

Decision Making by Teachers under Institutional Isomorphism in Educational Institutions

Tanzeel Ur Rahman Mir¹, Tahira Bibi², Ammara Nasim Sahi³

¹Project Officer, Fauji Foundation, Islamabad

²Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, Allama Iqbal Open University Islamabad

³Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Federal Education & Professional Training, Islamabad

Correspondence: tahira.naushahi@aio.edu.pk²

ABSTRACT

Aims of the Study: The article aimed to understand the process of institutional isomorphism in federal government educational institutions (FGEIs). It described how decision-making rationalities were maintained among teachers, under institutional isomorphism in primary and secondary schools. The main objectives of the study comprised; 1) to analyze the perceptions and presence of institutional isomorphism at FGEIs, 2) to analyze the decision making by teachers under institutional isomorphism.

Methodology: Mixed method approach was adopted to find the answer of the research study. Interviews from FGEIs local and regional officials were conducted for qualitative data. Questionnaires were administered collected data from different schoolteachers of FGEIs. The population of the study was Regional and Local Headquarters' officers of FGEIs, all Heads and 106 randomly selected teachers of FGEIs.

Findings: Coercion in relation to institutional isomorphism was maintained in FGEIs through formal laws and SOPs monitor and execute leading to coercive institutional isomorphism. Through a standard such as a value, norm, rule, goal, best practice, or principle. Whereas principles of FGEIs were of the view, this phenomenon has implication for employees.

Conclusion: The study concluded that a significant presence of strong isomorphism within FGEIs, resulting in limited autonomy for school heads when it comes to making decisions related to the school.

Keywords: Institutional Isomorphism, Coercive Isomorphism, Normative Isomorphism, Memetic Isomorphism, Elementary Level.

Introduction

The research in education sector regarding organization remained mostly dominated by management sciences. In management sciences path dependence is the auxiliary to isomorphism (term used by institutional scholars mostly). Isomorphism process ensures conformity in the institutions through regulative, cultural cognitive and normative structures and routines that arrange for strength to social yet bounded behavior rather than providing choices to decide freely. De Campo (2013) labeled institutions as

Article History

Received:
April 27, 2023

Revised:
June 20, 2023

Accepted:
June 26, 2023

Published:
June 30, 2023

greedy (end oriented) structures focused on own benefits only through following the bounded rationalities and the legitimized rationalities bounds their decision making (DM) process through constrains under isomorphism. Scott (2008) believed that schools are suited example of employed isomorphism in a preset cultural belief, internal structures and working under formal rules. De Campo (2013) highlighted institutional culture are, the mission and goals of the institution, governance structure, leadership style of administrators, curricular structure, academic standards, student and teachers' characteristics and the physical environment. These inclinations do contribute to maintain an order but has consequences for product global requirements. To match the global requirements countries like Pakistan required to revisit educational planning and management, with a lens, sensitive to meet the challenges of innovative and technological changing. In case of educational institutions, teachers are the main actors to impart the innovative and problem-solving skills to product (students) not only through formal education but through modeling as well. To empower the teachers in decision making is perceived to have direct consequence for quality of product (students). Study by Simon (2012) has shown that teachers' involvement in decisions, enhanced efficiency. Further studies have also reinforced impact of involvement of employees in decision making in learning institutions (Walter, 2018).

According to Strang, D (2017), sociologists find role of institutions in every aspect of life even from hand shaking to strategic planning. One may question that why societies have similar schools, military, government, and so forth? Mark (2001) describes those similar problems are faced by societies, so to resolve similar problem similar institutions are enacted, However, Ritzier (1996) argues classical theorist Weber considered this institution are enacted to meet the interest of principle that enacted the institutions Scott (2001). As the constraints that shape the behavior of individuals and Waska, R. (2015). labeled these as expectations of enactors and actor. Choices and decisions made under the rationality suited to enactors are shaped through rules, norms, and culture cognitions in any institution" (DiMaggio and Powell, 2000).

Study conducted on schools reveals "The enactor of any institute plans and manages standardized confirmation than empowering the members/actors in it (Polzer, T. 2016). It reveals that the schools under unity of command like in case of public sector educational institutions more are likely to follow the assimilations suited by the authorities, for easier control and end orientation rationality. This focused standardization or assimilation is referred to as isomorphism, applied to organizations by human ecologists, gain environmental assimilations (Heather, 2008). In this case of schools' teachers are the key implementers and standard assimilation has consequences (Lok, & Crawford, 2004).

According to DiMaggio and Powell (2000), the isomorphism dominates and maintains the order through three different interdependent mechanisms/pillars, coercive stems in regulative domain through rewards and costs, normative and mimetic through expected and anticipated ways of choices for decisions in any organization these coercive normative and cultural believes with a passage of time gets the historical precedence leading to institutional isomorphism. Meyer, Scott (2000) argued that schools have structural conformity with a set of rules and react when rules are threatened through central administrative decision making. Thus, achieving completely rational in pursuing the best; alternate to capitalize on the objectives and goals (Simon, 2012). Decision making in any social structure in diverse disciplines such as sociology, psychology, political and cognitive science, has been discussed. For this study, lenses of scholars in the domain of institutional theory i.e., of DiMaggio and Powell with wide-ranging support of Webber, and Scott have been used as beacon. For elaboration of decision making in organizations, along with other scholars Simmons has been adopted. The Endeavour has been made in this research to analyze the maintenance of institutional isomorphism and decision-making capacities of actors (teachers) in Federal Government Educational Institutes (FGEI's) being run through common rules/sops, norms and funded by same source in Pakistan (Abbottabad).

The research was aimed at describing the supporting mechanism of isomorphism in schools' end-oriented environments; whether influencing, specifically teachers' rationality for choosing the best alternative in a pre-set organizational culture.

Review of the Literature

The literature for this study has been reviewed keeping the theme, objective, and research questions in view. The related literature was reviewed different studies in the field of decision making within social structures were analyzed with the focus on actors (teachers) and rationality behind the decision making. Keeping in view the template of this study i.e., the centralized administrative, bureaucratic rationalities in institutions were contemplated through institutional scholars, mainly Max Weber's concept of formal social structures (formal institutions). The mechanism supporting the bureaucratic end-oriented rationalities was viewed through old and new institutional scholars' lens with institutional isomorphism in focus. Finally, the decision making by actors in institutions (in this case teachers) under the phenomenon of institutional isomorphism was examined using DiMaggio and Powell model.

Much literature has been written about decision making. Wasserman and Fred (1958) felt that the scientific study of decision-making appears to be at an early stage of development. The according to above scholars 'reviews of literature about decision making is divided into two factors, participatory and central decisions making. There are extensive studies in the literature regarding participation in organizational decisions by teachers employed in educational institutions. Results of some of these studies are summarized that a much higher impact is gained in terms of teaching when the number of teachers participating in the decision-making mechanism at schools is high Moore & Esselman (1992). Participation in administration decision motivate employees' attitudes and habits, decreasing resistance and opposition (Eren, 1993). A study under OECD (2006) shows that teachers and students believed that they participate in decisions at a lower level. However, they would like to participate more. Results of Bogler & Somech (2004) advocated that increased in budgetary participation increase organizational commitment. Yet teachers were merely an option. In Yilmaz (2012) augmented, teachers in decision making enhance ownership of teachers. FGEIs (2003) manifests participation in decisions increase productivity. Therefore, it can be argued that the degree of employee involvement in decisions encouraged by the administrator will show the degree of effectiveness (Moore & Esselman, 1992).

Michelle Hanlon (2021) divides the literature of organizational decision making into three areas 1st management science related to cost benefit and cost effectiveness of alternatives. 2nd the behavioral science school is domain of psychology and finally the classical school related to decision making in institutional settings. Centralized/bureaucratic model follow up of the steps is normally as, identification of problem, objectives and goals are set, generation of all alternative and best suited alternative in persuasion of goals and objective are adopted, evaluated, and executed. Many researchers, in fact, consider the classical model an impracticable model, if not naïve Michelle Hanlon (2021)

A case study regarding administrative Model of Decision Making (2017) introduced new model for decision making called administrative model. He explained, hierarchical set up having rational authority which direct the actors in the institutions as per administrative hierarchy. The same legal frames select controlling executives for maintaining order. Weber referred these authorities as rational or bureaucratic authorities. Madan (2014) elaborated Max Weber's idea of ideal bureaucracy as a type of organization having hierarchy of offices, competence, technical, qualification, fixed salaries, discipline control, documentation, and office incumbent. Weber referred as iron cage administered by closed-minded professionals who have almost no empathy and interest that can stretch outside their area of expertise (Swedberg, 1998).

Weber also critiqued this model's inherent dysfunctions and error due to powerful obsession i.e., rationalist thinking. Madan (2014) explains Weber's concept of rationality as actor (in case of schoolteacher) in an institution takes the choices suited to him /herself or career will be based on instrumental rationality or *zweck* rational. Instrumentally rational action one takes, based on its anticipated ability to achieve some considered end (*Zweck*, in German). Wert rational, or value-oriented rationality, is characterized by striving for a goal which may not be rational, but which is pursued through rational means; for maximizing the benefit of institution. If a teacher makes the alternative those are

suited to institution will be categorized as individual exercising the appropriate rationality. The legitimacy to rationality is provided by pillars of institutions (Scott, 2008). According to Hoy & Mackley (1995) ethical choices and rational decision making remains focus on feasible concerns. At a basic level Meyer and Rowan (1977) describe ration focused myths as the structural manifestation of widespread understandings of social reality (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). According to Scott (2008) hierarchy in organizations is characterized by downward delegation of authority yet to exercise control. In institutions, extrinsic motivation is from benefits like salaries, bonuses, rewards, and other incentives, by the hierarchy of authority, stimulates conformity to pre-decide rather than innovation (Styhre, 2007).

Federal Government Educational Institutions FGEIs in Pakistan is one of the largest chains of schools in Pakistan. The FGEIs are enacted with a mission to educate the children of ward of Armed forces and people living in cantonment areas. The hierarchy and model adopted by the FGEIs is a matching example for Weber's bureaucratic model of institutions maintaining, hierarchy, and division of labour, rules, and documentation with legal rationales.

Ministry of Defense is the parent Ministry of Federal Government Educational Institutions Directorate. A Policy Board is set up in Defense Division to oversee the working of the Directorate, its institutions and formulate broad based policies to ensure better quality education. The all tires of FGEIs are centralized bureaucratic model as evident from its above organization and functions. Analyzing the organization structure and set rules and SOPs FGEIs are pertinent example of bureaucracy /centralized model in vogue in education system.

The consolidation and centralization of the provision of education into bureaucratic high modern organizations and systems has benefits, but also costs (North, 1990). Large hierarchical organizations (both public and private) tend to rely on bureaucratic processes as in case of federal government institutions; employees engage in assessment of self and others (March, 1996) The schools pursue conformity to authorities as institutional norms (Parsons,2003). Bureaucratic authorities are devising policies aimed at institutional rationalities for educational institutions.

Institutions and Institutional Rationalities

Organizations compete not just for resources and customers; teachers are not necessarily the driving force behind organizational decisions, work activities, and the institutionalization of rules and norms for desired legitimacy (Meyer, 2000). Scott (1995) categorized three pillars of institutions as regulative, normative and cultural cognitive.

Table 1: *Pillars of Institutions*

	Regulative	Normative	Culture cognitive
Basic Order	Regulative Rules	Expectations	Constitutive schema
Mechanism	Coercive	Normative	Mimetic
Indicator	Rules, Laws,	Certification	Common/Shared logics
Basis of Legitimacy	Legally sanctioned	Morally governed	Culturally supported

Source: Institutions and organizations (Scott, 2008)

Table.1 explains that the regulative pillar plays through formal and informal procedures that institute, monitor and sanction actions, school rules and SOPs. The normative pillar gives stress on norms that in case of schools' school leader and teacher must follow at any cost. Finally, the cognitive pillar shapes the filter for acquired knowledge; central to cognitions related to information processing and making a decision making (Luthans, 2005). Cognitive factors are associated with internal issues of self to assert rationality for decision making; leading to framed, institutional isomorphism and legitimacy deemed inevitable decision-making practices in school system.

Powell (1991) holds the belief those institutions facing the same challenges and idea that will lead to isomorphism. Centralization schooling remained under believes of being more 'efficient' and potentially can reduce inequalities. This leads to coercive, normative & mimetic isomorphism institutions can lead to homogeneous organizational measures, also known as isomorphism (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). It has been argued that isomorphic pressure in the direction of conformity, organisms to adopt structures that are sometimes unfavorable for effectiveness (Meyer and Rowan, 1977, and rationality (Selznick, 1996). The advantage of compliance, however, is that the task often decisions can lead to increased legitimacy and reduction in capacities (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983 Suchman, 1995)

Institutional isomorphic increased legitimacy yet it has gradual negative effects on DM Capacities of actors. These construct in educational institutions as well, through the institutional pillars bounds the rationalities of through institutional isomorphism. The institutional isomorphism helps in achieving legitimacy to actor's rational yet effects his/her decision-making capacities. These isomorphic pressures may flow from different social source, the organizational management (Zysman, 1996), the financial control in pursuit of legitimacy (Katz.M,1975), constraints and or incentives; coercive through expedite the formal constraints and reward, normative through appreciations and bounded scenarios (Scott, 2008). Normative pressure from the occupations; an actor's decision is rational if legitimized by institutional perspective; (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, Powell, 1991).

As DiMaggio and Powell (1983) explain, coercive isomorphism in educational institutions as common legal environment, mimetic isomorphism refers to the process of modeling after, or imitating, inside/outside organizations under uncertainty, organizational technologies are poorly understood, when goals are ambiguous, Normative isomorphic pressures are associated with the impact of professionalization on the spread of organizational behaviours across a field through norms (Meirovich, 2015). In other words, we freely concede that teachers' understandings of their own behaviours are interpretable in rational terms. The theory of isomorphism addresses not the psychological states of actors but the structural de-terminates of the range of choices that actors perceive as rational or prudent. The SOPs and defined structured responsibilities of FGEIs presented in their official portal.....is evident of coercive, mimetic and normetic isomorphism.

Through planning and management, an educational organisation sets routine has implications for teachers/actors' choices (to generate innovative activity) at a specific threshold. Schools, having planned path dependence through institutional isomorphism, which curbs and/or costs the astray from defined path. This may achieve the order and objectives at initial level yet have implications for teachers' freedom to make independent decisions. Austin (1990) believed that to maintain an order has consequences for quality and relevance of product; does that meet the requirements of regional and global desires to capacitate teachers? The research aimed at the describing the supporting mechanism of isomorphism in schools, specifically teachers' rationality for choosing the best alternative in a pre-set organisational culture.

Research Methodology

A mixed method approach was adopted to find the answer to question of the research study. Interviews from FGEIs local and regional officials were conducted for qualitative data. questionnaires were administered collected data from different schoolteachers of FGEIs. The population of the study was Regional (Rawalpindi Region) and Local Headquarters' officers of FGEIs, all Heads and maximum available teachers of FGEIs at Abbottabad. The population focused for this study was randomly selected teachers (106) teachers and principals (6) and staff from Regional and local headquarters (3) of secondary and elementary FGEIs at Abbottabad, assumed as suitable institutional frames and all over Pakistan Further FGEIs being under Army bureaucracy was expected to be suitable having institutional isomorphism anticipated to be applied at national level.

Table 2: *Sample of Teachers as Respondent of the Study*

No	FGEI	N	n	Total
1	FG school Abbottabad	45	20	44%
2	FG school for Boys BRC Abbottabad	31	17	57%
3	FG school for Boys FF Abbottabad	30	17	57%
4	FG School for Girls AMC Abbottabad	37	18	49%
5	FG School for Girls Abbottabad	28	16	57%
6	FG School for Girls Narran Abbottabad	38	18	47%

N=Population, n=Sample, T=Total %=Percentage (Sample out of population)

Based on already conducted studies in this field, interview guide was prepared to conduct the semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interview of 06 principals of FGEIs at Abbottabad, 2 appointments from Abbottabad and 1 from regional FGEIs HQ Rawalpindi were conducted after formal permission from local and regional HQ of FGEIs. Details of the interviewees were given in the table below (Table 3).

Table 3: *Detail of Interview Participant*

S.No	Appointment	School/Admin Office
1	Grade 1 Local HQ	Abbottabad Station
2	Grade 1 Local HQ	Abbottabad Station
3	Grade 1 Regional	Regional Office Rawalpindi
4	Principle	FG Higher secondary school Abbottabad
5	Principle	FG school for Boys BRC Abbottabad
6	Principle	FG school for Boys FF Abbottabad
7	Principle	FG School for Girls AMC Abbottabad
8	Principle	FG School for Girls Abbottabad
9	Principle	FG School for Girls Narryan Abbottabad

Research Instrument

The Questionnaire for teachers was made keeping the research objectives and research questions. The questionnaire was prepared in dual languages i.e., English with translation in Urdu. The Alfa co-efficient through pilot testing of 25 FGEIs teachers selected through convenient sampling remained 7. In addition to the questionnaire, the study was employed a semi-structured; conducted with the school leaders and management authorities to analyze the mechanism of homogeneous mechanism maintained if prevailing in FGEIs mainly through institutional isomorphism. To ensure the content validity of the instruments, modifications were made in the data collection tools after getting feedback from 05 experts. Experts assisted in removal of the irrelevant questions and use of understandable language.

Data Analysis and Results

Keeping in view the objectives of study; this chapter contains two parts. Part I contains the results and discussions regarding semi-structured interviews conducted from school heads and staff officers of HQ FGEIs through qualitative analysis; encompasses the mechanism and maintenance of institutional isomorphism. Part II contains analysis of data; gathered from teachers of FGEIS through questionnaires. Part II is aimed at analysing the rationalities behind decision making of teachers at FGEIs under institutional isomorphism mainly through quantitative analysis dominantly.

Part I

The Analysis are Aimed at Practices and Perceptions Through which Institutional Isomorphism in FGEIs are Maintained.

The semi structured interviews were thematic based; through themes derived from institutional scholars (DiMaggio and Powell mainly). This makes it a very flexible method, a considerable advantage given the diversity of work in learning and teaching. Following themes were derived: -

- a. Funding through same source / budgetary control.
- b. Coercion through formal laws and SOPs.
- c. Normative pressure.
- d. Mimetic Pressure / Isomorphism.

Theme 1: Funding through same Source / Budgetary Control

Under the above-mentioned themes the analysis was coded, responses were analyzed in the light of secondary data from previous studies (Creswell, 2009).

Funding Through Same Source / Budgetary Control.

The interviewees were asked about, “*Do you think that that centralized budgeting is in vogue in FGEIs?*” The financial support or allocations are centralized or independent for your school or in line with other FG Schools. The theme was further coded as autonomy for school budget and budgetary control.

Perceptions and practices of participants were analyzed from their views to assess the extent of isomorphism and the mechanism maintaining. All the interviewees except one from headquarters revealed that the allocation of funds and budgeting is centralized. Budgetary control is exercised on the same line for all FGEIs under regional HQ. However, 20-30 percent input is incorporated in budget planning but that must be in line with other FGEIs. Participants confirmed those key resources of administration, as people, money, authority, and supplies. Allocation of resources are used as a controlling measure. Further, all the respondents agreed on the common structures will require some common practices for budgetary requirements. As per FGEIS Official website function of budgeting is domain of central committee at army level and regional headquarters are responsible for judicious utilization of approved projects. Three interviewees added that demographic and topographic features should be kept in mind while the allocation of budget. They were of the view that budgetary allocations are made on merit and as deemed necessary. Another participant added that cohesion and order is maintained through centralized planning and allocation. Three interviews supported the system in vogue as it is producing the desired results in a befitting manner.

Theme 2: Coercion Pressure through Formal Laws and SOPs

The second theme addressed the coercive isomorphism was coded through adherence of rules, routine actions under SOPs and autonomy in decision making. The respondents were asked, “*How coercive pressure is maintained in FGEIs to maintain the coercive isomorphism?*”

In response to this question participants appreciated the legal frames which according to them are the facilitating to routine order. Respondents from the FGEIs have the same view. However, three participants were of the view that the review of such legal frames is indispensable with inclusion of new technologies and relevance based educational goals. The SOPs, in FGEIs’ routine are adhered religiously and diversion to which can be liable to display action as evident.

All the principle had the common perception that the SOPs are supreme and being followed with true letter and spirit. When they here asked, “*Does under formal coercion the decision-making capacity flourish?*” All denied the enhancement of such capacities under strict coercion. One of the participants said it “*jub her kaam ke SOPs hae tou descion ke kya zaroorat hae; hum tou bus SOPs follow karate haen*” (Local Language) through coercion is the implementation through any means of super imposing these polices and rules formally. Meaning therefore they have very limited or no decision-making leverages. One of the principals had a view” *humara kaam follow karna hae, SOPs higher authorities*

banati hain” (Local Language) Meaning by that blindly following the orders without much to do in decision making. The legal rational authority by provides legitimacy to adherence of orders without questioning their authenticity of order as it’s legitimized through legal frames. In FGEIs from the official website it is evident that every activity and procedure is clearly written which provides basis to legal coercion. All participants agreed that coercion inform formal rules and SOPs are existing at FGEIs.

Theme 3: Normative Pressure

Third theme was normative pressure contribution in isomorphism. Keeping in view Meirovich (2015) normative framework involves the codes were adopted as SOPs, evaluation system, normative codes. The respondents were asked, “*How normative pressures in your view like SOPs, norms and cultural cognitions and normative codes contribute towards following of same routine by individuals; through expectations and shaming/shunning respectively*”?

Three participants were supported the system in vogue. Whereas principles of FGEIs were of the view that this phenomenon has implication for employees; having partial autonomy in matters which are already covered under SOPs. The expectations from schoolteacher’s deviations from norms are not accepted normally SOPs of Institutions follow the basis for homogeneous norms. Deviators are corrected and expected to follow norms in vogue. The professional norm of disciplinary conduct is mostly adopted in line of controlling headquarters. The response and Appendix B functions of FGEIs are supporting the current scenario in FGEIs is leading to legitimacy as described by institutional scholars. Which shows legitimacy is the criteria for appropriateness under the bounded frames for all FGEIs at Abbottabad.

Theme 4: Mimetic Pressure / Isomorphism

A Theme encompassed mimetic pressure coded as similar routine, similar infrastructure following common coercion. Same contributes to institutional isomorphism mechanism that has been identified by institutional organization theory to explain isomorphic institutional change is mimetic (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). The respondents were asked about *what are your views about mimetic pressures at FGEIs relation in maintaining institutional isomorphism?*

The Standard as said by two participants are adhered as the same line of military model rather than pure educational formal and informal requirements.

Through socialization and professional networks, respondent had common perception in line with Khan (2005) study which revealed in a complex environment it is a much simpler form of imitation through which teachers react to uncertainty and restrict to institutional routines. In North (1990), words, new entrants in any market aim to provide an innovative product or solution to attract buyers. However, there are situations restricted by legitimacy issues.

Keeping in same line in FGEIs as per view of three participants for better control and smooth management input-based policy and legal frames are in practice in FGEIs. All the respondents agreed that the activities in their respective institutions are commonly adhered same schedules. Although the weather differences between cold and warm region schedules do vary in time due to extreme weather; yet the activities are same as pedagogies, classrooms, furniture syllabus etc.

Part II

Teachers’ Rationalities for Decision Making under FGEI’s Institutional Isomorphism

This part of data analysis is quantitative in nature. However descriptive statistics were analysed in the light of empirical studies results of already conducted to enhance the results’ validity. Statistical analyses to determine, explains or predicts phenomena of interest (Creswell, 2011). This part focuses on analyse the rationalities possessed and shaped for decision making under FGEI’s institutional isomorphism. The data from 106 teachers of FGEIs was collected through closed ended questions through a questionnaire using the Likert scale. Analyses are as under:

Table 4: *Perceptions and Rationalities at FGEIs*

Statements	Mean
Unity of command Better Mode	2.70
Legitimized frames for DM are Rules and Norms	2.87
Deviation from set Institutional Patterns Incur Cost	2.73
Teacher Incentives and Restrictions to maintain Assimilations	1.96
Participation Routine in School Routine DM by Teachers	1.69
Less DM Involvement Effect DM Capacity	2.68

Table 4 shows that at FGEIs teachers' mean response was recorded through scale as 1 = Disagree 2=Undecided and 3=Agree. In response to statements, 1st for unity of command better mode mean was 2.70. Whereas respondents mean response to legitimized frames for DM are rules and norms 2.87. Deviation from set institutional patterns incur cost teachers mean response was 2.73. Regarding teacher incentives and restrictions to maintain assimilations mean response was 1.96. Participation routine in school routine DM by teachers mean response 1.69. Whereas, for less DM involvement effect DM capacity mean response remained. Finally, in response to less DM involvement effect DM capacity mean response remained 2 as per Table 4. Further, following tables shows the percentage of teachers disagreed, undecided and agreed to above statements to further analyzed the primary data.

Table 5: *Unity of command Better Mode*

Response	Frequency	Percent
Disagree	11	10.4
Undecided	10	9.4
Agree	85	80.2
Total	106	100.0

In Table5 descriptive analyses of respondents regarding unity of command in FGEIs was applied. Respondent were asked their perception regarding Unity of command Better Mode 11% disagreed with the statement while 9% remained undecided and 80 % agreed with the statement as per table 3.

Table 6: *Legitimized Frames for DM are Rules and Norm*

Response	Frequency	Percent
Undecided	14	13.2
Agree	92	86.8
Total	106	100.0

Table 6 by using descriptive analyses, results show the clear understanding by teachers regarding the driving force behind organizational decisions. Respondent were asked their perception regarding Legitimized frames for DM are Rules and Norms 13% undecided and 87% agreed with the statement.

Table 7: *Deviation from Set Institutional Patterns Incur Cost*

Response	Frequency	Percent
Disagree	08	07.5
Undecided	13	12.3
Agree	85	80.2
Total	106	100.0

The descriptive analyses in Table 7 shows that when respondent was asked their perception regarding deviation from set institutional patterns incur cost; 8% disagreed with the statement while 12% remained undecided and 80% agreed with the statement.

Table 8: *Teacher Incentives and Restrictions*

Response	Frequency	Percent
Centralized	77	72.6
Independent	11	10.4
Participatory	18	17.0
Total	106	100.0

According to table 8 responses of teachers' regarding their mechanism of deciding regarding teacher incentives and restrictions were, 73% believed it's centralized in their institution, while 10% believed its teachers themselves are responsible to decide, and 17 % said it's participatory.

Table 9: *Participation in Decision Making by Respondent*

Response	Frequency	Percent
1	33	31.1
2	73	68.9
Total	106	100

Table 9 describes that respondent about participation in school routine DM by respondent, 31% did not participated and 69% had participated. Mechanism to make school policy, rules and SOPs as evident from official website of FGEIS and respondent, as Ministry of

Table 10: *Less Decision-Making Involvement Effect Decision Making Capacity*

Response	Frequency	Percent
1	90	84.9
2	16	15.1
Total	106	100.0

Table 10 shows that respondents were asked their perception regarding less involvement in DM will affect DM capacity in response, 85% agreed with the statement and 15% were of the view it will not be so.

Findings

This study focused to describe the manifestation of institutional isomorphism and its relation to decision making by schoolteachers in educational institutions. The study was delimited to FGEIs Headquarter and schools at Abbottabad. Results revealed that all allocation of funds and budgeting is centralized on the same line for all FGEIs under regional Head Quarter (HQ). Moreover, through the pressure of budgetary control Isomorphism is maintained at FGEIs. However, the appointment holders from the HQ deemed it necessary as provide basis for specific objectives and guidelines. Coercion in relation to institutional isomorphism is maintained in FGEIs through, formal laws and SOPs monitor and execute leading to coercive institutional isomorphism. The study reveals regarding normative pressure in relation to institutional isomorphism support institutional isomorphism at FGEIs through a standard such as a value, norm, rule, goal, best practice, or principle. Whereas principles of FGEIs were of the view, this phenomenon has implication for employees. Regarding pressure of mimetic in relation to institutional isomorphism that existing FGEIs models adhered as the same line of military model rather than pure educational formal. Charter of duties and most of teacher revealed that unity of command is used as tool to maintain institutional isomorphism in FGEIs. For less freedom of decision making, perception is maintained in FGEIs that decision must have legitimacy; supported and under the umbrella of rules and SOPs. As per legal and normative requirement teachers followed the orders and decisions of higher authorities for maintain the routine at FGEIs to avoid any cost may be imposed for any deviation. Most of the teachers new it well that their incentives and restrictions are controlled by higher as per coercive status of FGEIs formal rules. In Routine matters medium to low participation of teacher were maintained at FGEIs; evident from official website of FGEIS as well., it was revealed that under the umbrella of

Ministry of Defense SOP Regional, Sub-Regional and Station Boards were constituted so as to help in the smooth functioning of the FGEIs which is still in-vogue and all are bound to follow it. Study revealed that teachers' capacity to make independent decision has the implications in FGEIs highly institutional isomorphism.

Conclusion

Overall, from 1st objective encompassed presences institutional isomorphism through regulative, normative and culture cognitive; the results show that strong isomorphism exists in FGEIs. The school heads showed their limited autonomy in making the school related decisions. The respondents from FGEIs local and regional headquarters (bureaucratic authorities) supported the isomorphism as it helps to maintain order and achieving the end results. Whereas the 2nd objective focused on the dynamics of teachers' decision making under institutional isomorphism through unity of command, legitimized frames and norms, deviation cost, teacher incentives and restrictions, participation routine in school routine pressures have considerable effect on their rationales; made suited to the predesigned set patterns. Results of this study show that the rationales behind the teachers' decision making remains the legitimacy which curbs the capacity of free and independent decision-making capacity among teachers at FGEIs at Abbottabad.

Discussion

This confirmed the studies by Litchfield (1956) and other studies in the same field; Kalev (2006) describes that financial authority controls through allocation and integration of the resources in commensuration with policy instructions. All participants agreed that coercion inform formal rules and SOPs are existing at FGEIs. This conforms the study by Lunenburg (2010) also supports the Ritzer (1996) explanation of Weber's bureaucratic concept of super imposing these policies and rules formally; have extremely limited are no decision-making leverages. Third theme was normative pressure contribution in isomorphism. Keeping in view Meirovich (2015) normative framework involves the codes were adopted as SOPs, evaluation system, normative codes. This conforms studies of DiMaggio & Powell (2000), strong normative isomorphic pressure in the direction of conformity can cause organisms to adopt structures that as per Meyer and Rowan, (1977) sometimes unfavorable for effectiveness and rationality of actors in institutions (Selznick, 1996). This opposes the concepts of Meyer & Rowan (1977) and Suchman (1995) who believed that the advantage of compliance, however, is that the task often decisions can lead to increased legitimacy.

A Theme encompassed mimetic pressure coded as similar routine, similar infrastructure following common coercion. Same contributes to institutional isomorphism mechanism that has been identified by institutional organization theory to explain isomorphic institutional change is mimetic (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). A special case of mimetic isomorphism can be observed in situations where institutional design by military for FGEI regulation. All the campuses of FGEIs follow the set routines and SOPs as the consulting each other to maintain the order which facilitates in achieving desired standards. Same is evident. As described by (Khan, 2005) institutional rules due to the suspicion that the institutional design primarily serves the partisan interest of the designers. It is evident from the status and SOP of FGEIs (Exhibit B). All participants are in view that in FGEIs same routine infrastructure and following of existing models are imitated. According to DiMaggio & Powell (1983) this is mechanism that has been identified by institutional organization theory to explain isomorphic institutional through mimetic.

Supported and conformed the Administrative Model of Decision Making. (2017) who described coherent conduct entails of a desired result. This also conforms the study by Administrative Model of Decision Making (2017) elaborating educational management has unity of command, through administrative model of decision making to the satisfaction is target orientation and pursuance as main objective an organizational authority.

Responses were in line to DiMaggio & Powell (1991). As they view the organization itself (i.e., a school, hospital, or court) as the locus of organizational behaviours as exhibitions of values and norms; New rationality (Selznick, 1996) in persuasion of legitimacy. The advantage of compliance of decisions can lead to increased legitimacy (Meyer and Rowan, 1977 DiMaggio & Powell, 1983 Suchman, 1995). Central goal of organizational activity is to acquire legitimacy, even if at the expense of organizational efficiency.

Results were in line with Weber (1985) concepts regarding instrumental rationality necessarily involved making conscious choices between different means and weighing the relative value of competing ends to avoid any legal consequences. Lunenburg, (2010) in same lines, argues that teacher in a school takes the choices suited more benefit and less cost to be born.

Scribner (1999) earlier in his research has found that through participation enhance the employee's capacities like DMAs evident from related literature that in bureaucratic organization, extrinsic motivation is that which is drawn from outside the individual from benefits like salaries, bonuses, rewards, and other incentives (Styhre, 2007).

Defense is the parent Ministry of Federal Government Educational Institutions Directorate. According to Rowan organizational behaviours as an expression of embedded routines and rituals rather than innovation encouraging environment (Meyer & Rowan, 2006). In another study Harter et al, (2003) explained this phenomenon as, a school may utilize strategies such as centralised, participatory or any combination of these or other approaches.

As Efe (2003) explain these phenomena that manifests participants in the study agreed as higher levels of participation will provide them with various skills by encouragement to participate and vice versa. Mechanism to make school policy, rules and sops as evident from official website of FGEIS and respondent, as Ministry of Defense is the parent Ministry of Federal Government Educational Institutions Directorate which facilitates in functioning of the FGEIs which is still in vogue, and all are bounded to follow it rather than taking input from FGEIs teachers.

Recommendations

Based on the research findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are proposed for the review of policy makers and all other stakeholders.

- Institutions, being objective-oriented, may refrain compromising the staff capacities by bounding them through the mechanism of institutional isomorphism. The teachers' rationales for decision making may not be restricted solely end-orientation.
- Instead of enforcing homogeneity, educational institutions should support the adoption of innovative routines.
- School heads may be granted more autonomy for their routine decision-making processes related to in planning and management.

Acknowledgments

None.


Conflict of Interest


Authors declared no conflict of interest.


Funding Source

The authors received no funding to conduct this study.

ORCID iDs

Tanzeel Ur Rahman Mir ¹  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2346-5716>

Tahira Bibi ²  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5002-9202>

Ammara Nasim Sahi ³  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6965-9012>

References

- Administrative Model of Decision Making. (2017). <https://study.com/academy/lesson/administrative-model-of-decision-making.html>. Retrieved on may 2022.
- Blau, P.M. (1956). *Bureaucracy in modern society*. New York: Random House. Campbell.
- Coser, L. A. (1967). 'Greedy Organizations.' *European Journal of Sociology* 8(2), 196.
- Cresswell, J.W. (2003). Research design: *Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. (2nd Ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009) Research Design: *qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches* (3rd edition) (Thousand Oaks, Sage).
- Creswell, J.W. & Plano Clark, V.L. (2011) *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publications.
- De Campo, M. E. (2013). Contemporary Greedy Institutions: An Essay on Lewis Coser's Concept in the Era of the "Hive Mind." *Sociologický Časopis / Czech Sociological Review*, 49(6), 969–987. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24642546>
- Di Maggio, P.j J. & Walter, W. Powell. (1983). "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48, 147-160.
- DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (2000). The Iron Cage Revisited: *Isomorphism in Organizational Fields*'. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- DiMaggio, P.J., & Powell, W.W. (1991). Introduction. In W. Powell & P.J DiMaggio (Eds.) *the new institutionalism in Organizational analysis*, 138. Chicago , IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Efe, H. (2003). *Effects of Implementers' Participation in Decision Making on Their perceptions of Achievement*. Sakarya University, Social Science.
- Eren, E. (1993). Management and Organization. Istanbul: Beta Printing and Eren, E. (2001). "Psychology of Organizational Behaviour and Eren, E. (2001). Psychology of Organizational Behaviour and Management (7.Edition). Istanbul: BetasPublications. No: 402. (1993). Yonetimveorgnizasyon. [Management and Organization] Istanbul: Beta Printing and Publishing.

From http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/PDF/Outputs/PolicyStrategy/3888Teacher_motivation_Pakistan.pdf.

- Harter, J.K. Schmidt, F.L. & Keyes, C. L. (2003). Will-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. In C.L.M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: The positive person and the good life* (pp.205-224) Retrieved from <http://media.gallup.com/documents/whitePaper--Will-BeingIn TheWorkplace.pdf>
- Heather, A. Haveman. \$ Robert J. (2008). Ecologists and Institutionalists: Friends or Foes? *The Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Ch.24 SAGE DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849200387.n25>.
- Hoy, A. & Mackley, T. (2000). Creating smarter schools through collaboration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(3), 247-271.
- Huber, G. P. (1996). Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. In M. D. Cohen & L. S. Sproull (Eds.), *Organizational learning* (pp.124-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kalev, Alexandra, Frank Dobbin, and Erin Kelly. (2006). "Best Practices or Best Guesses? Diversity Management and the Remediation of Inequality." *American Sociological Review*, 71, 589-917.
- John, L. (2004). *Institutional Change and Globalization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Katz, M.I B. (1975). *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America*. New York: Praeger
- Khan, T. (2005). *Teacher job satisfaction and incentive: A case study of Pakistan*. Retrieved
- Litchfield, E. H. (1956). key resources of administration are people, money, authority, and materials. *Administrative Science Quarterly* Sage. Lok P. and Crawford J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organization commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-338.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). The decision making process. *National Forum of Education administration and Supervision Journal*, 27(4), 1—12.
- Madan, A. (2014). Max Weber's critique of the bureaucratisation of education. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 11(1), 95-113.
- March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1996). Institutional perspectives on political institutions. *Governance: An international Journal of Policy and Administration*, 9(3), 247-264.
- March, J. G. (1996). Organizational learning. In M. D. Cohen & L. S. Sproull (Eds.), *Organizational learning* (pp. 515-540). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- March, J. G. (1999). *The pursuit of organizational intelligence*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Mark Hanson. (2001). Institutional Theory and Educational Change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 637-661.
- Meirovich, G. (2015). *Normative and Descriptive Aspects of Management*.
- Meyer, HD. & Rowan, B. (2006). *Institutional analysis and the study of education*. In HD. Meyer & B. Rowan (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in education*, 113. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Meyer, J. W. & Ronald, J. (2000). The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency." *Sociological Theory*, 18, 100-120.
- Meyer, J.W. & Scott, W.R.. (n.d). *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp.45-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Meyer, J.W. & Brian, R. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Meyer, J.W. (1992). *Centralization of funding and control in educational governance*. In J. W. Meyer & W. R. Scott (Eds.), *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp.179-197). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J.W. Scott, W. R...& Deal, T.E. (1992). *Institutional and technical sources of organizational structure: Explaining the structure of educational organizations*.
- Michelle Hanlon, (2021) . <https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12739> retrieved on 18 jul 2022
- Mintzberg, H. (1975). The manager's job: Folklore and fact. *Harvard Business Review*, 53, 49-61.
- Moore, W. P. & Esselman, M.E. (1992). *Teacher efficacy, empowerment, and focused instructional climate: Does student achievement benefit?* Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/62837693?accountid=12725>
- North, D. (1990). Institutions, *Journal of economic perspectives*, 5(1),97-112 OECD (2006). *Improving School Leadership*, Volume 1: Policy and Practice – ISBN 978-92-64-04467-8
- Onwuegbuzie. & Julie, P. C. (2011). Data Analysis is Mixed Research: A Primer. *International Journal of Education* 3(1), E13. Part II.
- Persons. (2003). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, courier Corporation, 04.04.-292
- Polzer, T., Meyer, R. E., Höllerer, M. A., & Seiwald, J. (2016). Institutional Hybridity in Public Sector Reform: Replacement, Blending, or Layering of Administrative Paradigms☆. In *How institutions matter!* (pp. 69-99). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Scott, J. (1998). *Seeting Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, W. R..Ruef, M. Mendel, P.J. & Caronna, C.A. (2000). *Institutional change and health care organizations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, W.R. (1991). *Unpacking institutional arguments*. In P.J. DiMaggio & W. W. Powell (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 164-182). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, W.R.. (2001). *Institutions and organizations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Scott, W.R.. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and Interests* (1st ed.): Sage Publications.
- Scott, W.R...(1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott., W. & Richard. (2008). *Institutions and Organizations Foundations for Organizational Science Foundations for Organizational Science A Sage Publications Series*. London: New York: New Delhi
- Selznick, P. (1996). Institutionalism “old” and “new”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 270-277.
- Simon, A. (1947). *Models of Man; Social and Rational, Mathematical Essays on Rational Human Behaviour in a Social Setting*. New York: Jhon Wiley and Sons, Inc.,

- Simon, M. A., & Tzur, R. (2012). *Explicating the role of mathematical tasks in conceptual learning: An elaboration of the hypothetical learning trajectory*. In *Hypothetical learning trajectories* (pp. 91-104). Routledge.
- Strang, D., & Sine, W. D. (2017). Interorganizational institutions. *The Blackwell companion to organizations*, 495-519.
- Styhre, A. (2007). *The innovative bureaucracy: Bureaucracy in an age of fluidity*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy Management Review*, 20(3), 571-560.
- Swedberg, R. (1998). *Max Weber and the idea of economic sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Walter, H. Hart, Ed..D. (2018). *Educational Leadership Administration: Teaching and Program Development*. Winthrop University; Vol. 29: Issue 1.
- Waska, R. (2015). *A casebook of psychotherapy practice with challenging patients: a modern Kleinian approach*. Routledge.
- Wasserman. Fred, S. Silander. (1958). *Decision Making; an Annotated Bibliography*, Cornell University: Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, 2 Note Decision.
- Weber, M. (1985). *Basic Concepts in Sociology*. Seacaucus, NJ, Citadel Press.
- Yilmaz, D. (2012). "The Role of Happiness in the relationship between Cultural fit and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour" Marmara University, Social Sciences Institute, Unpublished Masters's Thesis.
- Yilmaz, K. (2012). Relationship between Primary School Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Their Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(2).
- Zysman. J. (1996) 'The "Myth" of a Global Economy: Enduring national foundations and emerging regional realities', New Politica.