

Institutional logics and organizations in the Brazilian context: possible contributions and in search of an eclectic, ecumenical, and syncretic research agenda

Lógicas institucionais e organizações no contexto brasileiro: contribuições possíveis e em busca de uma agenda de pesquisa eclética, ecumênica e sincrética

Samir Adamoglu de Oliveira, João Marcelo Crubellate, and Luciano Rossoni

Introduction

[...] institutional logics reclaimed rationality as a differentiated set of types of reason (Suddaby, 2023, p. 516).

This special issue of RECADM¹ stems from a call for papers addressing institutional logics and organizations within the Brazilian context, leveraging the potential of the cultural lens inherent in this perspective (Adamoglu de Oliveira, Crubellate & Rossoni, 2022; Friedland & Mohr, 2004; Haveman & Gualtieri, 2017; Hinings, 2012; Thornton, 2015; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, 2015). We perceive this is a promising avenue for rejuvenating locally grounded Organizational Studies. Various research topics were proposed, and numerous possibilities for institutional analyses were explored. In this sense, the articles featured in this issue identify, explore, and explain the interplay between specific institutional logics and individuals, practices, organizations, and societal concerns, underscoring multi-level mechanisms and impacts within our national milieu.

The institutional logics perspective has witnessed substantial growth over the past two decades (Jupille & Caporaso, 2022; Valentino, 2021; Wu, Tan & Wang, 2023), with indications of further expansion within the domain of Management and Organization Studies (MOS). This is evidenced by the burgeoning array of institutional logics mapped and debated across various social landscapes, the observed dynamics among these logics, and the organizational responses they elicit, whether in entrenched Western capitalist economies or emerging economies (Haveman, Joseph-Goteiner & Li, 2023; Raynard & Greenwood, 2023). Consequently, the contributions of the papers in this issue align with this trajectory of expansion, offering studies that encapsulate contexts from the Global South, thus augmenting the substantial corpus of scholarly literature emanating from the Global North.

¹ We extend our gratitude to the numerous authors who submitted their articles for this special issue, as well as to the diligent reviewers who offered critically constructive feedback to enrich the texts included herein.


Article was invited in: 04/01/2024
 Reviewed in: 27/03/2024
 Approved in: 31/03/2024



Samir Adamoglu de Oliveira ,


Federal University of Paraíba, Brazil.
 Ph.D. in Management, Federal University of Paraná, Brazil.

samir.oliveira@academico.ufpb.br

João Marcelo Crubellate ,

Maringá State University, Brazil.
 Ph.D. in Management, São Paulo School of Business Administration, Getúlio Vargas Foundation, Brazil.

jmcrubellate@uem.br

Luciano Rossoni ,

University of Brasília, Brazil.
 Ph.D. in Management, Federal University of Paraná, Brazil.

lrossoni@unb.br

In their seminal formulation, Friedland and Alford (1991) posited a non-deterministic conception of society comprised of subsectors, which they termed institutional orders within an interinstitutional system. By introducing the notion of institutional logics, the authors sought to challenge the assumption prevalent among structural-functionalists of a general congruence of values in society – a notion imported by Institutional Theory over preceding decades. They argued that institutionalized practices could derive from a spectrum of values, even conflicting ones (David, Tolbert & Boghossian, 2019). By reinstating the significance of values – including contradictory ones – society (and its cultural substrate) would be reintegrated into institutional analysis, thereby broadening the scope of scholarly inquiry to encompass the heterogeneity of cultural meaning, and how it varies comparatively across institutional orders (Friedland, 2017; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2015). Thus, the institutional logics perspective diversified institutional rationalities, dismantling essentialist notions that dichotomize “[...] the rational and the non-rational, the technical and the cultural, the material and the ideal.” (Friedland, 2012, p. 585)

The strength of this contribution lies in acknowledging that the diversity inherent in heterogeneity can engender novelties within the interstices and adjacencies of existing frameworks, although the production of the new within a particular domain is invariably constrained by the “topology of the possible” delineated by other realms (Jupille & Caporaso, 2022, p. 68). Nevertheless, since no logic operates in isolation (the multiple logics interact with each other or, at least, coexist, albeit not always harmoniously), each logic can be more easily sustained and replicated to the extent that they complement one another within networks of enabling externalities while contradictions in the interinstitutional sphere carve out spaces for agency (Ocasio, Thornton & Lounsbury, 2017; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). Therefore, it is the modular nature of institutional logics that fosters agency.

As stated by Friedland (2012, p. 587), the “[...] ‘modularity’ of an institutional logic’s components – its cognitive frames, its identities, its values, its practices – allows them to be segregated, transposed, and combined.” Thus, it is the ability to draw upon references from various sources and to reshape action frames around – or from – institutional fragments (Jupille & Caporaso, 2022). Given that institutional pluralism – i.e., the diversity of variably complementary institutional logics that facilitate cooperation or competition (Ocasio, Thornton & Lounsbury, 2017) – is inherent to the social dimension of reality, this modularity entitles agency and entails a certain “configurational plasticity” wherein elements of institutional logics blend, reconcile, and interchange in virtually limitless ways (Friedland, 2012, p. 588).

These elucidations provide a framework for understanding the texts within this special issue, which illuminate the influences of the institutional logics under scrutiny, resonating with themes such as hybridisms and institutional ramifications across various fields, without reducing these effects solely to the constituent elements of the logics being examined. This is because, as institutional analysis clarifies, while it may be possible to decompose institutions to a certain extent, it is never entirely feasible (Scott, 2014; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). Let us now proceed to present the texts comprising this issue.

Contributions of the articles in the special issue

The articles in this special issue delve deeper into topics akin to those previously discussed, exploring the relationships between specific institutional logics, organizations, and fields, while elucidating mechanisms, and discussing their multi-level impacts. This issue comprises five articles that scrutinize institutional logics, treating it both as a conceptual framework (i.e., a subject of inquiry within our scholarly domain) and as an empirical object (i.e., a phenomenon). Below, we provide succinct summaries of these articles.

Opening the roster of articles featured in the special issue, we are honored to present an unpublished manuscript from one of the main authors in the field of institutional logics perspective. Roger Friedland and his collaborator Diane-Laure Arjaliès were generous in accepting our invitation, furnishing an original essay that significantly enriches our special issue. Entitled “Speaking for human being: Institutional logics, dragons, and the supra-human,” Friedland and Arjaliès (2024, this issue) endeavor to invigorate the institutional logics perspective and institutional analysis itself, addressing some of the recurrent criticism leveled against them in recent years. In this regard, the authors confront four critiques frequently directed not only at the institutional logics perspective but also at Institutional Theory. These encompass: allegations of tautology within the institutional logics perspective, concerns regarding the scope of institutionalist explanation as a whole, the lack of attention to ‘power dynamics’ within institutional analysis, and, stemming from the latter, the purported uncritical nature of the institutional logics perspective and institutional analysis in general. By boldly addressing these issues, they not only mount a robust defense of the institutional logics perspective but also, through a nuanced exploration of its essence and explanatory boundaries, provide insights to refine it as a theory and contemporary institutional analysis practice.

Here we encounter a compelling text, replete with insightful arguments, and reflective of the authors’ distinctive style², as they endeavor to enlighten the community of institutional analysts that certain issues (or problems) are, in philosophical and scientific terms,³ indeed “non-issues” or “non-problems”.

² Remarkably, Roger Friedland’s anti-dualist stance, prominent in his body of work, showcases remarkable versatility, allowing him to engage with pertinent intellectual references from diverse realms of Social Sciences and Contemporary Social Theory. Friedland’s ability to immanentize a category usually associated with the transcendent realm, such as social institutions, without, however, discarding/emptying its transcendent aspect, vividly illustrates this trait. The idea that institutional substances – a concept distinctively emphasized in his work – serve as ‘causes beyond causes,’ ‘transcendent grounds of immanence,’ ‘non-theistic deities,’ imbues the concept of institutions with almost religious undertones, ultimately characterizing the institutionalist viewpoint – and, specifically, the institutional logics perspective – as a “[...] religious sociology of practice.” This insight offers profound enlightenment for those seeking to grasp the role, importance, and impacts of institutions on civilizational and societal matters.

³ Most notably, the 3rd and 4th criticisms expounded upon in Friedland and Arjaliès (2024, this issue) merit attention. It is striking to contemplate the persistent recurrence of these two questions; from Weber (1972/2009) to Drori (2020), throughout the extensive discussion on ‘power’ already found in Dornbusch and Scott (1975) – the latter predating even the classic *Frameworks of Power* by Clegg (1989/2023) – it seems opportune to bring a closure to this issue, which has been exhaustively revisited in the debates between institutionalists and non-institutionalists in Management and Organization Studies (MOS).

We extend our gratitude to Friedland and Arjaliès for granting us permission to publish their work in Portuguese, following a meticulous linguistic and scientific review to ensure that their terms, concepts, and arguments remain unaltered by translation concerns. Being able to offer content of such caliber and significance in a manner accessible to our readership enriches the landscape of Brazilian institutionalist scholars while facilitating the dissemination of the institutional logics perspective within our country.

Subsequently, in “The declared and the undeclared in the manifestation of institutional logics: A study of theater practice in a cultural organization,” by Garcia and Matitz (2024, this issue), we encounter an empirical study centered on culture and institutional logics within a theater organization in Rio Grande do Sul. Through a comprehensive qualitative inquiry encompassing ethnographic data, interviews, and document analysis, the second article in our special issue aims to elucidate how a cultural organization cultivates theater practices grounded in the enculturation of institutional logics. Indeed, the authors unveil the emergence of the ‘Logic of Interior Theater’ as a result of the recursive process of enculturation of institutional elements within organizational practices. They elucidate that this process unfolds on both declared (intentional) and undeclared (unintentional) levels, wherein cultural elements are cognitively assimilated, encoded, stored, and later externalized at the social level. Through language, a community can disseminate and negotiate meanings, thereby rendering an institutional logic that is distinctive and adaptable to broader contexts. This occurs as practices intersect with diverse logics, reshaping meanings and engendering new interpretative schemes that are collectively embraced. Thus, this article unpacks themes such as the significance of cognitive patterns, culture as shared frameworks of meaning, and the interplay between materiality and meanings within institutional logics.

The forthcoming article, authored by Santos (2024, this issue), titled “Institutional logics in the reform of Brazilian federal professional education: Historical narrative of the present time (1993-2018),” unveils the institutional logics guiding Brazil’s federal professional education through the lens of regulatory transformations spanning from 1993 to 2018. Employing a historical-hermeneutic approach, the author weaves a narrative from legislative enactments (deemed as the primary data source), historicizing professional education within Brazilian public administration. Indeed, Santos identify a sociocultural logic termed ‘Bachelorism vs. Technicalism’ intersecting the institutional logics of ‘State’ and ‘Market’ prevalent in this domain. By tracing the institutional-legal shifts across various government regimes, the study illustrates how each administration, to varying extents, fostered the emergence and evolution of this logic. Thus, this historical inquiry elucidates the emergence and endurance of institutional logics amidst a major social challenge in Brazil – the reform of education, certainly – an issue of paramount importance that also reveals contradictions and tensions between logics.

Advancing further, Bueno, Kruly and Santos (2024, this issue) present their study “Institutional logics in organizational studies: What do national surveys show?” providing a timely and comprehensive snapshot of the state of research on institutional logics within the realms of Brazilian Public Administration and Business, Accounting, and Tourism. Through

a bibliometric analysis of 33 articles, the authors delineate the distinct features of Brazilian Organizational Studies utilizing the institutional logics perspective, identifying both traditional logics (drawn from classical studies) and emergent logics (theorized from their own investigations) prevalent in the Brazilian organizational context, indicating trends and research opportunities in the theme. This analysis indicates trends and avenues for further research in the field. Notably, the authors' findings reveal an expansion beyond the original logics posited by Friedland and Alford (1991) and Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012) – namely: religion, family, state, market, democracy, profession, corporation, and community – with studies in Brazil uncovering an additional 16 logics. This proliferation “[...] supports the idea that logics are a complex subject and still have several possibilities for study.” The reflections offered in this study provide valuable insights into the institutional logics perspective, prompting readers to contemplate the trajectory of its adoption within our scholarly community.

We conclude our special issue with another empirical study, authored by Sell and Lavarda (2024, this issue), titled “Hybrid institutional logic and management control system outputs driven by transparency, informational availability and accountability.” Through a qualitative case study conducted in the vice-rectorate unit of a Brazilian public university, the authors examine how hybrid institutional logics influence the outputs of the organization’s management control system. The article elucidates the emergence of the ‘Governmental Management Logic’ as a product of the hybridization between the ‘Bureaucratic’, ‘Professional’, and ‘Market Management’ logics, steering the management control systems outputs towards transparency, informational availability, and accountability in public institutions, mirroring the organization under scrutiny. Topics explored in this article include logic hybridization, tensions within and between institutional logics, governance system logics, and the integration of field logic parameters into local logics. Building upon observations made in the previous article by Bueno, Kruly and Santos (2024, this issue), this research introduces yet another institutional logic specific to the Brazilian organizational context.

In Table 1, we provide a comparative overview of these five articles in terms of their research objectives, methodological approaches, adopted conception of logics, depiction of the organized world where the addressed logics manifest, and a summary of their main contributions.

Table 1: Characterization of Articles in the Special Issue

Author(s) and Title	Empirical Setting	Research Question	Method and Level of Analysis	Logics Conception	Main Contributions
Friedland & Arjaliès <i>Speaking for human being: Institutional logics, dragons, and the supra-human</i>	N/A (not applicable) Essay	To revitalize the institutional logics perspective and institutional analysis itself, addressing criticisms frequently directed towards them in recent years, aiming to clarify and enhance ontological, epistemological, and conceptual issues of the theory.	N/A (not applicable) Multilevel	Theoretical	By addressing four recurring criticisms – (i) the tautological nature of the perspective; (ii) the broad scope of institutionalist explanations; (iii) the omission of ‘power dynamics’ in institutional analysis; and (iv) the resulting uncritical nature of the perspective and institutional analytics itself – this work not only defends the institutional logics perspective but also, through an exploration of its nature and explanatory boundaries, provides insights to refine it and enhance contemporary institutional analysis.
Garcia & Matiz <i>The declared and the undeclared in the manifestation of institutional logics: A study of theater practice in a cultural organization</i>	Cultural organization (a theater)	How a cultural organization develops theater practice through the enculturation of institutional logics.	Qualitative Practices articulating individual and collective instances	Support for investigating/ analyzing a chosen organizational phenomenon, reaching the logic as an interinstitutional phenomenon in itself	This work presents the ‘Logic of Rural Theater,’ derived from the recursive process of enculturating institutional elements within organizational practices. It occurs through practices that amalgamate diverse logics – ‘Amateur,’ ‘Modernist,’ and ‘Professional’ –thereby transforming meanings and fostering new collectively shared interpretative frameworks.
Santos <i>Institutional logics in the reform of Brazilian federal professional education: Historical narrative of the present time (1993-2018)</i>	Brazilian Federal Professional Education	How government regulatory shifts reveal the institutional logics guiding federal professional education from 1993 to 2018.	Qualitative Organizational field	Support for investigating/ analyzing a chosen social/institutional phenomenon	This analysis identifies a sociocultural logic termed ‘Bachelorism vs. Technicalism’ that intersects with the ‘State’ and ‘Market’ institutional logics, illustrating how various governments during the period have fostered this logic to varying degrees and extents.
Bueno, Kruly & Santos <i>Institutional logics in organizational studies: What do national surveys show?</i>	Academic field (Brazilian Public Administration and Business, Accounting, and Tourism areas)	To analyze studies published in national journals guided by the institutional logics perspective.	Bibliometrics N/A (not applicable)	Theme of analysis	This analysis of 33 articles identifies distinct characteristics of Brazilian Organizational Studies employing the institutional logics perspective. It highlights both traditional logics, derived from classic institutional studies, and emergent logics, theorized directly from the research at hand, as they are manifested in the Brazilian organizational context. This work also points to trends and research opportunities within the field.
Sell & Lavarda <i>Hybrid institutional logic and management control system outputs driven by transparency, informational availability and accountability</i>	Public Higher Education Institution (Vice-rectorate of a Federal University)	How hybrid institutional logics drive the outputs of the management control system.	Qualitative Organizational (tactical and operational)	Support for investigating/ analyzing a chosen organizational phenomenon	This analysis presents the ‘Government Managerial Logic’ as emerging from the hybridization of ‘Bureaucratic,’ ‘Professional,’ and ‘Managerial Market Logic.’ This synthesis influences management control systems to enhance transparency, information availability, and accountability within public institutions, as observed in the organization under scrutiny.

Source: Prepared by the authors (2024).

Each of these articles surpasses the concise summaries offered in this introductory essay. Individually and collectively, they highlight a dynamic research agenda that emerges when applying the institutional logics perspective. They present several findings, and we still aim to articulate additional insights to conclude this introductory essay.

Conclusions and future research on the topic

We anticipate that the articles featured in this thematic issue of RECADM will catalyze broader interest in this vibrant perspective of contemporary institutional analysis, inspiring fresh research endeavors that either adopt it directly or engage in fruitful dialogues with it to invigorate the field. Moreover, we also encourage further studies to delve into the institutional logics specific to our Brazilian cultural milieu, whether as intricate inter-institutional phenomena *per se* or as explanatory elements – either antecedent or consequent – of other socio-organizational phenomena. With this enthusiastic anticipation, we now turn to discuss potential avenues for future research on institutional logics and organizations within the Brazilian context. However, before doing so, it seems pertinent to reflect on the current trajectory of this perspective as shaped by the international scholarly agenda.

A few years ago, Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2015) conducted a meta-analytical review indicating that a significant portion of studies within this perspective focused on the ‘Profession’ and ‘Market’ logics. Their findings underscored a trend towards the weakening of professions and the proliferation of market-oriented ideas across various societal domains. Similarly, Valentino (2021) suggests a consensus that the ‘Market’ logic has pervasively permeated contemporary society – often referred to as the “market society,” a concept widely propagated by the media (Frerichs, 2023; Slater & Tonkiss, 2021). In a more recent review, Wu *et al.* (2023) made notable observations. Their study found that much of the research produced within the perspective between 1991 and 2022 focused on examining the effects of a single dominant logic within a given empirical setting, primarily in developed economies. Additionally, they noted a predominance of qualitative methods employed in these investigations. Similar insights are echoed by Pache and Thornton (2021) concerning research on the hybridism of logics, where the literature predominantly leans towards qualitative methods, emphasizing macro-level analyses in their discussions.

In broad terms, **the contemporary research agenda of the international community**⁴ suggests a growing interest in investigations addressing the dynamics of two or more logics competing or hybridizing, with the aim of comprehending their emergence, convergence, and persistence. The objective is to explore and explain the extent to which

⁴ We derived these topics from the international agenda in a non-systematic manner, primarily drawing from recent literature on the theme, notably including works by Friedland and Arjaliès (2024, this issue), Gümüşay, Claus and Amis (2020), Haveman *et al.* (2023), Lounsbury (2023), Lounsbury, Steele, Wang and Toubiana (2021), Lounsbury and Wang (2023), Pache and Thornton (2021), Raynard and Greenwood (2023), Redding (2024), Valentino (2021), and Wu *et al.* (2023). While this list is not exhaustive, the credibility of its authors, who are representative voices within the perspective, lends legitimacy to our presentation.

hybridism occurs or manifests, highlighting the mechanisms involved and probing their modular functioning within the hybridization processes *per se*. This trend reflects a keen interest on heterogeneity in institutional theorization, and a heightened recognition of the premise of pluralism and institutional complexity in organizational fields. Moreover, it also reflects the importance of studying the modularity of logics – i.e., how this “dimmer switch” or “gear shift” between logics occurs – seeking to understand how actors engage with them, navigate between them, or oppose them (if and when necessary) (Glaser, Fast, Harmon & Green, 2016; Jupille & Caporaso, 2022). These mechanisms are pivotal to be highlighted and explained, so we can truly grasp how logics operate, hybridize, articulate, and intertwine. The act of arbitrating when, where, and how to engage/associate with certain logics at the expense of others, urging them forward, is precisely what institutional analysis grounded in the institutional logics perspective seeks to understand (Perkmann, Phillips & Greenwood, 2022), especially because “[...] the conditions under which actors can successfully promote a given logic as a viable competitor to an existing logic, or when actors might subscribe to a logic that is not aligned with their interests [...] remain to be addressed.” (David *et al.*, 2019, p. 12-13)

Furthermore, there is a call for more studies on the impact of non-market logics (e.g., religion, state, family, or community logic) on the behavior of individual and organizational actors. Additionally, there is a demand for research into the processes by which actors respond to institutional logics (especially a strong process view). It is essential to explore the interactions between institutional logics and actors situated at different levels, focusing more on the meso and micro levels (on individuals than solely on organizations as entities), in contrast to the macro level focus. Moreover, there is a need to investigate how institutional logics manifest in contexts of emerging markets and developing countries, as well as in the face of complex institutional changes and grand social challenges (inequalities, climate issues, crises, and ruptures, including breakdowns of trust in fundamental institutional systems such as democracy, etc.). Finally, there are suggestions to employ more hypothetical-deductive approaches, mixed methods, or even historical research to advance the perspective.

In **the Brazilian context**, the institutional logics perspective appears to have been appropriated in a manner that is somewhat more ancillary than substantive. Drawing from the contention of Lounsbury *et al.* (2021), recently reiterated by Lounsbury and Wang (2023), this indicates an adoption of the perspective still primarily as an instrumental lens aimed at supporting explanations of other socio-organizational phenomena rather than investigating logics as complex interinstitutional phenomena in their own right. A more substantive adoption of the perspective in our field would involve considering its potential for developing our own theorizations regarding our cultural singularity, which is ecumenical and syncretic across several institutional aspects. While there is nothing inherently wrong with utilizing the institutional logics perspective instrumentally, we wish to underscore the importance of directing efforts towards producing studies aimed at elucidating mechanisms and their broader societal implications, allowing institutional logics to contribute to the understanding of relevant institutional

problems (Gehman, Lounsbury & Greenwood, 2016; Glynn & D'Aunno, 2023; Greenwood, Oliver, Lawrence & Meyer, 2017). Hence, fostering more intense dialogues with Contemporary Social Theories may prove beneficial to attain conceptual strengthening and gaining explanatory sophistication (e.g., Adler, Du Gay, Morgan & Reed, 2014; Clegg & Cunha, 2019).

Another aspect we would like to emphasize is the importance of moving beyond purely descriptive and confirmatory studies in our research on institutional logics. Instead, there should be a deliberate effort towards more exploratory analyses that aim to elucidate mechanisms and scrutinize not only their functioning in the empirical phenomena under investigation but also their broader consequences and outcomes in terms of larger institutional repercussions (i.e., effects on fields and societal aspects). We believe that neglecting this aspect may continue to impede our ability to offer original theorizations relevant to our Brazilian context of logics, particularly considering our reality as an emerging country, which has garnered current and growing interest from the scientific community applying the perspective (Haveman *et al.*, 2023; Wu *et al.*, 2023). However, we acknowledge that adopting this approach presents difficulties and challenges, as it entails conducting studies with bold methodological designs, significant temporal framing, and handling large datasets (Ocasio, Mauskopf & Steele, 2016). Perhaps, for this purpose, Historical Institutionalism could offer a promising alternative (Suddaby, Foster & Mills, 2014; Wang, Steele & Greenwood, 2019), as there is a growing demand for historically grounded research on institutional logics (Haveman *et al.*, 2023; Lounsbury & Wang, 2023; Raynard & Greenwood, 2023). Nevertheless, by embracing the institutional logics perspective to investigate logics *per se* – that is, treating logics as phenomena in themselves and discussing them substantively, elucidating their nature, constitution, and so forth – it appears necessary for the field to awaken in order to unlock the potential of the perspective to explain our *sui generis* logics, our native logics, those that are somewhat specific to the Brazilian historical and cultural reality. And on that matter, we take the liberty of reiterating certain points we have previously expressed.

In the call for papers that led to this special issue, it was our contention that our culturally diverse and syncretic traits could serve as a rich source of studies to provide an endogenous contribution from our research community to the institutional logics perspective. We provocatively questioned whether it would be plausible to discuss institutional logics specific to our Brazilian cultural reality (Adamoglu de Oliveira, Crubellate & Rossoni, 2022). We still uphold the potential of this provocation, particularly because we believe that the amalgamation of cultural traits influential in the institutional logic of our organizational and administrative life – conjecturally speaking – is largely the outcome of historical processes of logic hybridization constituting our interinstitutional system.

From our eclecticism, syncretism, and ecumenism – not solely in a religious or spiritual sense (although that may also apply), but across political, economic, ethical, and moral realms – we embrace ideologies that are occasionally foreign to our reality. Yet, we selectively arbitrate our values, virtues, and agreements, resulting in a population that combines various

cultural traits, generating configurations that are very much our own. Indeed, numerous examples come to mind: our ‘market patrimonialism,’ ‘bureaucratic democratization,’ and the intertwining of ‘political patronage’ and ‘clientelism’ in Brazilian politics (Penna, 1988, 2017); the array of our various types of ‘guarantees,’ ranging from ‘governability’ in public management (Bacha *et al.*, 2019; Schwartzman, 2007); or even our ‘crony capitalism,’ the ‘rentierism’ of our banks and financial system, and their implications for individuals, organizations, and entire economic sectors. Are these instances of hybrid institutional logics seemingly unique to our reality? We have reasons to believe so, while additional problematizations could be appended to our Brazilian organizational context.

In conclusion, the institutional logics perspective, given its cultural focus, holds the potential to illuminate various indigenous issues specific to us and our organizations. If examples like the ones we have highlighted – which by no means exhaust the possibilities – represent pure or blended types, the institutional analyses guided by the perspective might provide clarity. Moreover, given the richness of our distinct culture, we, as a research community, may also have numerous contributions to offer to the institutional logics perspective.

References

- Adamoglu de Oliveira, S., Crubellate, J. M., & Rossoni, L. (2022). Lógicas institucionais e organizações no contexto brasileiro. *Revista Eletrônica de Ciência Administrativa – RECADM*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7020661>
- Adler, P., Du Gay, P., Morgan, G., & Reed, M. (Eds.) (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Sociology, Social Theory and Organization Studies – Contemporary Currents*. (1. ed.) New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199671083.001.0001>
- Bacha, E., Falcão, J., Carvalho, J. M., Trindade, M. F., Malan, P. S., & Schwartzman, S. (2019). *130 Anos: Em Busca da República*. Rio de Janeiro/RJ: Instituto de Estudos de Política Econômica/Casa das Garças (Iepe/CdG).
- Clegg, S. R. (2023). *Frameworks of Power*. (2. ed.) London, Thousand Oaks, CA & New Dehli: Sage Publications.
- Clegg, S., & Cunha, M. P. (Eds.). (2019). *Management, Organizations and Contemporary Social Theory*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429279591>
- David, R. J., Tolbert, P. S., & Boghossian, J. (2019). Institutional Theory in Organization Studies. In Bergh, D. D. (Ed). *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management (online)*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.158>
- Dornbusch, S. M., & Scott, W. R. (1975). *Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Drori, G. S. (2020). Hasn't Institutional Theory always been critical?! *Organization Theory*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787719887982>

Frerichs, S. (2023). Economic sociology as comparative macrosociology: exemplified by the moral economy of debt. In Zafirovski, M. (Ed.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Economic Sociology*, 326-342. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367817152-19>

Friedland R. (2012). Book review: Patricia H. Thornton, William Ocasio & Michael Lounsbury (2012) The institutional logics perspective: a new approach to culture, structure, and process. *M@n@gement*, 15(5), 582–595. <https://management-aims.com/index.php/mgmt/article/view/3944>

Friedland, R. (2017). The value of institutional logics. In Krücken, G., Mazza, C., Meyer, R. E., & Walgenbach, P. (Eds.). *New themes in institutional analysis: topics and issues from European Research*, 12-50. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784716875.00006>

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991) Bringing society back in: symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, 232-263. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gehman, J., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (2016). How institutions matter: from the micro foundations of institutional impacts to the macro consequences of institutional arrangements. In Gehman, J., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (Eds.). *How Institutions Matter! (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 48 Part A)*, 1-34. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X201600048A002>

Glaser, V. L., Fast, N. J., Harmon, D. J., & Green, S. E. (2016). Institutional frame switching: how institutional logics shape individual action. In Gehman, J., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (Eds.). *How Institutions Matter! (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 48 Part A)*, 35-69. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X201600048A001>

Glynn, M. A., & D'Aunno, T. (2023). An intellectual history of Institutional Theory: looking back to move forward. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 17(1), 301–330. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0341>

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T., & Meyer, R. E. (2017). Introduction: into the fourth decade. In Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T., & Meyer, R. E. (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, 1-23. (2. ed.) London, Thousand Oaks, CA & New Dehli: Sage Publications. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446280669.n1>

Gümüşay, A. A., Claus, L., & Amis, J. (2020). Engaging with grand challenges: an institutional logics perspective. *Organization Theory*, 1, 1–20. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446280669.n1>

Haveman, H., & Gualtieri, G. (2017). Institutional logics. In Bergh, D. D. (Ed). (2017). *The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*, 1-29. Oxford: Oxford University Online. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.137>

Haveman, H. A., Joseph-Goteiner, D., & Li, D. (2023). Institutional logics: motivating action and overcoming resistance to change. *Management and Organization Review*, 19(6), 1152–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2023.22>

- Hinings, B. (2012). Connections between institutional logics and organizational culture. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 21(1), 98-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492611419798>
- Jupille, Joseph, & Caporaso, James A. (2022). *Theories of Institutions*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139034142>
- Lounsbury, M. (2023). The problem of institutional trust. *Organization Studies*, 44(2), 308–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406221131415>
- Lounsbury, M., Steele, C. W., Wang, M. S., & Toubiana, M. (2021). New directions in the study of institutional logics: from tools to phenomena. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 47, 261–280. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-090320-111734>
- 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>
- Ocasio, W., Mäskopf, M., & Steele, C. W. J. (2016). History, society, and institutions: the role of collective memory in the emergence and evolution of societal logics. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(4), 676-699. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0183>
- Ocasio, W., Thornton, P. H., & Lounsbury, M. (2017). Advances to the institutional logics perspective. In Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T., & Meyer, R. E. (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, 509-531. (2. ed.) London, Thousand Oaks, CA & New Dehli: Sage Publications. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446280669.n20>
- Pache, A.-C., & Thornton, P. H. (2021). Hybridity and Institutional Logics. In Besharov, M. L., & Mitzinneck, B. C. (Eds.). *Organizational Hybridity: Perspectives, Processes, Promises (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol. 69)*, 29-52. Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20200000069002>
- Penna, José Osvaldo de Meira (1988). *O Dinossauro: Uma Pesquisa Sobre o Estado, o Patrimonialismo Selvagem e a Nova Classe de Intelectuais e Burocratas*. São Paulo: T.A. Queiroz.
- Penna, José Osvaldo de Meira (2017). *Psicologia do Subdesenvolvimento*. Campinas/SP: Vide Editorial.
- Perkmann, M., Phillips, N., & Greenwood, R. (2022). Institutional arbitrage: how actors exploit institutional difference. *Organization Theory*, 3(2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877221090313>
- Raynard, M., & Greenwood, R. (2023). Commentary on perspective article: ‘institutional logics: motivating action and overcoming resistance to change’ – Heather A. Haveman, David Joseph-Goteiner, and Danyang Li. *Management and Organization Review*, 19(6), 1178–1184. <https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2023.23>
- Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*. (4. ed.) London, Thousand Oaks, CA & New Dehli: Sage Publications.
- Schwartzman, Simon (2007). *Bases do Autoritarismo Brasileiro*. (4. ed.) Rio de Janeiro: Publit Soluções Editoriais.
- Slater, D., & Tonkiss, F. (2021). *Sociedade de Mercado: Mercados e Teoria Social Moderna*. São Paulo: EDUSP – Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.

- Suddaby, R. (2023). Media Review: Ronald L. Jepperson and John W. Meyer Institutional Theory: The Cultural Construction of Organizations, States and Identities. *Organization Studies*, 44(3), 515-518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406221126291>
- Suddaby, R., Foster, W. M., & Mills, A. J. (2014). Historical institutionalism. In Bucheli, M., & Wadhvani, R. D. (Eds.). *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*, 100-123. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199646890.003.0004>
- Thornton, P. H. Culture and institutional logics. In Wright, James D. (Ed). (2015). *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences-5*, 550-556. (2. ed.) Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10455-6>
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure, and Process*. England: Oxford University Press.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2015). The institutional logics perspective (pp. 1-22). In Robert Scott, Marlis C. Buchmann & Stephen Kosslyn (Eds.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118900772.etrds0187>
- Valentino, L. (2021). Cultural logics: toward theory and measurement. *Poetics*, 88, 101574, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2021.101574>
- Weber, M. (1972/2009). *Economia e Sociedade: Fundamentos da Sociologia Compreensiva -1*. (4. ed.) Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília.
- Wang, M. S., Steele, C., & Greenwood, R. (2019). Mentalités and events: historicizing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(2), 473-476. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0370>
- Wu, X., Tan, X., & Wang, X. (2023). The institutional logics perspective in management and organizational studies. *Journal of Business Research*, 167, 114183, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114183>