

RESEARCH ON CATEGORIES IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF ORGANIZATIONS

Giacomo Negro, Özgecan Koçak and Greta Hsu

ABSTRACT

The concept of a “category” and the social process of “categorization” occupy a crucial place in current theories of organizations. In this introductory chapter to Research in the Sociology of Organization’s volume on Categories in Markets: Origins and Evolution, we review published work in various streams of research and find that studies of organizational forms and identities, institutional logics, collective action frames, and product conceptual systems have key commonalities and predictable differences.

1. INTRODUCTION

Categories and categorization processes in markets are thriving topics that span a number of literatures within the sociology of organizations. In this chapter, we identify common grounding points as well as key differences in this area of research, and we end by highlighting the contributions made by the chapters in this volume. Our aim, both in this introductory chapter and

Categories in Markets: Origins and Evolution
Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 31, 3–35
Copyright © 2010 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved
ISSN: 0733-558X/doi:10.1108/S0733-558X(2010)0000031003

in this volume, is twofold. First, we hope to make this vast, diverse literature accessible to those who do not work on categories directly. Second, we hope to encourage those who work on them to be stimulated and provoked by ideas from other perspectives.

Before continuing, we would like to note that research in categorization in organizational studies cannot be thought independently of the work in categories in other areas of sociology. Excellent reviews and special issue volumes already exist, most relevantly on symbolic boundaries (Pachucki, Pendergrass, & Lamont, 2007), on boundaries in general (Lamont & Molnar, 2002), on culture and classification (Baumann, Dowd, & Janssen, 2009), and on culture and cognition (Cerulo, 2010). Our chapter is offered as a complement to these recent analyses and it is organized as follows. In the next section we describe early and recent approaches to the study of categories and organizations. Then, we discuss points of convergence and distinction of these approaches. We conclude with an overview of the studies included in the current volume.

2. CATEGORIES AND CATEGORIZATION IN ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH

Many of the theories addressing categorization emanate from a branch in the study of organizations that views organizations and their environments as their focus of analysis (Scott, 1981). These theories engage with collective processes to explain social behavior, events, and mechanisms in and around organizations, and commonly read categories as socially constructed partitions that divide the social space and the distinct meanings associated with them (Durkheim & Mauss, 1963). Like other entities, organizations are subject to categorization. Categorization defines organizational identities, what organizations are expected to be by their members and other social agents. How organizations are placed within collective categorization systems affects the social, cultural, and material resources available to them. Knowing this, they often try to shape category systems and influence the choice of categories into which they are classified. Thus, understanding organizations' relationship to their environments often requires understanding categorization systems.

Categories as a conceptual tool for understanding organization–environment relationships has appeared in work on organizational forms, meaning systems in institutional fields, product classification systems, and social movement

frames. In these lines of research, categories were discussed as a part of broader cultural norms and rules; as a result, constraints of categorization were viewed as applying to all organizations within a domain or at least to very broad sets of them. In our view, the publication of Ezra Zuckerman's "Categorical Imperative" paper (1999) marked the beginning of (and was a key impetus for) the remarkable level of recent interest shown by organizational theorists in research using the idiom of categories (see also Hannan, 2010). One of Zuckerman's contributions was to demonstrate that cultural rules and norms apply in a more differentiated way. His work also identified more specific agents and mechanisms involved in at least enforcing categories, if not creating them. Among other things, this added differentiation opened up opportunities for defining new problems and making empirical analysis more tractable. In the rest of this section, we review the antecedents of interest in categories in prominent research programs in organizational studies. We then proceed to review more recent work, organizing our discussion in terms of common themes and different perspectives.

2.1. Antecedents

New institutional theorists emphasized cultural and cognitive processes driving organizational homogeneity, highlighting how the societal belief systems and cultural frameworks in which individuals and organizations are embedded shapes the practices and behaviors they adopt (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Shared cognitive structures such as taken-for-granted scripts, schemas, rules, and norms play a powerful role in shaping and mediating the regularity of social behavior (Zucker, 1983; DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). Cognitive structures come to be shared as a result of three processes (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). First, behaviors adopted by actors in order to solve recurring problems become habitualized with minimal effort in response to particular stimuli. Second, behaviors are typified by developing common definitions linked to habitualized behaviors. Third, typifications are transmitted broadly so that actors who lack direct knowledge of their origins also treat them as "social givens."

The concept of institutional logics (Friedland & Alford, 1991) gained particular interest as an analytical tool to study clashes in the assumptions, values, beliefs, rules, and schemata that provide meaning to material practices (Lounsbury, 2007). This has entailed a view of institutions as being in tension with each other, allowing for ambiguity, multiplicity, and contradiction to sow the seeds of change (Haveman & Rao, 1997; Clemens & Cook, 1999).

However, cognitive frameworks and processes do not automatically produce significant change. Change is shaped by the interaction of schemas with social networks and other resources in processes of diffusion, innovation, and mediation (DiMaggio, 1997; Strang & Soule, 1998).

Beyond organizational institutionalism, the concept of organizational form played a prominent role in theorization within organizational ecology. A form was initially defined as “a blueprint for organizational action,” assuming a particular configuration of core properties and specific patterns of input–output activities (Hannan & Freeman, 1977, 1986). A form’s blueprint can be inferred from the formal structure of the organization but it depends on its cognitive order – the ways of organizing that are defined as right and proper by relevant sectors of the environment.

Sociological theories of markets also conceptualized the social structure of markets as comprised of cognitive models and cultural rules as well as material resources and positions (White, 1981; Leifer, 1988; Baker & Faulkner, 1991; Podolny, 1993). These models enable producers to identify their rivals (Porac & Thomas, 1990; Porac, Thomas, Wilson, Paton, & Kanfer, 1995) and make critical decisions like volume of production and price to charge (White, 1981). They enable clients of organizations to estimate quality (Podolny, 1993) and allow consumers to evaluate products (Rosa, Porac, Runser-Spanjol, & Saxon, 1999). In this conception, market social structures are heuristic systems, or cognitive tools, that enable economic decision-making. They often have self-reinforcing dynamics. For example, pecking orders of quality and status tend to persist among producers as behaviors of producers and consumers reproduce structural inequalities (Podolny, 1993; White, 2002).

The significance of categorization has also been highlighted in research on the collective action frames that activists develop to organize constituents. The concept of frame as used in the study of social movements is derived primarily from Goffman’s (1974) work on frame analysis, and applied by Snow and Benford and their collaborators (Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986; Snow & Benford, 1988). In this interpretation, frames denote “schemata of interpretation” that enable individuals to locate, perceive, identify, and label events within their life space and the world at large. Frames function to organize experience and help to render events meaningful.

2.2. New Approaches to Categorization

While these theories of organizations addressed categorization, they mainly did so by considering categories implicitly as components of the external

environment. Zuckerman's (1999, 2000) work was the first to explicitly draw attention to category systems as taken-for-granted constructs that influence market behavior and market outcomes. In his research on financial markets, he found that firms that fail to establish themselves clearly as members of financial analysts' categories are less likely to receive coverage by analysts specializing in their industry. Such inattention reduces attractiveness to investors and impairs their value on the stock market and makes the price of their stock more volatile (Zuckerman, 2004). As a result of this selection process, firms are generally pressured to behaviorally conform to the category systems employed by their audience (Zuckerman, 2000).

Phillips and Zuckerman (2001) extended this perspective by developing a two-stage model of market competition describing an interface between two sets of actors: candidates and audience members. Candidates present offers to the audience for valuation and consumption, and the audience screens, selects, and consumes them. In the screening process, audience members must be able to compare offers with one another in order to make a choice; clear membership in a market category facilitates this.

Three key insights of this work have had significant impact on organizational research: (1) category boundaries are controlled by the perceptions of an audience, (2) they are consequential for organizations' interaction with other social actors, and (3) they can be studied empirically by using data on intermediaries' or other audiences' classification systems. The fact that this abstract theory about categories could resonate simultaneously with work on institutionalized rules and expectations, organizational forms, movement frames, and product classification systems, contributed to its influence.

The shift of attention to audiences and category boundaries has reoriented work within organizational ecology (see also Hannan, 2010). Most fundamentally, it has led to an effort to clarify the organizational form concept. According to Hannan, Pólos, and Carroll (2007) (see also Pólos, Hannan, & Carroll, 2002), categories emerge as audience members recognize similarities among groups of producers and come to regard and label them as members of a common set. If and when there is a high level of collective agreement about the cognitive model detailing what it means to be a member of the set, it is referred to as a category. And if the schema for the category becomes highly taken-for-granted such that audience members automatically assume that producers with the label have schema-consistent features, it is regarded as a form. The shift is evident in that forms are not distinguished by organizational architectures but involve social and cultural typifications. Forms constitute a key part of producers' identities; when producers are accepted as a member of a form, audiences assume

satisfaction of form codes by default. This new conceptualization pushes us to focus on the perceptions of audience members when specifying forms and their boundaries. This is a marked shift from earlier empirical approaches, which relied largely on industrial or product-market distinctions to specify organizational forms (Hsu & Hannan, 2005).

This emphasis on categorization has led to reformulations of other theories within organizational ecology, including density-dependent legitimation (McKendrick & Carroll, 2001; McKendrick, Jaffee, Carroll, & Khessina, 2003), niche theory (Hsu, 2006; Hsu, Hannan, & Koçak, 2009; Negro, Hannan, & Rao, in press-b), and resource partitioning (Hannan et al., 2007). Overall, this focus on categories draws renewed attention to the issue of diversity by highlighting the coexistence of multiple forms, blending and segregating processes, and new form emergence as vital components of organizational evolution (Hannan & Freeman, 1986; Hannan et al., 2007).

The categorical imperative argument also resonates with organizational institutionalism's focus on isomorphism. Cognitive structures and cultural frames, which had been an undercurrent in new institutional research, have since risen to the surface. Scott, in his *Institutions and Organizations* book, classifies shared conceptions and frames conveying meaning as the cognitive-cultural pillar of institutionalization, and characterizes categories and schema as symbolic systems that carry this pillar (Scott, 2008; Scott & Davis, 2008).

In recent years, institutional theories have moved away from a focus on explaining homogeneity toward a focus on sources of institutional change. Institutional logics connect meaning to material practices and bring cognitive-cultural schemas even more to the front as the motor for agency. Social agents are viewed as having the ability to apply a range of schemas, including those learned in other contexts, to understand and negotiate experiences (Swidler, 1986; DiMaggio, 1987; Sewell, 1992). As an example, Clemens (1993) demonstrates the role of organizations as carriers of cultural templates developed elsewhere in the environment in her study of American women's groups in 1890–1920. She finds that women's groups excluded from the organization and practices of electoral politics were motivated to discover or invent new channels for their political activities. For example, they copied business methods, drawing on corporate forms and cash exchanges to replace personal service as the medium for social action. Similarly, Schneiberg's (2002) study of fire mutual organizations finds that mutuals became more viable as they adopted theories of economic order that rejected corporate liberalism and embodied a vision of decentralized cooperatives of farmers, merchants, and independent producers.

3. COMMON GROUNDING POINTS OF NEW APPROACHES TO CATEGORIZATION

Because work on categories is a topical, as opposed to a paradigmatic, area of research, it embodies a diverse array of approaches. Yet different research programs have become blended as they ask similar questions about how category systems emerge, how they are used, and how they develop. It is often difficult to draw clear boundaries around research programs as articles incorporate orienting assumptions and investigation methods from different perspectives. Therefore, as we review the more recent work below, we also follow a topical organization. In the next section, we elaborate on several key grounding points that connect contemporary research on categorization. In the following section, we highlight the differences that remain identifiable among different perspectives, and how they contribute differently to research on categories.

3.1. Focus on Meaning Systems

Research on categories is distinctive in its focus on meaning rather than structure. This is not to deny the importance of social structure and organizations' positions in status hierarchies, role divisions, or other partitions of the social space. Rather, organizations' ability to access material and symbolic resources is increasingly seen as mediated by the meaning systems that audiences hold (DiMaggio, 1992). The mediation and the meaning systems themselves are construed somewhat differently by the various perspectives on which category researchers build on, but some basic elements are common.

Categories as mediation systems give meaning to market entities – agents and products. Zuckerman, Kim, Ukanwa, and von Rittman (2003) provide an illustration of meaning giving in their study of career dynamics among U.S. film actors. They find that newcomers to the film industry who specialize by concentrating their roles in fewer genres have a higher likelihood of future employment. This occurs because patterns of participation across categories provide signals of an actor's expertise to audience members; actors who participate in multiple categories are viewed as lacking expertise in each category. On the other hand, specialist actors are recognized as having skills appropriate for the particular category (or categories) they participate in, but run the risk of being seen as lacking the skills necessary for other categories.

In another study of the U.S. film industry, Baker and Faulkner (1991, pp. 283–284) argue that category meaning follows enactment of roles in markets. They define market roles as resources “used to pursue interests and enact positions.” In the wake of the blockbuster era when formulas for success were unknown, separation between commercial and artistic functions in filmmaking offered viable solutions to the problems of organizing cultural production. Art was viewed as created in the expressive domain, while business was conducted in the commercial domain. At the same time, the enactment of consolidated artistic roles, like the hyphenate writer-director, allowed directors and screenwriters to maintain aesthetic control over cultural projects and restrain producers’ bargaining power. Categories emerged from observed role claims, and then became diagnostic of the behavior audiences can expect of market actors.

In a study of the U.S. minivan market, Porac, Rosa, and Saxon (2001) argue that markets are created when potential buyers and sellers begin to connect an artifact with shared conceptual systems that define the physical attributes, uses, and value of the artifact in question, that is, whether the minivan has sliding doors, is used for family transportation, is a practical vehicle, and so forth. Central to the dynamics of market creation is the process of attribute abstraction that inserts products into a particular identity class through conversations across and between producers and consumers. In a related study, Rosa et al. (1999) find that market stories are critical sensemaking tools among participants in a social system that can be linked to market stability. They find that key differences in the nature of the stories used by consumers and producers to interpret one another’s behavior emerge as a category stabilizes. In particular, consumer references to the emerging minivan market category label decline as the product category stabilizes, while producer references increase. As a category stabilizes, consumers increasingly focus on specific attributes rather than the category in their sensemaking efforts. On the other hand, producers increasingly rely on category labels in the attempt to convince consumers that their product is the best representative of that category.

Second, categories as mediation systems are flexible, so categorical boundaries reflect fuzzy perceptions rather than rigid structures (Porac et al., 1995; Hannan et al., 2007). In this formulation, meanings are not unified systems that act as stand-ins for the material, concrete structures. Agreement among producers and consumers stabilizes the market by facilitating information flow, thus expediting the assimilation of new products and new uses for old products, but boundaries are permeable as

well as unstable. Research also links category flexibility to audience reactions to nonconforming market offerings. For example, Rosa et al. (1999) demonstrate that in unstable categories, atypical products are more acceptable. Negro, Hannan, and Rao (in press-b) and Kovács and Hannan (this volume) argue that categories with fuzzier boundaries present weaker schematization and thus entail lowered penalties for category spanning.

In studies of social movements, frames help to render events significant and to organize experience and guide action (Snow & Benford, 1988). Here, flexibility is tied to the interplay between frames specific to a movement's grievances and master frames, which function as meta-categories, like "justice" or "democracy" (Snow & Benford, 1992). Koonan (1995) shows that activists can bend a movement's frames but preserve its master frame in a study of 1950s–1960s political mobilization in Chile. Women mobilized organizational efforts for equal rights – the democracy master frame – first using a specific feminist frame, but were defeated by political party opposition. Later they started using a maternal frame based on their traditional role in the family. Because the authoritarian regime respected motherhood and family, women gained a mobilization opportunity at a time when men were silenced.

Third, the meanings and boundaries inherent in categories shift over time along with the structure of material rewards and opportunity. Mohr and Duquenne (1997) and Mohr and Guerra-Pearson (this volume) trace taxonomies of social welfare organizations in late 19th century New York City and illustrate how the boundaries distinguishing these organizational forms in New York City shifted between the period of poverty relief (using data from 1888) and the Progressive era (using data from 1917) in concomitance with changes in the identification of categories of poor persons receiving assistance. And, Thornton and Ocasio (1999) show that the change of institutional logics in the publishing industry from an editorial to a commercial focus redirected managerial attention and resources from internal to acquisition growth as well as from organic to adversarial relations between publishers and authors.

Focusing on the evolutionary stage of category systems, Ruef and Patterson (2009) study early credit classification and show that organizational membership in multiple categories is less problematic when classification systems themselves are emergent or in flux. As schemas became institutionalized, boundary violations receive greater attention and penalty by credit reporters. Conversely, the risk of a downgrade in market valuation also attenuates significantly when spanning multiple categories is widespread (Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2005).

3.2. Emphasis on Audiences in Category Emergence and Development

Category systems are commonly viewed as collective constructions rather than univocal mandates. Meaning is created not by a single authority or the researcher, but by diverse audiences.

In neo-institutional theory (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, 1991), the threat of being viewed as illegitimate by important audiences pressures organizations to conform. The multiplicity of audiences and their category systems can generate diverging pressures to conform. Market agents address such pressures in multiple ways. One way is to separate domains, buffering from contradictory expectations. Studying scholarly reputations, Clemens, Powell, McIlwaine, and Okamoto (1995) argue that academic disciplines' rewards for publication of journal articles versus books reflect the relationship of those disciplines to their audiences. Private universities privilege books while public universities privilege journal articles – books can generate conversations across subfields and disciplines and demonstrate diffuse relevance of scientific findings, whereas articles serve as the main output of evaluation within the field. These different orientations result in partially distinct career trajectories. Another solution is to challenge existing institutions – institutional entrepreneurs are individuals and groups of individuals that build new institutions out of established ones (DiMaggio, 1991; Garud, Hardy, & Maguire, 2007). Third, contingencies can bring market actors to adjudicate which category systems are more appropriate in a given occasion. Glynn and Lounsbury (2005), for example, show that the critics applied an aesthetic logic in their evaluations of a symphony orchestra's performances before a strike but shifted to a commercial logic after a strike.

In studies of collective action, successful mobilization depends on linking movements' frames with those held by the target audiences, tapping into collective beliefs, or constructing collective identities that are congruent with those held by specific audiences. Moore (1996) shows that intense scrutiny about their political and military interests caused scientists to create new organizations like SIPI, UCS, and SftP. These new organizations avoided association with partisan groups and redefined scientific research as oriented to the public interest and sponsor-free. Rao (1998) shows the importance of audience support for the outcome of competition among frames: when rival entrepreneurs promote incompatible frames, the frame that enjoys greater political support from the state, professions, and other organizations becomes ascendant. And Lounsbury and Rao (2004) argue that powerful producers are in a better position to preserve the existing structure of

categories. Industry media tend to be particularly attentive to the interests of dominant incumbents because they often rely on them for information, support, and revenue. So, some producers affect category construction; and the level of their influence mediates the creation of new categories.

Some research explicitly considers distinct audiences, including consumers (when studying the emergence of product-market categories) and managers (when studying the construction of competitor sets). Various segments of the audience engage in collective sensemaking and language, media coverage, and publicity become reflections of their collective agreement (Rosa et al., 1999; Kennedy, 2005). Alternatively, market mediators such as analysts and professional critics assume a more active role on one side of the interface as interpreters of actions for the other side (Hirsch, 1972; Zuckerman, 1999). If categorical divides are accepted by audiences, organizations that do not attend to them meet market disappointments.

Most research assumes that collective consensus is the basis for category formation. A different perspective emphasizes specific actors such as states in forming new categories. In a comparative study of categorization systems of American and French winemaking, for example, Zhao (2005) argues that the state as a source of classification influences organizational practices and strategies. Grape variety, geographic origin (appellation), and vintage influence classification, but French wines are classified primarily by geographic origin and American wines by grape variety. The French system is built on the principle that the environment (terroir) suitable for a grape varietal is unique. The principle has been historically sanctioned in the practices of winemakers as well as in the law. As a result, varietals tend to be spatially more concentrated. In the United States, the classification system does not constrain which varietals can be planted. Winemakers have carried out experiments to plant a number of varietals within each region and across regions, and varietals are more geographically dispersed.

Audiences can be differentiated. Organizations that seek to engage different audiences may encounter conflicting expectations. Zuckerman and Kim (2003) show that when critics who specialized in releases of major distributors reviewed a film and “certified” it as fit for the mass market, then the film obtained a larger box office success. On the other hand, films that attracted the attention of these critics were less successful in the independent segment, which defines itself in opposition to the majors. Categorization by one audience constrains how products and producers are identified by another.

Hannan et al. (2007) focus on a similar conception of audiences. They conceptualize organizational niches in terms of audience tastes, and

producers' positioning in categorical schemas. Relevant audience segments generally include "insiders" – the members or employees of producer organizations – and various kinds of "outsiders" – buyers and suppliers, investors, critics, regulators. Moreover, producers are audience to each other. A central idea in this audience-based theorization is that organizational fitness (success) depends on the appeal that producers' offerings obtain at the various social positions. In particular, appeal increases with fit to category schemas and with the producer's engagement at the position.

The formation of consensus among audiences on which labels to apply to sets of producers or offers is the seed of categorization systems. And disagreement about which producers or offers deserve a label, or disagreement about the meaning of the label, can be a spark for collective contention. For example, the microbrewery movement described by Carroll and Swaminathan (2000, p. 725) supported artisanal production and developed in antagonism toward industrial, mass-produced beer.

Besides the feature similarity model of form emergence (Hannan et al., 2007) described in the previous section, one prominent question is how the shared cognitive models that guide market action develop in the first place. White's (1981) model of market genesis theorizes that firms observe the production schedules of their competitors and make decisions with regards to their own volume and price that are guided by the tangible outcomes of other producers. Rosa et al. (1999), Porac et al. (2001), and Rosa and Spanjol (2005) add to this process of individual observation and enactment a process of collective sensemaking. They follow Weick's (1979) theory of recursive enactment, where shared market structures evolve from the activities of market actors who are coupled in behavior-cognition cycles. One implication of enactment is that it builds agreement among producers and consumers on how specific products are categorized. Rising agreement, in turn, stabilizes the market by facilitating information flow, thus expediting the assimilation of new product models and new uses for old products.

To this, Kennedy (2005, 2008) and Anand and Peterson (2000) add the role of media. Kennedy (2005) argues that firms rely on media coverage to identify their competitors and observe their price-volume positions rather than each other's press releases. Thus, collective understanding of product categories is shaped by the news that reporters select. Anand and Peterson (2000) show that new information technology and the different methods of data collection that media use can influence market structure. They show that as the *Billboard* magazine changed its methodology for compiling its weekly charts, perception of market categories changed.

3.3. Focus on Legitimation of Categories and of Organizations

Categories and category membership are not value-free. Some categories are seen as legitimate, and membership in them desirable. The legitimacy that organizations receive due to their membership in categories and the processes of legitimation of classes of organizations as organizational forms are central questions in category research. In most research, categories are seen as heuristic systems constructed by audiences. Category systems affect behavior to the extent that they are accepted as the natural way of carrying out a certain activity.

Producers and their offers benefit from the legitimacy that is accorded to a category by demonstrating their similarity to other category members. Bielby and Bielby (1994) argue that market actors use reputation, imitation, and genre categories as strategies to rationalize and legitimize their actions in a highly institutionalized context. Work similar to established genres facilitates shared understandings and requires less effort to coordinate and promote. In a study of television programming, network executives pick pilots similar to genre templates and use them to rationalize and legitimize their decisions.

Different kinds of repercussions ensue from nonconformity with category schemas. Zuckerman and colleagues (Zuckerman, 1999, 2000; Zuckerman et al., 2003) show that organizational and individual actors that do not neatly fit into commonly used categorization systems are overlooked by key market intermediaries or perceived to lack the skills necessary for any one category. They are also interpreted differently by different parties, leading to greater volatility in their market performance (Zuckerman, 2004). Using niche theory, Hsu and colleagues (Hsu, 2006; Hsu et al., 2009) argue that actors that operate in multiple categories are perceived as fitting poorly into any one of these categories and therefore suffer valuation penalties.

Similarity, or isomorphism, is important not only for single organizations to gain acceptance but also for groups of organizations to be recognized as a distinct organizational form. As anticipated in the previous section, Hannan et al. (2007) propose that categories are more likely to be regarded as taken-for-granted ways of organizing when audience members perceive organizations as having a high degree of similarity along relevant (or salient) dimensions. Conversely, lack of similarity impedes the development of a template for organizing. At the community level, novel organizational forms are more likely to emerge with increases in the density and size of forms with similar identities, although cross-form competition in saturated regions of the identity space hampers new form emergence (Ruef, 2000; Perretti, Negro, & Lomi, 2008).

In addition to similarity judgments within a category, differences between categories create distinctions and spur cognitive legitimation. Categories that are more distinct from others are said to have greater contrast. High contrast corresponds to situations where members have full membership in a category and are clearly distinctive vis-à-vis nonmembers. McKendrick and Carroll (2001) and McKendrick et al. (2003) first argued that taken-for-grantedness results from perceptually focused identities. Organizations with related identities that cluster spatially in a place contribute more to legitimation.

Research also shows that motivated actors can mobilize to “establish” organizational forms. Rao, Morrill, and Zald (2000) conceptualize the construction of new organizational forms as a political process in which movements play a double-edged role: They de-institutionalize existing beliefs, norms, values embodied in extant forms and establish new forms that instantiate new beliefs, norms, values. Institutional entrepreneurs are crucial in this process: they lead efforts to identify political opponents, frame issues and problems, and mobilize constituencies.

Clemens (1996) explicitly defines an organizational form as frame, “people who act together in a particular way.” Opportunities and success for social movements depend on the forms–frames utilized for collective action. Studying the relationship between different forms and frames of women’s and minority organizations, Minkoff (1994) finds not only that service provision organizations were perceived as more moderate and less challenging and helped general mobilization, but also that they helped the emergence of the advocacy form of organizations that was more confrontational but used similar templates for organizing.

The cross-form interplay is also proposed by Clemens (1993) through the notion of organizational repertoires. She argues that in the early 1900s US women’s groups were excluded from the organization and practices of electoral politics, so they copied and transformed models of organization legitimated in other domains (business, state bureaucracy, and lobbies) to pursue their interests. The audience’s resonance with these forms and frames in other domains legitimated the political action of the new women’s movement.

3.4. Category Memberships as Constituting Identities

Category memberships are constitutive of collective identities (Padgett & Ansell, 1993; Podolny, 1993; White, 2002; Zuckerman et al., 2003). These

identities can be defined by outsiders, insiders, or more often by both. For example, managers in Scottish knitwear categorized their firm and noted which of the other firms in the industry were “high-fashion handframe,” “handknitters,” or “mass-market contractors” (Porac et al., 1995). Hollywood producers can be “major” or “independent” based on how critics classify them (Zuckerman & Kim, 2003). Identity has multiple functions: it informs organizational actors of courses of action that are open to and expected of them, helps firms identify their rivals, and serves as handles for frames of reference that audiences use in their evaluations.

Categories represent a specific kind of collective identity, where audiences have abstracted from the uniqueness of individual organizations to form a typification of commonality among a set of organizations that appear to form a common, cohesive set (Hannan et al., 2007). Membership in categories both enables and constrains organizations because it establishes the features and behaviors that are expected of organizations and shapes the way audience members evaluate organizations.

Baron (2004) distinguishes organizational identity based on product-market dimensions from one based on labor market dimensions. With respect to the former, identity plays a key role as a form of enabling and constraining factor in the dynamics of resource partitioning (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000). Mass producers and contract brewers who wished to compete with microbrews found that they needed to conceal their true origins because consumers of microbrews purchased based on organizational identity rather than product characteristics. Meanwhile, microbrews and brewpubs strategically deployed their identities to criticize the values and practices of mass brewers while playing up features that exclude mass brewers and contract brewers from the specialty brewing segment.

Outside resource partitioning, a study on “traditionalism” and “modernism” in Italian winemaking shows that two categories can be claimants over the same label and one (the traditionalists) category risks disappearance if the rival (the modernist) gains ground. When they perceive a threat that their identity can be confused with the modernists’, the traditionalist producers activate to resharpen category boundaries and the activation slows down mobility across the two groups (Negro et al., in press-a). With respect to labor market identities, employment relations can also define blueprints that function as labor market identities that have enduring effects on organizations; changes in those identities have been shown to have disruptive effects on organizational survival, performance, and employee turnover (Baron, Hannan, & Burton, 2001; Hannan, Baron, Hsu, & Koçak, 2006).

An early argument by Selznick (1957) posits that institutionalization produces a distinct identity for the organization. Identity, which is a function of the patterned interaction between individuals and groups, is imbued with value and incorporated as a competence so that maintaining identity is vital for the organization. The relevant domain of these interactions is often an industry, where common identities are established through social comparisons, status competition, and structurally equivalent network positions (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999).

Pedersen and Dobbin (1997, 2006) observe that the identity of formal organizations emerges from the combination of two processes, assertion of universal isomorphism and distinctive enumeration. With the first, actors in organizations pursue similarity to templates to classify themselves as conforming and to symbolize their rationality. With the second, actors create unique features to enumerate (differentiate) themselves and realize rationality. Glynn and Abzug's (2002) research on corporate naming practices also suggests institutional pressures result in similarities as well as differences – firms changing names to adapt to prevalent norms in their institutional environments, but their new organizational names continue to evoke their old name to avoid the loss of past legitimacy.

Research on collective mobilization distinguishes between self, social, and collective dimensions of identity. The first defines meanings attached to a role played in a network of relationships, the second defines meanings as a member of a group, and the third defines shared beliefs about memberships, boundaries, and activities (Stryker, 2000). The analysis of identities in this literature studies the interrelationships among these dimensions. Participation in social movement organizations involves enlargement of personal identity for participants and offers fulfillment and realization of self (Stryker, 2000). Also, Klandermans and de Weerd (2000) argue that social identity influences collective identity, for example, group identification increases the intention to participate in protest among Dutch farmers. And members have to incorporate collective identities in their own view of self by setting boundaries between group members and nonmembers, developing a political consciousness that defines and analyzes interests, and negotiating everyday symbols and actions (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). Melucci (1996) argues that cognitive definitions and active interactions among actors define collective identity of a social movement. Organizational forms as frames, organizational leadership, and actors' relations jointly bridge the gap between structural conditions and personal motives and orientations.

4. DIFFERENCES

Research on categories diverges in some predictable ways, reflecting diverse theoretical assumptions and interests.

4.1. Agency

Extant research sees the process of category emergence as cooperative and instrumental in some cases, while more conflict-ridden and sometimes accidental in others.

In his analysis of structuration of U.S. art museums, DiMaggio (1991) describes how the conflict in the categorization of organizations connects to struggles outside organizations, at the societal level. Between 1920 and 1940, a reformist model stressing broad public educational goals supplanted an established model espousing the curatorial logic of the connoisseurs and elite patrons. Alternative conceptions of the museum also reflected social struggles between the elite upper classes and their social circle of collectors and curators on the one hand, and the new class of museum professionals fueled by the expansion of higher education in the fine arts on the other.

For researchers interested in social movements, agency tends to be contentious and political and so is categorization. Movement frames are viewed as symbolic representations that are consciously and strategically used by social groups to legitimate and motivate collective action (Snow et al., 1986). Jasper (1998) argues that movement leaders have considerable cultural importance in the framing process – they coordinate strategic efforts, and bring creativity in defining new forms of protest and new organizational structures. Leaders symbolize a movement to outsiders and insiders, which means they transmit messages about the movement's intentions, trajectory, and tactics, in other words they are interpreters of the underlying frame (Ganz, 2000). In addition to leaders' actions, people are mobilized into social movement action on the basis of social networks (McAdam & Paulsen, 1993; Tarrow, 1998). Contrary to the idea that social networks are simple carriers of information, Snow, Zurcher, and Eklund-Olson (1980) show that emotions and cultural meanings flow through activists' networks and enable their efforts.

In other research that tends to focus on the cognitive processes underlying audience members' perceptions of category meanings and boundaries

agency appears more controlled (e.g., Hannan et al., 2007). Category development emerges as almost natural cognitive convergence, without strong intervention by identifiable actors. We trace this difference in how agency is addressed to three reasons. The first is the different intellectual roots of theorization on categories. What we label a controlled agency view draws mechanisms from cognitive science and its information processing, cognitive efficiency framework. Categories are functional for individuals, guiding market interactions and facilitating market order. As audiences try to make sense of the world, their schemas, meaning systems converge eventually. What we label a political agency view, on the other hand, emphasizes the social construction and dissemination of categories. There is conflict and battle among multiple parties to make their schemas dominate the market. Institutional entrepreneurs rise against incumbent institutions by advocating alternative frames, they manipulate symbols and rituals to signal what kind of market actors they are (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). The interests of different parties are seen more in dispute than in agreement.

The difference may also be due to a focus on automatic cognition versus deliberation. In the controlled agency view, legitimacy is conceptualized as taken-for-grantedness that results from an aggregation and sensemaking process; in the political view, legitimacy is a process of norm-enforcement that follows norm-building through negotiation and contestation in social domains. Increasingly, however, while legitimation stems from imbibing market actors with schema beliefs, some work has begun to incorporate more deliberative action (Negro et al., in press-a). Automatic mimicry and thoughtless adaptation are coupled to the traditional concern with normative and regulative institutions giving greater role to forethought and norm enforcement (Colyvas & Powell, 2006).

Third, the two views have different kinds of audiences in mind. The controlled agency view focuses on “small” audience members such as customers that have limited influence on categorization as individuals, while the political view focuses on large organizational actors such as governments and dominant producers. With its consideration of individual mobilization and co-optation of influential allies via the political opportunity structure, research on social movements bridges the two views.

4.2. Power

Research differs in the relevance of power dynamics and politicking around category systems. Some work suggests low involvement, limited to

controversies between factions of producers who insist on sharp categorical distinctions and on the authenticity of their interpretation (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; Negro et al., in press-a).

It is when researchers look beyond small players in large markets that they begin to see more power and politics. Porac, Wade, and Pollock (1999) find that corporate boards deciding on CEO compensations identify peer groups primarily by industry, but also make self-serving additions to these sets. Peer definitions are expanded beyond industry boundaries when firms perform poorly, industries perform well, CEOs are paid highly, and when shareholders are powerful and active. Thus, short-term political interests coexist with established collective beliefs as organizational actors attempt to create and control market outcomes. Similarly, Fleischer (2009) proposes that as levels of underwriting increase, the number of conflict-of-interest relationships among brokerage firms also increase, and these organizations are motivated to generate greater ambiguity in rating systems.

In work building on neo-institutional theory, there is more systematic interest in self-serving manipulation and the use of power to institute favored schemas. Espeland and Stevens (1998) emphasize that the power to categorize is serious power. Greenwood and Hinings (1996) and Hinings, Greenwood, and Brown (1991) argue that struggles can emerge between organizational coalitions over organizational templates. For example, professional organizations can be structured as partnerships or corporations; public agencies can adopt a bureaucratic or a customer service logic; management-worker relations may be defined as solidary and participatory or as oppositional. Institutional templates may change when an emerging coalition finds the existing template inimical to its interests, has a sense of itself as a mobilized group, and has an alternative to offer.

Moreover, field-level industry actors including the state and the media influence category durability and change (Lounsbury & Rao, 2004; Zhao, 2005). Lounsbury and Rao find that when performance variability in a mutual fund category increases, the category tends to be reconstituted through the creation of new categories by industry media, but the media are attentive to the interests of dominant incumbents because they often rely on them for information, support, and revenue. So, industry concentration mediates the creation of new categories.

In research on social movements, politics and power dynamics shape how frames emerge and succeed. These dynamics play out through coalescence of different groups around causes, their accumulated resources as in those held by the elite, and movements' access to political institutions. Movements develop as vehicles of collective action capable of mobilizing organizations

and people when they are able to frame the grievances and interests of often less powerful constituencies.

Studying suffrage organizations, McCammon (2001) and McCammon, Campbell, Granberg, and Mowery (2001) find that suffragists were more successful at gaining access to the polity and favorable votes when they proposed a womanly perspective frame instead of a justice frame based on natural right as citizens. When organizers and leaders of the national movement argued that women would bring their unique “womanly” perspective, people were far more likely to be persuaded to join the suffrage movement. Expediency arguments worked better. McCammon (2001) suggests that arguments that do not resonate with widely held beliefs in this way are simply not as effective in spurring mobilization.

The success of a movement increases with the opening of opportunities for organizations structured by access to formal political institutions and by alliances with elite groups (Tarrow, 1998). Rao et al. (2000) show that in alternative dispute resolution one frame of community mediation emerged from the support provided by social workers, community activists, legal service lawyers, and academics. This frame, however, was supplanted by a multidoor courthouse frame supported by organized elites including the American Bar Association (ABA) and the U.S. Justice Department. When elites are disorganized or possess little influence to change the system, however, frames proposed by activists are more likely to be affirmed (Rao et al., 2000).

4.3. Methods

Routinely, researchers rely on “case” studies of industries/markets/movements over a stretch of time in their history. However, they use a variety of methods, some of which are specific. Work emerging from organizational ecology has shown considerable interest in the use of logical formalization to build and integrate theory on categorization (Pólos et al., 2002; Hannan et al., 2007). In this approach, micro-level processes are specified and linked upwards to draw conclusions about macro-level processes (where the central outcomes of interest for this perspective are). This reconstruction pushes theorists to revisit key assumptions and specify category-related processes in a precise way (Hannan et al., 2007). Formal theory on categorization has progressed more quickly than empirical work, although a number of recent studies have attempted to test the implications of this new theory on categories (e.g., Hsu, 2006; Negro et al., in press-b; Hsu et al., 2009; Bogaert

et al., this volume). Despite the push for audience-centric definitions of category boundaries, much empirical research in this tradition continues to rely on archival sources that only indirectly measure perceptions of audience members to specify category membership.

A number of studies, in contrast, have made market participants' category systems the direct focus of empirical inquiry, including collecting perceptions of the competitive landscape (Porac & Thomas, 1990; Porac et al., 1995), perceptions of peers (Porac et al., 1999), and conversations around product categories (Rosa et al., 1999). Studies have also extracted data about market networks from producers' press releases and media coverage (Kennedy, 2005, 2008). In social movement research, selective cases use transcriptions of biographical interviews with activists, as well as quantitative methods for frame analysis, sample surveys, content analysis of interview texts, and examination of semantic structures to demonstrate the role of frames in collective processes (Johnston, 2002).

A key methodological challenge is finding ways to link different levels of analysis such as field-level institutional logics and firm-level attributes or behavior (Schneiberg, 2002). Theorists have used both qualitative and quantitative methods to do this in research on categorization. For example, Stark (1996) and Haveman and Rao (1997) use detailed qualitative analysis of discourse within a field to study the emergence of hybrid forms of organization. Other research uses sophisticated network methods to map systems of forms and discourse using emic classificatory logics (Mohr & Duquenne, 1997; Ruef, 2000). However, much empirical research has relied on industrial, product-based distinctions – only indirectly measuring perceptions of distinct audience members when specifying category membership.

4.4. The Value of Multiple Perspectives on Categorization

As a topical area of research, there is considerable convergence, as well as divergence, in approaches to studying categorization in markets. Convergent themes, such as interest in the active role played by market audiences in the process of category emergence and how category memberships constitute organizational identities, point to common principles about the basic origins and functions of category systems in markets. At the same time, research on different kinds of category systems, be they organizational forms, movement frames, product classification systems, or institutionalized logics of action, demonstrate considerable range in

guiding assumptions, core processes, and empirical approaches around these principles.

To some degree, differences in approaches can be traced back to the different perspectives guiding researchers efforts. Each of the various perspectives we have discussed can be viewed as contributing to understanding of categorization in unique and valuable ways. For instance, new institutional theory informs us as to how schemas are connected to institutional logics and cultural frameworks within societies and can be viewed as a source of both institutional constraint and of change. Organizational ecology informs us about how categorization is connected to general processes of selection and evolution in the organizational world. Socio-cognitive theories provide insight into the socially constructed nature of category schemas by producing detailed pictures of how market participants make sense of market landscape using shared cognitive models and their impact on market opportunities. And social movement theory provides yet another angle on the socially constructed nature of category schemas, studying how social movement activists purposefully construct and transpose collective frames to constitute collective identities and mobilize potential constituents.

Yet, we hesitate and try to resist emphasizing such subfield distinctions. In our review of work on categorization, we observe that there already has been considerable cross-fertilization of ideas. For example, a number of studies draw on insights that can be seen as stemming from multiple perspectives, such as institutional theory and social movements literature (e.g., Clemens, 1993; Haveman & Rao, 1997; Schneiberg, King, & Smith, 2008), organizational ecology and institutional theory (Scott, Ruef, Mendel, & Caronna, 2000; Ruef, 2000), organizational ecology, institutional theory, and social movements (Rao et al., 2005), and socio-cognitive theories, institutional theory, and organizational ecology (Zuckerman & Kim, 2003; Kennedy, 2005, 2008). In fact, in work on categorization, these research programs blend to an extent that drawing clear boundaries between literatures is not easy. Articles that span multiple perspectives have had considerable impact and have served to draw attention across boundaries. And by making researchers aware of research in multiple perspectives, they enable them to draw judiciously on insights to push theory forward.

As our review hopefully has shown, the way that categorization shapes markets is complex and multifaceted and would not be sufficiently understood by a single approach. One could therefore think of the work across these perspectives as part of a larger research program, within which there are important distinctions in perspectives that complement and

address gaps where other perspectives do not speak to issues. In the aggregate, the different perspectives are rapidly developing new and ever-more-nuanced insights into this phenomenon.

5. OVERVIEW OF THIS VOLUME

The chapters in this volume reflect this diversity in perspectives on categorization. They are organized into three sections, which reflect key processes of categorization: how categories emerge and are enacted, how audiences use categories, and how categorization systems evolve over time. Insights from each of the four perspectives are applied by authors in each section to inform current knowledge on categorization. We conclude our introduction to this volume with a brief overview of the contributions of each chapter.

5.1. How do Categories Emerge? How are they Structured and Enacted?

We begin with a set of chapters examining category or form emergence. Each highlights a different type of process through which new categories emerge and gain legitimacy.

The chapter by Jensen studies how new category identities are created through the recombination of preexisting categories. This study is grounded in the notion that market identities are constituted through the positioning of products and organizations vis-à-vis two types of categories: product and status. Both categorical dimensions specify social codes regarding appropriate features or behavior. Jensen argues that categorical positioning is a particularly important issue for normatively illegitimate products whose market potential would be significantly improved by claiming more legitimate market identities. The empirical case he considers is the emergence and legitimation of a new genre combining elements from the preexisting genres of comedy and pornography in the Danish film industry. This new genre attained a unique and legitimate market identity through selective use of legitimate and illegitimate genre elements and association with middle-status film actors.

Kahl, Kim, and Philips' study similarly explores the role of market identities in the constitution of a new category. In their chapter, they argue that attention to the sequence of identities inherent in products shapes the development of category meaning. They explore this issue by studying

the emergence of the jazz canon, and the role producers' identities played in determining which songs become canonical. In their examination of identity patterns, they distinguish between musicians who originally record a song or rerecord it early, and those who rerecord that song later. They argue that later "adopters" were attracted to songs that followed a category combination of black originators and white early adopters. This particular combination associates "lowbrow" origins with "highbrow" (with respect to jazz) reputation, and suggests that patterns of a song's long-term success are shaped by style authenticity and legitimacy.

The final chapter in this set considers the emergence of consensus in category meaning from a very different angle, by studying heterogeneity and contention among contemporaneous agents' conceptions around the same category label. Bogaert, Boone, and Carroll examine the emergence of auditing as an organizational form in the Netherlands and how fragmentation in the population of auditing firms affected form legitimation. They find that the existence of contesting professional associations that use the label of "auditor" to refer to professionals with different qualifications slowed down the legitimation of the form. Revising the theory of density-dependent legitimation, they argue that when there is such contestation about labels and associated schemata, firms do not contribute equally to form emergence and therefore calculations of density should take into account the fuzziness of form definitions. They show that empirical models using measures of fuzzy population density and contrast explain legitimation dynamics better than models using classic population density.

5.2. How are Categories Used? What are their Implications?

The chapters in the second section relate to three ways in which categories are used: as tools for external audiences to interpret and evaluate organizations or their products; as mobilization frames that activists use to create organizations or gather resources for them; and as cognitive infrastructures for learning and innovation.

The first two chapters extend existing theory on audience-imposed constraints for category spanning. Roberts, Simons, and Swaminathan tease out the mechanisms by which firms straddling market categories are penalized, analyzing the effect of category change on access to consideration sets and subsequent valuation separately. They find that, while previously non-kosher producers of wine do not have trouble accessing the kosher market, they are penalized by critics in terms of the quality ratings they

receive. Lower quality ratings constrain these producers to charge lower prices for their products.

Kovács and Hannan argue that external audiences' reaction to category spanning depends on the fuzziness of the spanned categories. When categories have fuzzy boundaries, spanning categories does not cause much additional confusion for the audience. When the categories that firms span are highly distinctive, audience members have greater difficulty assessing the producer and therefore devalue it more. Using data on evaluations of food service organizations, they find that producers in high contrast categories receive better evaluations than producers in low contrast categories but that producers spanning high contrast categories are devalued more than producers spanning low contrast categories.

In the next chapter, Carroll, Feng, Le Mens, and McKendrick develop the concept of technological contrast, as an indicator of the distinctiveness of technological paths. They elaborate on how technological contrast of different products in a market may affect the assessment of consumers as well as the behavior of managers and engineers of a firm. They argue that being in high contrast technological niches grants the firm an advantageous strategic position due to high perceptual focus among relevant audiences, giving managers little reason to drop the technology, and allowing the firm to accumulate resources to move into other technologies. Studying the tape drive industry, they show that firms producing high contrast formats are more likely to move into new formats and are less likely to fail.

Rao, Ingram, and Yue investigate a second basic way in which categories are used: as devices for mobilization. Building on the notion that categorization is a basis for collective action their chapter relates the incidence of protests against Wal-Mart to self-categorization of community members. They argue that identification with social categories lead community residents to sustain interactions and develop a feeling of cohesion that spur engagement in defense of local trade and labor, which they see as threatened by entry of mass retailers. Rao et al. focus on the socio-demographic structure of communities and juxtapose alternative predictions of how racial composition can affect protest actions. On one hand, racial diversity weakens the self-categorization of individuals as community members, thwarting participation in collective action. On the other, diversity can offer access to heterogeneous resources and constituencies easing mobilization. Their analysis of protest events against Wal-Mart's store opening proposals supports the homogeneity hypothesis, so community identities are more powerful when they coalesce around shared traits.

The chapter by Schneiberg and Berk provides a third perspective on the function of categories in markets, as tools for learning and innovation. Extant literature largely focuses on the way categories serve as sensemaking tools that stabilize market interaction and exchange. Schneiberg and Berk push against this by arguing that categories can also serve a destabilizing function. Through a case study of accounting systems in the early 20th century, they find that the new categorization system that cost accountants adopted during this time worked to promote continual learning and innovation. They document how multiple features of this system, including benchmarking and the adoption of provisional and flexible cost and product categorizations, helped foster discovery and experimentation within American manufacturing. Through what they call a “deviant” case of categories and markets, they push researchers to revisit fundamental assumptions about the functions of categories in markets.

5.3. How do Category Systems Change?

The final section of this volume highlights the dynamic nature of categories. The chapters in this section consider change at two levels: in the positioning and identities of organizations vis-à-vis categories and in the category meanings themselves.

In the first chapter, Karthikeyan and Wezel study identity repositioning, the expansion of a social actor’s appeal beyond its original category membership. Following Hannan et al. (2007) they argue first that identities that lack sharpness in the eyes of audience members are more amenable to repositioning because audience expectations are less stringent. Second, repositioning is successful to the extent that identity extension maintains congruence with the original category features. Studying the redefinition of the political identity of the British Liberal Democrats Party from 1950 to 2005, the authors find that attention measured as coverage by the newspaper *The Times* increased as Liberals borrowed political issues from rival Labour and Conservative parties but only in combination with references to their original ideological roots. A process of identity matching thus influences the future trajectory of change in social domains.

In the next chapter, Mohr and Guerra-Pearson advance our understanding of how cultural categories influence organizational innovation, which can lead to shifting category meanings. They argue that cultural codes are only interpretable in relation to other codes and that different classificatory systems are embedded in different domains of social life.

By implication, organizational forms are situated in the interrelation of distinct technologies, statuses of people, and social problems. Studying social relief organizations in New York City over the period 1888–1917, they examine ways in which organizations described themselves and find that recombination of forms is more prevalent for organizations that are public, those that receive public funding support, those that exhibit radical identities, and those located in crowded competitive spaces. Also, they argue that the symbolic domain is more amenable to recombination than the material domain where resources like buildings and personnel require more effort to rearrange, which explains why innovations in technologies were prevalent and why, once technologies and statuses were connected, new categories of social problems became easier to identify.

In the concluding chapter, Kennedy, Lo, and Lounsbury consider how category blending can change the meaning of the category schemes themselves over time. For example, category blending may, over time, result in naturalized hybrid categories that are valued by market audiences in their own right. To advance understanding of evolution in category meanings, they develop a new theoretical construct – category currency – to capture the clarity and valence of a category. They then illustrate this notion’s use in the case of nanotechnology and develop a framework of alternative category schemes (i.e., strategies that do not conform to existing market categories) that could gain currency at the expense of existing market categories.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Glenn Carroll, Michael Hannan, and Dave McKendrick for helpful comments. Errors remain ours.

REFERENCES

- Anand, N., & Peterson, R. A. (2000). When market information constitutes fields: Sensemaking of markets in the commercial music industry. *Organization Science*, *11*, 270–284.
- Baker, W. E., & Faulkner, R. R. (1991). Role as resource in the Hollywood film industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, *97*, 279–309.
- Baron, J. N. (2004). Employing identities in organizational ecology. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *13*, 3–32.

- Baron, J. N., Hannan, M. T., & Burton, M. D. (2001). Labor pains: Change in organizational models and employee turnover in young, high-technology firms. *American Journal of Sociology, 105*, 960–1012.
- Baumann, S., Dowd, T. J., & Janssen, S. (2009). Introduction: Classifying culture – Agents, structures, processes. *Poetics, 37*, 295–297.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1994). “All hits are flukes”: Institutionalized decision-making and the rhetoric of network prime-time television program development. *American Journal of Sociology, 99*, 1287–1313.
- Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the U.S. brewing industry. *American Journal of Sociology, 106*, 715–762.
- Cerulo, K. A. (2010). Mining the intersections of culture and cognitive science. *Poetics, 38*, 115–132.
- Clemens, E. S. (1993). Organizational repertoires and institutional change: Women’s groups and the transformation of U.S. politics, 1890–1920. *American Journal of Sociology, 98*, 755–798.
- Clemens, E. S. (1996). Organizational form as frame: Collective identity and political strategy in the American labor movement, 1880–1920. In: D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy & M. N. Zald (Eds), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 205–226). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clemens, E. S., & Cook, J. M. (1999). Politics and institutionalism: Explaining durability and change. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25*, 441–466.
- Clemens, E. S., Powell, W. W., McIlwaine, K., & Okamoto, D. (1995). Careers in print: Books, journals, and scholarly reputations. *American Journal of Sociology, 101*, 433–494.
- Colyvas, J., & Powell, W. W. (2006). Roads to institutionalization: The remaking of boundaries between public and private science. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 21*, 305–353.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1987). Classification in art. *American Sociological Review, 52*, 440–455.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1991). Constructing an organizational field as a professional project: U.S. art museums, 1920–1940. In: W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 267–292). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1992). Nadel’s paradox revisited: Relational and cultural aspects of organizational structure. In: N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (Eds), *Networks and organizations* (pp. 118–142). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1997). Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 263–287.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 147–160.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction. In: W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1–38). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Durkheim, E., & Mauss, M. (1963 [1903]). *Primitive classification*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- Espeland, W. N., & Stevens, M. L. (1998). Commensuration as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 313–343.
- Fleischer, A. (2009). Ambiguity and the equity of rating systems: United States brokerage firms, 1995–2000. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 555–574.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In: W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–266). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Ganz, M. (2000). Resources and resourcefulness: Leadership, strategy and organization in the unionization of California agriculture (1951–1966). *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 1003–1062.
- Garud, R., Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2007). Institutional entrepreneurship as embedded agency: An introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies*, 28, 957–969.
- Glynn, M. A., & Abzug, R. (2002). Institutionalizing identity: Symbolic isomorphism and organizational names. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 267–280.
- Glynn, M. A., & Lounsbury, M. (2005). From the critics' corner: Logic blending, discursive change and authenticity in a cultural production system. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42, 1031–1055.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 1022–1055.
- Hannan, M. T. (2010). Partiality of memberships in categories and audiences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 159–181.
- Hannan, M. T., Baron, J. N., Hsu, G., & Koçak, Ö. (2006). Organizational identities and the hazard of change. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 15, 755–784.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. H. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 929–964.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. H. (1986). Where do organizational forms come from? *Sociological Forum*, 1, 50–72.
- Hannan, M. T., Pólos, L., & Carroll, G. R. (2007). *Logics of organization theory: Audiences, codes, and ecologies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haveman, H. A., & Rao, H. (1997). Structuring a theory of moral sentiments: Institutional and organizational coevolution in the early thrift industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102, 1606–1651.
- Hinings, C. R., Greenwood, R., & Brown, J. L. (1991). Change in autonomous professional organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28, 375–393.
- Hirsch, P. M. (1972). Processing fads and fashions: An organization-set analysis of cultural industry systems. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77, 639–659.
- Hsu, G. (2006). Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audiences' reactions to spanning genres in feature film production. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 420–450.
- Hsu, G., & Hannan, M. T. (2005). Identities, genres, and organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 16, 474–490.
- Hsu, G., Hannan, M. T., & Koçak, Ö. (2009). Multiple category memberships in markets: An integrative theory and two empirical tests. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 150–169.

- Jasper, J. M. (1998). The emotions of protest: Reactive and affective emotions in and around social movements. *Sociological Forum*, *13*, 397–424.
- Johnston, H. (2002). Verification and proof in frame and discourse analysis. In: S. Staggenborg & B. Klandermans (Eds), *Research methods in social movements and protest* (pp. 65–95). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kennedy, M. T. (2005). Behind the one-way mirror: Refraction in the construction of product market categories. *Poetics*, *33*, 201–226.
- Kennedy, M. T. (2008). Getting counted: Markets, media, and reality. *American Sociological Review*, *73*, 270–295.
- Klandermans, B., & de Weerd, M. (2000). Group identification and political protest. In: S. Stryker, T. J. Owens & R. W. White (Eds), *Self, identity, and social movements* (pp. 68–90). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Koonan, R. (1995). Women against the state: Political opportunities and collective action frames in Chile's transition to democracy. *Sociological Forum*, *10*, 80–111.
- Lamont, M., & Molnar, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *28*, 167–195.
- Leifer, E. M. (1988). Interaction preludes to role setting: Exploratory local action. *American Sociological Review*, *53*, 865–878.
- Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 289–307.
- Lounsbury, M., & Rao, H. (2004). Sources of durability and change in market classifications: A study of the reconstitution of product categories in the American mutual fund industry, 1944–1985. *Social Forces*, *82*, 969–999.
- McAdam, D., & Paulsen, R. (1993). Specifying the relationship between social ties and activism. *American Journal of Sociology*, *99*, 640–667.
- McCammon, H. J. (2001). Stirring up suffrage sentiment: The formation of the State Woman suffrage organizations, 1866–1914. *Social Forces*, *80*, 449–480.
- McCammon, H. J., Campbell, K. E., Granberg, E. M., & Mowery, C. (2001). How movements win: Gendered opportunity structures and the State Women's Suffrage Movements, 1866–1919. *American Sociological Review*, *66*, 49–70.
- McKendrick, D. G., & Carroll, G. R. (2001). On the genesis of organizational forms: Evidence from the market for disk drive arrays. *Organization Science*, *12*, 661–683.
- McKendrick, D. G., Jaffee, J., Carroll, G. R., & Khessina, O. M. (2003). In the bud? Analysis of disk array producers as a (possibly) emergent organizational form. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *48*, 60–93.
- Melucci, A. (1996). *Challenging codes: Collective action in the information age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*, 340–363.
- Minkoff, D. (1994). From service provision to institutional advocacy: The shifting legitimacy of organizational forms. *Social Forces*, *72*, 943–969.
- Mohr, J. W., & Duquette, V. (1997). The duality of culture and practice: Poverty relief in New York City, 1888–1917. *Theory and Society*, *26*, 305–356.
- Moore, K. (1996). Organizing integrity: American science and the creation of public interest organizations, 1955–1975. *American Journal of Sociology*, *101*, 1592–1627.

- Negro, G., Hannan, M. T., & Rao, H. (in press-a). Category reinterpretation and defection: Modernism and tradition in Italian winemaking. *Organization Science*.
- Negro, G., Hannan, M. T., & Rao, H. (in press-b). Categorical contrast and appeal: Niche width and critical success in winemaking. *Industrial Corporate Change*.
- Pachucki, M. A., Pendergrass, S., & Lamont, M. (2007). Boundary processes: Recent theoretical developments and new contributions. *Poetics*, 35, 331–351.
- Padgett, J. F., & Ansell, C. K. (1993). Robust action and the rise of the Medici, 1400–1434. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1259–1319.
- Pedersen, J. S., & Dobbin, F. (1997). The social invention of collective actors: On the rise of the corporation. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 431–443.
- Pedersen, J. S., & Dobbin, F. (2006). In search of identity and legitimation: Organizational culture and neoinstitutionalism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 897–907.
- Perretti, F., Negro, G., & Lomi, A. (2008). E pluribus unum: Domain framing, candidate matching and organizational form emergence in U.S. television broadcasting, 1940–1960. *Organization Science*, 19, 533–547.
- Phillips, D. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2001). Middle status conformity: Theoretical restatement and empirical demonstration in two markets. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107, 379–429.
- Podolny, J. M. (1993). A status-based model of market competition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 829–872.
- Pólos, L., Hannan, M. T., & Carroll, G. R. (2002). Foundations of a theory of social forms. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11, 85–115.
- Porac, J. F., Rosa, J. A., & Saxon, M. S. (2001). America's family vehicle: The minivan market as an enacted conceptual system. In: R. Garud & P. Karnoe (Eds), *Path dependence and path creation* (pp. 213–242). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Porac, J. F., & Thomas, H. (1990). Taxonomic mental models in competitor definition. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 224–240.
- Porac, J. F., Thomas, H., Wilson, F., Paton, D., & Kanfer, A. (1995). Rivalry and the industry model of Scottish knitwear producers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 203–227.
- Porac, J. F., Wade, J. B., & Pollock, T. J. (1999). Industry categories and the politics of the comparable firm in CEO compensation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 112–144.
- Rao, H. (1998). Caveat emptor: The construction of nonprofit watchdog organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 912–961.
- Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2005). Border crossing: Bricolage and the erosion of categorical boundaries in French gastronomy. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 968–991.
- Rao, H., Morrill, C., & Zald, M. N. (2000). Power plays: How social movements and collective action create new organizational forms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 237–281.
- Rosa, J. A., Porac, J. F., Runser-Spanjol, J., & Saxon, M. S. (1999). Sociocognitive dynamics in a product market. *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 64–77.
- Rosa, J. A., & Spanjol, J. (2005). Micro-level product market dynamics: Shared knowledge and its relationship to market development. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33, 197–216.
- Ruef, M. (2000). The emergence of organizational forms: A community ecology approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 658–714.
- Ruef, M., & Patterson, K. (2009). Credit and classification: The impact of industry boundaries in 19th century America. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 486–520.

- Schneiberg, M. (2002). Organizational heterogeneity and the production of new forms: Politics, social movements, and mutual companies in American fire insurance, 1900–1930. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 19, 39–89.
- Schneiberg, M., King, M., & Smith, T. (2008). Social movements and organizational form: Cooperative alternatives to corporations in the American insurance, dairy, and grain industries. *American Sociological Review*, 73, 635–667.
- Scott, W. R. (1981). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2008). *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open systems perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., & Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations. From professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation*. Evanston, IL: Harper & Row.
- Sewell, W. H., Jr. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1–29.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1, 197–217.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In: A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds), *Frontiers of social movement theory* (pp. 133–155). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B., Jr., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 464–481.
- Snow, D. A., Zurcher, L. A., Jr., & Eklund-Olson, S. (1980). Social networks and social movements: A microstructural approach to differential recruitment. *American Sociological Review*, 45, 787–801.
- Stark, D. (1996). Recombinant property in East European capitalism. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101, 993–1027.
- Strang, D., & Soule, S. A. (1998). Diffusion in organizations and social movements: From hybrid corn to poison pills. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 265–290.
- Stryker, S. (2000). Identity competition: Key to differential social movement participation? In: S. Stryker, T. J. Owens & R. W. White (Eds), *Self, identity, and social movements* (pp. 21–40). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 273–286.
- Tarrow, S. G. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, V., & Whittier, N. (1992). Collective identity in social movement communities: Lesbian feminist mobilization. In: A. D. Morris & C. McClurg Mueller (Eds), *Frontiers of social movement theory* (pp. 104–129). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 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, 801–843.

- Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- White, H. C. (1981). Where do markets come from? *American Journal of Sociology*, *87*, 517–547.
- White, H. C. (2002). *Markets from networks: Socioeconomic models of production*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zhao, W. (2005). Understanding classifications: Empirical evidence from the American and French wine industries. *Poetics*, *33*, 179–200.
- Zucker, L. G. (1983). Organizations as institutions. In: S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Advances in organizational theory and research 2* (pp. 1–43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (1999). The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. *American Journal of Sociology*, *104*, 1398–1438.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (2000). Focusing the corporate product: Securities analysts and de-diversification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *45*, 591–619.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (2004). Structural incoherence and stock market volatility. *American Sociological Review*, *69*, 405–432.
- Zuckerman, E. W., & Kim, T-Y. (2003). The critical trade-off: Identity assignment and box-office success in the feature film industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *12*, 27–67.
- Zuckerman, E. W., Kim, T-Y., Ukanwa, K., & von Rittman, J. (2003). Robust identities or nonentities? Typecasting in the feature film labor market. *American Journal of Sociology*, *108*, 1018–1074.