceptance. In the context of organizing and tracing an academic protocol role or office, I propose that authoritative text can also be interpreted according to the stages of institutionalization. For example, figurative texts (i.e., speech acts developing plans for protocol activities) occur in situated practices and represent the pre-institutionalization stage within an organization because only a few core actors tune into the conceptual nature of the text. Because of the conversation-text dialectic, they ‘get it’ and understand its value, and may even accept it, but it requires more agency to move the figurative text through the next stage of semi-institutionalization. Here it is possible to see the text take on more concreteness as it gains agency and legitimacy, becoming championed by others and transforming into some documented

format (i.e., new story describing a new protocol office) that can be referential and authoritative. In this stage I suggest the text still retains some level of attribution to its creator but is on its way to being “self-replicating” (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). When the text reaches the final stage of full institutionalization, it reaches full concrete status, meaning it is embedded institutionally and no longer is connected to any attributed source because it becomes constitutive of organization. It is produced and reproduced institutionally and is therefore, taken for granted.

Attribution to a source is not discussed in CCO theory, although authorship is. According to Taylor and Van Every (2014, p. 27), authority is intimately connected with the notion of authoring; both derive from the Latin root *auctor*, which means the source or origin. Therefore, the perceived legitimate right to influence and decide on organizational matters is not determined by hierarchical position or leader titles per se, but by whom is seemingly “authentically translating the purposes of the organization.” Authoring is thus not just interactional, but transactional, as parties orient around a common object or purpose that, in turn, establishes its legitimacy as it adds value to the organization. Authoring communication materializes itself, first, through the conversations that negotiate the terms of the transaction and rules of association and, second, in the resulting text that inscribes such terms and rules, whether such texts appear as written documents or tacit understandings.

I suggest that authorship can be found in institutional theory vis-à-vis the concept of the institutional entrepreneur. I propose that the institutional entrepreneur through his or her agency, is that champion of authoritative text. This means that, in the context of creating a university protocol office, that he or she is capable of authoring discursive activities and materializing texts, which lead to changing an organized environment.

## Research Questions

The work of an institutional entrepreneur can inform the usefulness of authoritative texts and vice versa. According to Micoletta, Lounsbury, and Greenwood (2017) “there is a relative dearth of studies that illuminate how and why institutional entrepreneurship may lead to institutional change” (p. 1893). Likewise, there is not much research about the emergence, legitimization, and distribution of authoritative texts over time (Hardy & Maguire, 2010; Holm & Fairhurst, 2018; Kuhn, 2008, 2012). It is my hope that this study can focus on the institutional entrepreneur to trace intentional and purposive change through communication practices developed through CCO, and to demonstrate by example how organizations are constituted in communication (Boivin et al, 2017).

The contribution of institutional entrepreneurship can help fill a gap with respect to the institutionalization of protocol in academic institutions. Additionally, authoritative texts can inform the work of institutional entrepreneurs, especially in highlighting the creation of figurative and concrete texts associated within institutional work. Therefore, this study is grounded by the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the role of the institutional entrepreneur in the creation of the role of protocol at an academic institution?

RQ2: To the extent possible, how does the institutional entrepreneur make use of authoritative (concrete and figurative) text?

## Chapter 3 Methods

This chapter reviews the steps taken to study the research questions presented in Chapter Two. This study followed a qualitative analysis approach using the format of structured interviews to build data for analysis (Tracy, 2013). Coding the data was conducted using the constant comparative method (Charmaz, 2006), focused on identifying interesting data, whether they were responsive to the research questions or not. The data analysis process selected was the grounded iterative analysis approach, which provided opportunities for reflexive interpretations of what matters among data, alternating between etic and emic viewpoints (Tracy, 2013).

The chapter begins with an explanation of the collection of data followed by a section on how interviews were conducted, and thereafter reviewing coding methodologies used to examine what was happening with data.

### *Sample Collection*

Criteria for research subjects were determined to be academic employees who perform some level of protocol at academic institutions. To source the data, I further determined that the subjects should come from public institutions in English speaking countries. Institutions that are public rather than private tend to have more front-facing information and content that can be accessible from searchable engines and websites. While academic protocol exists in many institutions in other countries, it was considered important to compare practices among English-speaking institutions.

In addition, employees may or may not be currently working as protocol specialists, so I referred to an international organization for protocol specialists, Protocol Diplomacy International—Protocol Officers Association ([www.protocolinternational.org](http://www.protocolinternational.org)), to source for

research subjects. This source was ideal because people who join this organization self-identify with the realm of protocol and have some inclination towards the practices found in protocol. This organization is a recognized body of professionals engaging in protocol specialties practiced in the realms of military, government, business, and academia. In fact, academia is the largest growing sector of membership, having grown from 21 academic members in 2012 to 73 academic members in 2018. Members include professionals who are actively practicing protocol in their professional roles, as well as professionals who wish to learn how to incorporate protocol skills into their position. PDI-POA is what Greenwood et al (2002) would describe as a space where interactions among members create emergent understandings of shared conduct and behavior. I would like to note that I too, am a member of this organization and therefore understand the value of its mission of advancing the knowledge and practice of protocol across a growing number of institutional fields.

Subjects for this qualitative research study were selected from the 2018 PDI-POA membership listing, downloaded from the website. The data pool was created by searching for the words ‘university’ or ‘college’ from the membership list, and all qualified members were downloaded from this initial search. The following data subjects were removed from the set: the researcher, students, retirees, and members whose institution is not primarily English speaking. The list was sorted alphabetically by last name and the researcher catalogued each institution as ‘public’ or ‘private’ institutions, verifying that status by reviewing each institution’s website. This step validated 41 members working for 27 public institutions and therefore, served as a purposive sampling for the qualitative research.

Following the process approved by IRB, these 41 candidates for research participation were contacted by email and invited to participate in the study, with a copy of the IRB approved

information sheet supplied. There were eight candidates removed from the pool because they self-identified as no longer working in their role or at the institution or who declined to participate due to work related demands of their time. Among the sample set, twelve agreed to participate. They are identified in this study as R1, R2, R3...R12. The participants came from institutions that were well established to recently formed: ranging from 1828 to 1995 in terms of the founding of the university. The range of enrollment from 3,500 to 96,000 students (excluding online) demonstrated a breadth of small to large institutions. These ranges also addressed the longevity and scale of institutions, which served as a viable sample of academic institutions in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

To provide context about the data set, all institutions are public institutions, where institutional information is often more accessible than from private institutions. The institutional enrollment size typically describes undergraduate and graduate students who attend classes on campus (not those attending through online degree programs). Some institutions have more than one campus so these enrollment numbers would be included since the multi-campus institution is common within higher education. Some institutions are part of a state-wide system, while others are independent institutions.

### *Interviews*

Mediated interviews (Tracy, 2013) were conducted and recorded using Cisco Webex Meetings software program, and I also used a secondary recording method from a cell phone recording application. The back-up method proved to be the more reliable recording since not all Webex recordings worked correctly. An interview schedule approved by IRB was used to conduct each interview (see Appendix A). The interviews averaged 80 minutes to complete. The interview schedule was broken into two parts: questions related to the individual role at the



university/institution, and questions about the institutional role of protocol. At my discretion some interviews started with the questions related to the individual role, and others started with questions about the institutional role. This method helped me recognize that some of the same information was asked in different contexts and helped set up what might seem to be redundant questions as a probe for deeper input. As conversations flowed, there were times when remedial or pedagogical exchanges occurred (Tracy, 2013). At other times, there were follow up questions asked that emerged from the information provided by the participant. I documented notes during the interview to capture personal thoughts.

Some questions focused on the existence of protocol practices at their institution, whether in their own role, in their department, or elsewhere. There were questions probing the awareness of what protocol is on campus. Questions about the history of protocol on campus were asked. Other questions asked about evidence of protocol practices in their own scope of work. At times, conflicts in answers were identified, and further probing occurred to help the participant manage the discrepancy in information.

Each of the twelve interviews were transcribed verbatim, including disfluencies, and generated 308 pages of 13,069 single spaced, numbered lines of text in Word. The transcribed texts underwent a series of coding episodes, which will be explained below.

### *Coding and Analysis*

To prepare the transcriptions for primary coding, a copy of each transcribed document was created to conduct further analysis, keeping the original transcriptions intact. Changes made to the copy included:

- renaming the coded transcription document: Last name Transcription- Primary Coding;

- creating a new header for each document with the following color and text codes to identify passages in the text:

Yellow = Factoid	Gray = Opinion
Blue = Commentary	Red Font = Description of Questions
Purple = Example	Italic and Bold Font = Prepared Question
Green = Historic	Italic Only = Follow Up Question

These color categories helped visually process text as it was developing in narratives. For example, when a respondent wove historical references with facts and opinions, I found it helpful to dissect the answer using color codes for further clarity or reference back to if contradicting information was identified elsewhere in the transcription.

Using a grounded theory approach (Tracy, 2013; Saldaña, 2015), a line-by-line primary coding method was used to interrogate the transcribed text and determine what was happening. To track overall themes, I relied on the color coding to identify passages in the text that provided meaning and applied descriptive, or in vivo coding (Saldaña, 2015). The text was accompanied by a comment box or analytic memo identifying what was happening with the portion of text. Sometimes the memo posed a reflexive question for future exploration, or a note reacting to the text. If there was a notable quote to remember, it was identified by “IN VIVO=*text*.”

This line-by-line method was used on two transcriptions and it became clear that the role of the institutional entrepreneur and corresponding activities i.e., institutional work, was emerging as pivotal data. The preliminary data showed that the concept of institutional entrepreneur from institutional work theory (DiMaggio, 1988; Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence et al, 2011) was foregrounding and emerging as a key concept across all participants. The evidence of concrete authoritative texts was weak and proving to be inconclusive across all data sources, which will be addressed in Chapters Four and Five. I found that the original

concept of authoritative texts, especially concrete texts, (Kuhn, 2008) was being backgrounded by the subjects. Therefore, at this stage and before coding any further data, I revisited the original research questions and modified the questions presented in Chapter Two.

The remaining transcriptions were coded using a new method: reading narrative chunks and coding the emergent theme as a block of text. The color coding and method of applying comment boxes remained the same, but the criteria directed by the research questions changed with a focus on documenting evidence of institutional entrepreneurship.

After all Word transcriptions were reviewed using the primary coding method, the data underwent a second level coding to identify categories and themes (Tracy, 2013; Saldaña, 2015). To prepare the data I systematically went through each color-coded text and built an Excel page according to color. Each coded textual sample was copied over from Word to Excel to build a sheet per colored text. If comments or memos were made, they too were transferred over. The source was identified as well in case I needed to reference the original transcription. Columns were added for capturing codes. This became my codebook to begin my analysis of data, and the unit of analysis was the quote. Once the Excel sheets were prepared, I conducted second level coding to identify emergent themes and sensitizing concepts. During this process patterns were identified, interpreting was noted, meaning was assessed, and some data emerged stronger than others.

The coded data per respondent were then isolated a second time into a new, single Excel page for the third-level coding process. Using this format each item was examined for reliability and additional coding was again color coded. The identified codes were analyzed and condensed into themes. The color-coded items were organized together by theme and examined for evidence of patterns and similarities. I organized the data according to categories, for example

data that described creating tools, creating websites, or creating manuals were gathered into an analytic theme called “Documentation.” Table 1 demonstrates that this analytic process produced ten hierarchical categories. Appendix B is organized by these categories.

**Table 1: Chart of Analytic Categories**

<b>Hierarchical Categories</b>
A=Seeking Change
B=Rationale for Change
C=Internal Communication Initiating Change
D=Creating Change
E=Preparing Change
F=Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization
G=Institutional Work
H=Documentation
I=Movement of Change
J=Inhibitor to Change

These categories and descriptions guided further analysis of the data according to stages of institutionalization, described in Chapter Two. To summarize, institutionalization can be traced through four stages: innovation, pre-institutionalization, semi-institutionalization, and full institutionalization. As the data were analyzed during the second level of coding using an iterative approach, I observed that each respondent’s situation was occurring at different stages of development and could be organized accordingly. The third level of coding was developed to organize behaviors found in the categories and I assigned them to the stages, which helped structure evidence of (or lack thereof) an institutional entrepreneur creating -or authoring- the role of the academic protocol function. The data were then reflexively synthesized one last time into the four stages, and that data were once again captured in a new Excel sheet. At this point all speech disfluencies were removed from quotes selected for final analysis. Fact checking was conducted when a quote needed to be confirmed. At this third level of analysis, the coding was

completed to include examples of corresponding research data to create a table combining the categories and emergent behaviors with descriptions and corresponding examples, assigned to different stages of institutionalization (see Appendix B). Appendix C was organized with examples of the institutional entrepreneur present within the different stages of institutionalization.

## Chapter 4 Findings

### RQ1: Findings

The data used in this study foregrounded the presence of institutional entrepreneurship and institutional work, which prompted a deeper exploration into the role, evidenced by the research questions. The interviews demonstrated a variety of pathways that led me to explore this angle more deeply. During the first level of coding, the prominence of the institutional entrepreneur clearly emerged. For example, “the associate registrar definitely championed this” (R8), “I’ve tried to educate our vice presidents” (R6), and “we’ve built this protocol team that consists of about 100 people around campus” (R9) are fragments identifying someone engaging in the process of organizing a protocol role at an academic institution (institutional work). They show support, or lack thereof, and efforts to achieve success, or not (institutional entrepreneur). The findings explored in this section will provide more insight into institutional work and institutional entrepreneur.

Regarding the role of the institutional entrepreneur in the creation of protocol at a university, the data demonstrated three key findings. The first finding refers to the institutional entrepreneur’s direction of change. The second focuses on inhibitors of change that institutional entrepreneurs experience. The third relates to the four stages of institutionalization, referencing data that show behaviors associated with each stage.

#### *Directional Change*

This finding presents three general strategies or approaches to creating an academic protocol office at a university. The first is described as a top-down process from the standpoint of a president/chancellor/institutional leader who seeks consistency at the institution and/or

wants a dedicated staff. The second approach is from the bottom-up, by an individual who wants to elevate events, focus on the reputation of the institution, and build consistency across the institution. The individual may or may not be able to single-handedly mobilize assistance from others to make it happen. The third approach is also from the bottom up, but by a group of individuals who work together to create and champion change. These three approaches are explained in further detail beginning with the institutional entrepreneur approaching change from the top down.

*Top-down.* An institutional entrepreneur is most often thought of as a person who has a position of power and influences others and persuades them to embrace change as he/she sees it. The person in authority is expected to be a visionary and create direction for the institution. In this study, this type of institutional entrepreneur is a president/chancellor or chief executive working from the top down to create change that should mutually benefit the president and the institution. These chief executives focused on consistency from people around them who conducted high level event planning, managed the official residence, and hosted distinguished guests.

One of the surest methods of building consistency is to create a dedicated team who is authorized to do the protocol work for the institution. One way is to create new resources from scratch and another is to reorganize existing resources. Research data demonstrated that chief executives opted to reorganize existing resources to establish protocol functions, as opposed to creating new staff and offices from the ground up. For this type of top-down model of change the institutional entrepreneur, in this case the chief executive, has the liberty to use authority but also needs to negotiate buy-in from colleagues and subordinates for the change to be fully supported.

For example:

So, the president – this is what I think happened – approached the provost and the university secretary, and they were on the same page, a conversation was had at the cabinet level with all the executive officers, and then I was brought into the conversation. (R10)

He [chief of staff] came directly with the president. And that was part of the deal. And when he came, he saw some things that needed to be changed...Where he utilized some things that he learned at his previous institution and implemented them here. He also utilized what we already had here and sort of created and sort of morphed it. So, in other words, we had the special events office but they didn't have the protocol piece. (R12)

In both examples each chief executive foresees reorganization as the way to bring protocol into the institution and use their authority to create change at the institution. As institutional entrepreneurs, they seek out change, negotiate buy-in, and create change that moves from the top downward into the institution. Once the reorganization is completed, the work of the high-level institutional entrepreneur ends, and the work of the newly created staff begins, with full support of the chief executive behind them.

*Bottom-up.* The second type of directional change for an institutional entrepreneur is the bottom-up approach. Not all institutional change is initiated at the top and neo-institutional theory provides space to explore individuals not endowed with authority to be institutional entrepreneurs (Maguire, Hardy & Lawrence, 2004; Taylor & Van Every, 2014). As mentioned earlier, the data presented two types of bottom-up approaches. The first is that of an individual working to secure a champion who can support an idea or a proposal and help move it upwards. According to Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), this champion is an actor “whose role is supportive or facilitative of the entrepreneur’s endeavors” (p. 217). Not one individual can change an institution and needs support from someone else who can be persuaded that the change offers benefits, and that it is worth fighting for. People who recognize the need for protocol often are



not in positions of authority to make it happen. They tend to work in the field of ceremonies or event planning where protocol skills are best suited to manage events that influence the institution's reputation. Therefore, an individual institutional entrepreneur seeks out people within the institution to help them move the needle to advance the protocol initiative.

People who help – and who have some material stake – are identifiably champions for the individual institutional entrepreneurs (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). It is not a prerequisite that the champion is endowed with power and authority but does have to have some legitimacy, which is found at all levels of an institution. The data show examples of an institutional entrepreneur securing a champion from a direct supervisor, an administrative leader they have worked with, or the institution's president. For example:

So when my first supervisor, and again, I got to give her props too, she was the associate registrar at the time, and she also thought this [protocol role] was a really good idea, and that I should be starting to work on this too. She was the first one to mention it to me and I said yeah, cause essentially the question to me was, 'hey, we're thinking about maybe doing a protocol document, do you think you'd want to write it?' (R1)

He was the executive director - at the time - of executive communications and he very much, he allowed me to have a lot of autonomy...and there was an interim VP who was in our department who had known me and she thought it sounded good as well, and then since our president was just coming in I think he was very open to, again it was like the perfect storm and I don't know if the times had been different if we had gotten it passed so quickly because things happened very quickly in order to develop what became...this office. (R8)

What we see is the champion role performed by a person anchored in an institutional position and who is well connected. They serve the individual by encouraging them on their journey or they step in and assist moving the initiative upward, as demonstrated in the above examples. The champion functions as a mentor and if high enough within the institution, can plow a path for easier access for an individual institutional entrepreneur to facilitate change.

The second type of the bottom-up approach is distinguished by a group of people working as a collective to institute change regarding common topics of interest. This cohort or group people who are socially constructed around a shared concern over inefficiencies and desire to learn together. They function as a collective to experience solutions together and champion a shared cause. Formation of the group can be organic where people naturally find each other and identify topics of common interest or can be intentionally brought together through selection or invitation to explore focused topics. For groups to influence change institutionally, the latter is often a more effective way for individuals to collectively work as institutional entrepreneurs. The group itself can move ideas from the bottom up and champion the change it seeks. For example:

We actually kind of leaned upon the experience and the universal voice of, at that time there were about 18 members or so, who were hand selected from the president's office staff who were kind of representative of events within the prominent units and colleges and things like that. (R8)

In this example, the group's original focus of initiating consistency in events campus wide expanded to championing some form of protocol at the university. The initial group grew from 18 members in 2009 to over 500 members today as the scope and reach became more inclusive.

These examples identify distinctions between bottom-up and top-down directional change led by institutional entrepreneurs. The findings demonstrate that institutional entrepreneurs can emerge from a spectrum of authority and expertise. The data also suggest that institutional entrepreneurs cannot work in a vacuum. They need to seek buy-in and support from others, who are considered champions. There are times, however, when championing efforts go awry, or the work of an institutional entrepreneur fails to achieve the intended results, as described below.

## *Inhibitors to Change*

The second finding of this study relates to the fact that change is not always welcomed institutionally. Change directed by an institutional entrepreneur does not follow a direct, straight path to success. Change is contingent on many variables, and the previously described directional change explains pathways to change. Change can stagnate as evidenced by some of the narratives collected. It can be halted in its tracks. I posit it can take a circuitous route that tests the patience and perseverance of the institutional entrepreneur.

One of the clearest examples of an inhibitor to change that data revealed is that of the silo effect at institutions. The term *silo effect* explains how an institution can function in a decentralized, disconnected, and autonomous environment. To an extent, this is part of the nature of an institution due to the physical structure, the bureaucracy of an organization, and the distribution of authority. But silos are often a barrier to authority and are effective at resisting change. Take for example Respondent 11's summary of her experience trying to create consistency within the institution.

I've been in events before, but this is the first time at an academic institution. And I didn't even realize how, you know, siloed and how un-uniformed we were... There are a lot of silos in each college, and school and division have staff that do events in different capacities. We are not a centralized events office. (R11)

Here is an example from Respondent 12 assessing her environment when she first arrived at the institution. "There were a lot of silos, a lot of colleges, deans that were kind of operating as if they did not exist as part of a greater family." Respondent 6 addresses the challenge silos present when trying to coordinate resources institutionally.

My challenge has been to find out how the president can become involved and help with any protocol issue that comes about as delegations come to visit, visiting professors, you

know they could come for two days they could come for two months. And it's been very difficult to break through that barrier. (R6)

Silos are organizational barriers that can inhibit an organization's effectiveness to centralize resources or communicate intra-institutionally (Mace-Vadjunec, Hileman, Melnykovich, Hanes, Chance, & Emerick, 2015; Forsten-Astikainen, Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, Lämsä, Heilmann, & Hyrkäs, 2017). However, a related inhibitor to change that emerged from the data was resistance to change. Culture and norms are difficult to alter institutionally, and the work of creating a protocol role significantly changes the institutional logics.

The following examples describe the frustration when expertise is refuted internally. Respondent 7 said, "sometimes you get people who are like, you know, 'stay away from my event. It's my event'." Another subject, Respondent 8 explained, "he [department head] would not have felt that my experience would ever have benefited him. You know, that's still some of the struggle, it's proving yourself, proving your worth and benefit." The role of protocol is a skill set that takes time and exposure to experiences to develop when an institutional entrepreneur is incubating the idea of a possible protocol position.

### **Stages of Institutionalization**

In order to understand the role of the institutional entrepreneur associated with creating a protocol role at an institution, I found the data revealing particular behaviors exhibited at different times. The third finding reviews the stages of institutionalization discussed in Chapter Two and identifies behaviors indicative to each stage. Why stages? They serve as pathways experienced by the institutional entrepreneur as well as road maps to institutionalizing protocol at their university. The findings are laid out in Appendix B according to the stages of

institutionalization: Innovation (Stage 1), Pre-Institutionalization (Stage 2), Semi-Institutionalization (Stage 3), and Full-Institutionalization (Stage 4). As described in Chapter Two, these stages effectively demonstrate how institutional work is produced and reproduced, such as academic protocol, in socially constructive environments, such as universities (Berger & Luckmann, 1967).

Table 2 on the following page is a summary of Appendix B, which is the documentation of my third-level coding. The listed behaviors are emergent from the data, organized according to when behaviors were engaged to help make sense of how the process of creating a protocol role or office was conducted. The table is organized by the four stages with types of behaviors appropriated with each stage. Some behaviors are emergent in different stages, while others are definitively associated with one stage. Behaviors distinguish processes of change experienced within each of the stages of institutionalization and are contextual to creating a protocol office. Note the items in *italic* reference behaviors are identified as inhibitors to change, which are sites of struggle.

**Table 2: Behaviors According to Stages of Institutionalization**

<b>Innovation</b>	<b>Pre- Institutionalization</b>	<b>Semi- Institutionalization</b>	<b>Full- Institutionalization</b>
Identifying a systemic problem	Securing buy-in Creating documentation	Communicating change	Being a resource
Conversations about need	Internal processes Advising	Internal processes Securing buy-in Advising	Consistency Reputation building
Elevating the institution	Being a resource Building capacity	Being a resource Collaborating	Reputation protecting Standardization
Securing buy-in	Consistency	Consistency	
Developing proposals	Reputation building Reputation protecting	Influencing Standardization	
Benchmarking	Standardization Influencing	Reputation building Reputation protecting	
Reputation building	<i>Vague understanding</i>	Training	
Reputation protecting	<i>Disconnected</i>	Creating documentation	
Advising	<i>Imposed limitations</i>	<i>Silo effect</i>	
Building capacity	<i>Risking reputation</i>		
<i>Lack of awareness</i>			
<i>Leadership change</i>			
<i>Poor timing</i>			
<i>Silo effect</i>			

## *Innovation*

In this study I found evidence of an institutional entrepreneur – whether approaching from the bottom-up or top-down – starting with an idea, a vision, a way yet defined to improve the institution. They see things others cannot yet see. They formulate arguments or recognize opportunities only they can express. At this nascent stage the institutional entrepreneur articulates a rationale for change by identifying a systemic problem, creating moments of conversations with strategic individuals to secure buy in, and demonstrating expertise in protocol.

At this first level of institutionalization, the institutional entrepreneur is testing the idea and stepping forward to take an initiative. Data demonstrate that several of the listed behaviors in Table 2's Innovation column give reason to take initiative. For example, Respondent 8 identifies a systemic problem within her institution (i.e., absence of centralized protocol processes and roles) and develops a rationale for protocol: "There's so much disconnect. People are recreating the wheel all the time. There's no centralized area for people to go to for, to answer questions, no one is seen as the universal holder of this (protocol) knowledge." Another subject, Respondent 1, explains how the idea of protocol emerged by identifying a void in service, another example of a systemic problem.

When I started there were lots of discussions with the then-report that I was reporting to in the office of the registrar about needing potentially to do more types of these high level things and dignitaries and invitees and that sort of thing, and nobody was really doing that. (R1)

Conceptualizing benefits for the institution emerges in Stage 1 and helps define the rhetoric for change as buy-in is sought. Once the rationale is shaped, the institutional entrepreneur engages in communicative practices that connect with others to build buy-in.

Examples of communicative practices operationalized during this stage include: benchmarking (i.e., querying other organizations about their protocol practices to aid in local decision making for new protocol processes or initiatives); developing proposals (i.e., documents outlining new protocol processes or initiatives); securing buy-in (i.e., gathering support from others for new protocol processes or initiatives); building capacity (i.e., assembling resources to execute new protocol processes or initiatives); and collaborating (i.e., working with others to develop new protocol processes or initiatives). Communication practices are necessary to gauge support for ideas. The institutional entrepreneur who wants to create a protocol role must be skilled with the institution's cultural communication practices to secure buy-in from others. Respondent 12 used benchmarking to build a case for protocol that leadership would review:

So, I researched you know other institutions... And just kind of utilizing other positions that I found, to show the need and to build the case for the position. And obviously I was able to compare salaries and look at those things. (R12)

Also indicative of the innovative stage is creating a sense of expertise on the subject. To move an idea forward, the institutional entrepreneur should exude knowledge on the subject. This type of behavior is categorized as protocol work and is operationalized by: reputation building (i.e., constructing a base of protocol knowledge that enhances the institutional entrepreneur's standing among stakeholders); reputation protecting (i.e., ensuring that activities conducted by others on behalf of the organization do no harm to the organization); and advising (i.e., giving recommendations on protocol practices to others about what should be done).

For example, Respondent 7 addresses protecting an institution's reputation, saying "that's really what it comes down to, you're letting people put together events that don't have the background or the understanding of all the perils that they put the institution in." Recognition of expertise and professional reputation is important to all the respondents, and one who works in



an environment where protocol is not yet officially recognized explains, “at every given opportunity I try and push it [protocol] out there, and that’s what we do.” (R4)

During this stage the institutional entrepreneur is crafting a rationale that makes sense for the institution and if the powers of persuasion are effective, attracts the interest from a small core of people who see the same potential and champion the idea. Table 2 illustrates practices and behaviors useful for building a case for support of an idea. The rationale of the institutional entrepreneur is focused on *why* a protocol presence is good for the institution and is actively engaging in the protocol work being proposed. While this institutional work is happening, inhibitors to change are encountered creating a challenge for the idea to advance further inside the institution. These inhibitors can stop the nascent process in its tracks regardless if an institutional entrepreneur has a champion and buy-in from others. For example, when a president leaves the university, incomplete projects are often tabled until new leadership is secured. The next stage, pre-institutionalization, addresses how innovative ideas move from a small group of people and secures buy-in from a larger pool of supporters and higher level of authority to create the change.

#### *Pre-institutionalization*

For those institutional entrepreneurs who are working to create change from the bottom up, this stage becomes critical to the success of their efforts. Data show that success of institutional change is dependent upon actively speaking to others about the initiative and its benefits, gaining authority, and then following up on some form of documentation to set up the right conditions for implementing change. Referencing the second column in Table 2, the behaviors listed identify actions taken by the institutional entrepreneur to employ discursive practices to produce academic protocol institutionally.

In the example below, Respondent 1's bottom-up approach was to engage many people across the campus in support of creating a protocol service. Initially, the protocol service idea was successfully supported by a supervisor who championed the idea, moving it upwards to leadership during the first stage. Respondent 1 then took charge of preparing for change by drafting a document (i.e., a concrete text) and circulating it widely to get additional buy-in from others.

Right now this [protocol guide] is in draft form, so I've been leading that, writing that, revising it, making sure to go out to the [institution] community and asking for feedback on it, so that we've had several rounds of sort of that communication piece, people can be involved. That's been a large part of it. (R1)

The approach taken by Respondent 1 is unique in the data set because of the transparent method used to secure as much buy-in as possible, as early as possible. This effort produces a solid foundation at the pre-institutionalization phase.

Another approach by Respondent 6 demonstrates a different result, one where she has been stuck at the pre-institutionalization level for several years. She explains the bottom-up behaviors indicative of Stage 1, how she championed the role and sought buy-in from a supervisor. Then she continues to explain what she did at the pre-institutionalization stage.

I kind of hashed it out with the VP who happened to be a good friend of mine. You know to be honest - I think a lot of it was, it was time for me to be promoted, to be perfectly honest - ...so there are a number of hoops to jump through to justify a promotion, at least in our world...It's very self-serving, but it worked...Initially when I started in this role, which I'm looking back here now, five years ago, first I met with the special assistants to each of our deans to let them know what I was doing. (R6)

This process was less than transparent; rather it was opportunistic and perhaps self-serving, requiring only buy-in from the human relations department. I share this example from the data because Respondent 6 struggles with relevancy inside her institution and feels stuck.

Additional findings demonstrate cases where protocol has the potential for institutionalization, but the respondents have been unable to grow their circle of supporters to advance protocol practice institutionally. For example, Respondent 4 describes a vague understanding of protocol among peers, “some of them [staff] do, some of them get it, but the majority don’t” (R4). Referencing Table 2, vague understanding is considered an inhibitor to change in Stage 2 because it requires more work by the institutional entrepreneur to explain protocol and why it is important to them, which slows down the momentum towards Stage 3. Respondent 3 echoed the same sentiment with, “I think if you ask most of my colleagues, you know, ‘what does she do?’ first of all, I’m an event planner, that’s what they think of me, and number two, ‘oh, she’s the etiquette lady’.” In this example, vague understanding demonstrates a lack of awareness of the professional skill that protocol provides to the institution. This institutional fog can lead to a perpetual state of stagnation for protocol roles. Similarly, Respondent 6 offers, “I think if would go around today and ask people what I do, protocol would never come into the conversation.” Norms and values play a significant part in cultural awareness within institutions. While the subjects in the study want to secure protocol into a more prominent role institutionally, if they cannot organize buy-in during the pre-institutionalization stage, the findings of this study demonstrate that the protocol role stagnates in Stage 2.

Respondent 7 has been an institutional entrepreneur promoting the idea of protocol for nearly half her career. She describes multiple struggles with trying to incorporate protocol into more of her responsibilities but has been met with resistance time and again. The process of innovation and pre-institutionalization stages has stagnated over 10 years. Her approach of introducing the idea of protocol institutionally has been to present herself as an institutional expert. She has been professionally trained and has conducted her protocol functions unofficially

for a long time. She recalls how her supervisor responded when she asked to include protocol in her job title, “that’s not your biggest priority right now” and again, when Respondent 7 drafted a proposal for a chief of protocol position she recalled, “my boss just told me that’s not going to happen.” Eventually, during the pre-institutionalization stage, there was a restructuring of staff. “We brought together the office of special events and the office of university ceremonies, so we created an over-arching office” (R7). But protocol was not specifically included, so Respondent 7’s strategy towards change was to seek permission step by step. After the office merger Respondent 7 explains this episode, “then at that point I was like ‘well we’re all together now, can we just go ahead and say ‘we’re the office of events and protocol?’ and she [Senior VP] said ‘yeah !.’” Finally, after two more years, Respondent 7 once again sought permission to add protocol to her role. She recalls this conversation with her supervisor.

I was running out of business cards and I told my Senior VP, ‘instead of constantly explaining why the director of ceremonies is going to be handling this visit, can we just put ‘protocol officer’ in my title? I need new business cards and can I just add ‘protocol officer’? And she was like, ‘ok’. That’s how I got my title! (R7)

A key finding from the data is that the outcome of success and struggle to form a protocol office is distinguished by the efforts to operationalize the behaviors listed in Table 2 during the innovation and pre-institutionalization stages. Successful efforts are those that gain buy-in from people and those that consider the reputation and future of the institution. Drafting proposals is an excellent way to document a rationale and focus on why and how an innovative idea is a good addition to the institution and identifies specific existing offices or personnel to lead the effort. Data demonstrate this is true for both the top-down and bottom-up approach to change. This sample below provided is verbatim from a historical document, drawn from a proposal drafted to

create a centralized events office. This is a bottom-up approach that boosted momentum and developed a foundation for the existing protocol role, which grew from this original initiative.

Recognizing the challenges of event planning at [institution], the event coordinators network...recommended in 2009 the development of a centralized events office, initiating a paradigm shift from the various [institution] constituencies planning events independently to a more centralized, collaborative, and effective office. ...intended outcomes: increase demonstration of excellence at all [institution] events, greater alignment of [institution's] strategic plan and vision within campus events and activities, increase campus awareness and communication of events, offer support and guidance for non-event planning professionals, increase productivity and effectiveness. (R8)

The success of integrating a protocol role at a university is determined by the ability to move from Stage 2 to Stage 3, and the data have demonstrated key behaviors that contribute to success. Referencing back to Table 2, these behaviors are identifiable in both stages. The importance of one grows from Stage 2 to Stage 3, while the intensity of another diminishes from Stage 2 to Stage 3. The result is dependent upon how quickly an institution adapts to change. The next stage, semi-institutionalization focuses on institutional work once buy-in has been achieved.

### *Semi-institutionalization*

During this stage the institution commits to the idea and is willing to communicate the decision throughout the institution. Ownership or attribution of the innovative idea dies away as the institution begins to accept it. Resources become available to ensure that the change can have the most impact institutionally. Successful transition engages others to help reorganize people, redefine existing roles, or create new offices. For institutional entrepreneurs who are chief executives, this transition is par for the course. For those who do not have authority and are trying to move the idea from the bottom up, they may have a difficult time transitioning to the semi-institutionalization stage because they might lose control of the idea they helped create as the institution begins to objectify it (i.e., turned into a concrete text) (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996).

The data demonstrate that few respondent institutions have reached the semi-institutionalization stage. The findings show that two subjects are in between Stage 2 and 3 whereas two have exhibited behaviors that are indicative of semi-institutionalization. Characteristic of this stage is the absence of having to establish a rationale for change. Seeking buy-in for support diminishes as the practices become further embedded institutionally and there is no need for proposals or rationale to persuade others of an idea. Momentum takes root during Stage 3 and is operationalized by behaviors listed in the third column of Table 2 as: communicating change (i.e., using text, such as emails, formal announcements, or strategic plans to inform decisions about new protocol processes or initiatives); securing (firm) buy-in (i.e., gathering support from those in authoritative positions for new protocol processes or initiatives); and collaborating within the institution (i.e., working with others to operationalize the new protocol processes or initiatives). Notice that some behaviors have been associated with previous stages, but at this stage the emphasis shifts from creating to being created. At the time of the interview Respondent 1 was experiencing the final stages of endorsement for her role and considering the next steps.

So, once it's endorsed then I think that will really help. Then we'll continue to feel out the types of things that essentially would come to our office...we'll probably have to do more communication on that [the new office] and what it means, and educate people that [protocol] is a thing that we are calling ourselves now. (R1)

According to the data, semi-institutionalization becomes communication focused. Once endorsed by the proper channels, focus turns to introductions and announcements of new positions, new offices or new personnel. For example, Respondent 12 was a new hire for the role at the institution and experienced a proper introduction. "There was a press release to the local newspapers. And there's an article that goes across campus about new positions and roles, an

email that's sent out" (R12). The process was lengthy for Respondent 8, who initiated the protocol role from the beginning as an institutional entrepreneur and helped move the process through approval. Another example of behavior found in Stage 3 is creating documentation (i.e., material product announcing new protocol offices, titles, roles; published announcements; job descriptions; and organizational charts).

I had to apply for the new role, because the new role was created as a manager position. I had to get it, and then once I got it, it was like 'ok, well you can start writing this on business cards because the president is in approval of it.' (R8)

Printing titles of offices and positions onto business cards is indicative of official endorsement, which occurred after the idea to create the protocol role secured enough supportive and convincing buy-in during Stage 2. It also demonstrates the importance of concrete text materializing as a form of constitutive communication, whereby communication is produced and reproduced.

The following example given by Respondent 10 offers insight where the innovation and pre-institutionalization stages were initiated from the top-down as a reorganization. Respondent 10 was officially appointed to lead the new office and function, and she explains the approach she took at introducing her new role on campus.

So, after we were established, I met with each of the vice presidents to discuss our office and let them know what we'd like to do and how we'd like to help and partner. And after meeting with each of them, they identified programs and events in their areas that they thought we could help elevate. (R10)

This process exemplifies the practice of communication that occurs during institutionalization. In this instance, personal interaction serves to keep communication flowing and securing buy-in, influencing, and collaborating, all behaviors categorized in the third column of Table 2. This is

another example where communication is constituting the organization using repeated use of figurative texts.

Each of these afore mentioned examples describe the significance of communicating the decision of change to a wider audience. It is during this stage where the decision can be rejected or accepted. One example that speaks to the possibility of rejection comes from Respondent 3 who experienced a difficult transition once the president created her role, also from the top-down model. She remembers:

There was a disaster. The president was very enthused about the idea...and he sent out an email ...Well that was in 2008, right, when the economy tanked. So, the president puts out this email and he says, 'he's created this position, and I'm going to be the one who does it, and blah blah blah, here's why' and people were not happy. You know they saw that as a superfluous waste of money ...it wasn't the happiest day of my life, believe me. (R3)

For Respondent 3, despite her expertise and tenure, she has struggled to affirm her position outside of the executive offices and therefore, her role and office has not yet fully experienced this semi-institutionalization stage. This example demonstrates how movement through Stages 1 through 3 can be thwarted, and hence inhibitors of change should not be underestimated or ignored.

The findings indicate that behaviors during Stage 3 can be operationalized as: training (i.e., providing protocol skill and knowledge performative inside the organization to others); advising (i.e., giving recommendations to others on developed protocol practices for the organization); and building reputation (i.e., constructing a base of protocol knowledge that enhances the organization's standing among stakeholders). These are critical to a successful transition through semi-institutionalization. These behaviors also connect the protocol role with the institution's collective work and explain how protocol serves the institution's interests. The



following examples help demonstrate how different these behaviors are from the pre-institutionalization stage.

Evidence of training is located in the semi-institutionalization stage because the focus is to build a deliverable program to members of the institution. In the office where Respondent 8 works they collaborate with an existing organization whose members are a strategic audience for the protocol office. “We provide training and resources through the [name)] group...there’s a concentrated session on protocol at our workshop...and throughout the year we have multiple brown bag sessions that we may incorporate that [protocol] topic” (R8).

Among the behaviors associated with semi-institutionalization, advising is critical for building protocol roles. Advising or consulting is a repetitive practice offered by experienced practitioners and viewed as credible and reliable for those who seek it out. Several respondents referred to this form of communication as part of their institutional work and contribution to the community. Respondent 4 describes their role, “we are also a source of information for the university. So, we get contacted even if we’re not doing events for them, we consult, we act as consultants for the university...” And this example from Respondent 8 concerning the scope of advice they provide:

So, I’ve tried to really drive home in our office that it needs to be consistent, again the branding imbued in the protocol elements and standards as well. So that’s what we do on a day-to-day consulting perspective...people defer to us, you know, ‘I have this person visiting, what do I do? Is this gift appropriate? What would the wording be for this? Do you have any flags that I can use because someone from Panama is visiting?’ (R8)

Regarding reputation building, another behavior characteristic in Stage 3, Respondent 2 says, “I make sure that the protocol is there, the appropriate things and appropriate person is there and that the dialogue that they are having is appropriate to move [name of institution] forward.” This language is characteristic of thinking first about the institution, which is an

exemplar of semi-institutionalization. Concern for reputation lives at this stage and is operationalized as protocol work when the context of events and activities requires an extraordinary level of attention to detail, as well as providing a distinguished person or group with a level of hospitality beyond a standard practice.

It is worth noting that these behaviors found in Stage 3 are shaping the final stage of institutionalization. But the same types of behaviors have been found in the previous stages. What are the differences? Advising in Stage 1 is distinctively different than in Stage 3 because the institutional entrepreneur is first developing the skill set and demonstrating its usefulness. Advising in Stage 3 is performative as institutional work on a daily basis, being produced and reproduced as expertise, which is a form of legitimacy and authority.

Securing buy-in during Stage 1 is much different than in Stage 3. Buy-in at the nascent stage is necessary to move an idea forward and secure approval, but once that has been achieved, buy-in for the protocol function is then focused on building an institutional presence with an office, a staff and a budget. While there is evidence of reputation building in all previous stages as seen in Table 2, the behaviors in prior stages were focused on supporting the idea of a protocol function. Once the protocol function has gained full support and is becoming a work of practice, the reputation building becomes paramount to the institution itself, regardless of who leads the institution. Protocol helps operationalize the institution's reputation. As the protocol function materializes through the stages of institutionalization, the connection to the original institutional entrepreneur dissolves and the institution begins the process of absorbing it into its body of practice. As this process becomes routinized, we begin to witness the taken-for-grantedness that full institutionalization realizes.

### *Full Institutionalization*

The original institutional entrepreneur who first conceived of the idea and worked to secure buy-in from others diminishes from the scene at the stage of full institutionalization. If the person is still involved with the protocol function, he/she has assumed the role of a bona fide protocol professional and no longer is connected to the origins of the idea. At this stage the functionality of protocol is fully absorbed and taken for granted by the institutional community. It has become embedded in the organization and is fully communicated and documented.

A protocol role or office becomes fully institutionalized in part when it has presence on the institution's website, it creates tools and resources for others to access, and continues to advise and protect the reputation of the institution. Referencing Table 2, the characteristic behaviors emerging from the data and fully organized and operationalized within Stage 4 are: standardization (i.e., bringing conformity of protocol practices and initiatives to assure consistency and regularity within the organization); and being a resource (i.e., creating protocol tools for others and responding to others with their protocol needs).

Standardization can be considered intentional work that includes developing processes that are applicable to all (Lawrence, Suddaby & Leca, 2011). Respondent 8 explains this process from a couple of different perspectives, first from the role of the office and the second from the experience of guests and the president. "We are upheld to maintain standards of excellence in protocol within our [name of institution] level of events, that then become the benchmark for others to follow" (R8). Secondly, she explains, "but when they [guests of the institution] come and they step on campus, that it's a [name of institution] branded event they will have the same experience and the president will have the same shared experiences" (R8). This level of standardization focuses on consistency across the institution. When the protocol role is fully

institutionalized, siloed environments can no longer ignore the protocol function on campus. The fully institutionalized protocol office or position sets the standards others are to abide by or look up to for guidance.

Seen as an office of service, the protocol staff begin to function as resources for others, which provides an opportunity to create and maintain standards institutionally. Respondent 10 explains her role, “I am one of the, probably, most frequently sought out person, or the go-to for special events and ceremonies. And, I serve as, like a special advisor, you know, to colleagues across campus.” Respondent 12 offers this description of her office’s commitment to standardization and being a resource.

We were created to be a resource to empower others to be consistent as we represent our institution. So, we wanted some consistencies, we wanted some thoughtfulness, we wanted more diplomacy, we wanted to collaborate more, we wanted to kind of, again, to bridge these gaps, because we were two institutions and now we’re one. (R12)

At this stage, the presence of an official protocol function has been fully organized, accepted and considered a helpful resource. There is a mutually beneficial relationship between the protocol staff and the community. Consider this explanation from Respondent 8:

And I think that the one way people have bought into it because again, they don’t have the background nor do they have a lot of resources in their department, and so they have been pleased that we have provided some templates and standards and resources for them so they don’t have to purchase them themselves. (R8)

The staff are responsive to the protocol needs of the community and peers recognize the protocol expertise and resources associated with the protocol office.

The fourth column on Table 2 lists the behaviors associated with full institutionalization of a protocol office or function on campus. They represent the routinization that happens during full institutionalization. In my findings there were not so many behaviors identified for this stage

because I did not discover a research subject who completely worked at this level of institutionalization, but there are two respondents who are on their way to achieving full institutionalization. More data would need to be collected to contribute to this finding.

This concludes the review of the three key findings related to the first research question. Established in the findings of RQ1, the role of the institutional entrepreneur is indeed present in each stage of institutionalization. The data are clear that an institutional entrepreneur is not necessarily an individual with authority and power. Anyone can function as an institutional entrepreneur but in order to succeed, they must establish access to stakeholders and must be endowed with persuasive skills. Securing buy-in is a critical skill that helps an institutional entrepreneur move an idea through institutionalization. These skills are rooted in communicative processes which define how organizations function.

## **RQ2 Findings**

There are three key findings regarding how the institutional entrepreneur makes use of authoritative texts. The first finding relates to the use of figurative text by an institutional entrepreneur throughout all stages of the institutionalization process. The second finding addresses the use of concrete text by an institutional entrepreneur throughout the four stages of institutionalization. I conclude with a comparison of how both figurative and concrete text interact throughout the stages.

### *Figurative Texts*

Recall that a figurative text is an abstracted representation of a practice site, and in the case of this study, narratives, memories, and recalled conversations are examined for the presence of organizational interaction (Kuhn, 2008). The data show evidence of figurative text

throughout all stages of the institutionalization process. In the early stages, stories and recalling historical paths help describe institutional problems that protocol can overcome. They also provide rationale for changing the institution. Struggles are told, solutions to inefficiencies discussed, and new structural changes considered.

The data also demonstrate how figurative texts are used during the first stage of institutionalization. The innovation stage presents the most abstract thinking. Past conversations represent the greatest instances of authoritative text at this stage. The recollection of conversations marks the progression of stages.

So he was a minister, so he came to [name of institution] as vice president and I talked to him around that time I was finding, it was around that time that I discovered PDI, and I said to him, 'you know I'd like to talk about how we can better acknowledge protocol in our title, you know bring it into because that's what we do. When people need advice they call us, so it's known that we're recognized.' (R4)

In this example Respondent 4 pinpoints a key conversation held in the past that to her stresses the time when she was recruiting support for protocol at her institution. There is no evidence of a memo, message, email related to this encounter, but the figurative text supplies a reasonable level of authority to substantiate this experience as the innovative stage of institutionalization and her as an institutional entrepreneur.

During this nascent stage, the data demonstrate that successful institutional entrepreneurs have a propensity to persuade effectively. This finding offers some insight into the difficulties they encounter, which includes circulating discussions through established channels. In the following example, the institutional entrepreneur secured an established leader to present the protocol proposal, who, by implication, relied on figurative texts over a concrete text, (i.e., a drafted proposal), as the method of persuasion with a new president.

[The interim vice president] was the best person because she was very strong and when she told him [president] that this [a protocol role] was something that should happen, you know, he was new enough that he trusted the good people that he had met. (R8)

The figurative text is authoritative from the standpoint of R8 as she identifies an effective champion moving the idea from the bottom upwards to persuade leadership. Additionally, this is an exemplar of those conversational moments where recommendations and decision making are only captured figuratively.

During the second stage of institutionalization figurative texts become more strategic, and documented text is more broadly developed to secure buy-in. Strategy becomes more concrete, therefore requires documentation that can be read, reviewed, and recreated. Some respondents who move through the innovation stage are involved in direct conversations with higher-level stakeholders. This is evidenced both with the bottom-up approach and the top-down approach. Instead of seeking permission, the institutional entrepreneur becomes experienced at negotiating the direction and formation of the protocol function, demonstrated by Respondent 1's description of planning the protocol office.

So, I was involved in those conversations because we really had a hard time coming up with something that would encapsulate all events, because I'm a person, an office of one, I can't possibly do all events. By putting in the ceremonies piece we hoped that would kind of differentiate between just a conference let's say, and a ceremony that was important, you know, with dignitaries and potential flags and pieces of protocol. (R1)

In this example, Respondent 1 describes discussions of various topics concerned with establishing a new functional office. Discussions with others helps build consensus on a realistic direction of tasks and duties. She describes reorganization of an existing role – ceremonies – and making it more conducive to a protocol function. Conversation is cited as the authoritative text, where, in this case, decisions to reconstitute an existing office were made.

Evidence of the use of figurative text during the semi-institutionalization stage in this data set is limited to narratives and other forms of summation. Part of the findings related to authoritative text is that change is often not documented for public consumption because the process involves leadership at different levels at different times discussing content in a private setting. Few respondents acknowledged notes taken about meetings, only describing them figuratively speaking. For instance, Respondent 10 is an institutional entrepreneur poised to create change after a top-down approach led to a reorganization involving her office. She did not supply concrete evidence of these meetings, only recalling her intent with stakeholders after the change was made. This level of communication is representative of the semi-institutionalization stage because it is describing an implementation phase.

So, after we were established, I met with each of the vice presidents to discuss our office and let them you know, what we'd like to do and how we'd like to help and partner. And after meeting with each of them, they identified programs and events in their areas that they thought we could help elevate. (R10)

Recalled conversations function as the chief form of the figurative texts invoked by the participants in this study. They are ascribed authoritative by those who were part of the creating and implementing experience. The narrative functions as the institutional story of how change comes to be.

Finally, because there was no evidence that any of the subjects studied reached the full-institutionalization stage, there is no evidence from the data related to figurative texts during Stage 4. Evaluation of the data suggests that the use of figurative authoritative texts is heavily used during the first two stages of institutionalization as change is dependent on telling and retelling the ideas to others. Figurative texts are an important communicative tool for institutional entrepreneurs to articulate the rationale for change, secure champions, and gain buy-



in. The latter stages of institutionalization do not appear to rely on figurative texts in the same way because concrete texts appear to be more reliable tools to document new change being institutionalized. The next section reviews findings applicable to concrete texts, evident in the research study.

### *Concrete Texts*

Referencing the definition of concrete text from Chapter Two, concrete texts are made material and are shaped by the traceable actions of actors who author the text into existence (Kuhn, 2008). In this study these are evidenced as proposals, manuals, guides, templates and website content. During the first stage of institutionalization data demonstrate that concrete texts appear on rare occasion, perhaps because the institutional entrepreneur is typically relying on direct conversations designed to build a case and find supporters to champion the idea. There is evidence in the data demonstrating drafts of proposals are created to initiate interest in a protocol office or role to stakeholders at this stage, but this effort can be premature. The data suggest this effort can stagnate if a champion has not been secured or buy-in is not firmly established. Respondent 11 presented a drafted proposal for a protocol role on campus, but crisis hit the institution at just about the same time. The proposal never received the proper vetting.

It [the protocol proposal] was all written, there was no presentation. I passed it along to my boss. I honestly don't know what desks it ended up on. I'm not sure if it ever got to the chancellor level. Because there were a lot of changes that happened...it was very poor timing as far as when that proposal was coming across and everything else was happening on campus. (R11)

In this example, perhaps this proposal is not authoritative in the sense that it would be produced and reproduced. CCO (discussed in Chapter Two) says that a document such as a proposal has “textual agency,” so it retains authoritativeness as it ‘performs something’ that a

person alone cannot do (Cooren, 2004). The proposal is drafted by a person, but it becomes an authoritative text when it gains agency. In this example, the document did not move beyond the innovation stage, which demonstrates that it is probable the draft was presented prematurely, without securing the necessary buy-in and legitimacy during this early stage, but still retains value that can be used in the future, when conditions are more promising.

For those respondents who were actively engaged in the innovation stage and successfully secured buy-in, they could then focus on creating more documentation to help build a case for a protocol function. Evidence of documentation from the findings include job descriptions, proposals, and benchmarking, all designed to establish credibility that the innovative idea is a worthwhile endeavor for the institution. Respondent 5 serves as an example, saying, “right now we do not have a chief of protocol title on campus. I’m in the process- I’ve just rewritten my own job description to incorporate that- and I’m trying to go through the approval process.”

The data confirm that concrete documentation created during the pre-institutionalization stage helps support success of instituting change. Drafting documentation that explains a protocol function and developing communicative tools during this stage helps move the innovative idea forward and extends the buy-in, as shown in Table 2. Respondents offered a clear vision of what documentation they wanted to create when the protocol function became established. Respondent 10 explained, “focus this spring will be on our webpage, and I’m trying to get some event planning tools and resources available, [both] internal and external.” Another subject, Respondent 1 conceptualized how to manage an expected workload.

Because it’s fairly new we’re still trying to formalize how that works. So I am working also on creating an event template so that when we get a request coming in from you know a high profile, either government or a ministry, or whatever it is, when it comes in

we kind of have an idea of who takes on what task, you know, who communicates with what pieces, 'am I leading it, am I not leading it?' that kind of thing. (R1)

Formalizing protocol work includes 'putting it down on paper' which helps build agency and explains how the work will be organized and communicated internally.

As the institutional entrepreneur moves the initiative forward and reaches the semi-institutionalization stage, attribution as to the source of the innovative idea begins to disappear, as previously mentioned. As more people are involved and as the idea becomes more common-practice, the origin becomes less important. During this stage, concrete texts are manifested as tools to improve consistency, create standardization, and share knowledge across the institution, both horizontally and vertically.

The institutional entrepreneur turns attention to full integration into the institution. Examples of concrete texts are resources articulating protocol services through websites, manuals, guides, training presentations and newsletters. Respondent 1 states, "the protocol guide is something that they [event planners] need because it allows them to be able to create traditions and standards without, like, being their opinion" (R1). During semi-institutionalization cementing the innovative idea institutionally becomes emphasized, which requires some level of promotion, demonstrated by Respondent 12. "You know we do 'the protocol-tip-of-the-month' email that's sent out across campus. So, sort of in the promoting of the office" (R12).

Cementing the innovative idea occurs when it is taken for granted by everyone who encounters it. The functionality becomes routinized as common practice. This is when the idea has entered the full-institutionalization stage. Concrete texts are developed to apply all levels of the institution. "We've had to create the protocol guide. You know, we've had to set some of

these standards in motion, because they didn't exist" (R12). At this stage the concrete text becomes indisputable and serves to standardize behaviors for institutional consistency.

### *Tracing Authoritative Texts*

What I found interesting in the data are evidence that both figurative and concrete texts operate in tandem throughout each stage. There appears to be a flow of each authoritative text that runs through the course of institutionalization. Figurative texts appear more pronounced in the early stages than concrete texts, and conversely, concrete texts materialize in the later stages. Both discursive forms are present during each stage but occur at different levels of intensity and functionality.

The aforementioned examples in this chapter serve as evidence how this representative flow is operational within institutions. To address this point, R1 was an exemplar of how conversations (figurative text) were used to support the formation of the protocol function at her institution, and then explaining how documentation (concrete text) was used to create that functionality and get approval for the formation of the office. If I were to trace the use of authoritative texts for R1, Stage 1 would have a high level of figurative text and low level of concrete text in the first stage. As R1 moved to the second stage, evidence of concrete text emerged that became foregrounded as buy-in was achieved around her. R1 had a hand in re-writing a job description to include protocol duties. She drafted a protocol guide and circulated it widely and transparently for feedback, which further moved the role of concrete texts higher through the stages. Conversations related to building the office continued, remaining important to the success of the initiative. Figurative text still played a relevant part to the process of institutionalization but moved from a narrative to secure buy-in to a narrative to create the office. The figurative texts diminished and the concrete texts expanded, evidencing soundness of

change. Both types of authoritative texts took different paths, tracing their intersection at the latter Stage 2 and early Stage 3. At the time of this study, R1 had not fully achieved Stage 3, but was certainly on target to reach it within a matter of months after university leadership approved the protocol guide.

There was no apparent difference in the proportional use of authoritative texts but the transition between stages could take months or years. For those examples where the process has taken years, there was little evidence of concrete texts in the early stages. To be clear, all but two of the subjects queried were involved with promoting the idea of a protocol role and had full knowledge of that history.

Finally, I found that much of the work of institutionalization happens in between the various stages. It is in that space where conversations are happening, drafts are written, buy-in is solicited. It is also in this in-between space where stagnation happens, buy-in is difficult to render and unforeseen institutional changes interfere with the progress of innovation. Therefore, the stages are markers of institutional work conducted by institutional entrepreneurs who engage in communication that constitutes an organization.

This review of authoritative text in the context of an institutional entrepreneur demonstrates how various forms of communication shape an organization via constructed conversations, narratives, persuasive documents, and formalized documents. Figurative texts help explain who has played a part in instituting the protocol function while concrete text formalizes the authority and presence of the protocol function.

These findings taken together have presented a surety that creating a protocol role at an academic institution is attainable when someone (an institutional entrepreneur) capable of

enduring the process of institutionalization can form alliances, bring others into the process, make room for additional institutional entrepreneurs, create supportive texts, and let go when the time comes for the innovative idea to become routinized into the culture, norms and practices of the institution.

## Chapter 5 Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore how protocol offices or roles are institutionalized at universities, relying on two theories to guide the direction of the research. The first was from institutional theory and its concept of an institutional entrepreneur. This key concept was selected for its ability to analyze behaviors used to create a protocol function at a university. One of the goals of this study was to see if the institutional entrepreneur concept could be expanded beyond the traditional power-centered individual (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006).

The second theory was CCO, communication constitutive of organizations, and its Kuhnian concept, the authoritative text. Studying evidence of figurative and concrete texts offered insight into how texts were utilized by institutional entrepreneurs as they seek change in an institution. Another goal of this study was to broaden the idea of discursive activity. I hoped by studying these concepts in tandem emergent patterns would help explain how protocol roles are created at universities. I found the exercise of interweaving two theories challenging and gave my research a richer discovery, more so than had I focused on one or the other alone. To review the challenges and discoveries, the following section discusses the results of my findings related to both research questions. I then review future research and implications for institutional theory and CCO, limitations, and conclude with suggested practical implications.

### *RQ1: Discussion*

Regarding RQ1, I found evidence that institutional entrepreneurs from low power positions can influence institutional change. It is helpful to refer to institutional theory and its neo-institutional branch, which has theorists recognizing that individuals who exercise agency

contribute to institutional work (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). They have expanded knowledge studying how individuals engage in a “making sense process” (Phillips, Lawrence & Hardy, 2004) to change their environment and contribute to “institutional practical action” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). Because institutions are “products of discursive activity” one cannot help but recognize the influence of individuals as they use discursive tools in everyday scenarios to influence institutional practices (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Kuhn, 2012).

Returning to the role of the institutional entrepreneur, this study extends the concept of legitimacy at the individual level (Lammers & Garcia, 2014). I argue that legitimacy exists outside the traditional power/leader exemplar. The respondents of this study represented a spectrum of positions/titles, from an administrative associate to an assistant vice president. This representation of agency is important to consider when distinguishing who is capable of purposive, intentional work and who is authorized to carry out that work. Lawrence et al (2009) encouraged more study in the “practical work of actors in relation to institutions” and the implications of this research indeed focus on the work and behaviors of individuals with agency without ascribed legitimacy. These agents of change approach institutional work differently from leaders attributed with power, and this study identifies three approaches to directional change. Each approach has the capability of successfully effecting change or struggling through the change. I found that the behaviors of the institutional entrepreneurs described in Chapter Four could be further analyzed in the context of success and struggle.

Among the implications of this study is that behaviors themselves go through a process of institutionalization. For someone who is interested in being an institutional entrepreneur, it would be helpful to reflexively study behaviors and identify where success and struggle might



happen when introducing an innovative idea within an organization. Here are two considerations: behaviors can start strong and then diminish into the background when the idea has reached full institutionalization, or they can start off in nascent stages of development and then grow with each level of the institutionalization of the innovative idea. To provide further explanation, I draw from Table 2 in Chapter Four and focus on the behaviors of buy-in and advising to demonstrate the first example, and then use reputation building and standardization to discuss the second.

Recalling the emergent data demonstrating buy-in, I suggest it is important to recognize that this process is more so rooted in individual dispositions than institutional norms or culture. Institutional entrepreneurs bring their intrinsic qualities to bare when institutional work involves rhetorical activities. Securing buy-in is about the act of persuasion, both a rhetorical and discursive process. The first obligation of an institutional entrepreneur is to find a way for the idea to fit into the existing institutional logics. Challenging the logics creates discord, which leads to struggle. This behavior is evidenced in the early stages of institutionalization because in order to move an idea forward it must first influence a small group of like-minded individuals and it has to be strong and it has to last. These supporters take the idea of the institutional entrepreneur and disseminate it to others, using discursive activities of their own. The idea can spread vertically to others endowed with authority or horizontally, sharing with a larger group that can absorb the idea. The power of persuasion moves the idea like ripples away from the original source (the institutional entrepreneur) until the idea becomes practiced, routinized, and then absorbed. However, there is a caveat to the influential effects of this behavior. Individuals who frame their discursivity around the institution and not themselves have more success at securing buy-in from leaders and peers (both vertically and horizontally).

Buy-in reaches a saturation point in institutionalization during Stage 3 when enough people accept the idea and it becomes less identified to the source of origin. For an aspiring institutional entrepreneur recognizing that forward momentum is key to keeping an idea alive regardless who advances it is an important consideration. Including others into the process helps make the idea thrive and gather momentum.

Another behavior that starts strong in the nascent stage and gets absorbed later is that of advising. To be an institutional entrepreneur who has vision that an idea is good for the institution starts with personal knowledge from some experience outside the current organizational practices. The respondents in this study demonstrated a clear understanding of universal protocol practices that exist in diplomacy and military, providing examples of how protocol could benefit their institution. Sharing that knowledge is an important step in advancing an idea through an organization, and typically the institutional entrepreneur wants to lead by example. The difference between success and struggle is how effective one is in imparting knowledge and identifying practice sites within the organization. The successful institutional entrepreneur engages in a co-oriented relationship with others, learning what protocol skills are needed on campus and answering questions they may have about protocol. The interests of peers must be successfully satisfied in the early institutionalization stages if the protocol role is to be routinized among multiple users. An institutional entrepreneur with an innovative idea must explain the benefits and rewards to the end users, in effect, to sell it.

Advising has been identified by respondents as a viable way to explain the benefits of protocol to the institution. As expertise becomes established, the institutional entrepreneur's idea begins to be routinized as institutional work. Through advising the institutional entrepreneur transfers the skill set and knowledge to others who then practice it for themselves. Following a

Kuhnian theoretical concept, advising is representative of “situated conversations” scaled up from micro-level interactions (2012). Building that knowledge base helps embed it institutionally, which theoretically leads to a successful outcome for creating a protocol function on a campus.

Alternatively, telling peers how to do protocol or inserting oneself into the affairs of others leads to struggle, especially when one recalls the inhibitors of change discussed in Chapter Four. The implication here is that too much of a good thing (e.g., assertive advising) can stall the institutionalization process. Nonetheless, once the innovative idea reaches Stage 3, this behavior becomes routinized into institutional logics. These two examples demonstrate how certain behaviors need to be strong at the beginning stages to advance the innovative idea through the process of institutionalization.

Then there are those behaviors that develop slowly, grow stronger over the process, and then anchored once the innovative idea reaches full institutionalization. Two behaviors from the data, reputation building and standardization, are used to discuss implications of behaviors in more detail.

Regarding reputation building the difference between success and failure of an innovative idea rests with whose reputation is being built. The institutional entrepreneur who focuses on building the institution’s reputation achieves greater success than if they focus on building their personal reputation. Concern for reputation is a sensemaking argument used to gain support for an innovative idea, such as a protocol role. Protocol is an effective means to protect the institution from embarrassing situations, and an institutional entrepreneur framing an innovative idea around institutional reputation embeds it as it moves through the stages. When one thinks ‘protocol,’ one thinks ‘reputation.’

The institutional entrepreneur who shows interest in building personal reputation by spearheading the innovative idea might struggle with credibility. The implication of concern for self-interest over institutional reputation leads to a stalled process because the previous work of buy-in and advising is not advanced for the greater good. An institutional entrepreneur must come to an understanding that eventually the personal connection to an idea becomes absorbed by the institution as more people become involved in advancing it. Success is likely when focus on what is good for the organization outweighs how best to advance personal interest.

The second example of a behavior that slowly becomes embedded over time is standardization. It is a process that is developed in the latter stages of institutionalization out of practicality. The institutional entrepreneur recognizes opportunities to communicate ground rules and processes when the idea is becoming practiced and then routinized. As mentioned by Respondent 1 in Chapter Four, creating standards is important “so people don’t insert their own opinions into the process.” Standardization applies to all within the organization and creates horizontal and vertical functionality and the implication is there is no doubt how the organization prefers to practice the idea.

Standardization depends on documentation to produce and reproduce the practices institutionally. Standardization documents new communication that constitutes the organization. Documentation cements the practices into the institution’s work and its logics. It is during this final stage when the innovative idea is taken for granted. I would submit that the role of the institutional entrepreneur is taken for granted as well. The implication is the institutional entrepreneur becomes decoupled from the innovative idea once full institutionalization is achieved. In fact, I would further submit there is no longer an innovative idea, nor an institutional entrepreneur, once something is fully institutionalized. Because of the legitimacy

inherent in taken-for-grantedness, there is no need for institutional clarity about the rationale or purpose of the change, except for perhaps historical or archival necessity. Once an idea has reached full institutionalization, it no longer is an idea; it is an embedded, socially constructed, legitimate part of the institution.

#### *RQ2: Discussion*

RQ2 sought to identify use of authoritative text by institutional entrepreneurs. My findings confirmed that institutional entrepreneurs are “text producers” (Meyer et al, 2018). The research data demonstrated a heavy use of figurative texts and a lighter use of concrete texts. In retrospect it was partially a result of the design of the questions, which relied on recounting the past as respondents used story-telling methods for answers. Respondents were asked to supply evidence of documentation, and a few were submitted. They were evaluated for content and interpreted to identify what stage of institutionalization they were created.

I noticed that the abstracted text helped the respondent ‘see’ what has happened regarding efforts to create a protocol role. There were admissions of failure, expressions of hope, explanations of approaches, and contextual description of institutional environments. These figurative texts, in the form of stories, showcased the relevancy of sensemaking (Weick, 1995) of where they had been and where they wanted to go with the process of creating a protocol function. These texts also framed discourse through action, consequently connecting the past actions to future actions (Phillips et al, 2004).

This study did not demonstrate substantive use of documents that describe the role of protocol at the institution. In this regard, most of the respondents were low “text producers” of documented text. In fact, during the interview it was not uncommon for a respondent to realize the importance of concrete text, saying “I need to do/create that.” Regarding the use of texts to

advance the role of protocol, respondents who were functioning in an unofficial capacity seemed to struggle with creating concrete texts to further institutionalize their role. On the other hand, it was interesting to see respondents actively pursuing the creation of a formal office and using concrete texts effectively. Some respondents were creative with the utility of borrowed concrete text.

I uncovered a trend by respondents who relied on borrowed concrete text from other sources. Phillips et al (2004) described this as a “recognizable genre” which can be easily incorporated by others as their own text (p. 643). One example from a respondent was the soliciting of samples of protocol job descriptions to help with the drafting of a job description. There was an example of another respondent taking an existing commencement guide and adapting it to create a protocol guide. Another example involved using a protocol guide from a state government institution as a framework to modify into a university-specific protocol guide, reflecting the university’s policies, practices, and branding.

This approach is an exemplar of an institutional entrepreneur, who sees value in both legitimate internal and external resources and utilizes them to move an innovative idea forward. External sources such as other universities, government offices, and professional associations like PDI-POA create their own concrete texts and an institutional entrepreneur values them. The institutional entrepreneur mimics existing information that has already been vetted for legitimacy and sourced from a reliable authority. This is what Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) describe as mimicry, which “draws on existing patterns of action to legitimate new practices” (p.226). The consequence of this practice of soliciting, sharing, and adopting, is that best practices institutionalize protocol much more quickly. Building a common textual framework could

potentially create uniformity across institutions, further institutionalizing protocol at academic institutions.

What is done with the borrowed text determines whether the institutional work will impact intended change, and the data showed that this a short cut, to take something proven in one institution and adapt it for utility at another institution. This is also evidence of co-orientation, where individuals from one institution are ‘tuning in’ to see what is happening at another institution, and drawing from existing practices and processes (Kuhn, 2012). Based on the data, I suggest that, because of the growing trend to institutionalize protocol at universities, those institutions who have yet to textualize the role will fall behind their peer institutions.

Finally, when reviewing the data, I draw from Meyer et al (2018) who posited, “literature suggests that, the role of text varies according to the stage of institutionalization” (p. 400). The findings of this study agree with this statement. Discourses and other verbal use of texts help build the case, draw attention to, and persuade others to support the efforts to institutionalize the protocol role. They serve a valuable function for securing buy-in, building support, and explaining the value of a protocol function. Additionally, concrete texts such as web pages, fillable forms, templates, and manuals help describe the institutional work of protocol. This study demonstrated that there is a mixed use of figurative and concrete texts at various stages of institutionalization, and each institution exercised the use of texts differently. The data are not generalizable to the extent that I can suggest a universal approach towards successfully implementing a protocol role at a university. But the textual evidence demonstrates there are several effective approaches using authoritative text to successfully implement the protocol function.

### *Implications for Institutional Theory and CCO*

For this study I selected the stages of institutionalization as my framework to explore how an institutional entrepreneur communicates, organizes, and operationalizes change. These two pillars of neo-institutional theory were relevant to this research given that my goal was to examine how a protocol role is created at an academic institution. The utility of stages of institutionalization helped demonstrate how innovative ideas or practices become embedded in an institution (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996; Boivin et al, 2017). Additionally, the institutional entrepreneur has been significantly studied in institutional theory. Scholarly literature addresses embedded agency, centered agency, authority, and discursivity of institutional entrepreneurship (DiMaggio, 1988; Phillips et al, 2004; Lawrence & Suddaby, 2008; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Lammers & Garcia, 2014).

Communicative constitution of organizations, (CCO), is also incorporated into the framework of this study to explore organizational communication vis á vis the role of authoritative text in relation to the institutional entrepreneur. This theory is relevant and complementary on two levels. The first was that communicative acts that are discursive are essential to the formation and sustainability of organizations (Cooren et al, 2011). Secondly, a conversation-text dialectic is understood through authoritative texts, which can help materialize action and interaction produced by actors (Cooren et al, 2011). Taken together, these theoretical concepts created the foundation for this study.

There are several implications related to the key findings of this study as they relate to institutional entrepreneurs and stages of institutionalization. The first addresses the legitimacy of an institutional entrepreneur interested in change that impacts the institution in which they are embedded. The data demonstrated that an institutional entrepreneur does not have to be endowed



with authority or power to initiate change within an institution. The results of the study indicated that individuals across the institutional spectrum have the capacity to make sense of their environment and imagine change in areas they are familiar with. This is even more evident when individuals encounter other perspectives drawn from outside experiences and feel empowered to affect their environment. Several respondents indicated their interest in academic protocol after they were exposed to the professional association that serves the interests of protocol professionals, PDI-POA. It is from this exposure respondents realized that a functional protocol office could manage the growing demands of high-level activities on their campuses which required different practices not yet developed, and each respondent was interested in making it happen. This awareness of an idea and commitment to change is represented by the first stage of institutionalization. All but one of the respondents saw themselves as that change agent and described themselves as someone not endowed with any particular power or authority to initiate change. Still, they managed to pursue the idea through the innovation stage.

A second implication relevant to this study is an institutional entrepreneur's effectiveness at communicating the change they are seeking. Discourse analysis in institutional theory tells us that institutionalization can be constituted through texts (Phillips et al, 2004). Regarding discourse through CCO, Kuhn (2012) explains that "text is the substance through which conversation takes shape" (p. 551) and therefore takes on a materiality. The research demonstrated evidence of this through the standpoint of authoritative text, with a greater emphasis in figurative text than concrete text. When asking someone, 'Can you describe your role as it relates to protocol?' a typical response by the respondents was a narrative that provided detail, context, and perhaps critique about what changes they wanted to create. This is an example of a figurative text used by an institutional entrepreneur to communicate the change

they are seeking, the effectiveness enabled through the conversation-text dialectic. Another approach for supplying an effective answer would be to refer to a concrete document, such as a job description, and summarize the relevant information to answer the question. According to CCO both authoritative text approaches are valid and formed through discourse.

To build a case for creating change, both forms of authoritative text are relevant during different stages. Figurative texts are effective when the audience is quite small and unconcerned about a fluid, abstracted representation of the topic. The institutional entrepreneur, as author, can alter the scope of the narrative depending on the audience. This is a suitable textual approach for the early stages of institutionalization, but as change moves forward, there comes a pivotal moment when concrete texts are necessary to effectively communicate the change being sought. The concrete text is disseminated to a wider audience, the content fixed, and the institutional entrepreneur identified as the author until the concrete text becomes absorbed into the organization's corpus. Concrete texts are necessary for the latter stages of institutionalization if change is fully institutionalized. Thereby, organization and organizing are constituted by communication and communicating.

Finally, there is a notable implication related to stages of institutionalization and their relationship with authoritative text. In Chapter Two, I proposed that authoritative text could be interpreted according to the stages of institutionalization. Based on the results of the findings, albeit limited by the self-reporting form by the respondents, I believe there is still evidence to support this claim. It has been established that the figurative text in its various forms was used prevalently in the innovation stage. This is the space where ideas are fleshed out and tested for validity as well as support. We know that buy-in begins in this stage and is necessary to secure in order to move an idea forward. Concrete texts in their nascent form are developed during this

stage, but anything beyond a drafted document is premature. CCO supports this, as sensemaking (as an organizing process) happens before concrete texts are shaped.

Reviewing the final stage of full institutionalization, the opposite outcome occurs. Concrete texts are embedded in the organization and routinization is absorbed. Conversely, figurative texts are practically obsolete, replaced by taken-for-grantedness within the organization. The relationship between concrete and figurative texts fluctuates during the pre-institutionalization stage and semi-institutionalization, as some audiences grow and others decline, and various attempts at documenting the process are taken over by other stakeholders.

Finally, one should consider how inhibitors to change can stall efforts to textualize an innovative idea. Progress through the stages of institutionalization can be time consuming, is impacted by seasons of stagnation, and always requires agency. Barriers that impact the progress of an innovative idea may initiate a necessary re-orientation of text to communicate adjustments within the organization. CCO is not so much concerned with a successful outcome as it is focused on how authoritative the texts are. Part of the intent of this study was to consider a connectivity between institutional theory and organizational communication through CCO, which I hope has been satisfactorily demonstrated.

### *Future Research*

Considering the insights from this study, there are two areas I consider worth exploring for future research. Regarding advancement of CCO, future research is needed to explore the concept of ownership, attribution, and authorship of authoritative texts. Kuhn's scholarship has been translated for 'the firm' i.e., the perspective of the organization. But 'the firm' is not the only author of texts. I posit that CCO has the capacity to study the role of individuals or agents, not just firms or organizations, in authoring texts. This study has shown that individuals without

attributed power can indeed affect organizations with new ideas. CCO has demonstrated that actors with agency (or in the language of institutional theory, legitimacy) and not necessarily rank are capable of constructing authoritative communication within organizations, but more research is needed to explore how agency manifests itself.

A second area of study worth exploring relates to institutional theory and the stages of institutionalization. The extant literature has been using three stages (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996; Colyvas & Powell, 2006; Meyer et al, 2018) with a mention of innovation as a starting point. I have demonstrated that a four-stage model encapsulates the cycle of institutionalization more appropriately. The innovative idea cannot be overlooked because there is a great deal of communication occurring during this stage that creates the basis for the schema of future stages. Additionally, more investigation of the in-between spaces of the stages could inform and refine the model even more.

### *Limitations*

This research study could have benefited from a larger data sample. The existing purposive sample of twelve respondents represented 44% of the possible pool of 27 participants. I intentionally limited my data sample to public academic institutions to ensure all research subjects were operating from similar public standards, unsure if conversations related to actions by presidents and chancellors are treated as confidential material. But this limit excluded the contributions from known protocol offices established at private universities. In retrospect, I could have selected my data according to any accredited academic institution and thus would have included both public and private universities.

Additionally, my data were dependent upon a self-reporting form of inquiry. While I had no doubt that the answers, reflections and stories relayed by the participants were indicative of

their experiences and representative of the academic protocol roles on their campus, querying evidence of authoritative text from a single source had its limits. Each of the twelve institutional samples could have generated a richer data set if I had interviewed more than one person per institution. Some respondents referenced other colleagues that had knowledge about the process of institutionalizing protocol at their university. Had I factored in a snowball sample to recruit more subjects, and obtained permission to interview them, perhaps other significant data would have emerged. Including more narratives would have corroborated the original, primary narrative or introduced alternative perspectives to consider in analysis. It is also possible that conflicting data would have to be addressed with follow up interviews or study of documentation.

### *Practical Implications*

There are two levels of practical implications this study can assist with: the first from the perspective of academia and the second from the point of view of the individual interested in the protocol role at their own university.

Because academic protocol is trending across many academic institutions, it is currently lacking any model or insight into standards of practice that are accepted and replicated across the industry. A practical implication of this study is to introduce this research to the PDI-POA community, which has a growing membership from academia. A presentation to this audience about the theoretical underpinnings, combined with a summary of data, would invoke more dialogue regarding how protocol roles are created. It could assemble interest from institutions yet to start this process, showing them a theoretical framework that can help focus their efforts. It would also assist in building an understanding of institutional work yet to be completed for universities who are engaged in the process of creating a protocol role.

Practitioners of protocol can use the findings of this study to design models and surveys that could become instruments of education to other institutions not connected to PDI-POA. Sharing tools that explain the path forward, the work entailed, and the necessary resources is a practical demonstration of knowledge building that is currently missing in this growing field. This study shows there are no templates or guides to help interested people create this opportunity on campuses. Research to capture more salient data about existing protocol programs could assist future benchmarking efforts. Developing a model that outlines the stages of institutionalization and micro behaviors that are associated with the stages could be applicable to any academic institution regardless of size, affiliation or condition of leadership.

The second level of practical implications of this research study focus on individuals already engaged or wanting to engage a protocol role at their institution. Realizing that mentors are needed to champion the idea is insightful for the institutional entrepreneur navigating the institutional hierarchy. Since academic protocol is new for most institutions, internal buy-in from a core group of people who can support the idea is critical for making progress through the stages. Securing buy-in from a supervisor is important but recruiting others who recognize the potential value of the service to the institution are also necessary supporters to operationalize future stages.

Discursive activity alone has been shown to not be very effective at moving an idea through stages, so internal concrete texts could be developed sooner rather than in later stages. It is key for institutional entrepreneurs to realize that texts matter in organizing. They are dynamic contributors to communication within organizations, which is why recognizing that communication constitutes organizing is important to achieving results. Institutional entrepreneurs might consider developing concrete texts that illustrate the concept, purpose, and

benefit of a protocol office. The saying “if you build it, they will come” is apropos for practitioners who are conducting protocol in an unofficial capacity. In this age where a myriad of technological tools is utilized institutionally to share information, these utility tools can help inform unofficial work and institutionalize it. Creating concrete authoritative texts in earlier stages, such as web sites, web pages, templates, or any such material content designed to inform a client base can help routinize protocol into recognized practice of the institution. Making use of social media platforms to demonstrate protocol work institutionally helps communicate protocol on your own terms and can advance the initiative further, especially if there is a gap of service on campus in this area of work.

And finally, understanding stages of institutionalization will help any future individual who connects with the role of an institutional entrepreneur. Recognition of where the heavy lifting occurs when initiating a new idea can provide direction when developing the idea. In addition to recognizing the stages, equally helpful is being mindful of the micro behaviors associated with struggle and success. They can serve as a compass for reorienting direction through the course of the institutionalizing protocol work at an academic institution.

### *Conclusion*

For this thesis I examined how a protocol office or role is created at an academic institution, which is a trending development in academia. Of interest was discovering differences between institutions who had the protocol role established, recognizing some were achieving success while others struggled to receive acknowledgement of the protocol work being done on behalf of the institution. Exploration of differences led to an understanding of how an institutional entrepreneur creates change by tracing the development of a protocol role through the four stages of institutionalization. Further inquiry led to an understanding of how

authoritative texts, both figurative and concrete, are present throughout the stages of institutionalization. Theoretical implications were offered for further inquiry into institutional theory and CCO, and practical implications were presented for practitioners of protocol. This study resulted in a deeper understanding of how to create change at institutions. It contributed to extant knowledge of institutional theory and CCO, particularly relevant to the role of an individual and matters of organizational communication. While there was no decisive, go-to answer related to how to create a protocol role at an academic institution, the findings pointed to insights worth exploring in the future as institutionalization is further demystified.



## References

- Alford, R., & Friedland, R. (1985). *Powers of theory: Capitalism, the state, and democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, J. R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 408-437.
- Battilana, J., & D'Aunno, T. (2009). Institutional work and the paradox of embedded agency. In: Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R. & Leca, B. (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations*. Cambridge University Press. 31-58.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Bisel, R. (2010). A communicative ontology of organization? A description, history, and critique of CCO theories for organization science. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(1): 124-131.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE.
- Colyvas, J. (2007). From divergent meanings to common practices: The early institutionalization of technology transfer in the life sciences at Stanford University. *Research Policy*, 36(4): 456-476.
- Colyvas, J., & Powell, W. (2006). Roads to institutionalization: The remaking of boundaries between public and private science. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27: 305–353.
- Cooren, F., (2004). Textual agency: How texts do things in organizational settings. *Organization*. Volume 11(3): 373–393.

- Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P., & Clark, T. (2011). Communication, organizing and organization: An overview and introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies*, 32(9): 1149-1170.
- Corman, S., Kuhn, T., McPhee, R., & Dooley, K. (2002). Studying complex discursive systems: Centering resonance analysis of communication. *Human Communication Research*, 8(2): 157-206.
- Cornelissen, J., Durand, R., Fiss, P., Lammers, J., & Vaara, E. (2015). Putting communication front and center in institutional theory and analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(1): 10-27.
- Denza, E. (1976). Diplomatic Law. Oceana Publications, Inc. Dobbs Ferry, NY.
- DiMaggio, P. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. *Institutional patterns and organizations culture and environment*, 3-21.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 147-160.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1991). Introduction. The new institutionalism in organizational analysis. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1-38.
- Eisenman, M. (2013). Understanding aesthetic innovation in the context of technological evolution. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(3): 332-351.
- Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory*, 14(1): 5-26.

- Forsten-Astikainen, R., Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, P., Lämsä, T., Heilmann, P., and Hyrkäs, E. (2017). Dealing with organizational silos with communities of practice and human resource management, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 29(6): 473-489.
- Foucault, M. (1983). The subject and power. In: Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. (Eds.) *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*, Chicago: Chicago University Press. 208-226.
- French, M. M. (2010). *United States Protocol: the guide to official diplomatic etiquette*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Maryland.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 58-80.
- Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2010). Discourse, field-configuring events and change in organizations and institutional fields: Narratives of DDT and the Stockholm Convention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6): 1365-1391.
- Holm, F., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2018). Configuring shared and hierarchical leadership through authoring. *Human Relations*, 71(5): 692-721.
- Kuhn, T. (2008). A communicative theory of the firm: developing an alternative perspective on intra-organizational power and stakeholder relationships. *Organization Studies*, 29(08 & 09): 1227-1257.
- Kuhn, T. (2012). Negotiating the micro-macro divide: Thought leadership from organizational communication for theorizing organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(4): 543-584.

- Lammers, J., & Barbour, J. (2006). An institutional theory of organizational communication. *Communication Theory, 16*(3): 356-377.
- Lammers, J., & Garcia, M. (2014). Institutional theory. In: Putnam, L. & Mumby, D. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication: advances in theory, research, and methods, (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. Chapter 8: 195-216.
- Lawrence, T., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In: Clegg, S., Hardy, C., Lawrence, T. & Nord, W. (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational studies, (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)* London: Sage Publications. 215-254.
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2009). *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 20*(1): 52-58.
- Mace-Vadjunec, D., Hileman, B. M., Melnykovich, M. B., Hanes, M. C., Chance, E. A., & Emerick, E. S. (2015). The lack of common goals and communication within a level I trauma system. *Journal of Trauma Nursing, 22*(5): 274-281.
- McCaffree, M. J., Innis, P., & Sand, R. M. (2013). *Protocol: the complete handbook of diplomatic, official & social usage 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition*. Center for Protocol Red Book Studies, LLC.
- Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*(5): 657-679.

- Meyer, R., Jancsary, D., Höllerer, M., & Boxenbaum, E. (2018). The role of verbal and visual text in the process of institutionalization. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(3): 392-418.
- McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2000). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. *Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique de Communication*, 10(1/2): 1-16.
- Micelotta, E., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (2017). Pathways of institutional change: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 43(6): 1885-1910.
- Phillips, N., Lawrence, T., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4): 635-652.
- Powell, W., & Colyvas, J. (2008). Microfoundations of institutional theory. *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 276-298.
- Powell, W., & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.). (2012). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. University of Chicago Press.
- Protocol Diplomacy International – Protocol Officers Association. (2018, Dec 5)  
[www.protocolinternational.org](http://www.protocolinternational.org)
- Putnam, L. L., & Nicotera, A. M. (2010). Communicative constitution of organization is a question: Critical issues for addressing it. *Management communication quarterly*, 24(1): 158-165.
- Putnam, L. L., Phillips, N., & Chapman, P. (1996). Metaphors of communication and organization. In: Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C., & Nord, W. R. (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*. London, UK: SAGE. 375-408.

- Radlovic, I. M. (1956). *Etiquette & protocol: a handbook of conduct in American and international circles*. Harcourt, Brace and Company. New York.
- Rothenbuhler, E. (1998). *Ritual communication: from everyday conversation to mediated ceremony*. Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE.
- Satow, E. M., & Bland, N. (1957). *A guide to diplomatic practice, 4th edition*. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Schoeneborn, D., Blaschke, S., Cooren, F., McPhee, R. D., Seidl, D., & Taylor, J. R. (2014). The three schools of CCO thinking: Interactive dialogue and systematic comparison. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(2): 285-316.
- Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grass roots: A study in the sociology of formal organization*. (Vol. 3). University of California Press.
- Simmons, J. (1954). The story behind protocol. *The Diplomat*. Jan. 1954.
- Suddaby, R., & Greenwood R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1): 35-67.
- State, U. S. (2019, Mar 9) *Discover Diplomacy*. Retrieved from Discover Diplomacy: <https://www.state.gov/discoverdiplomacy/>
- Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2000). *The emergent organization: Communication at its site and surface*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2010). *The situated organization: Case studies in the pragmatics of communication research*. Routledge.
- Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2014). *When organization fails: Why authority matters*. Routledge.

- Thornton, P., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In: Greenwood, R. & Oliver, C. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 840, 99-128.
- Tolbert, P., & Zucker, L. (1996). The institutionalization of institutional theory. In: Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C., & Nord, W. R. (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. 175-190.
- Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative Research Methods*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- United Nations document. (2017, Oct 28). Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 1961.  
[http://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9\\_1\\_1961.pdf](http://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9_1_1961.pdf)
- Weick, K. (1969). *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations* (Vol. 3). SAGE.

## Postell Thesis Interview Schedule

### The questions are designed in two parts:

- to explore the individual role
- to explore the role at an institutional level

### The goal of these interviews is two-fold:

- to collect institutional history
- to collect texts that demonstrate authority of the protocol role and/or office

### Drafted Questions:

#### Individual Information:

Your Name:

Your Title:

Your Department:

Your Institution:

Size of Enrollment:

Years in this role:

#### Questions about individual role at the university/institution:

- When you speak about protocol **what does it mean to you?**
- How do **you define** protocol when explaining it to others?
  - (Behavioral? Communicative? Ceremonial?)
- Can you describe **your role** as it relates to protocol?
  - What do you do? Work tasks and oversight.
  - What are the responsibilities you perform for others?
  - Is there a document or anything written that formally outlines your role? (web page? Job description? Memorandum?)
- When was the role **created**?
  - Was it Independent? (Blended/Hybrid? Absorbent? Evolving?)
  - Was there someone within the institution who championed the role?
    - Who? What was their position at the institution?
  - Describe any past actions/history that contributed to the role's creation?
  - Tell me about the evolution.
- Why do you think the role was created?
- What institutional **documents or texts** do you rely on to guide you in your role? Can you send me examples?
- Describe how your role is **formalized** at the institution?
  - Is there documentation that explains it?
    - Can you share the job description?



- Who authored it?
    - How has it evolved over time?
  - If not, how does the role fit into the norms and values of the institution?
- When was the last time you used protocol in your **scope of work**? (provide an example of protocol in action)
  - Was it a planned/invitation/anticipated occurrence?
  - Or was it unplanned/unanticipated occurrence?
  - Describe how the planning phase was organized?
    - Did you work alone or with others during the planning phase?
    - Who was the lead?
    - How was the lead determined?
    - What role did you play?
    - Who was the higher authority to report to?
    - What was the timeline?
  - What methods of communication were used during the planning phase?
    - Are there examples of documentation you can share?
    - (samples of emails, meeting notes, agendas, scripted text)
    - Who authored them? (if not you, who)
    - Can you provide samples of written documents?
  - Describe your role during the execution phase?
    - Did you work alone or with others?
    - Who was the lead?
    - How was the lead determined?
    - What role did you play?
    - Who was the higher authority to report to?
    - What was the timeline?
  - What methods of communication were used during the execution phase?
    - Are there examples of documentation you can share?
    - (samples of emails, meeting notes, itineraries, scripted text)
    - Who authored them? (if not you, who)
    - Can you provide samples of written documents?

#### Questions about institutional role:

- Can you describe all the **protocol functions/roles** at your institution and what department or unit is responsible?
- Are there protocols from the realm of **diplomacy** set up at your institution?
  - Yes:
    - Do you know the history how it emerged?
    - No: Is there someone else I can speak to who would know?
    - Is there a document that explains it?
- Is there a **specific office** where protocol plays a functional role at your institution?
  - Yes:

- the name of it/department or reporting unit
- What does your institution **mean by it**?
- What is the direct-report line?
  - Has that always been the case?
- Is there **evidence** that the institution has a clear definition of protocol?
  - Where can I find it?
- Can you describe what **texts** are used internally to explain the function and role of the office?
  - Who authored them?
  - Can you send me examples?
- What evidence can you provide that demonstrates protocol is articulated as part of the **value and norms** of your institution?
  - Does protocol contribute to any aspirational goals?
  - What does protocol offer?
- **History:**
  - Tell me how and when the office was **created**?
    - Do you know why the role was formalized?
    - Was it reactive to a situation? Proactive? Opportunistic?
    - If you don't know, who can I speak with who knows the history?
  - Were there **documents** created or used to map the initial concept?
    - Who authored them?
    - Can you send me examples?
  - Describe for me the **process** of how it came about?
    - Who played an instrumental role in the process?
    - Did they get involved early or later in the process?
    - Is there any documentation that explains it?
      - (meeting notes, memos, emails, article, etc.)
  - Who played an instrumental role in the **decision**?
    - Was there a task force, a campaign, or a singular decision maker?
    - What document was used to make the decision?
      - (report, letter, presentation proposal, etc.)
  - Were there **communiques** created to formalize the office?
    - Who authored them?
    - When was it put into writing?
    - Can you send me examples?
  - Were there **announcements** within the institution about the office?
    - Who authored them?
    - When was it put into writing?
    - Can you send me examples?
- **No:**
  - Is the role of protocol **scattered** throughout different departments or offices?
  - Can you explain the rationale for how the protocol role functions today?

- Is there documentation addressing the **function of protocol** at your institution? Can you send me examples?
  - Have there been **attempts** to institutionalize the function of protocol?
    - Yes:
      - Who has played an instrumental role?
      - How would you characterize their efforts, or lack-there-of?
      - Can you identify narratives where protocol could play a more vibrant role?
      - When was the last time someone spoke about the function or role of a protocol office?
      - Is there any communication speaking to these attempts?
      - (can you share examples of emails, notes, etc)
    - No:
      - Do you have an opinion as to why that is?
  - Would you characterize the effort or lack-there-of as a result of discord with the **norms or values** of the institution?
    - What would need to **change** at the institution?
    - Who would need to change?
    - In your opinion, who could be the change agent?
- 
- Who else do you know/can you recommend that I can speak with about the topic and the history?
  - Who else can I speak with who can fill in the gaps?

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
B=Rationale for change	Identifying a systemic problem	Example of inconsistencies of similar reputational work	NOT ALL COLLEGES, NOT ALL DIVISIONS WERE PLANNING EVENTS AND CEREMONIES AND THINGS AT THE SAME LEVEL. [R10]
			I WOULD FIND THERE WOULD BE FRUSTRATIONS BECAUSE THINGS WEREN'T ALWAYS DONE THE WAY OUR OFFICE DID IT. [R10]
		Evidence of an inefficient, decentralized system	THERE'S SO MUCH DISCONNECT. PEOPLE ARE RECREATING THE WHEEL ALL THE TIME. THERE'S NO CENTRALIZED AREA FOR PEOPLE TO GO TO FOR, TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, NO ONE IS SEEN AS THE UNIVERSAL HOLDER OF THIS KNOWLEDGE. [R8]
		Historical evidence of missed opportunities to elevate the institution	THERE WERE SOME BIG UNIVERSITY ANNIVERSARIES THAT HAD COME UP, AND THAT COULD HAVE HAD THE POTENTIAL OF REALLY LEVERAGING PARTNERSHIPS AND POSSIBLE MEDIA. AND THINGS KIND OF WENT UNDER THE RADAR BECAUSE PEOPLE DIDN'T KNOW THEY WERE HAPPENING. AND THEY WERE PLANNED AT A SMALLER LEVEL, YOU KNOW, INTERNALLY WITHIN A COLLEGE OR A REGIONAL CAMPUS, AND THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE DIDN'T EVEN GET WIND OF IT UNTIL MAYBE TWO OR THREE WEEKS BEFORE THE EVENT WHEN THE PRESIDENT WAS ASKED TO ATTEND. [R10]
	Conversations about need for more high level attention	Interest in filling a void on campus	WHEN I STARTED THERE WERE LOTS OF DISCUSSIONS WITH THE THEN-REPORT THAT I WAS REPORTING TO IN THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR ABOUT NEEDING POTENTIALLY TO DO MORE TYPES OF THESE HIGH LEVEL THINGS AND DIGNITARIES AND INVITEES AND THAT SORT OF THING, AND NOBODY WAS REALLY DOING THAT. [R1]
		Example of past attempt to build buy-in from administration	AND I AND MY COLLEAGUE MET WITH HIM, AND EVEN THEN WE WERE SAYING 'WE NEED AN OFFICE OF CENTRALIZED EVENTS,' AND HE WAS LIKE, 'WELL YOU KNOW, I DON'T KNOW.' AND FINALLY I JUST SAID '[NAME], HERE'S THE MAIN PROBLEM.' [R7]

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
B=Rationale for change	Conversations about need for more high level attention	Example of planning for the future	BECAUSE WE'RE A FAIRLY YOUNG INSTITUTION WE WERE HITTING OUR 25 <sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY IN 2015, AND THAT KIND OF PROMPTED PEOPLE TO THINK ABOUT 'OK SO WHERE ARE WE HEADING IN THE NEXT 25 YEARS AND HOW DO WE ACCOMPLISH THOSE THINGS?' AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WAS BROUGHT UP I THINK WAS 'YOU KNOW, WE NEED TO KIND OF GET OUR DUCKS IN A ROW IN JUST OUR INTERNAL PROCESSES, LIKE HOW WE DO THE THINGS THAT WE DO AND HOW DO WE PULL THEM OFF REALLY REALLY WELL?' [R1]
	Considering institutional consistency	Explanation of history that speaks to why the role was created	IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT CONSISTENCY AND QUALITY WOULD ALWAYS BE THERE THE THOUGHT WAS THERE REALLY SHOULD BE SOMEBODY'S JOB [R1]
		New president's experience with institutional events	BECAUSE I THINK THE PRESIDENT RECOGNIZED THAT THERE NEEDED TO BE A LITTLE BIT MORE STRUCTURE, A LITTLE BIT MORE CONSISTENCY IN EVENTS. HE MENTIONED WHEN HE FIRST CAME HERE THAT HE RECEIVED LIKE A 100 DIFFERENT INVITATIONS IN THE GET-GO, AND THAT HALF THE TIME HE DIDN'T EVEN KNOW THEY WERE [institution's] EVENTS, BECAUSE NONE OF THEM HAD THE SAME LANGUAGE, THEY DIDN'T HAVE THE SAME BRANDING. THAT'S A COMMUNICATIONS ISSUE AS WELL. [R8]
	Elevating the institution	Explanation of top administration rationalizing the new protocol role	OUR SENIOR LEADERSHIP WANTED TO HAVE THE PROTOCOL COMPONENT JUST AS WE WANTED TO ENHANCE THE REPUTATION OF THE INSTITUTION AND CREATE SOME CONSISTENCIES AND EFFICIENCIES. SO THEY FELT THE NEED TO ADD THAT COMPONENT. SO THEY CREATED MY POSITION. [R12]
C=Internal communication initiating change	Conversation	Seeking out leadership to engage and propose a new concept	AND I KNEW THE VP THERE AND THEN THIS CONVERSATION STARTED, 'MAYBE SHE SHOULD START MOVING OVER HERE.' [R1]

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
C=Internal communication initiating change	Developing a proposal	Concrete example of using communication to initiate an idea of change supported by a group	SO THERE'S AN ECN WHITE PAPER THAT WAS SUBMITTED IN JUNE 2010 AND THAT WAS KIND OF THE IMPETUS TO START THIS. [R8]
	Job description	Drafted job description to include protocol role	RIGHT NOW IT'S ALL A DRAFT FORM. I MEAN IT'S JUST LOOKING AT SOME OF THE OTHER JOB DESCRIPTIONS AND THE POSTINGS THAT HAVE GONE OUT. [R5]
E=Preparing Change	Peer support	Describing the collective authority of a formed group envisioning change	WE ACTUALLY KIND OF LEANED UPON THE EXPERIENCE AND THE UNIVERSAL VOICE OF, AT THAT TIME THERE WERE ABOUT 18 MEMBERS OR SO, WHO WERE HAND SELECTED FROM THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE STAFF WHO WERE KIND OF REPRESENTATIVE OF EVENTS WITHIN THE PROMINENT UNITS AND COLLEGES AND THINGS LIKE THAT. SO WE DRAFTED THE RECOMMENDATION BASED ON A SWOT ANALYSIS THAT WE HAD DONE AS MEMBERS, AND I PRESENTED THAT. [R8]
	Developing a proposal	Example of past effort to institutionalize the protocol function	I DID A LOT OF THE LEG WORK UNDER SUPERVISION OF MY BOSS AT THE TIME, THE DIRECTOR POSITION THAT I'VE KIND OF STEPPED INTO. SO SHE EXPRESSED AN INTEREST IN PUTTING THIS TOGETHER, BUT I WAS THE ONE THAT DID A LOT OF THE LEG WORK AND PUT TOGETHER THE PROPOSAL UNDER HER GUIDANCE. [R11]
	Visionary goal setting	Example of recognition that protocol is needed on campus	AGAIN, THE 25 <sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY [of the institution] AND JUST HAVING THAT AWARENESS OF MOVING FORWARD. HOW DO WE WANT TO SEE OURSELVES? HOW DO WE WANT TO DO THESE THINGS, TO BECOME A BIGGER BETTER INSTITUTION? I THINK AGAIN, THAT KIND OF PROMPTED THAT KIND OF CONVERSATION. [R1]
	Internal process	Describing the process of building a strategy to create a protocol office	SO I GUESS THE OVER ALL LESSON IN DEVELOPING THIS WAS TO DEVELOP PARTNERSHIPS, BUILD RELATIONSHIPS , HAVE YOUR DATA, HAVE YOUR BACKING, OR HAVING THE REASON WHY YOU'RE PREPARING THIS THING [protocol role]. [R8]

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Benchmarking	Explaining how protocol manifested into a proposal for a new role at the institution	I WAS RESEARCHING OTHER INSTITUTIONS, OUR PEER AND ASPIRATIONAL...AT THAT TIME IT APPEARED THAT A LOT OF OFFICES WERE STARTING TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOT ONLY THEIR ACADEMIC CEREMONIES, IF THEY WERE, THEY WERE ALSO INCORPORATING THIS ELEMENT OF PROTOCOL INTO THEIR OFFICES. [R8]
		Description of research to build a case for protocol	SO I RESEARCHED YOU KNOW OTHER INSTITUTIONS... AND JUST KIND OF UTILIZING OTHER POSITIONS THAT I FOUND, TO SHOW THE NEED AND TO BUILD THE CASE FOR THE POSITION. AND OBVIOUSLY I WAS ABLE TO COMPARE SALARIES, AND LOOK AT THOSE THINGS. [R12]
		Describing a process that helped justify and articulate a proposal to create a protocol role at the institution	SO I RESEARCHED OTHER INSTITUTIONS, AND FOUND [name of person] AND KIND OF LOOKING AT HER ROLE AND SHE RAN THE PRESIDENT'S HOUSE FOR MANY YEARS. AND JUST KIND OF UTILIZING OTHER POSITIONS THAT I FOUND TO SHOW THE NEED AND TO BUILD THE CASE FOR THE POSITION. AND OBVIOUSLY I WAS ABLE TO COMPARE SALARIES, AND LOOK AT THOSE THINGS. [R12]
	Reputation building	Description of relationship with leadership as protocol is being considered for the existing office	I FEEL THAT WE ARE WELL RECEIVED AND THAT THE CHANCELLOR AND THE CHANCELLOR'S CHIEF OF STAFF DO RECOGNIZE THAT THE VALUE THAT WE'RE ABLE TO BRING TO EVENTS AND CAMPUS IN GENERAL...BY DOING THE CHANCELLOR'S EVENTS WE'RE KIND OF LEADING BY EXAMPLE. [R11]
		Envisioning how protocol can help the institution	IT'LL BENEFIT THE UNIVERSITY BECAUSE WE'LL HAVE ESTABLISHED SOMETHING, YOU KNOW, FOUNDATIONALLY FOR THE UNIVERSITY. [R5]

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Internal process	Building a case why the existing office should also include protocol services, relying on existing positive experience with the president's office.	THEY [other offices on campus] HAVE THE ABILITY TO DO SOME OF THEIR OWN EVENTS AND THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT THEY'RE, YOU KNOW, WELL VERSED IN PROTOCOL OR WELCOMING DIGNITARIES TO CAMPUS, OR THOSE SORTS OF THINGS. AND THAT'S WHY I WOULD RATHER BE THAT CENTRAL REPOSITORY SO THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO FACILITATE. OUR WORK WITH THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE IS INSTRUMENTAL AND I THINK THAT THEY RELY HEAVILY ON OUR WORK AND OUR ORGANIZATION AND OUR EXPERIENCE AND OUR PROTOCOL INSIGHT. [R5]
	Reputation protecting	Perspective from a professional who has a functional protocol title and office recognizing not everyone in the institution appreciates the value of protocol	AND SOMETIMES I DON'T THINK PEOPLE THINK IT'S A BIG DEAL. BUT HOW THIS ONE LITTLE THING CAN GO WRONG, CAN BE YOU KNOW, HORRIFIC IN THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND THE PRESS. YOU KNOW IF SOMEONE IS OFFENDED OR SOMETHING ISN'T PLANNED RIGHT. SO I THINK IT'S REALLY A NECESSITY AS WELL. [R10]
	Reputation protecting	Explanation of institutional risk with staff unskilled in protocol	'THAT'S REALLY WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO, YOU'RE LETTING PEOPLE PUT TOGETHER EVENTS THAT DON'T HAVE THE BACKGROUND OR THE UNDERSTANDING OF ALL THE PERILS THAT THEY PUT THE INSTITUTION IN. [R7]
		Perspective of why protocol is important	JUST PRESENT A UNITED FRONT IF NOTHING MORE. [R9]
	Advising	Explaining how to remind others their office can perform protocol services	AT EVERY GIVEN OPPORTUNITY I TRY AND PUSH IT OUT THERE, AND THAT'S WHAT WE DO. [R4]
		Recognition that a designated protocol advisory role is necessary at the institution	LITTLE BY LITTLE WE STARTED TO REALIZE INSTITUTIONALLY THAT THERE JUST NEEDED TO BE SOMEBODY THAT HAD A VOICE, THAT HAD SOME ADVISORY CAPACITY. [R1]



Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Building capacity	Describing the process of drafting a protocol proposal that has to get approval	WHICH HAS INVOLVED A LITTLE BIT OF POACHING, A LITTLE BIT OF CRAFTING AND NOW I WILL BE WORKING WITH HR IN TRYING TO EXPLAIN TO THEM THAT INDEED THIS IS IMPERATIVE, AND THEN IT'LL [protocol proposal] PROBABLY HAVE TO GET APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE. [R5]
		Describing how there is support for the protocol proposal from supervisors	YEAH IT'S GREAT, THEY'RE [supervisors] ON BOARD AND MAYBE IT'S PERSONAL BECAUSE THEY FEEL THAT IF I SUCCEED THEN THEY SUCCEED. [R5]
	Collaborating	Describing the need to reach others at the institution to collaborate about protocol	PEOPLE ARE JUST SORT OF HIDDEN IN LITTLE POCKETS AT UNIVERSITIES DOING THIS TYPE OF WORK. [R12]
	Consistency	Describing how inconsistent practices are on campus and how protocol can help	INVITATIONS AREN'T EVEN CONSISTENT YOU KNOW, AS FAR AS ON OUR EVENTS. AND I'M LIKE , 'SO YOU GUYS IT SHOULD ALL LOOK SORT OF THE SAME, SO PEOPLE KNOW IT'S COMING FROM THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE.' [R9]
	Influencing	Explaining how his expertise in protocol is getting noticed and is helping form a proposal for an official role	WE'RE GETTING CONTACTED ABOUT IT ALREADY. YOU KNOW, SO SINCE I'VE BEEN HERE THEY, WHICH IS GOOD, THAT'S HOW WE'RE PERCEIVED, SO I'M GOING TO FURTHER THAT. [R5]

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Standardization	Describing the inconsistencies across campuses to commencement practices, and how the protocol role can help standardize the practices.	WE HAVE QUESTIONS OF REGALIA. THERE'S NO REAL EXPERT, THERE WAS A PERSON IN THE CEREMONIES OFFICER POSITION, BUT THEY WEREN'T REALLY GIVEN THE AUTHORITY TO SAY 'NO YOU CAN'T DO THAT' KIND OF THING, LIKE IT WAS SORT OF A 'WELL THIS IS KIND OF WHAT WE DO.' WE REALLY DON'T HAVE ANY OFFICIAL DOCUMENTATION, WE KIND OF FEEL IT OUT, YOU KNOW, THAT KIND OF FLY BY THE SEAT OF YOUR PANTS SORT OF THING. IT WASN'T REALLY WORKING AND SO THE THOUGHT WAS THERE REALLY NEEDS TO BE SOMEBODY WHO'S IN CHARGE AND SAY 'NO THIS IS WHAT WE DO AND THIS IS WHY WE DO IT.' [R1]
J=Inhibitor to Change	Disconnected	Describing frustration with peers who refuse to take the role of protocol seriously	AND I'M LIKE, THAT DOESN'T MEAN A DAMN THING. PLEASE, YOU SAY RESPECT AND PROTOCOL, BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING SO YOU HAVE TO, IT'S RE-EXPLAINING AND RE-EXPLAINING, TRYING TO EXPLAIN, YOU KNOW, THE IMPORTANCE OF IT AND HOW IT DOES AFFECT THE UNIVERSITY AND THE INSTITUTION AND OUR REPUTATION. [R5]
		Describing a situation of failure of faculty to notify the presence of a distinguished guest on campus	'WHY WOULDN'T YOU THINK OF LETTING US KNOW THAT YOU HAVE A CONSUL GENERAL TO CAMPUS? YOU INVITED THEM, THEY SPOKE AT YOUR DARN EVENT, LET US KNOW THIS SO THAT WE CAN MAKE SURE THAT THEY'RE RESPECTED AND THINGS ARE FOLLOWED.' [R5]
	Complacency	Describing the cultural climate from the point of view of a protocol professional	AND WHEN I COME HERE, IT'S LIKE 'WHAT? YOU GUYS DON'T KNOW OR YOU DON'T CARE ?' IT [protocol] WAS LACKING ON CAMPUS HERE. AND I'M REALLY PASSIONATE ABOUT PROTOCOL. [R9]
	Instability	The environment is void of vision, leadership or support for formalizing the protocol role	IF I WERE TO BRING THIS [the protocol proposal] UP AGAIN, IT WOULDN'T BE PUSHED THROUGH. I HAVEN'T FELT LIKE I'M IN AN ENVIRONMENT WHERE I COULD, WITH EVERYTHING ELSE GOING ON. [R11]

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
J=Inhibitor to Change	Lack of awareness	Recognition by protocol professional that there is lack of awareness what protocol is and how it can be beneficial	AND I DON'T THINK IT'S [protocol] SOMETHING THAT PEOPLE REALLY KNOW THEY CAN USE. [R9]
	Leadership change	When presidents come and go, the protocol proposal loses momentum	EVERY TIME WE'VE HAD A NEW LEADER THEY'VE HAD THINGS REORGANIZED DURING MY TIME HERE. SO IT'S KIND OF HARD WHEN YOU'VE GONE THROUGH THIS MANY LEADERS AND I'VE BEEN HERE SIX AND A HALF YEARS. [R11]
	Poor timing	When a protocol proposal is presented at the same the institution is reeling in conflict	IT WAS VERY POOR TIMING AS FAR AS WHEN THAT PROPOSAL WAS COMING ACROSS, AND EVERYTHING ELSE WAS HAPPENING ON CAMPUS. [R11]
	Silo effect	Discovering how disconnected are the elements of the institution, inhibiting collaboration or support	I'VE BEEN IN EVENTS BEFORE, BUT THIS IS THE FIRST TIME AT AN ACADEMIC INSTITUTION. AND I DIDN'T EVEN REALIZE HOW YOU KNOW, SILOED AND HOW UNUNIFORMED WE WERE. [R11]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
B=Rationale for change	Change of title	Explanation of negotiating a new title with 'protocol' in it, to help formalize it on campus	I THINK THAT'S AN IMPORTANT PIECE PERHAPS IN THIS BECAUSE THERE'S NOTHING THAT RECOGNIZES PROTOCOL AT OUR INSTITUTION AND I FEEL AS OUR OFFICE DOES DO THAT, THAT I WANTED TO GET THAT [a protocol title] IN THERE. [R4]
C=Internal communication initiating change	Job description	Active contribution in creating a protocol role at the institution	AFTER, IT KIND OF GAVE ME AN IDEA AS TO WHAT THEY [human resources] THOUGHT I SHOULD BE DOING IN THIS ROLE. I WAS ABLE TO WEIGH IN ON, AND I WANTED TO MAKE SURE I WAS ABLE TO KEEP SOME THINGS FROM MY OLD JOB DESCRIPTION THAT I KNEW I WOULD STILL BE DOING. [R10]
		Concrete example of using communication to start institutionalizing protocol	AND THEN THAT JOB DESCRIPTION WAS TWEAKED HERE BY THE CHIEF OF STAFF AND THE HR DEPARTMENT. [R12]
		Example of stalled efforts between stages and inconclusive direction for protocol	CREATING THE DOCUMENTATION ABOUT THE NEED FOR AN OFFICE WAS PRETTY SPECIFIC. BUT WHEN THE OFFICE FINALLY CAME TOGETHER THERE WAS NOTHING THAT I WAS GIVEN AND THERE WAS NO INFORMATION OR COMMUNICATION THAT I WAS PRIVY TO ABOUT THAT[the creation of the office of events and protocol]. [R7]
E=Preparing Change	Buy-in	Example of a document getting vetted by various stakeholders for their input	RIGHT NOW THIS [protocol guide] IS IN DRAFT FORM , SO I'VE BEEN LEADING THAT, WRITING THAT, REVISING IT, MAKING SURE TO GO OUT TO THE [institution] COMMUNITY AND ASKING FOR FEEDBACK ON IT, SO THAT WE'VE HAD SEVERAL ROUNDS OF SORT OF THAT COMMUNICATION PIECE, PEOPLE CAN BE INVOLVED. THAT'S BEEN A LARGE PART OF IT. [R1]
		Example of building responsibilities and focus of the new office before launching to the community	WE HAVEN'T EVEN OFFICIALLY CHANGED ANY ON THE WEBSITE OR ANYWHERE ELSE. LIKE CEREMONIES AND PROTOCOL WE'RE KIND OF KEEPING THAT INTERNAL RIGHT NOW AS AN OFFICE. WE WANT TO KNOW THAT'S THE FOCUS, THAT CEREMONIES AND PROTOCOL GO TOGETHER. [R1]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
E=Preparing Change	Buy-in	Describing how buy-in from peers could secure documentation of office expansion	WHEN I WROTE IT, SO I'M FORTUNATE THAT I HAVE CREATED MY JOB DESCRIPTION MYSELF...I WANTED TO EXPAND THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OFFICE, BUT THEN I ALSO WANTED TO HAVE THE [group] WITH US TO HIRE A NEW PERSON. [R8]
	Peer Support	Building institutional change by creating a collective that grows and needs protocol	BUT WHAT WE TRY TO DO IN DEVELOPING THIS OFFICE WAS TO ALSO DEVELOP A GROUP LIKE I SAID THE ECN. AND WE ARE OVER 500 MEMBERS STRONG ON CAMPUS AND IT'S CRAZY, BECAUSE THAT MANY PEOPLE...ARE DOING LITTLE LITTLE EVENTS HERE AND THERE. [R8]
F=Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization	Introduction	Communicating internally after decision was made to create a new role	INITIALLY WHEN I STARTED IN THIS ROLE, WHICH I'M LOOKING BACK HERE NOW, FIVE YEARS AGO, FIRST I MET WITH THE SPECIAL ASSISTANTS TO EACH OF OUR DEANS TO LET THEM KNOW WHAT I WAS DOING. [R6]
		Internal communication declaring new role	I'M LOOKING AT A LETTER THAT WAS SENT IN MARCH 2013 TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FROM MY DIRECT REPORT INTRODUCING MY ROLE. [R6]
	Internal process	describing a process used to differentiate the protocol role of a one-person office	SO I WAS INVOLVED IN THOSE CONVERSATIONS BECAUSE WE REALLY HAD A HARD TIME COMING UP WITH SOMETHING THAT WOULD ENCAPSULATE ALL EVENTS, BECAUSE I'M A PERSON, AN OFFICE OF ONE, I CAN'T POSSIBLY DO ALL EVENTS. BY PUTTING IN THE CEREMONIES PIECE WE HOPED THAT WOULD KIND OF DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN JUST A CONFERENCE LET'S SAY, AND A CEREMONY THAT WAS IMPORTANT, YOU KNOW, WITH DIGNITARIES AND POTENTIAL FLAGS AND PIECES OF PROTOCOL. [R1]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
F=Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization	Buy-in	example of institutional leadership engaged in the process	I'M STILL WAITING ON OUR CHANCELLOR TO VETT IT ONE LAST TIME WITH HIS INDIVIDUAL COLLEAGUES FROM THE HERITAGE MINISTRY AND HE'S GOT A LOT OF INSIGHT INTO THOSE PROTOCOL PIECES. WE'RE HAVING THAT VETTED ONE LAST TIME. [R1]
F=Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization	Internal process	Description how regular communication throughout a process leads to successful planned change	THEY'VE [the institutional leaders] BEEN UPDATED NUMEROUS TIMES BY THE VP SAYING 'THIS IS COMING, THIS IS WHAT WE'RE DOING' SO THEY'RE NOT UNINFORMED ABOUT WHAT IS HAPPENING. THEY JUST HAVEN'T SEEN THE FINAL DOCUMENTATION YET. SO ONCE THAT HAPPENS IN FEBRUARY THEN HOPEFULLY WE'LL GET THE ENDORSEMENT, THEN MOST LIKELY WE'LL GO THE BOARD AS WELL FOR ENDORSEMENT, I THINK, WE MAY JUST LEAVE IT AT SENATE. [R1]
	Concrete communication	Example of a president reorganizing roles and communicating institutional rationale that is accepted	I WOULD SAY YES, THAT WHAT WAS SHARED WITH THE CABINET AS OUR OFFICE CAME INTO EXISTENCE, IT'S REALLY MORE LIKE...MAYBE AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, AS TO LIKE, THE PRESIDENT'S RATIONALE FOR WHY ONE, HE WOULD WANT TO TAKE THE OFFICE FROM THE PROVOST, AND WHAT HER [president] EXPECTATIONS FOR US ARE. [R10]
	Stagnant communication	Example of institution slow to formalize protocol role	SO WE HAD ALL THE THINGS IN PLACE TO CREATE A GOOD CENTRALIZED EVENTS OFFICE. WE JUST WEREN'T FORMALLY AN OFFICE OF EVENTS AND PROTOCOL UNTIL PERHAPS A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO. [R7]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
F=Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization	Tactical permission	Example of seeking permission to communicate new role when leadership fails to communicate new role institutionally	BUT I WAS RUNNING OUT OF BUSINESS CARDS AND I TOLD MY SENIOR VP, I SAID , 'UM, INSTEAD OF CONSTANTLY EXPLAINING WHY THE DIRECTOR OF CEREMONIES IS GOING TO BE HANDLING THIS VISIT, CAN WE JUST PUT 'PROTOCOL OFFICER' IN MY TITLE? I NEED NEW BUSINESS CARDS AND CAN I JUST ADD 'PROTOCOL OFFICER'?' AND SHE WAS LIKE, 'OK.' [R7]
	Unofficial communication	Example of how communication of change moves throughout an institution	AND WORD TRAVELS FAST, EVEN THOUGH IT'S A BIG CAMPUS IT TRAVELS FAST. AND BECAUSE I WAS ALREADY KIND OF FUNCTIONING INDIVIDUALLY IN THIS ADVISOR ROLE IT WASN'T LIKE PEOPLE DIDN'T KNOW. [R10]
G=Institutional Work	Advising	Explaining how to build a profile of expertise on campus when not functioning in an official protocol office or title.	BEING A REFERENCE FOR OTHERS TO EITHER RUN THEIR IDEAS BY US, OR BEING A REFERENCE TO INSTRUCT THEM OR TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE WHEN YOU HAVE A VISITING DIGNITARY. [R5]
		Describing ability to connect others	WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO SORT OF SAY TO PEOPLE 'THIS IS THE PERSON YOU WANT TO TALK TO.' [R7]
		Example of being a resource to help with events as needed. Trying to expand that role to include protocol.	WHAT WE TELL PEOPLE IS 'WE'RE HERE TO CONSULT, WE'RE HERE TO ASSIST IF YOU WANT SOMEBODY ON SITE TO HELP WITH THE AGENDA, WE'LL MAKE SURE WE'RE THERE.' IT'S BEEN PLENTY OF TIMES THAT I'M JUST THERE, YOU KNOW, IN THE WINGS, AND, 'LET ME KNOW IF YOU NEED HELP.' [R7]
	Advising Telling	Describing the mixed results from advising about protocol to peers	AND I'LL HAVE SOME PEOPLE THAT'LL TAKE IT AND BE VERY GRATEFUL FOR THE INFORMATION AND THEN I GET PEOPLE WHO GET TOTALLY IRRITATED THAT I KINDA TELL THEM HOW TO PERFORM. [R7]



Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
F=Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization	Advising Telling	Describing situations where advise is offered by an unofficial protocol person who is trying to insert authority or expertise	I'LL SAY YOU KNOW, 'HEY, WHEN YOU START TO PLAN THIS, LET ME KNOW IF YOU NEED HELP. IT'S ALWAYS AN EXPECTATION THAT WE HELP YOU, NOT TELL YOU WHAT TO DO. AND THEN, DON'T FORGET THAT YOU'LL WANT TO CONSIDER THIS FOR A GIFT AND NOT THAT.' OR 'DON'T FORGET, YOU'LL WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU KNOW, THIS PERSON IS OBSERVING A PARTICULAR RELIGIOUS HOLIDAY DON'T, YOU KNOW, DON'T PLAN YOUR MEAL IN THE MIDDLE OF RAMADAN' OR WHATEVER.[R7]
		Example where the official protocol person is advising peers on campus	AND YOU KNOW, 'LET ME KNOW ABOUT INCOMING VISITORS FOR FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS.' [R6]
		Explanation from an official protocol office regarding the effectiveness of telling versus advising	I DON'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK AS WELL IF WE WERE TELLING PEOPLE HOW TO DO THINGS ALL THE TIME. [R12]
G=Institutional Work	Being a resource	Describing the intention of forming the new protocol role at the institution	THIS IDEA OF PROTOCOL IS REALLY KIND OF IN THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PIECE AS WELL BECAUSE THERE WERE, SOME THINGS ARE NOW COMING TO MY OFFICE THAT OTHER PEOPLE HAD DONE IN THE PAST. SO IT'S KIND OF THIS COMMUNICATION EDUCATIONAL PIECE ON WHAT WE'RE DOING, WHY WE'RE DOING IT, WHAT IT MEANS FOR OTHER PEOPLE, AND KIND OF HELPING THEM ALONG WITH .....SO THEY HAVE WHAT THEY CONSIDER POTENTIALLY TO BE A PROTOCOL QUESTION THEY KNOW WHERE TO GO AND ASK IT. [R1]
		Example of inserting oneself as a resource to others planning high level events	AND THEN I GOT LOOPED IN WHEN I HEARD ABOUT IT [a high level event]. I REACHED OUT TO HER AND I SAID 'HEY, SO THIS IS COMING ALONG, HOW'S IT GOING?' [R9]



Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Advising Telling	Explanation of purpose of unofficial protocol role as a resource	IT'S JUST MORE OR LESS, BEING, I DON'T KNOW, A STAPLE ON CAMPUS. YOU KNOW, JUST REALLY A RESOURCE. YOU KNOW? [R9]
	Being a resource	Describing the response given when people push back on protocol	I'M NOT HERE TO POLICE YOUR EVENT, I'M JUST HERE TO HELP, YOU KNOW, ELEVATE YOUR EVENT, AND HELP YOU IDENTIFY, YOU KNOW MAYBE RESOURCES YOU HADN'T CONSIDERED, OR PARTNERSHIPS THAT YOU KNOW, OPPORTUNITIES THAT WERE MISSED.' [R10]
	Building capacity	Describing the process of reorganization	YOU KNOW WE SPENT THE FIRST YEAR JUST TRYING TO FIGURE OUT EVERYONE'S ROLE AND HOW WE WERE GOING TO WORK TOGETHER AS AN OFFICE OF EVENTS AND PROTOCOL. [R7]
		Explaining how new everything is, but the vision is to grow	YOU KNOW TALKING WITH THE PRESIDENT, HE SAID THAT WE NEED EVENTUALLY TO GET THIS OFFICE LARGER BUT THE CAPACITY RIGHT NOW IS NOT THERE AND IT'S GOING TO TAKE US A WHILE TO GET THERE. [R1]
G=Institutional Work	Building capacity	Describing how buy-in from peers was important to create the office	THEY [campus peers] HAD A VESTED INTEREST IN THIS [new protocol office], AND I WANTED TO BE RESPECTFUL AS WELL AS THE FACT THAT SOME OF THEM, LIKE I SAID, PARTICULARLY IN DEVELOPMENT, ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, SOME OF THE COLLEGES, GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS, THEY WERE DOING SOME OF THE PROTOCOL WORK AS WELL. SO IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH UNIVERSAL DOCUMENTS THAT APPEALED TO EVERYONE ACROSS CAMPUS, I WANTED TO ENSURE THAT WE ALL AGREED. AND THAT WE ALL HAD THE BUY IN TOGETHER. [R8]
	Consistency	Describing frustration when guiding peers about protocol	SO I FEEL LIKE I'M CONSTANTLY HELPING PEOPLE SORT OF YOU KNOW, BE CONSISTENT.[R9]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Being a resource	Offering assistance to improve events so they appear consistent across campus	THE NURSING SCHOOL OR THE MEDICAL COLLEGE'S WHITE COAT CEREMONY, WE DON'T NECESSARILY WANT TO TELL THEM HOW TO DO THEIR CEREMONY, BUT WE WANT TO HELP THEM, SO THAT IT'S CONSISTENT AND LOOKS LIKE AN [institution's name] CEREMONY. [R12]
		Describing the necessity to finalize and approve the protocol proposal	WE'VE DONE THINGS A BIT AD HOC IN THE PAST. I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT FOR US MOVING FORWARD TO, TO CEMENT THIS [the protocol proposal] AND GET THIS REALLY CLEAR FOR EVERYBODY. [R1]
	Reputation protecting	Explaining the goals and intentions of institutional events organized by the office	COORDINATING EVENTS THAT HOLD UP THE ACADEMIC MISSION OF OUR INSTITUTION, I FEEL LIKE THAT IS ALWAYS WHAT WE'RE STRIVING TO DO. [R11]
		Example of staff protecting the institution's reputation though in an unofficial capacity	WE TRY TO INSERT OURSELVES, WE DO THAT ON A DAILY BASIS. SOME DAYS, YOU KNOW, IT'S REALLY HARD TO JUMP IN ON SOMEBODY ELSE'S EVENT OR PROCESS. CAUSE YOU KNOW, WE HAVE ENOUGH OF A WORK LOAD YOU KNOW WITH THE EVENTS ITSELF. BUT, YOU KNOW, CARING ABOUT THE INSTITUTION AND WANTING IT TO BE SEEN BY ITS VISITORS... [R11]
G=Institutional Work	Reputation protecting	Perspective from a professional who performs protocol in an unofficial capacity	THAT'S REALLY WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO, YOU'RE LETTING PEOPLE PUT TOGETHER EVENTS THAT DON'T HAVE THE BACKGROUND OR THE UNDERSTANDING OF ALL THE PERILS THAT THEY PUT THE INSTITUTION IN. [R7]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Standardization	Describing the challenge of creating protocol standards on campus	THEY'RE [event organizers] STARTING TO KNOW IT [protocol] A LITTLE BIT BETTER AND I THINK THEY ARE ALL A LITTLE APPREHENSIVE AND LIKE 'PROTOCOL IS SO SCARY AND SHE'S NOT GOING TO LET US HAVE OUR STUFF' AND IT'S LIKE 'NO, THAT'S NOT IT. YOU KNOW ? I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE YOU'RE DOING THINGS JUST THE RIGHT WAY. CAUSE CERTAIN THINGS, CERTAIN THINGS HAVE TO HAPPEN IN THE RIGHT WAY.' [R9]
		Example of standardizing practices across campuses after the protocol office is vetted and approved	IMPORTANT THAT THEY [satellite campuses] HAVE THIS FUNDAMENTAL DOCUMENTATION SO THAT THEY KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THEY NEED TO DO, AND IF THEY HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR ANYTHING THAT I CAN OBVIOUSLY SUPPORT THEM AND FIELD THOSE QUESTIONS. [R1]
		Describing a president with a vision and tapping an individual who could execute standards at the highest level for the institution	HE [the president] WANTED THINGS STANDARDIZED ON CAMPUS AND HE WANTED, YOU KNOW, SOMEBODY INVOLVED WHO COULD, WHO KNEW WHAT TO DO WHEN WE HAVE THESE ALL THESE MILITARY PEOPLE COMING AND GOING CONSTANTLY. AND HE WAS REALLY BIG ON INTERNATIONAL SPEAKERS AND STUFF LIKE THAT. HE WANTED LIKE A CLEARINGHOUSE. HE WANTED ME TO HELP PEOPLE. [R3]
	Influencing	Describing limited influence over other offices because of past structure	IN THE PAST THEY HAVEN'T KNOWN TO GO TO MY OFFICE FOR ANYTHING. BECAUSE WE ONLY DO THINGS THAT THE CHANCELLOR SAYS WE SHOULD DO. [R9]
		Explaining how the office influences cooperation	WHEN I HAVE SAID THIS IS SOMETHING THAT THE PRESIDENT PREFERS, PEOPLE HAVE NORMALLY GONE WITH IT. [R8]
	Reputation building	Describing the protocol role at the institution	REALLY IT'S JUST PUSHING OUT GOOD INFORMATION AND TO HELP THE UNIVERSITY [R10]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Expertise Consistency Reputation protection	Explaining how a focus on protocol keeps experiences consistent on campus	I SEE MY ROLE AS SORT OF MAKING SURE THAT PEOPLE KNOW THE CUSTOMS, THE GREETINGS, YOU KNOW, THE ORDER OF PRECEDENCE. MAKING SURE THAT THE CHANCELLOR IS DOING, REPRESENTING AND ACKNOWLEDGING THINGS AS IT SHOULD BE. [R9]
H=Documentation	Concrete document planned	Example of planning to build a website with protocol resources	FOCUS THIS SPRING WILL BE ON OUR WEBPAGE, AND I'M TRYING TO GET SOME EVENT PLANNING TOOLS AND RESOURCES AVAILABLE, [both] INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL. [R10]
		Example of managing future requests using documentation	BECAUSE IT'S FAIRLY NEW WE'RE STILL TRYING TO FORMALIZE HOW THAT WORKS. SO I AM WORKING ALSO ON CREATING AN EVENT TEMPLATE SO THAT WHEN WE GET A REQUEST COMING IN FROM YOU KNOW A HIGH PROFILE, EITHER GOVERNMENT OR A MINISTRY, OR WHATEVER IT IS, WHEN IT COMES IN WE KIND OF HAVE AN IDEA OF WHO TAKES ON WHAT TASK, YOU KNOW, WHO COMMUNICATES WITH WHAT PIECES, 'AM I LEADING IT; AM I NOT LEADING IT?' THAT KIND OF THING.[R1]
	Concrete document created	Describing the source of a draft protocol manual	IT WAS SPECIFICALLY THE CONVOCATION MANUAL, BUT IT HAD A LOT OF THE CONTENT THAT WE KIND OF PULLED OUT INTO THE PROTOCOL MANUAL. [R1]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
H=Documentation	Concrete document created	Original language from a proposal arguing for a centralized office and foundation from which protocol emerged	'RECOGNIZING THE CHALLENGES OF EVENT PLANNING AT [institution]. THE EVENT COORDINATORS NETWORK- WE WERE CALLED THE EVENT COORDINATORS COUNCIL AT THE TIME- RECOMMENDED IN 2009 THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CENTRALIZED EVENTS OFFICE, INITIATING A PARADIGM SHIFT FROM THE VARIOUS [institution] CONSTITUENCIES PLANNING EVENTS INDEPENDENTLY TO A MORE CENTRALIZED, COLLABORATIVE, AND EFFECTIVE OFFICE. ...INTENDED OUTCOMES: INCREASED DEMONSTRATION OF EXCELLENCE AT ALL [institution] EVENTS, GREATER ALIGNMENT OF [institution's] STRATEGIC PLAN AND VISION, WITHIN CAMPUS EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES, INCREASE CAMPUS AWARENESS AND COMMUNICATION OF EVENTS, OFFER SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE FOR NON-EVENT PLANNING PROFESSIONALS, INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFECTIVENESS.' [R8]
J=Inhibitor to Change	Informal culture	Description of casual demeanor and culture making protocol work difficult	MY PRESIDENT IS VERY CASUAL, YOU KNOW - THIS IS WHAT KILLS ME. SO THAT PERSON IN CHARGE KIND OF DETERMINES THE CULTURE OF PROTOCOL AND DIPLOMACY ON YOUR CAMPUS. [R7]
J=Inhibitor to Change	Informal culture	Example where protocols were ignored for distinguished guests on campus	I HEARD ABOUT A DELEGATION COMING FROM KOREA I THINK, TO ONE OF OUR SCHOOLS, AND I THINK THE PRESIDENT HAD NOT BEEN INFORMED OR INVOLVED. AND I THINK IT'S EMBARRASSING WHEN YOU HAVE HIGH LEVEL PEOPLE COMING FROM ANOTHER COUNTRY TO OUR INSTITUTION AND DON'T GET ANY INTERACTION WITH THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSTITUTION. [R6]
	Resistance	Example where offers for protocol assistance are refused	SOMETIMES YOU GET PEOPLE WHO ARE LIKE, YOU KNOW, 'STAY AWAY FROM MY EVENT. IT'S MY EVENT.' [R7]

Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
H=Documentation	Concrete documented created	Example of the cycle to prove value and trying to further institutionalize protocol, but meeting resistance	HE [department head] WOULD NOT HAVE FELT THAT MY EXPERIENCE WOULD EVER HAVE BENEFITED HIM. YOU KNOW, THAT'S STILL SOME OF THE STRUGGLE, IT'S PROVING YOURSELF, PROVING YOUR WORTH AND BENEFIT. [R8]
J=Inhibitor to Change	Vague understanding		SOME OF THEM [staff] DO, SOME OF THEM GET IT, BUT THE MAJORITY DON'T. [R4]
		Difficult to offer protocol services when there is a lack of understanding on campus	MY CHALLENGE HAS BEEN TO FIND OUT HOW THE PRESIDENT CAN BECOME INVOLVED AND HELP WITH ANY PROTOCOL ISSUE THAT COMES ABOUT AS DELEGATIONS COME TO VISIT. VISITING PROFESSORS, THEY COULD COME FOR TWO DAYS THEY COULD COME FOR TWO MONTHS. AND IT'S BEEN VERY DIFFICULT TO BREAK THROUGH THAT BARRIER. [R6]
		There is a disconnect to clearly understand protocol	WITH QUESTIONS PEOPLE PROBABLY DON'T EVEN REALIZE THEY'RE ASKING A PROTOCOL QUESTION. [R11] THERE'S A LOT OF TIMES WHERE PEOPLE THINK WE'RE ORDERING THE FOOD AND UNLOCKING THE DOOR AND IT ENDS WITH THAT. [R11]
	Disconnected	a protocol professional is not recognized on campus	I THINK IF WOULD GO AROUND TODAY AND ASK PEOPLE WHAT I DO, PROTOCOL WOULD NEVER COME INTO THE CONVERSATION. [R6]
	Limitations	description of supervisor's comments limiting protocol as scope of workload	'THAT'S NOT YOUR BIGGEST PRIORITY RIGHT NOW.' [R7]
	Risking reputation	Example of explaining to leadership the consequences of allowing untrained staff conduct protocol	'THAT'S REALLY WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO, YOU'RE LETTING PEOPLE PUT TOGETHER EVENTS THAT DON'T HAVE THE BACKGROUND OR THE UNDERSTANDING OF ALL THE PERILS THAT THEY PUT THE INSTITUTION IN.' [R7]

Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
C=Internal communication initiating change	Inclusive process Buy-in	Securing feedback from stakeholders and vetting a protocol guide which will become formalized and impact the institution.	WE DEFINITELY THOUGH DID HAVE SEVERAL ROUNDS OF FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY, WHETHER IT BE SENATE OR YOU KNOW JUST GENERAL,... SO THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THAT OPEN COMMUNITY DISCUSSION. AND 'HEY, IF YOU'RE INTERESTED IN READING THIS REALLY LONG PROTOCOL DOCUMENT YOU CAN GIVE FEEDBACK. FEEL FREE TO CONTACT ME.' AND WE ALSO DID DO A SPECIFIC FEEDBACK SESSION WITH CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS AS WELL,... WITH THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES BECAUSE WE HAD THAT, YOU KNOW, CHANGE OF OUR VERBIAGE. SO THEY WENT BACK AND FORTH ON SEVERAL DIFFERENT VERSIONS, AND THEN WE ALSO HAD THE SAME WITH THE FIRST NATIONS CENTER-SLASH-SENIOR ADVISOR ON ABORIGINAL RELATIONS, WE HAD FEEDBACK GOING BACK AND FORTH WITH THOSE GUYS. AND THEN WE DID THE COMMUNITY ONE AS WELL...BECAUSE WE REALLY NEED PEOPLE TO ADOPT IT AND THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PIECE OF IT IS REALLY IMPORTANT TO US TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYBODY WAS ON THE SAME PAGE. [R1]
E=Preparing Change	Plans to educate the community of change	Example of need to explain to the community what protocol means to the institution	WE'LL PROBABLY HAVE TO DO MORE COMMUNICATION ON THAT [the new office] AND WHAT IT MEANS, AND EDUCATE PEOPLE THAT THAT IS A THING THAT WE ARE CALLING OURSELVES NOW. [R1]
	Plans to institutionally build office	Strategy of building the protocol function after institutional endorsement	SO ONCE IT'S ENDORSED THEN I THINK THAT WILL REALLY HELP. THEN WE'LL CONTINUE TO FEEL OUT THE TYPES OF THINGS THAT ESSENTIALLY WOULD COME TO OUR OFFICE. [R1]
F= Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization	Internal process	Description of communication or reorganization permeating through hierarchy	SO THEN THAT KIND OF WHERE IT TRICKLED DOWN TO YOU KNOW, US BEING INVOLVED WITH DEANS OR DIRECTORS OR DIFFERENT PROGRAM OFFICERS WITHIN EACH OF THOSE DIFFERENT DIVISIONS TO HELP WITH THEIR EVENTS. [R10]



Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
F= Tracing Communication of new office, role, title, reorganization	Concrete communication	Example of official communication of new role, once endorsed institutionally	I HAD TO APPLY FOR THE NEW ROLE, BECAUSE THE NEW ROLE WAS CREATED AS A MANAGER POSITION. I HAD TO GET IT, AND THEN ONCE I GOT IT, IT WAS LIKE 'OK WELL YOU CAN START WRITING THIS ON BUSINESS CARDS BECAUSE THE PRESIDENT IS IN APPROVAL OF IT.' [R8]
		Example of official communication of new role, once endorsed institutionally	THERE WAS A PRESS RELEASE TO THE LOCAL NEWSPAPERS. AND THERE'S AN ARTICLE THAT GOES ACROSS CAMPUS ABOUT NEW POSITIONS AND ROLES. AN EMAIL THAT'S SENT OUT. [R12]
	Face-to-face meetings	Example of institutional leaders cooperating with new protocol office	SO AFTER WE WERE ESTABLISHED, I MET WITH EACH OF THE VICE PRESIDENTS TO DISCUSS OUR OFFICE AND LET THEM YOU KNOW, WHAT WE'D LIKE TO DO AND HOW WE'D LIKE TO HELP AND PARTNER. AND AFTER MEETING WITH EACH OF THEM, THEY IDENTIFIED PROGRAMS AND EVENTS IN THEIR AREAS THAT THEY THOUGHT WE COULD HELP ELEVATE. [R10]
G=Institutional Work	Advising	Example of functioning in the capacity of protocol in an unofficial office or title, and being trusted to advise	I AM GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADVISE ON, TO MAKE SURE THAT EVENTS THAT OUR CHANCELLOR AND OUR INSTITUTION ADHERE TO STANDARDS AT WHICH, YOU KNOW, KEEP THE INSTITUTION IN IT'S BEST LIGHT, AS WELL AS THE POLITICS OF AN ACADEMIC INSTITUTION AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY. AND MAKE SURE THAT WE UPHOLD THOSE ELEVATED EVENTS THAT WE DO. [R11]
		Explaining that at the highest level there is trust in protocol knowledge, though the work is done unofficially without office office or title.	WE HAVEN'T LED THE CHANCELLOR ASTRAY, BUT A LOT OF IT IS JUST EXPERIENCE THAT WE'VE LEARNED AND PEOPLE HAVE TRUSTED IN , YOU KNOW, THAT WE'RE DOING OUR JOB AND WE'RE DOING IT WELL. THERE'S NOT A TON OF FORMALITY. [R11]



Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Advising	Describing how known their office is for matters of protocol, although they are not an official office of protocol	WE ARE ALSO A SOURCE OF INFORMATION FOR THE UNIVERSITY. SO WE GET CONTACTED EVEN IF WE'RE NOT DOING EVENTS FOR THEM, WE CONSULT, WE ACT AS CONSULTANTS FOR THE UNIVERSITY AND WE'LL GET CONTACTED BY DEPARTMENTS... [R4]
		Official office does not have full authority to mandate, but advises and partners when approached	OFFICE IS AGAIN CONSULTED, BUT IT DOES NOT CARRY THE WEIGHT TO SAY 'NO, YOU CAN'T SAY THIS,' SO WE KIND OF WORK TOGETHER AND SHARE OUR BACKGROUNDS AND OPINIONS. [R8]
		Explaining her role is primarily advisor to the president on all levels of protocol matters	MY JOB IS VERY MUCH BACKGROUND JOB. SO HE'S [the president] CERTAINLY VERY WELL AWARE OF THAT. HE OFTEN ASKS ME QUESTIONS AND YOU KNOW I GIVE HIM A LOT OF ADVISE, BUT HE INVARIABLY FOLLOWS. AND SO HE DOESN'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT IT. [R3]
	Advising Consistency Being a resource	Describing how to build a successful formula of an official protocol office and how to influence peers on campus	SO I'VE TRIED TO REALLY DRIVE HOME IN OUR OFFICE THAT IT NEEDS TO BE CONSISTENT, AGAIN THE BRANDING IMBUED IN THE PROTOCOL ELEMENTS AND STANDARDS AS WELL. SO THAT'S WHAT WE DO ON A DAY-TO-DAY CONSULTING PERSPECTIVE.....PEOPLE DEFER TO US, YOU KNOW, 'I HAVE THIS PERSON VISITING, WHAT DO I DO? IS THIS GIFT APPROPRIATE? WHAT WOULD THE WORDING BE FOR THIS? DO YOU HAVE ANY FLAGS THAT I CAN USE BECAUSE SOMEONE FROM PANAMA IS VISITING?' [R8]
		Example of how the official protocol office advises and maintains consistent standards	WE ADVISE ON GIFTING. WE TRY TO LIKE ESTABLISH THESE STANDARDS AND ADHERE IT TO KIND OF THE THE BRAND STANDARDS THAT WE HAVE AND CONSISTENCIES SO THAT WE'RE NOT, YOU KNOW, WE DON'T HAVE ONE DEPARTMENT OR ONE COLLEGE DOING SOMETHING THAT'S - YOU KNOW- NOT NECESSARILY CONSISTENT WITH WHAT EVERYBODY ELSE IS DOING. [R12]

Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Being a resource	Describing how the ceremonies office is contacted for protocol advice, functioning in an unofficial capacity but recognized by peers	WE ARE ALSO A SOURCE OF INFORMATION FOR THE UNIVERSITY. SO WE GET CONTACTED EVEN IF WE'RE NOT DOING EVENTS FOR THEM. WE CONSULT, WE ACT AS CONSULTANTS FOR THE UNIVERSITY AND WE'LL GET CONTACTED BY DEPARTMENTS. [R4]
		Describing approach of the protocol office being resourceful not enforceable	I WOULD BE CAREFUL WITH THE WORD 'GUIDELINES ' BECAUSE YES, THEY'RE RESOURCES, BUT WE'RE NOT AT A POINT WHERE WE SAY, YOU KNOW THAT IT HAS TO BE THIS WAY. WE OFFER SUGGESTIONS. [R12]
		Example of being responsive when asked, and drawing distinction to when to insert advise when necessary	IF ASKED, I DON'T STICK MY NOSE INTO, AUTOMATICALLY . I WILL COUNSEL THEM [peers on campus], MAKE SURE THINGS ARE DONE PROPERLY AND, YOU KNOW ESPECIALLY WITH THE QUESTIONS ABOUT FLAGS AND APPROPRIATE GREETINGS AND STUFF LIKE THAT. A LOT OF THEM KNOW TO CALL ME. NOW IF I FIND OUT THAT SOMEBODY INVITED A, YOU KNOW, A THREE STAR GENERAL AND HASN'T TOLD US [the president's office], I WILL STICK MY NOSE IN THAT. [R3]
		Describing the buy in across campus and speaks to their trustworthiness	SO I THINK THAT HAS ALSO HELPED REINFORCE WHO WE ARE AND KIND OF FORMALIZED THE OFFICE AS A RESOURCE ACROSS CAMPUS. [R8]
	Collaborating	Explaining how collaborating with state offices is important for the institution	WE TRY REALLY HARD TO CREATE THESE PARTNERSHIPS SO THAT THEY WILL USE US AND WORK WITH US, NOT ONLY OUR OFFICE, BUT OUR INSTITUTION. [R12]
		Describing how the office has reached out to others on campus to assist with high level events	WE'VE BUILT THIS PROTOCOL TEAM, THAT CONSISTS OF ABOUT A 100 PEOPLE AROUND CAMPUS THAT HANDLE EXTERNAL AUDIENCES. [R12]

Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Collaborating	Explaining how collaborating with state offices is important for the institution	I HAVE BECOME THE LIAISON WITH THE – I THINK I JUST MENTIONED THE SECRETARY OF STATE – WITH THAT OFFICE, AND THEY HAVE HAD A COUPLE OF VISITS WHERE THEY HAVE BROUGHT DELEGATIONS TO [the state] AND WANTED TO INTRODUCE THE DELEGATION TO [the institution] AND WHICH I PLAYED A ROLE. [R6]
	Consistency	Describing what was important about the new protocol office from the perspective of the president	I THINK THAT SHE [the president] WAS LOOKING TO HAVE MORE CONSISTENCY ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY. AND I THINK THAT SHE BELIEVED THAT I COULD HELP CREATE THAT CONSISTENCY. [R10]
		Recognizing that the institution's events are getting consistent and recognizable	TO BRING SOME CONSISTENCY TO THE EVENTS OR THE BRAND STANDARDS THAT HAVE BEEN CREATED, IMPLEMENTED FOR WHAT IS NOW [institution's name]. [R12]
	Influencing	Explaining how accepting the role of protocol is at the institution after it was created	I AM SOMETIMES SURPRISED AT THE IMPACT AND LEVEL OF INFLUENCE THAT WE DO HAVE. THAT'S MORE OF THE PEOPLE IN OUR DEPARTMENT THAT'S VERY PLEASED WITH MY STAFF AND THE LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT AND INVOLVEMENT THAT WE HAVE ON CAMPUS AND THE REPUTATION THAT WE'VE CREATED, BUT WE WERE NOT SET UP THAT WAY IN TERMS OF THE HIERARCHY. [R8]
	Reputation building	Leading by example and expertise to build the reputation of the office	IF WE ARE ESPOUSING TO BE THE PREEMINENT EVENT PRODUCERS AND TO HAVE PROTOCOL KNOWLEDGE AND THINGS , I THINK THEN THAT WE NEED TO BE ABLE TO BACK THAT UP WITH THE SERVICES THAT WE'RE PROVIDING. [R8]
		Example of using protocol to contribute to the success of the institution	AND IT'S LIKE, WHAT, HOW CAN WE PUT US OUT THERE TO THE WORLD? YOU KNOW MORE SO, AND I THINK THE PROTOCOL PIECE IS JUST INTEGRAL TO THAT, THAT WE'RE ALWAYS PUTTING OUR BEST FOOT FORWARD AND SHOWING THE BEST AT [institution]. [R10]

Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Reputation building	A specific person focused on protocol considers the institution's reputation when leaders interface with the community	I MAKE SURE THAT THE PROTOCOL IS THERE, THE APPROPRIATE THINGS AND APPROPRIATE PERSON IS THERE AND THAT THE DIALOGUE THAT THEY ARE HAVING IS APPROPRIATE TO MOVE [institution] FORWARD. [R2]
		Explaining the rubric of what events require protocol expertise at the institution	IS THIS A PUBLIC FACING EVENT? DOES IT INVOLVE SENIOR ADMINISTRATION? DOES IT INVOLVE GOVERNMENT? IS IT DONOR RELATED? YOU KNOW, ALL THOSE MORE PUBLIC FACING, AND HAVING TO DO WITH OUR, I DON'T WANT TO SAY OPTICS, BUT YOU KNOW, OUR REPUTATION, RIGHT? WITH OUR REPUTATION. [R1]
	Reputation building Standardization Advising	Describing the role of protocol performed that is unofficially recognized	I AM GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADVISE ON, TO MAKE SURE THAT EVENTS THAT OUR CHANCELLOR AND OUR INSTITUTION ADHERE TO STANDARDS AT WHICH, YOU KNOW, KEEP THE INSTITUTION IN IT'S BEST LIGHT, AS WELL AS THE POLITICS OF AN ACADEMIC INSTITUTION AS WELL AS THE COMMUNITY. AND MAKE SURE THAT WE UPHOLD THOSE ELEVATED EVENTS THAT WE DO. [R11]
	Reputation protecting	Explaining what motivates the protocol team to protect the institution	WE ARE TRYING TO OBVIOUSLY AVOID PROBLEMS. [R12]
		Considering the reputation of the chancellor and meeting expectations	AND OF COURSE I'M ALWAYS THERE LOOKING FOR THE CHANCELLOR, RIGHT, BECAUSE I'M NEW HERE AND HE KNOWS IF I HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT, I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT AT LEAST IT'S PERFECT FOR HIM AND THEN HE HAS A GOOD TIME. [R9]
	Training	Example of how the protocol role is recognized as an authority to learn from	THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, ACTUALLY HIS ASSISTANT, HAD ME DO A PRESENTATION TO ALL ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS IN THE COLLEGE. [R7]

Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Training	Examples of how the protocol role is recognized as an authority to learn from	WE PROVIDE TRAINING AND RESOURCES THROUGH THE ECN GROUP...THERE'S A CONCENTRATED SESSION ON PROTOCOL AT OUR WORKSHOP...AND THROUGHOUT THE YEAR WE HAVE MULTIPLE BROWN BAG SESSIONS THAT WE MAY INCORPORATE THAT TOPIC. [R8]
		Concrete example of using a prepared guide to train others about protocol	WE KIND OF HAVE THIS STEP BY STEP GUIDE, TO TEACH THEM 'THIS IS WHAT YOU NEED TO DO, THESE ARE THE PEOPLE YOU NEED TO CALL AND GET INVOLVED.' [R12]
		Explanation of the benefit of trained personnel	THE ADVANTAGE OF HAVING A MORE WELL TRAINED GROUP OF PEOPLE IN PROTOCOL, IS THAT WE CAN STEP IN AND HELP ONE ANOTHER. [R7]
H=Documentation	Concrete documentation	Evidence demonstrating protocol is articulated as part of the institution	I'M LOOKING AT THE PRESIDENT'S WEBSITE RIGHT NOW, AND ALL IT SAYS IS 'UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTIAL EVENTS: WE PROVIDE EVENT AND PROTOCOL EXPERTISE.' [R6]
		Evidence of concrete guide developed for institutional use	THE PROTOCOL GUIDE IS SOMETHING THAT THEY [event planners] NEED BECAUSE IT ALLOWS THEM TO BE ABLE TO CREATE TRADITIONS AND STANDARDS WITHOUT, LIKE, BEING THEIR OPINION. [R1]
	Concrete documentation	Example of a website developed with tools accessible to all	WE ALSO HAVE A WEBSITE THAT....IS ALSO A REPOSITORY OF RESOURCES AND AN AREA WHERE PEOPLE CAN COME AND RECEIVE OUR TEMPLATE....AND SEE THE FORMS OF ADDRESS THAT [institution] WOULD USE. [R8]
		Evidence of interaction with others and responsiveness to their needs	WE KIND OF CREATED SOME GUIDELINES AND RESOURCES FOR THE REST OF CAMPUS THROUGH OUR OFFICE AND THROUGH SHARED CONVERSATIONS WITH RESPECTIVE DEPARTMENTS. [R8]
		Example of creating value for others	YOU KNOW WE DO 'THE PROTOCOL TIP OF THE MONTH' EMAIL THAT'S SENT OUT ACROSS CAMPUS. SO SORT OF IN THE PROMOTING OF THE OFFICE. [R12]

Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
J=Inhibitor to Change	Silo effect	Combatting repetition of roles, impeding development of full protocol functionality	THERE ARE A LOT OF SILOS IN EACH COLLEGE, AND SCHOOL AND DIVISION HAVE STAFF THAT DO EVENTS IN DIFFERENT CAPACITIES. WE ARE NOT A CENTRALIZED EVENTS OFFICE. [R11]

Stage 4: Full-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Being a resource	Explaining how the office participates in planning other institutional events via committee work	OBVIOUSLY IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM WE HAVE A LOT OF COMMITTEE DRIVEN EVENTS. AND SO TYPICALLY SOMEONE FROM OUR OFFICE WILL BE SERVING ON THE COMMITTEE JUST TO ASSIST WITH THOSE KIND OF LOGISTICAL, PROTOCOL PIECES OF THE EVENT PLANNING. WE ALSO ADVISE REGARDING PROGRAM, LIKE PROGRAM ORDER, PRESIDENTIAL ORDER. [R12]
		Describing the influence of the protocol office at the institution and partnership made available to others	AND I THINK THAT THE ONE WAY PEOPLE HAVE BOUGHT INTO IT BECAUSE AGAIN, THEY DON'T HAVE THE BACKGROUND NOR DO THEY HAVE A LOT OF RESOURCES IN THEIR DEPARTMENT, AND SO THEY HAVE BEEN PLEASED THAT WE HAVE PROVIDED SOME TEMPLATES AND STANDARDS AND RESOURCES FOR THEM SO THEY DON'T HAVE TO PURCHASE THEM THEMSELVES. [R8]
	Being a resource Expertise	Explaining the reach across campus and recognizability of the office's protocol work	I AM ONE OF THE, PROBABLY, MOST FREQUENTLY SOUGHT OUT PERSON, OR THE GO-TO FOR SPECIAL EVENTS AND CEREMONIES. AND, I SERVE AS LIKE A SPECIAL ADVISOR, YOU KNOW, TO COLLEAGUES ACROSS CAMPUS. [R10]
	Being a resource Standarization Advising	Describing purpose of the protocol office to serve the entire institution and ensure standards are achieved	AND WE'RE ALWAYS AVAILABLE TO ASSIST, SO EVEN IF YOU KNOW, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AREN'T INVOLVED, WE'RE HERE AS A RESOURCE TOO, FOR THE SMALLER CEREMONIES AND THINGS, BECAUSE WE STILL DO WANT TO HAVE THAT STANDARD, AND THAT'S KIND OF WHY OUR OFFICE CAME TO BE IN EXISTENCE IN THE FIRST PLACE. [R10]
	Being a resource Consistency Reputation building	Describing purpose of the protocol office to serve the entire institution and ensure standards are achieved	WE WERE CREATED TO BE A RESOURCE TO EMPOWER OTHERS TO BE CONSISTENT AS WE REPRESENT OUR INSTITUTION. SO WE WANTED SOME CONSISTENCIES, WE WANTED SOME THOUGHTFULNESS, WE WANTED MORE DIPLOMACY, WE WANTED TO COLLABORATE MORE, WE WANTED TO KIND OF, AGAIN, TO BRIDGE THESE GAPS, BECAUSE WE WERE TWO INSTITUTIONS AND NOW WE'RE ONE. [R12]



Stage 4: Full-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G= Institutional Work	Consistency	Describing the benefit and value of consistent protocol practices throughout the institution, regardless of location	THAT FINESSING OF FEELING UNIQUE AND HAVING FLEXIBILITY TO A CERTAIN DEGREE, BUT ALSO ENSURING THAT EVERYTHING IS AS CONSISTENT IS AS POSSIBLE, SO THAT WHEN YOU HAVE YOUR DIGNITARIES AND YOU'RE PLATFORM PARTY GOING FROM THE CONVOCATION CEREMONY IN [one location] TO THEN GOING TO [another location], THE EXPECTATION IS THE SAME. THAT THEY KNOW EXACTLY WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN, THEY KNOW EXACTLY WHAT'S GOING ON, THEY'RE NOT SURPRISED BY ANYTHING. [R1]
		Explaining the value of developing protocols across the institution	SO THOSE CAMPUSES SORT OF HAVE TO HAVE THAT IDEA OF WHAT IS EXPECTED IF THEY HOLD A LARGE HIGH PROFILE EVENT, RIGHT? BECAUSE THEY'RE KIND OF DOING IT ON THEIR OWN THEY STILL HAVE TO HAVE THAT TETHER, THAT SUPPORT, AND THAT'S KIND OF WHAT THE PROTOCOL ROLE HELPS WITH. [R1]
G=Institutional Work	Reputation protecting	Perspective from a protocol professional who explains her work to her institutional peers	HE'S NOT THE SAME AS EVERYBODY ELSE YOU KNOW, HE'S YOUR CEO AND AS SUCH HE NEEDS TO BE PRESENTED, HE'S THE PHYSICAL EMBODIMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY. SO MY JOB IS TO MAKE SURE THAT HE LOOKS GOOD, ALWAYS. [R3]
		Perspective from a professional who has a functional protocol title and office	EVEN IF THE PRESIDENT ISN'T THERE, WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT [institution's name] IS LOOKING GOOD. [R10]
		Perspective from a professional who has a functional protocol title and office	THE IDEA OF THAT WE CREATE THIS STANDARD ON HOW CERTAIN THINGS SHOULD BE, THAT REGARDLESS OF WHO'S IN LEADERSHIP IT WOULD BE GOOD FOR THE UNIVERSITY, BE GOOD FOR THE PRESIDENT, BE GOOD FOR THE DEANS, AND BE GOOD FOR THE PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE. [R10]
	Standardization	Example of a protocol office exercising standards across the institution	BUT WHEN THEY COME AND THEY [guests of the institution] STEP ON CAMPUS THAT IT'S A [institution's name] BRANDED EVENT THEY WILL HAVE THE SAME EXPERIENCE AND THE PRESIDENT WILL HAVE THE SAME SHARED EXPERIENCES. [R8]



Stage 4: Full-Institutionalization			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
G=Institutional Work	Standardization	Example of a protocol office creating a consistent practice of informing leadership	THE PEOPLE THAT ARE ORGANIZING THAT, OR HEADING UP THAT EVENT, IF THEY'RE GOING TO BE INTERACTING WITH OUR SENIOR LEADERSHIP, THERE IS KIND OF A WAY THAT WE HAVE, KIND OF A STANDARD PRACTICE AS FAR AS BRIEFING THEM. [R12]
		Concrete example of documenting protocol standards institutionally	WE'VE HAD TO CREATE THE PROTOCOL GUIDE. YOU KNOW, WE'VE HAD TO SET SOME OF THESE STANDARDS IN MOTION, BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T EXIST. [R12]
		Describing the influence of the protocol office at the institution	WE ARE UPHELD TO MAINTAIN STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE IN PROTOCOL WITHIN OUR INSTITUTE LEVEL OF EVENTS, THAT THEN BECOME THE BENCHMARK FOR OTHERS TO FOLLOW. [R8]
		Concrete example of documenting protocol standards institutionally	SO WITH THE PROTOCOL PIECE MY MAIN FOCUS WHEN I FIRST STARTED WAS WRITING THE DOCUMENTATION. SO AT THIS POINT MY ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY IS TO FINALIZE THE LARGE [institution name] PROTOCOL GUIDE THAT IS INSTITUTIONALLY WIDE AND WILL BE HOPEFULLY ENDORSED IN THE NEW YEAR BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS. [R1]
		Example of how the protocol office serves all levels institutionally	AND WE'RE ALWAYS AVAILABLE TO ASSIST, SO EVEN IF YOU KNOW, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AREN'T INVOLVED, WE'RE HERE AS A RESOURCE TOO, FOR THE SMALLER CEREMONIES AND THINGS, BECAUSE WE STILL DO WANT TO HAVE THAT STANDARD, AND THAT'S KIND OF WHY OUR OFFICE CAME TO BE IN EXISTENCE IN THE FIRST PLACE. [R10]

**Appendix C**  
**Evidence of the Institutional Entrepreneur through Stages of Institutionalization**

Stage 1: Innovation			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
A=seeking change	Champion for change: self	Example of bottom-up change. This person initiated conversation with new leadership who had experience with protocol, hoping to create an ally for change.	SO HE WAS A MINISTER, SO HE CAME TO [institution's name] AS VICE PRESIDENT AND I TALKED TO HIM AROUND THAT TIME I WAS FINDING, IT WAS AROUND THAT TIME THAT I DISCOVERED PDI, AND I SAID TO HIM, 'YOU KNOW I'D LIKE TO TALK ABOUT HOW WE CAN BETTER ACKNOWLEDGE PROTOCOL IN OUR TITLE, YOU KNOW BRING IT INTO BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT WE DO. WHEN PEOPLE NEED ADVISE THEY CALL US , SO IT'S KNOWN THAT WE'RE RECOGNIZED' [R4]
		Example of bottom-up change. This person risked her position to convince new president she could be his direct report.	WHEN WE GOT A NEW PRESIDENT, A COUPLE OF PRESIDENTS BACK, YOU KNOW, WHEN HE CAME I SAID 'I DON'T WANT TO BE THE ALUMNI DIRECTOR ANYMORE. I'VE GOT MORE TO OFFER, I WANT TO DO SOMETHING ELSE.' AND I WAS READY FOR HIM TO SAY, 'FINE, GO FIND ANOTHER JOB' BUT HE CREATED THIS JOB FOR ME. SO IT WAS ACTUALLY CREATED HERE 10 YEARS AGO.[R3]
		Example of bottom-up change by institutional entrepreneur proposing new position. Work in progress and building buy-in. visionary.	SO THAT'S WHAT I'M [proposing], THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO CREATE [a chief of protocol role]. AND SO I'VE TAKEN THE LEAD ON THAT. [R5]
		Example of bottom-up change by institutional entrepreneur proposing new position. Supervisor would not champion the change. Failed attempt.	YEAH, AND I TRIED TO CREATE THE TITLE OF 'CHIEF OF PROTOCOL' BUT MY BOSS SAID, 'IT'S NOT GONNA HAPPEN.' [R7]
	Champion for change: supporter	Example of bottom-up change. This person developed proposal for centralized protocol and events office and pushed initiative through a time of transition, securing buy-in from supervisors who championed it and proposed to a new president.	HE WAS THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND HE VERY MUCH, HE ALLOWED ME TO HAVE A LOT OF AUTONOMY...AND THERE WAS AN INTERIM VP WHO WAS IN OUR DEPARTMENT WHO HAD KNOWN ME AND SHE THOUGHT IT SOUNDED GOOD AS WELL, AND THEN SINCE OUR PRESIDENT WAS JUST COMING IN I THINK HE WAS VERY OPEN TO, AGAIN IT WAS LIKE THE PERFECT STORM AND I DON'T KNOW IF THE TIMES HAD BEEN DIFFERENT IF WE HAD GOTTEN IT PASSED SO QUICKLY BECAUSE THINGS HAPPENED VERY QUICKLY IN ORDER TO DEVELOP WHAT BECAME...THIS OFFICE. [R8]
		Example of bottom-up change. Supervisor recognizing talent and interest. Starting with creating a document defining protocol for the institution.	SO WHEN MY FIRST SUPERVISOR, AND AGAIN, I GOT TO GIVE HER PROPS TOO, SHE WAS THE ASSOCIATE REGISTRAR AT THE TIME, AND SHE ALSO THOUGHT THIS [protocol role] WAS A REALLY GOOD IDEA, AND THAT I SHOULD BE STARTING TO WORK ON THIS TOO. SHE WAS THE FIRST ONE TO MENTION IT TO ME AND I SAID YEAH, CAUSE ESSENTIALLY THE QUESTION TO ME WAS, 'HEY, WE'RE THINKING ABOUT MAYBE DOING A PROTOCOL DOCUMENT, DO YOU THINK YOU'D WANT TO WRITE IT?' [R1]

**Appendix C**  
**Evidence of the Institutional Entrepreneur through Stages of Institutionalization**

Category	Behavior	Description	Example
D=creating change	Reorganization	Example of an institutional entrepreneur taking lead of create protocol office.	I THINK IT ALSO BEHOVED US THAT MY INTERIM VP WAS LIKE 'SURE, I'LL TAKE THIS RESPONSIBILITY ON'. BECAUSE I THINK THE PRESIDENT WAS LIKE, 'THIS LOOKS LIKE A GREAT IDEA AND YEAH BUT, WHO'S RESPONSIBLE FOR IT?' AND SHE SAID 'WELL YEAH, INSTITUTE OF COMMUNICATIONS WILL TAKE IT ON' THEN IT WAS LIKE 'OH OK, WELL SURE' YOU KNOW. 'I TRUST YOU' KIND OF THING. [R8]
		Example of top-down leadership acting as an institutional entrepreneur creating a new team.	I THINK ORIGINALLY WHEN WE WERE HOUSED IN THE DONOR RELATIONS, RIGHT? SO WE KIND OF HAVE THAT, AND REPORTED TO THE VICE CHANCELLOR OF DONOR RELATIONS, AND SO I THINK THE CHANCELLOR, TWO CHANCELLORS AGO SAID 'NOPE. YOU KNOW, I WOULD LIKE MY OWN EVENTS TEAM, YOU KNOW, THAT REPORTS DIRECTLY TO ME. THAT, YOU KNOW I HAVE A DOTTED LINE STRAIGHT TO THEM, VERSUS HAVING TO GO THROUGH ALL OF THE FUNDRAISING. [R9]
		Example of top-down change initiated by president's office.	THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST KIND OF TALKED SOME THINGS THROUGH AS FAR AS OUR REPORTNG, AND REALLY WANTING TO ELEVATE OUR OFFICE, BUT ALSO ELEVATE EVENTS AND CEREMONIES ACROSS THE CAMPUS SYSTEM. [R10]
	Envisioning a new office	Institutional entrepreneur work to conceptually create a new functioning office.	SO FOR THE MOST PART WE'RE TRYING TO ASCERTAIN OR AT LEAST GATHER ALL THE PROTOCOL INTO A CENTRAL REPOSITORY AND THAT'S MY EFFORT RIGHT NOW. IS TO CREATE A STANDARD, UNIFORM, SINGLE, LIKE A ONE STOP SHOP, FOR PROTOCOL AND DIPLOMACY HERE AT THE UNIVERSITY. [R5]
	Persuasion	Institutional entrepreneur working from bottom-up to secure endorsement of new office.	[The interim vice president] WAS THE BEST PERSON BECAUSE SHE WAS VERY STRONG AND WHEN SHE TOLD HIM [president] THAT THIS WAS SOMETHING THAT SHOULD HAPPEN, YOU KNOW, HE WAS NEW ENOUGH THAT HE TRUSTED THE GOOD PEOPLE THAT HE HAD MET. [R8]
	Opportunistic	Example of bottom-up change initiated by individual who wants a promotion.	I THINK I WAS, AND I KIND OF HASHED IT OUT WITH THE VP WHO HAPPENED TO BE A GOOD FRIEND OF MINE. YOU KNOW, TO BE HONEST, I THINK A LOT OF IT WAS, IT WAS TIME FOR ME TO BE PROMOTED TO BE PERFECTLY HONEST, AND WE'RE A STATE [institution], THERE ARE A NUMBER OF HOOPS TO JUMP THROUGH TO JUSTIFY A PROMOTION. [R6]
<b>Stage 2: Pre-Institutionalization</b>			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
A=seeking change	Champion of change: self	Example of botom-up change. Institutional entrepreneur creating title reflecting protocol as a role.	WHEN I WENT PART TIME I SPECIFICALLY WANTED, I NOT ONLY NEGOTIATED THE PART TIME BUT I NEGOTIATED THE TITLE AND I WANTED PROTOCOL IN THERE BECAUSE THERE'S NOTHING THAT RECOGNIZES PROTOCOL AT OUR INSTITUTION AND I FEEL AS OUR OFFICE DOES DO THAT, THAT I WANTED TO GET THAT IN THERE. [R4]
	Champion for change: supporter	Example of bottom-up change. VP cleared the path for the proposal to be completed and the VP introduced it to the institutional leadership.	THE VICE PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT HAS BEEN VERY INSTRUMENTAL IN CREATING THIS CHANGE, IN CREATING THIS DOCUMENT AND GIVING ME THE LEEWAY TO DO IT, YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN, GIVING ME THE CARTE BLANCHE TO JUST DO WHAT YOU DO. BUT THEN I GOTTA SAY THAT I PUSHED FOR IT, TOO. [R1]
		Example of top-down support from direct report. This example remains a work in progress with no decisions to create official role.	EVEN THOUGH I'M NOT PLANNING EVENTS FOR HIM [the vice chancellor of operations], HE RECOGNIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF WHAT WE PROVIDE FOR THE CAMPUS, AND FOR THE CHANCELLOR. AND SO YES, HE HAS CHAMPIONED FOR THAT ROLE. [R11]

**Appendix C**  
**Evidence of the Institutional Entrepreneur through Stages of Institutionalization**

Category	Behavior	Description	Example
A=seeking change	Champion for change: leader	Example of top-down decision for new protocol role and reorganization and leadership collaboration.	SO THE PRESIDENT – THIS IS WHAT I THINK HAPPENED- APPROACHED THE PROVOST AND THE UNIVERSITY SECRETARY, AND THEY WERE ON THE SAME PAGE, A CONVERSATION WAS HAD AT THE CABINET LEVEL WITH ALL THE EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, AND THEN I WAS BROUGHT INTO THE CONVERSATION. [R10]
		Example of top-down decision by chief of staff and president. Previous experience with a protocol role. Reorganization of personnel to create a new protocol office.	HE [chief of staff] CAME DIRECTLY WITH THE PRESIDENT. AND THAT WAS PART OF THE DEAL. AND WHEN HE CAME HE SAW SOME THINGS THAT NEEDED TO BE CHANGED. ... WHERE HE UTILIZED SOME THINGS THAT HE LEARNED AT HIS PREVIOUS INSTITUTION AND IMPLEMENTED THEM HERE. HE ALSO UTILIZED WHAT WE ALREADY HAD HERE AND SORT OF CREATED AND SORT OF MORPHED IT. SO IN OTHER WORDS, WE HAD THE SPECIAL EVENTS OFFICE BUT THEY DIDN'T HAVE THE PROTOCOL PIECE. [R12]
D=creating change	Reorganization creating a new office	Example of top-down leadership acting as an institutional entrepreneur, recreating something from another institution.	I ACTUALLY HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO, WHEN OUR CURRENT PRESIDENT AND CHIEF OF STAFF, I WORKED WITH THEM FOR SEVEN YEARS AT A DIFFERENT INSTITUTION. SO THEY ACTUALLY, WE CREATED IT THERE, THAT POSITION, AND THEN WHEN THEY WERE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY, OUR PRESIDENT WAS GIVEN THIS NEW JOB POSITION, HE FELT THAT IT WAS NECESSARY TO BRING THAT TYPE OF, YOU KNOW, EXPERTISE TO THIS INSTITUTION...AND SO THEY BROUGHT ME IN TO BRIDGE THAT. SO WE HAVE THE PROTOCOL AND SPECIAL EVENTS PIECE UNDER ONE ROOF. [R12]
		Example of bottom-up change, restructuring direct reports and staff, approved by leadership.	WE BROUGHT TOGETHER THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL EVENTS AND THE OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY CEREMONIES SO WE CREATED AN OVER-ARCHING OFFICE. [R7]
		Example of bottom-up proposal for a new office. Institutional entrepreneur working transparently.	IF IT'S APPROVED BY OUR VP AND HR, I STILL WOULD PROBABLY WANT THE PRESIDENT'S BLESSING BECAUSE WHAT IT'S CREATING IS A CHIEF OF PROTOCOL FOR THE UNIVERSITY. [R5]
	Documentation	Example of bottom-up proposal for a new office. Institutional entrepreneur working transparently.	ONCE WE GET OUR [protocol manual] DRAFT FINALIZED AND ENDORSED THEN THAT WILL SITUATE THE OFFICE IN A MUCH MORE CONCRETE WAY. [R1]
<b>Stage 3: Semi-Institutionalization</b>			
Category	Behavior	Description	Example
A=seeking change	Circumstantial	Example of bottom-up change, recommending changing name of office to reflect reorganization.	THEN AT THAT POINT I WAS LIKE 'WELL WE'RE ALL TOGETHER NOW, CAN WE JUST GO AHEAD AND SAY 'WE'RE THE OFFICE OF EVENTS AND PROTOCOL?'' [R7]
D=creating change	Reorganization	Example of stagnant change, missing a strong institutional entrepreneur.	IT WAS JUST SORT OF LIKE 'OH YEAH, WE'RE GONNA MAKE YOU THE OFFICE OF EVENTS AND PROTOCOL NOW.' IT WAS SORT OF LIKE THIS LAST MOVE, IT'S LIKE, WELL THIS IS HAPPENING NOW, YOU KNOW. [R7]

**Appendix C**  
**Evidence of the Institutional Entrepreneur through Stages of Institutionalization**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Example</b>
D=creating change	Expansion of work	Example of top-down change initiated by president using known resources to improve other functional areas.	I HAVE BEEN TAPPED TO HELP WITH SOME ADMISSIONS RECRUITING STUFF THAT WS NEVER PART OF MY JOB. AND THE REASON WHY, THIS PRESIDENT DECIDED HE WANTED TO INITIATE A CAMPAIGN, A SORT OF ROAD SHOW, TAKING OUR ADMISSIONS RECRUITING FROM CITY TO CITY TO CITY SO AND HE'S TRIED IT WITH THE ADMISSIONS COUNSELORS AND HE WAS NOT SATISFIED WITH THE PRODUCT. AND A LOT OF THE DISSATISFACTION BOILED DOWN TO THE INTANGIBLES, THE ACTUAL THINGS THAT MAKE THINGS NICE, AND HAVING A PERSON MAKING DECISIONS THAT HAD SOME SENSE OF STYLE AND APPROPRIATENESS. [R3]
	Expansion of office	Example of bottom-up change, creating new roles that expand office. Institutional entrepreneur expanding scope and reach of protocol.	HER TITLE IS UNIVERSITY EVENTS AND CEREMONIES DIRECTOR SHE KIND OF OVERSEES THE PLANNING AND ACTUALLY LIKE DOES THE COORDINATION FOR COMMENCEMENT, CONVOCATION, THE WHITE COAT CEREMONY, THOSE THINGS. AND THIS PERSON WOULD BE LEADING LIKE THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS TRAINING PROGRAMS AND ORIENTATION AND THINGS, SO WE'VE COME A LONG WAY FOR OVER A YEAR. [R10]
		Example of top-down change to replicate protocol positions throughout the institution. Institutional entrepreneur expanding scope of reach of protocol.	THEY'RE A LOT OF OTHER PLACES, COLLEGES, AND POTENTIALLY IN THE HOSPITALS THAT WOULD LIKE TO HAVE KIND OF AN ARM, A POSITION THAT'S AN ARM TO US. AND WE'RE TRYING TO KINDA GO THROUGH THE PROCESS RIGHT NOW WITH HR AS TO WHETHER IT'S A DOTTED LINE THAT WOULD REPORT UP TO ME, OR A HARD LINE. BUT THESE PEOPLE WOULD BE HOUSED WITHIN THE UNITS IN WHICH THEY SERVE. SO WE'RE CREATING A NEW STRUCTURE. I THINK THAT WHATEVER WE- THE FORMAT THAT WE CREATE FOR THIS POSITION. WE'RE CURRENTLY WORKING ON -WHICH IS IN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, I THINK THAT THAT STRUCTURE WOULD THEN BE UTILIZED FOR OTHER PARTS OF CAMPUS AS WE CONTINUE TO GROW. [R12]
<b>Stage 4: Full Institutionalization</b>			
<b>Category</b>	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Example</b>
D=creating change	Institutionally credentialled	Example of top-down support for protocol and creating authority through title and responsibility.	I THINK WITH MY POSITION, YOU KNOW BEING THE ONLY AVP FOR PROTOCOL... YOU KNOW THAT SORT OF EXPLAINS TO PEOPLE, KIND OF THE SUPPORT HIGH LEVEL, THAT OUR SENIOR LEADERSHIP THINKS ABOUT PROTOCOL. [R12]