SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2025
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SERIES NO. 229

INSTITUTIONAL LOGIC IN MARKETING – A STRATEGIC PERSPECTIVE ON RELATIONSHIP BUILDING AND MARKET SEGMENTATION

Jarosław PLICHTA

Krakow University of Economics; plichtaj@uek.krakow.pl, ORCID: 0000-0001-9969-9832

Purpose: The study investigates the influence of institutional logics such as market, bureaucratic, communal, mission, professional, and entrepreneurial logics, on B2C market segmentation and customer- relationship management (CRM). Its objectives are to (a) develop a transparent, reproducible framework for aligning marketing strategies with these logics and (b) demonstrate that such alignment enhances consumer trust, engagement, and repeat – purchase behaviour.

Design/methodology/approach: A comprehensive search was conducted on the Web of Science, Scopus, ABI/Inform, and JSTOR for peer- reviewed articles published between 1990 and 2024. Keywords combined "institutional logic*" with "market segmentation", "CRM", and "brand strategy". After title and abstract screening against inclusion criteria (explicit discussion of at least one institutional logic and direct relevance to segmentation or CRM), 72 articles remained.

Findings: (1) Proposal of logic-based segmentation. Firms with a dominant market logic use price-value and functional criteria; communal-logic firms emphasize community events and peer reputation; bureaucratic-logic firms highlight certifications and clear procedures; entrepreneurial-logic firms spotlight innovation and risk-taking; mission-logic firms foreground ethical commitments; professional-logic firms leverage expert endorsements. (2) CRM alignment. When firms' CRM tools (e.g., loyalty programs, personalized communications, certification displays) resonate with customers' institutional logics, brand trust and engagement increase. (3) Value co-creation development. Institutional congruence fosters deeper co-creation as consumers perceive brands as legitimate partners within their normative frameworks.

Research limitations/implications: As a theoretical paper, it lacks empirical validation. Future studies should develop both qualitative and quantitative measures of consumer and firm logic profiles, then test their effects on trust, purchase intention, and loyalty through field surveys or experiments. Future research is advised to develop quantitative surveys measuring consumer and firm logic profiles and to conduct field experiments manipulating CRM communications to establish causal links.

Practical implications: Managers can enhance segmentation accuracy and CRM effectiveness by: (1) Diagnosing both corporate and customer logic profiles, (2) Tailoring product positioning, messaging, and loyalty mechanisms to these profiles, (3) Embedding institutional alignment into brand strategy to boost trust and retention.

Originality/value: This is the first paper to integrate the institutional logics meta-theory with market segmentation and relationship marketing, offering a novel lens for both scholars and practitioners to design consumer-centric strategies.
Keywords: Institutional logics; Market segmentation; Relationship marketing; Customer trust; Value co-creation, Logic-align marketing.
Category of paper: Conceptual paper, Viewpoint.

1. Introduction

Dynamic changes in the global economy in recent decades have forced the search for an explanation of the logic of contemporary market processes, which resulted in the emergence of various concepts, including the SDL concept (Services Dominant Logic), which is an attempt to search for universal premises for the actions of contemporary entities, or directly for consumers themselves within the concept (CDL - Consumer Dominant Logic) (Bruhn et al., 2024; Vargo, Akaka, 2009). Creating value based on the dominance of intangible elements in contemporary products perceived as bundles of values has found wide application in marketing (Grönroos, Voima, 2013; Nabhan et al., 2024; Shaner et al., 2024; Vargo, Lusch, 2004). The evolution of the marketing concept is heading in the same direction, emphasizing the importance of values and social relations. This trend is consistent with the institutional approach to contemporary transaction processes, which emphasizes the importance of behavioral factors and structures based on interpersonal relationships (Kotler, 2020; Plichta, 2019a; Shaner et al., 2024). Due to the role played by customers in the stakeholder structure of enterprises and the importance of relationships in contemporary markets, this article addresses the issue of the importance of institutional logic in marketing. The hypothesis adopted as the basis for considerations is that the institutional logic according to which a given organization operates is a key element of segmentation and the basis for building effective relationships with buyers. Despite the emergence of hypermedia space and modern technologies, market segmentation and the selection of the target group remain a key stage in the marketing management process.

2. Premises for the development of the concept of institutional logics

Since the 1980s, there has been a growing interest in institutional economics and its applications in management (Anam et al., 2024; Ferreira et al., 2014; Martins et al., 2010). This applies not only to the New Institutional Economics and the transaction cost theory developed, e.g., by O.E Williamson, but also to a return to the achievements of the so-called old-stream institutionalists, who emphasized behavioral aspects in their concepts (Simon, 1990;

Veblen, 2017) and the role of individuals in creating relationships and structures of production and exchange (Coase, 1937; North, 1990b; Ostrom, 1998; OE Williamson, 1993). The demands made among scientists regarding a departure from the so-called The changes in the so-called scientific imperialism manifested by a silo and exclusionary approach to the development of scientific disciplines in favor of inclusiveness and a more holistic approach have found good justification for the development of various, often eclectic concepts in institutional economics (Brzeziński et al., 2008; Fiedor, Hockuba, 2009; Gorynia, 1998; Richter, 2001; Stone, 1986). The departure from neoclassical assumptions regarding the determinants of entities' behaviors occurred gradually, often outside the mainstream, e.g. in marketing or in behavioral finance, which drew on the achievements of psychology and sociology, combining quantitative and qualitative methods in research (Kahneman, Tversky, 1984; Foxall, 1997; Jonassen, 1959; Lee et al., 2007). In the area of management sciences, for example, the school of organizational behavior currently draws many elements from institutional achievements (Ponte, Pesci, 2022). This also resulted in the development of research and publications in the field of the efficiency of exchange processes, referring mainly to the theory of transaction costs, agency theory or property rights theory, addressing the broad issue of explaining the existence and functioning of various forms of organizing economic activity (Carroll, Teece, 1999; Jensen, Meckling, 1979; Menard, Shirley, 2005), cooperative phenomena or corporate governance and relations between stakeholders (Bundy et al., 2018; Chung, Luo, 2008; Messiah, 2006; North, 1990a). To this day, however, the institutional approach does not often appear in the issues of mainstream management, which is certainly one of the reasons for which is the problem with the research methodology and measurement of, for example, transaction costs, agency costs and transfer of property rights resulting from the behavior of entities that are often hidden in nature and with the separation of physical costs and transaction costs (Hodgson, 2010; Plichta, 2019b). Another reservation is the focus on the cost side and the assumption of reducing transaction costs, which are the main reasons for inefficiency at the level of organizational units and the entire economy, and to a lesser extent on value creation (Plichta, 2019a). This certainly makes management and measurement of effectiveness and efficiency, which plays a fundamental role in management, difficult.

Globalization and the development of transnational corporations, new business models and integrated logistics chains or network organizations have shed light on the causes of the formation of market structures at the micro-, meso- and macro-levels and the relations between the public and private spheres (Menard, Shirley, 2005; Ostrom, 2010). The dynamism of changes explained mainly by technological progress, global mobility and threats resulting from the expansionary economy of natural resources has directed the attention of some researchers to the social consequences and the impact on changes in the institutional environment, emphasizing cultural conditions and the role of informal institutions in the behavior of market entities (Dobler, 2011; Li, 2024; Williamson, 2009). The need to describe contemporary phenomena characterized by information noise and uncertainty resulting from information asymmetry on the one hand and the growing capabilities of information and communication technologies on the other hand imposes a search for regularities and a specific logic of these processes. This is certainly a big challenge for organizations looking for tools to facilitate management in the digital era. It is also a challenge to create a new research perspective for dynamic and complex social relations, including economic ones (Wu et al., 2023).

The fact that organizations are embedded in complex institutional relations was noticed by DiMaggio and Powell, who pointed out that organizations compete not only for resources and customers, but also for political power and institutional legitimacy. This causes organizations to become similar (isomorphism) to each other in the process of imitation and conformism dictated by the implementation of goals and the uncertainty of their achievement (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983). Therefore, the actions of organizations are not only the result of their strategies of action, but above all the result of institutional ties between participants in value creation processes (stakeholders) within different institutional logics. This means that different participants in exchange processes, regardless of their role and place in value creation processes, can act according to the same or different institutional logics, which, according to many authors, is, for example, the reason for entering cooperative relations or is the reason for competitive behavior. For example, the presence of strong institutional norms or state policies can reduce resistance to competitiveness and encourage market actors to form alliances and partnerships (Thornton et al., 2012a)

3. Areas of application of the concept of institutional logics

The concept of institutional logic has evolved over the years - from a macro-social perspective to an organizational and micro-social level. Today, it is used in economics, management, marketing, and entrepreneurship. It is also discussed in other disciplines, such as sociology and psychology or political science (Cervi, Christopoulos, 2024). The concept and creation of the foundations of institutional logic dates to the early 1990s, when the first classifications and research programs were created. Already in 1949, Selznick expressed the view that institutions have their values and identities that influence their decisions, contesting the neoclassical rationality of economic decision-making (Selznick, 1949). In 1977, Meyer and Rowan drew attention to the fact that organizations adopt structured norms and myths to maintain their legitimacy and are not guided only by efficiency considerations. They also pointed to the role of the legitimization factor in the convergence of organizational structures and behaviors (Meyer, Rowan, 1977). A breakthrough in this respect was the publication by DiMaggio and Powell in 1983, analyzing the causes and process of organizations becoming like each other. They specified three types of institutional isomorphism (coercive, mimetic, and normative) (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983). In 1991, Friedland and Alford defined institutional logic as a set of cultural beliefs and rules that determine decision-making processes at the macro-social level (e.g. state, market, family, religion). Institutional logic was considered to be competing belief systems that shape the way individuals and organizations act. (Friedland, 1991). Thornton and Ocasio made a major contribution to the operationalization of the concept, developing the concept of institutional logic for many years in many areas, such as leadership and corporate governance (Thornton, Ocasio, 1999) or the determinants of companies' strategic decisions (Thornton, 2004; Thornton et al., 2012a). In the following years, the concept of institutional logic was formalized and research on complexity, how organizations navigate and cope in the face of conflict between different logics and how to combine different logics within the framework of their activities was deepened (Greenwood et al., 2011; Lounsbury et al., 2021; Thornton et al., 2012b). The concept of institutional logics has been used and studied in many disciplines (Cervi, Christopoulos, 2024; Lounsbury, Wang, 2023; Wu et al., 2023). However, a detailed understanding of how the different elements associated with logic combine or group together to form a coherent and recognizable pattern and how this pattern evolves is still lacking. That is, how the elementary components of logic become collectively shaped to become coherently identifiable and maintained in each social domain.

4. The essence and classification of institutional logic

Various classifications of institutional logics aim to comprehensively capture the mechanisms of the organization's relations with the environment. Research conducted for many years is most often based on several classifications of institutional logics, the most popular of which are:

- Friedland and Alford’s concept referring to the main foundations of social order, such as the state (power and administration), family (social ties) and religion (spiritual values) (DiMaggio et al., 1991, p. 259).
- Scott's concept is based on three pillars that are the basis of legitimization, namely: regulatory (imposition of norms), normative (social pressure) and cultural-cognitive (internal beliefs and values) helps to understand why organizations follow certain logics and how they are implemented and legitimized in organizations (Scott, 1995, 2000).

The concept of Thornton, Ocasio and Loudsbury, which distinguished 7 institutional logics: market, state, professional, community, family, religious, and corporation (Thornton et al., 2012). The most frequently discussed and used concept in research and publications is the last concept of 7 institutional logics, in which several dimensions can be distinguished:

- cultural-cognitive (beliefs and values in the organization),
- normative (standards and professional ethics),
- structural (formal structures, policies, corporate governance, division of power),

- symbolic (symbols and rituals, brand management and marketing communication),
- material (allocation of resources, artefacts and devices used in the organization).

The fundamental element that distinguishes institutional logic from organizational culture is that institutional logic is the rules and norms that regulate the way of acting in each environment. Organizational culture, on the other hand, is the rules, norms and practices that primarily shape the identity and internal behavior of an organization. Organizational culture can be a combination of various institutional logics, which it interprets in a sense. For example, the organizational culture of a university can be a combination of state, market and professional logic. In private universities, market logic prevails, while in public universities, state logic prevails. However, in both situations, there are tensions between these main logics, reinforced on the one hand by legitimization and subordination to norms and on the other hand by a clear signal from the legislator about the need for change and adaptation to international competition in accordance with market logic. The new paradigm of university management initiated by the 2018 higher education reform promotes strong organizations based on strong leadership, hierarchical structures, efficiency, standardization and accountability. However, it leaves the decisive voice to the regulator and state authorities, which causes numerous tensions in both types of universities. (Urbanek, 2020, p. 105). In turn, family businesses have been dominated for many years by family logic, which is based on family ties, loyalty and personal relationships, which increasingly often come into conflict with market logic focused on efficiency, competition and profit maximization. The effect of this is, among others, the search for formal solutions for ensuring succession and protecting material and social resources related to the activities of such entities.

The relations of an organization with its environment may have a different nature. For many years, the traditional approach in strategic management, where the so-called environmental factors were pointed out, has been evolving towards an institutional and more subjective approach. The effect of this is the division of the environment into institutions in the form of organized entities and units with specific resources, e.g. intellectual or technological, and institutions in the sense of formal and informal norms and rules of action. An example of combining various research and conceptual approaches is the stakeholder theory developing towards stakeholder relationship management, referring to relationship marketing, resource theory and transaction cost theory (Bourne, 2016; Freeman et al., 2004; Plichta ed., 2022). Stakeholder theory allows for enriching the concept of institutional logic with research on the relationships between various logics and building relationships with stakeholders. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that institutional logic, or rather their combination, affects stakeholder relations. Most importantly, each market entity, not only the organized one, should operate according to a specific combination of institutional logics.

The concept of institutional logic can be identified with the concept of an organizational field, which is defined as a group of organizations that interact and function within a common institutional environment, including regulators, competitors, customers, suppliers, and professional associations. While the organizational field is shaped by external influences, such as legal regulations, professional norms or economic pressures, institutional logic defines the "rules of the game" in the organizational field (Wooten, Hoffman, 2017). An example is banking institutions, which for many years were guided by state logic based on legal regulations, government policy, and public interest, which were characterized primarily by transparency, responsibility, and compliance with the law. With globalization, they began to apply on an increasingly large-scale market and corporate logic focused on profit, efficiency and expansion strategy. In turn, the entry of new entities representing new business models based on new communication and information technologies into the education sector, offering e.g. remote learning, introduced market logic, changing the image of the education sector. In each organizational field, different institutional logics can compete, co-exist, and combine. In the health care system, professional logic (medical ethics) can clash with market logic (hospital profitability). In universities, state logic (public financing) coexists with market logic (tuition fees, rankings).

Institutional logics are dynamic and may change over time, for example, due to regulatory pressure resulting from the implementation of sustainable development policies, technological progress, or social movements that force producers to adopt a pro-ecological orientation. Tensions between logic within an organization, e.g. in the form of protests and strikes or in stakeholder relations, can cause conflicts and change the organization itself and the structure of the organizational field. Managers play an important role in solving them and adapting various institutional logics. In 2019, research conducted among 1000 managers of public sector organizations in the United States on the adaptation of organizations to climate change indicates that the effectiveness of this adaptation depends on the interaction between institutional logics at the macro level (government authority, professionalism and the market) and the meso level (risk-based logic and capability-based logic). The presence of distinct organizational configurations suggests that not all organizations respond to climate threats to the same extent. Only the group of pioneers (adapted to climate change) demonstrates effective adaptation. The study results highlight the crucial role of top managers in integrating competing logics to improve climate resilience (Zhang, Welch, 2023).

5. Institutional logic of customer relationship management

The fundamental element of shaping stakeholder relations in the organizational field is marketing. Despite the existence of a well-known canon of marketing instruments, each organization can shape it within the framework of various action strategies, which, according to the considerations presented so far, should be consistent with a specific institutional logic or their combination. This assumption indicates the role of institutional logic in fulfilling expectations and methods of interaction with stakeholder groups to achieve their own strategic and operational goals. For example, companies guided by market logic focus on relations with investors and maximizing profits, while organizations operating according to community logic focus on social involvement and relations with local communities. Patients expect relationships based on expert knowledge and ethics from entities operating according to professional logic, e.g. doctors, which means building trust and complying with ethical norms. It can be hypothesized that, to build relationships within a given institutional logic, both parties to the relationship should act in the same logic, or it should be dominant. Within a given organization and thus in relations with various stakeholders, hybrid logic may exist, e.g., doctors are guided by professional logic (professional ethics, expert knowledge), but at the same time, hospitals may be managed in a market-oriented manner (cost-effectiveness, competition).

Customer relationship management is a marketing concept and practice that has been developed over many years, the idea of which is based on creating and co-creating values that lead to building trust and credibility between the parties to the relationship. It has been adapted to the field of cooperative relations between stakeholders, using instruments developed by marketing. However, it is currently most widely used in the B2B and B2C markets in customer relationship management. To implement the above values, CRM systems should, within their properties and purpose, implement many functions and tasks that affect the value delivered to customers, such as customer data management, marketing and sales process automation, task planning and coordination, reporting, data security, customer service, or personalization. Nevertheless, trust, credibility, and reputation are key values that build long-term relationships (Sztompka, 2007).

In relationships, we deal with a whole bundle of values. The most famous are the concepts of Schwarz, Rokeach, Mitchel (VALS) and Kahl (LOV) (Payne, Holt, 2001; Sagan, 2011). By synthesizing the basic functions of CRM systems and value structures, we can indicate several groups of values that shape effective relationships with customers (AB Carroll, 1991; Cropanzano, Mitchell, 2005; Hofstede, 2001):

- relational (social) values – based on trust, loyalty and emotional commitment,
- economic values based on material benefits and reciprocity and fairness of exchange,
- normative values – based on honesty, transparency, and corporate social responsibility,
- Cognitive values – based on knowledge and competences, increasing shared experience and learning, as well as innovation and adaptation to the client,
- Cultural values – aimed at adapting to client values and intercultural sensitivity.

Based on the analysis of the values delivered to customers in the customer relationship management process and the general characteristics of various institutional logics, it is easy to see that they are closely interconnected (Table 1).

Table 1.
Human values as a link between institutional logic and systems of CRM

Institutional logic	Value Group	Example of a relationship with CRM systems
Market	Economical	Customer segmentation is based on economic value, enabling the delivery of personalised offers, discounts, and promotions.
Professional	Cognitive	CRM system adapted to manage expert knowledge, e.g., in hospitals and law firms.
Community	Relational	CRM supports loyalty programs and activities based on building a community around the brand.
Corporate	Economic and normative	CRM that optimizes sales processes, monitors employee performance, and automates KPI analyses.
State/Bureaucratic	Normative	CRM that ensures regulatory compliance, e.g. customer data protection in line with GDPR.
Enterprising	Cognitive, Economic	CRM supports the analysis of market trends and personalization of services for dynamic start-ups.
Missionary/Community	Normative, Relational	CRM focused on social engagement and building relationships with donors and volunteers.

Source: own study.

It should be emphasized that the building of relationships with customers may differ significantly depending on their preferences and value structures. This also applies to differences resulting from B2B and B2C relationships. Similarly, just as the existence of transaction costs is not limited to inter- and intraorganizational relationships, institutional logics are not the domain of organizations, but also of individual market entities. Therefore, the effectiveness and efficiency of relationships with customers depend on the recognition and operationalization of institutional logics both within a given organization and among customers. This means that it is necessary to introduce criteria into segmentation variables that allow for the identification of attitudes and behaviors toward individual logics. Community logic will probably be more a feature of customers who value long-term relationships and brand loyalty, and those who buy ecological products and support local communities, while professional logic will be more characteristic of customers who value specialist knowledge, expert recommendations, and individual service. A consequence of the segmentation process is the need to develop marketing strategies that consider the adopted segmentation criteria that refer to the basic institutional logics.

6. Proposal for methodology

Both in marketing literature and institutional research, there is a growing shift from functional understandings of market segmentation toward approaches that incorporate deeper motivations and the cultural frameworks within which consumers operate. In response to this trend and the triangulation of the research process, this study proposes a methodology that integrates the perspective of institutional logics with operational tools of market segmentation and customer relationship management (CRM). It is assumed that consumers differ not only in terms of demographic characteristics or lifestyle but also function within distinct institutional logics, that is, normative and symbolic structures that influence how they understand values, evaluate brands, and form expectations toward relationships with organizations.

The starting point for designing the research model is the recognition that institutional logic is present both on the side of the consumer and the organization (brand). The consumer's logic constitutes an independent variable that shapes their expectations toward the company, while the logic represented by the brand, manifested through marketing communication, CRM activities, and organizational identity, serves as the second independent variable. A key element of the model is the mediating variable, such as logic congruence, understood as the perceived alignment between the organization's values and actions and the consumer's internal beliefs. This congruence influences the consumer's level of engagement with the brand, which in turn leads to increased trust and both declaration and actual loyalty. The model also includes moderating variables, such as the consumer's involvement with the product category and the broader cultural and demographic context.

The proposed methodology follows a sequential combination of qualitative and quantitative research. The initial phase involves content analysis and conceptual mapping based on a systematic literature review. Relevant publications from the fields of relationship marketing, institutional management, and research on consumer values and segmentation are analyzed. Based on this analysis and using appropriate software tools, researchers can code institutional logics (market, bureaucratic, communal, mission, professional, entrepreneurial), associate them with segmentation variables (e.g., price/value, community, ethics, professional quality), and identify corresponding CRM tools (e.g., loyalty programs, co-creation platforms, expert recommendations). In the next step, conceptual maps are created based on the content analysis of academic articles, marketing strategies, customer communication, etc., to visualize connections between logics, segments, and relationship tools. These maps allow for the identification of recurring configurations and relationships, which are then formulated into a theoretical model.

The qualitative phase also includes in-depth interviews (IDIs) with marketing experts, company representatives, and consumers. These interviews aim to validate the identified logics, explore their interpretation in the context of everyday consumer choices, and collect language and examples useful for constructing research instruments. Based on the gathered data, survey questionnaires for the quantitative phase are developed. These should include measurement scales for all model variables, including consumer logic, logic congruence, brand trust, loyalty, and moderating factors. The study should be conducted among respondents from the B2C sector. After exploratory factor analysis (EFA), the data should undergo confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), followed by testing of structural relationships using structural equation modelling (SEM). This methodology allows not only empirical testing of theoretical assumptions concerning the role of institutional logics in marketing but also for practical application, particularly in developing CRM systems and market segmentation strategies that reflect the cultural-normative conditions of target audiences. As a result, organizations can not only tailor their offers and communications better but also build stronger customer relationships based on shared values, leading to greater trust, engagement, and long-term loyalty.

7. Conclusions and future research

The concept of institutional logic has been developed in many areas for over 30 years. However, both its basic assumptions and its possibility of application in management sciences require further conceptual and research work. The advantage of this concept is its universal nature, reaching the essence of exchange processes, which allows for a holistic approach to this problem. Based on the analysis of selected publications and own research on institutional processes in the field of marketing, the hypotheses put forward in the text about the possibility and need to apply this concept in this area can be positively verified. The evolution of the marketing concept toward value marketing and social and relational marketing is in line with the direction of research on various institutional logics. As shown, the original concept of institutional logic referring to organizations should take into account the broader context of value creation processes in the vertical (value creation chains) and horizontal (management of relationships with stakeholders) systems, and in particular with customers. They also act, like other participants in value creation processes, according to specific institutional logics. Therefore, it is possible to indicate the connections between institutional logic and activities in the field of customer relationship management and with the characteristics of segments and target groups. This means that it is necessary to introduce criteria into the segmentation variables that allow for the identification of attitudes and behaviours towards individual logics.

Table 2 presents hypothetical examples of market segments developed based on the characteristics of individual institutional logics in connection with selected market strategies (Table 2).

Table 2.
Institutional logic as a link between market segmentation and market strategies

Market segment	Institutional logic	Compatibility with traditional market strategies
Economic rationalists	Market	Cost advantage strategy (Porter) - minimize costs and increase efficiency.
Experts and professional users	Professional	Qualitative differentiation strategy (Porter) - emphasize unique features and high quality.
Socially engaged	Missionary and community	Social marketing (Kotler) - communication of social and ethical values.
Innovation leaders	Entrepreneurial	Innovation leadership strategy (Kotler) – creating new trends, unique offers.
Loyal relational customers	Community/Missionary	Relationship marketing (Grönroos) – building long-term relationships with customers.
Transactional	Market/Corporate	Market penetration strategy (Ansoff) – mass advertising and aggressive expansion.

Source: own study.

This indicates a great opportunity to enrich the current market segmentation methodology and to better link it with the marketing strategy and the strategy of the entire organization. Analysis of the institutional logic according to which a given organization operates in relations with other entities increases the possibility of greater compliance between the image, identity, and reputation of the organization, which can ensure its more sustainable development.

Research on the application of the concept of institutional logic in marketing is in its early stages. The hypotheses presented in the text require empirical verification. The research program should cover both the sphere of external relations and internal relations of the organization, as various institutional logics connects both areas. This also opens a new area of research on factors that shape the relationships between stakeholders and in network systems. Several main directions for further research in this area are indicated, namely greater exposure of values, the importance and practical application of this concept, and the possibilities of managing logic and institutional order (Lounsbury et al., 2021, p. 267).

Acknowledgements

„The publication/article presents the results of the Project financed from the subsidy grant to the Krakow University of Economics”.

References

1. Anam, M.S. et al. (2024). New Institutional Economics: Bibliometric analysis and future research directions. *Indonesian Journal of Economics, Social, and Humanities, 6(2),* 177-192.
2. Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley.
3. Bourne, L. (2016). *Stakeholder relationship management: A maturity model for organizational implementation.* Routledge.
4. Bruhn, M., Saleschus, M., Hadwich, K. (2024). Theoretical Foundation of Customer-Dominant Logic. In: M. Bruhn, M. Saleschus, K. Hadwich (Eds.), *Customer-Dominant Logic: Customer-Dominant Management as a New Target in Relationship Marketing* (pp. 51-72). Springer Fachmedien. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-45352-7_3
5. Brzeziński , M., Gorynia, M., Hockuba, Z. (2008). Economics and other social sciences at the beginning of the 21st century. Between imperialism and cooperation. *Ekonomist, 2,* 201-232.

6. Bundy, J., Vogel, R.M., Zachary, M.A. (2018). Organization–stakeholder fit: A dynamic theory of cooperation, compromise, and conflict between an organization and its stakeholders. *Strategic Management Journal, 39(2),* 476-501. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2736
7. Carroll, A.B. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Morai Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons, 34(4),* 39-48.
8. Carroll, G.R., Teece, D.J. (1999). *Firms, Markets and Hierarchies: The Transaction Cost Economics Perspective.* Oxford University Press.
9. Cervi, F., Christopoulos, T.P. (2024). Dynamics of institutional sustainability logics in organizations: A systematic literature review. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR, 22(2),* e2023-0086. https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395120230086x
10. Chung, C.-N., Luo, X. (2008). Institutional Logics or Agency Costs: The Influence of Corporate Governance Models on Business Group Restructuring in Emerging Economies. *Organization Science, 19(5),* 766-784.
11. Coase, R.H. (1937). The Nature of the Firm. *Economica, 4(16),* 386-405.
12. Cropanzano, R., Mitchell, M.S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management, 31(6),* 874-900.
13. DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review, 48(2),* 147-160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101
14. DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. et al. (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis (Vol. 17).* University of Chicago Press Chicago, IL.
15. Dobler, C. (2011). Institutions – an empirical approach. In: The Impact of Formal and Informal Institutions on Economic Growth (pp. 61-122). NED-New edition. Peter Lang AG. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv9hj8zr.8
16. Ferreira, M.P., Pinto, C.F., Serra, F.R. (2014). The transaction costs theory in international business research: A bibliometric study over three decades. *Scientometrics, 98*, 1899-1922.
17. Fiedor, B., Hockuba, Z. (Eds.) (2009). *Economic sciences in the face of contemporary challenges*. Polish Society Economical.
18. Foxall, G. (1997). *Marketing psychology: The paradigm in the wings*. Springer.
19. Freeman, R.E., Wicks, A.C., Parmar, B. (2004). Stakeholder Theory and "The Corporate Objective Revisited". *Organization Science, 15(3),* 364-369. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0066
20. Friedland, R. (1991). *Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, 232-263.
21. Gorynia, M. (1998). *Behavior of enterprises in the transformation period. Microeconomics of transition.* Poznań University of Economics.

22. Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E.R., Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals, 5(1),* 317-371.
23. Grönroos, C., Voima, P. (2013). Critical service logic: Making sense of value creation and co-creation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 41(2),* 133-150.
24. Hodgson, G.M. (2010). Limits of transaction cost analysis. The Elgar Companion to Transaction Cost Economics. Cheltenham, UK/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 297-306.
25. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage publications.
26. Jensen, M.C., Meckling, W.H. (1979). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. In: *Economics social institutions* (pp. 163-231). Springer.
27. Jonassen, C.T. (1959). Contributions of Sociology to Marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 24(2),* 29-35. https://doi.org/10.2307/1248844
28. Kahneman, D., Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values, and frames. *American Psychologist, 39(4)*, 341.
29. Kotler, P. (2020). Marketing and value creation. *Journal of Creating Value, 6(1),* 10-11.
30. Lee, N., Broderick, A.J., Chamberlain, L. (2007). What is 'neuromarketing'? A discussion and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Psychophysiology, 63(2),* 199-204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2006.03.007
31. Li, T. (2024). The joint effects of formal and informal institutions on entrepreneurial startups: A global perspective. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2024.2354667
32. Lounsbury, M., Steele, C.W.J., Wang, M.S., Toubiana, M. (2021). New Directions in the Study of Institutional Logics: From Tools to Phenomena. *Annual Review of Sociology, 47(1),* 261-280. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-090320-111734
33. Lounsbury, M., Wang, M.S. (2023). Expanding the Scope of Institutional Logics Research. *Management and Organization Review, 19(6),* 1185-1188. https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2023.24
34. Martins, R., Serra, F., Leite, A., Ferreira, M.P., Li, D. (2010). *Transactions Cost Theory influence in strategy research: A review through a bibliometric study in leading journals*. globADVANTAGE - Center of Research in International Business & Strategy.
35. Menard, C., Shirley, M.M. (Eds.) (2005). *Handbook of New Institutional Economics*. Springer Nature. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/b106770
36. Messiah, C. (2006). Review of theoretical concepts of corporate governance. *Scientific Papers, 700.* Cracow University of Economics, 47-62.
37. Meyer, J.W., Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83(2),* 340-363.
38. Nabhan, F., Waluyo, A., Ferdinand, A.T. (2024). *The Important Role of Network Value Alignment (Nva) in Improving Marketing Performance: Perspective of Service-Dominant*

Logic Theory (SSRN Scholarly Paper 5072839). Social Science Research Network. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5072839
39. North, D.C. (1990a). Cooperation: The theoretical problem. In: *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (pp. 11-16). Cambridge University Press (CUP). http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511808678.004
40. North, D.C. (1990b). *Institutions, institutional change, and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
41. Ostrom, E. (1998). A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address. *American Political Science Review, 92(01).* American Political Science Association, 1-22.
42. Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *Transnational Corporations Review, 2(2),* 1-12.
43. Payne, A., Holt, S. (2001). Diagnosing Customer Value: Integrating the Value Process and Relationship Marketing. *British Journal of Management, 12(2),* 159-182. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00192
44. Plichta J. (ed.) (2022). *Key tools and elements of the co-management concept in building cooperative relationships with stakeholders*. http://www.attyka.net.pl/pl/p/Kluczowe-narzedzia-i-elementy-koncepcji-co-management-w-budowaniu-relacji-kooperacyjnych-z-interesariuszami/125
45. Plichta, J. (2019a). Transaction costs in the processes of co-creation of value by consumers. *Scientific Papers. Special Series, Monographs, 264*. Cracow University of Economics.
46. Plichta, J. (2019b). Measurement of transaction costs-different approaches and research perspective. *Ekonomista, 3,* 291-320.
47. Ponte, D., Pesci, C. (2022). Institutional logics and organizational change: The role of place and time. *Journal of Management and Governance, 26(3),* 891-924.
48. Richter, R. (2001). New economic sociology and new institutional economics. In: *Essays on New Institutional Economics* (pp. 51-75). Springer.
49. Sagan, A. (Ed.). (2011). *Customer Value in Market Systems*. Krakow University of Economics Publishing House.
50. Scott, W.R. (1995). *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
51. Scott, W.R. (2000). *Institutional Change and Healthcare Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care*. University of Chicago Press. https://books.google.pl/books?id=vomaHpFVcOAC
52. Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the Grass Roots (Vol. 3).*
53. Shaner, M.B., Bush, V., Parajuli, J. (2024). Marketing under pressure: Improvisation as an instrumental process for change. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice,* 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2024.2446154

54. Simon, H.A. (1990). Bounded Rationality. In: J. Eatwell, M. Milgate, P. Newman (Eds.), *Utility and Probability* (pp. 15-18). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
55. Stone, A. (1986). The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting. By Williamson Oliver E. New York: Free Press, p. 450, \textdollar27.95. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev., 80(04),* 1424-1425. https://doi.org/10.1017/s000305540018596x
56. Sztompka, P. (2007). *Trust. The Foundation of Society*. Sign.
57. Thornton, P.H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Stanford University Press.
58. Thornton, P.H., Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional Logics and the Historical Contingency of Power in Organizations: Executive Succession in the Higher Education Publishing Industry, 1958-1990. *American Journal of Sociology, 105(3),* 801-843. https://doi.org/10.1086/210361
59. Thornton, P.H., Ocasio, W., Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford University Press.
60. Urbanek, P. (2020). The evolution of institutional logic in the reformed higher education system in Poland. Economy National. *The Polish Journal of Economics, 302(2),* 95-122.
61. Vargas-Hernandez, J.G., Vargas-Gonzàlez, O.C., Vargas-Hernandez, J.G., Vargas-Gonzàlez, O.C. (1 CE, January 1). *Socio-Organizational Structure and Institutional Logics* [Chapter]. https://Services.Igi-Global.Com/Resolvedoi/Resolve.Aspx?Doi=10.4018/979-8-3693-1155-4.Ch004. IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1155-4.ch004
62. Vargo, S.L., Akaka , M.A. (2009). Service-Dominant Logic as a Foundation for Service Science: Clarifications. *Service Science, 1(1),* 32-41.
63. Vargo, S.L., Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 68(1),* 1-17.
64. Veblen, T. (2017). *The theory of the leisure class*. Routledge.
65. Williamson, C.R. (2009). Informal Institutions Rule: Institutional Arrangements and Economic Performance. *Public Choice, 139(3/4),* 371-387.
66. Williamson, O.E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism*. Simon and Schuster.
67. Williamson, O.E. (1993). Calculativeness, Trust, and Economic Organization. *The Journal of Law & Economics, 36(1),* 453-486.
68. Wooten, M., Hoffman, A.J. (2017). *Organizational fields: Past, present and future*. The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism, 55-74.
69. Wu, X., Tan, X., Wang, X. (2023). The institutional logics perspective in management and organizational studies. *Journal of Business Research, 167*, 114183.
70. Zhang, F., Welch, E.W. (2023). Explaining Public Organization Adaptation to Climate Change: Configurations of Macro- and Meso-Level Institutional Logics. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 33(2),* 357-374. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muac027