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Aims of the research

- To further the understanding of the changes of pharmacy work and organisation
- To focus on the institutional, organisational, professional, and discursive dynamics which accompanied these changes
- To Compare the finding in four countries (UK, US, Italy, and Sweden).
- To identify similarities and differences between the national trajectories
Research process and methods

- Systematic review of historical documents
- Interviews with knowledgeable individuals
- Multiple case studies
- Systematic comparison

Initial focus on structure of ownership of pharmacy ‘outlets’
This presentation

Puzzled by differences: while strong family resemblances exist in the practice of pharmacy throughout the world the sale of pharmaceuticals is quite different (e.g. store layout; array of products; ownership)

What does this tell us about pharmacy?

What the case of pharmacy tells us about organisational and institutional phenomena?
Some striking differences in pharmacy Ownership

Sweden

Italy

UK

USA
How did we get here?
## Critical events in deciding the question of ownership in the four countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>ITALY</th>
<th>SWEDEN</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
<td>End of the guilds</td>
<td>Individual pharmacist owner only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
<td>1806 Freedom of establishment but within public health idea (in French dominions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
<td>1865 Personal non tradable license (coexisting pre-unitary privileges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td>1888 Deregulation (Chains and tradable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td>1908 Poison act (Multiples upheld)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913 Personal non tradable licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion but no change (ind. pharmacist owner only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td>1927 Restriction (pharmacist owner only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td>1928 overturned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968 Personal tradable licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>1971 Nationalisation (chainlike)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>1971 State can restrict (no change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003 NHS must approve transfer from independent to corporate owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006 New org. form: parafarmacia. Liberalization of OTCs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 End of monopoly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **1815** De facto deregulation
- **1884** NHS grants new contracts to new pharmacies only when “necessary or desirable”
- **1888** Deregulation (Chains and tradable)
- **1908** Poison act (Multiples upheld)
- **1913** Personal non tradable licence
- **1920s** Discussion but no change (ind. pharmacist owner only)
- **1927** Restriction (pharmacist owner only)
- **1928** overturned
- **1968** Personal tradable licence
- **1971** Nationalisation (chainlike)
- **1971** State can restrict (no change)
- **2003** NHS must approve transfer from independent to corporate owner
- **2006** New org. form: parafarmacia. Liberalization of OTCs
- **2007** End of monopoly
Pharmacy as in-between industry

- Our study confirms previous research (Goodrick and Reay, 2005)
- Different logics, rationalities, and discourses all operate at the same time in the field of pharmacy
- Public health, professional, commerce, managerial, and even family institutional logics
- What is new:
  - Articulation of the structurally complex nature of the sector
  - Different institutional logics co-exist
The ‘glocal’ nature of pharmacy

- Similar logics and ideas carried around by immigrants, armies, texts, and fashion
- Precipitated in highly specific organizational forms and institutional arrangements in the four countries
- Local translation of traveling innovation
- Both global and local: ‘glocal’
  - From isomorphism to family resemblance
  - Focus on local field of forces
  - Beyond transfer: attempt to do the same is cause of difference
Working logics together: knotting points and hotspots

- Different logics do not just co-exist, they need to be knotted together
- Knotting events and knotting actants
- Recurrent pattern of knotting activity
- Ownership as institutional ‘hot spots’
  - Building on institutional faults
  - Institutional arrangements are necessarily contingent and provisional
- A predictive use of process theory?
Coda

A few weeks ago the new Italian conservative minister submitted a bill that overturns the “market revolution” introduced by his liberal precursor. The law severely restricts the sale of OTC outside pharmacy and reconfirmed pharmacy a personal non tradable concession.