



**Categorizing Institutional Logics, Institutionalizing  
Categories:  
A Review of Two Literatures**

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Annals</i>
Manuscript ID	ANNALS-2016-0089.R3
Document Type:	Article
Keywords:	INSTITUTIONAL THEORY, SOCIOLOGY, COGNITION

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## **Categorizing Institutional Logics, Institutionalizing Categories: A Review of Two Literatures**

Rodolphe Durand  
HEC Paris  
1 rue de la liberation, Jouy-en-Josas 78351, France  
+33-139-677-277  
[durand@hec.fr](mailto:durand@hec.fr)  
&

Patricia H. Thornton  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843, USA  
(650) 380-5011  
[pthornton@tamu.edu](mailto:pthornton@tamu.edu)

**April 17, 2018**

45 Acknowledgements: We would like to acknowledge Eunice Rhee and Jade Lo for their insights and  
46 initiative in organizing the Symposium on Institutional Logics and Categories: Reflections, Integration  
47 and Future Directions at the 2016 Academy of Management, the other panelists of this symposium,  
48 Candy Jones and Lynne Zucker, and audience participants, and the helpful comments of editors Kimberly  
49 Elsbach and Charlie Galunic and the anonymous reviewers at the Academy of Management Annals.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Categorizing Institutional Logics, Institutionalizing Categories:**  
4  
5 **A Review of Two Literatures**  
6  
7

8  
9 **Abstract**  
10

11 This review assembles two highly referenced streams of research in organization and  
12 management studies over the past decade: institutional logics and categories. We present the gist  
13 of each literature focusing on the interaction within and between organizations vis-à-vis the  
14 institutional logics and category systems that condition behavior. Then, we suggest that both  
15 streams have compatible assumptions that warrant further integration and suggest opportunities  
16 for future research stemming from (1) complementarities related to inter- and intra-audience  
17 variance, formation and recombination of logics and categories, and actors' identity and (2)  
18 differences related to theory level of analysis, incorporation of conflict, and methods of analysis.  
19 Integration can lead to better specified mechanisms, processes, and contexts important to  
20 improving accuracy and development of these research streams.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The field of organization and management studies has developed into fragmented parallel  
4 streams of research. For scholars interested in institutional change, organizational behavior, and  
5 decision-making within organizations, it is time to assess the opportunities for converging  
6 existing frameworks to enhance scientificity, accumulate findings, and improve theorizing  
7 (Okhuysen and Bonardi, 2011; Cornelissen and Durand, 2012). This review analyzes the reasons  
8 and challenges for rapprochement between the institutional logics and categories research, which  
9 share positive momentum in recent publication numbers, a common research community, and  
10 focus on similar questions and problems.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 A record of publications, tripling in a decade the number of yearly articles published in  
22 top journals, identifies these two perspectives as vibrant research streams within organization  
23 and management studies. Since 2011, approximately 120 articles using the institutional logics  
24 framework appeared in top journals each year in the fields of communications, management,  
25 strategy, entrepreneurship, education, public policy, and sociology (Ocasio, Thornton, and  
26 Lounsbury, 2017). About 100 articles on average for market categories appeared in top journals  
27 in psychology, marketing, strategy, organization theory, economics, and sociology (Durand and  
28 Paoletta, 2013; Vergne and Wry, 2014; Durand, Granqvist, and Tyllstrom, 2017). Many of the  
29 same authors contribute to both domains, however in an uncoordinated fashion thus far. For  
30 instance, Greenwood examined how the influences of multiple institutional logics moderate  
31 organizational decision making and more recently recategorization and gains in status  
32 (Greenwood et al, 2010; Delmestri & Greenwood, 2016); Lounsbury studied the effects of  
33 competing institutional logics on practice adoption and recently nascent categories (Lounsbury,  
34 2007; Wry & Lounsbury, 2011; Lee, Hiatt & Lounsbury, 2017); Durand argued in favor of a  
35 refocus of research on goal-based categories and examined how institutional logics can be used  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 as strategic resources (Durand and Paoletta, 2013; Durand, Szostak, Jourdan & Thornton, 2013).  
4  
5 Finally, both perspectives tackle fundamentally the same questions: what is the value of deviance  
6  
7 vs. conformity? Why and how do individual and organizational actors maintain or upend  
8  
9 preexisting orders? Why do certain organizations succeed whereas others decay and disappear?  
10  
11

12         The institutional logics perspective is defined as a framework for analyzing the  
13  
14 interrelationships among individuals, organizations, and institutions in social systems (Friedland  
15  
16 and Alford, 1991; Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012). Institutional logics are “the socially  
17  
18 constructed historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices, assumptions, values,  
19  
20 and beliefs by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time  
21  
22 and space, and provide meaning to their daily activity” (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999: 804).  
23  
24

25  
26 Researchers have shown that institutional logics have influences on actors at different levels of  
27  
28 analysis, i.e., individuals, groups, and organizations, for example with respect to executive  
29  
30 succession (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999), corporate governance (Geng, Yoshikawa and Colpan  
31  
32 (2016); corporate networks (Bhappu, 2000), practice adoption (Lounsbury, 2007), professional  
33  
34 identity (Dunn and Jones, 2010), organizational deviance (Durand and Jourdan, 2012),  
35  
36 organizational foundings (Almandoz, 2012), corporate social responsibility (Zhang and Luo,  
37  
38 2013; Ioannou and Serafeim, 2015), firm innovation (Pahnke, Katilla and Eisenhardt, 2015) and  
39  
40 interorganizational learning (Vasudeva, Alexander, and Jones, 2014), among others.  
41  
42  
43

44         Categories are defined as interfaces of cognitive agreement about a considered object.  
45  
46 More precisely, categories are the symbolic and material attributes of products, firms, and  
47  
48 industries that are both shared among actors and that distinguish these entities from others  
49  
50 (Carruthers & Stinchcombe, 1999; Douglas, 1986; Zerubavel, 1991; Zuckerman, 1999). Market  
51  
52 actors, both producers and consumers, use categories to represent themselves and to  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 communicate with each other in markets for products and services. A high level of agreement  
4 about what it means to be a member of the set (e.g., a craft brewer, a comedy movie) suggests  
5 that the category is institutionalized and taken for granted (Hannan Polos, and Carroll, 2007;  
6 Negro, Kocak, and Hsu, 2010). Without categories serving as the “social agreements about the  
7 meanings of labels applied to them” (Negro, Hannan and Rao, 2011: 1450), neither institutional  
8 consensus nor social, economic, and symbolic exchanges are likely to be achieved. Research  
9 provides evidence of the influence of categories on competitors’ recognition (Porac et al, 1989;  
10 1999), organizational evaluation and reputation (Hsu et al, 2009), strategic opportunities (Hsu  
11 and Grodal, 2015), and firm performance (Paoletta and Durand, 2016).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 A few researchers have previously connected the two literatures, but there has not been a  
25 systematic review for this purpose. For instance, Ocasio, Lowenstein, and Nigam, (2015) suggest  
26 that categories constitute institutional logics through the distribution of streams of  
27 communication in organizations and institutional fields. As evidence continues to accumulate  
28 that these two perspectives are fertile terrains for organization and management research  
29 (Lounsbury and Beckman, 2015; Durand et al, 2017), and multiple scholars engage in both  
30 literatures, it makes sense to further highlight promising areas of integration and cross-  
31 fertilization. For example, the institutional logics stream fails to mobilize useful concepts from  
32 the category research, such as prototypes, goal-based categories, and theories of value. Similarly,  
33 the categories stream sometimes refers to an institutional logic but remains evasive as to how  
34 precisely institutional logics influence outcomes.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 What do we miss if we do not integrate these two perspectives? What is to be gained?  
50 How do mutual oversights create needless shortcomings in both literatures? To address these  
51 questions, the purpose of this review is to identify and present the core ideas of each research  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 stream (section I), and to examine the epistemological compatibility, and complementarities and  
4 differences across both streams in order to suggest avenues for future research (section II). We  
5 detail six avenues related to inter- and intra-audience variance, formation and recombination of  
6 logics and categories, actors' identity, theory integration and boundary conditions, incorporation  
7 of conflict, and use of multiple methods.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

## 15 **I. LITERATURE REVIEW: KEY IDEAS AND CONCEPTS**

16 First, we review articles published in the top journals<sup>1</sup> as well as significant contributions from  
17 other impactful journals, edited volumes, and books. Second, we rely on knowledge of the two  
18 literatures over the last two decades that is published separately elsewhere (Thornton and Ocasio,  
19 2008; Thornton, Lounsbury, Ocasio, 2012; Ocasio, Thornton and Lounsbury, 2017; Durand and  
20 Paoletta, 2013; Durand et al. 2017). Third, this review is articulated in two subsections,  
21 beginning with how institutional logics influence organizations, how organizations deal with  
22 multiple institutional logics, and how individual and organizational actors instigate institutional  
23 change. Then, the review details the research on the formation of categories, the antecedents and  
24 consequences of category membership, and how actors strategically develop category  
25 memberships.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **I.1. From Organizational Fields to Institutional Logics**

43  
44 Friedland and Alford's (1991) critique of institutional and organization theory provided the  
45 foundation for a new perspective in institutional theory. In essence, Friedland and Alford (1991)  
46 melded Marxian conflict theory with Weberian value spheres to identify solutions to long  
47 standing problems of agency, bounded rationality, self-interest, power, and resources in  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

---

53  
54 <sup>1</sup> Administrative Science Quarterly; American Journal of Sociology; American Sociological Review; Academy of  
55 Management Journal; Academy of Management Review; Journal of Management Studies; Management Science;  
56 Organization Science; Strategic Management Journal  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 organization and management studies. While this approach was not new (Weber, 1978; Merton,  
4 Brown, and Cottell, 1959), it had not been applied to contemporary institutional and organization  
5 theory. More precisely, Friedland and Alford (1991) countered that society is an inter-  
6 institutional system, where for example the family, religion, market and the state coexist as  
7 institutional orders, and that each institutional order differentially influences individuals' and  
8 organizations' rationality and actions. Moreover, the differences in organizing principles across  
9 institutional orders heighten actors' attention to contradictions which create opportunities to  
10 manipulate institutional logics for purposeful gain with implications for institutional change.  
11 Fundamentally, each institutional order is a cultural knowledge corridor that distinctly shapes  
12 attention and the interpretation of meaning.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Building on this critique, scholars empirically demonstrated the limits of neo-institutional  
27 theory in a number of ways; its inability to explain adaptation (Kratz and Zajac, 1996), its lack of  
28 a theory of action (DiMaggio, 1988; Hardy and Mcguire, 2008), its over emphasis on the  
29 structural influence of an organizational field (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999), its singular focus on  
30 mimetic isomorphism (Mizruchi and Fein, 1999), and its dependence on two-stage models of  
31 practice diffusion (Lounsbury, 2007; Purdy and Gray, 2009; Shipilov, Greve and Rowley, 2010).  
32 Simplistic views of organizational actors as rational (motivated by efficiency) or non-rational  
33 (motivated by legitimacy) based on market (technical) versus normative (institutional)  
34 environments (Meyer and Rowan, 1977), were ripe for revision. We highlight in subsequent  
35 subsections the themes characterizing this revision.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 **Influence of Institutional Logics on Organization Decisions.** An early series of  
51 studies showed that a change in the dominant institutional logic changed the determinants of  
52 organizational decision making (Thornton, 2004). Developed in the higher education publishing  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 industry, these studies integrated the institutional logics perspective with the Carnegie School of  
4 attention (Ocasio, 1997) to examine the determinants of CEO selection (Thornton and Ocasio,  
5  
6 1999), risk of acquisition (Thornton, 2001), and adoption of organizational form (Thornton,  
7  
8 2002). Key findings were a change from family and professional to market institutional logics  
9  
10 changed the basis of attention to highlight different dimensions of corporate governance.  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 How institutional logics affect organizational decisions and outcomes continues to be  
17  
18 explored in conjunction with a variety of organization theories, evidencing different mechanisms  
19  
20 for organizational creation and strategic choice. For instance, economic cycles and the level of  
21  
22 association of founders' functional backgrounds affect how opportunity structures appear to  
23  
24 organizations and their leaders and predict the founding of banks (Almandoz, 2012). Bank  
25  
26 management teams with a greater proportion of members with a finance background (market  
27  
28 logic) as distinct from a community background (community logic), were more likely to use  
29  
30 risky deposit instruments to spur rapid growth (Almandoz, 2014). Marquis and Lounsbury  
31  
32 (2007) linked ecological theory to institutional logics to show how conflicting logics seeded in  
33  
34 local (community) versus global (market) principles inspired a resistance movement. They  
35  
36 demonstrated how the acquisition of local banks (specialists) by out of town large banks  
37  
38 (generalists) fueled an increase in the founding of small community banks. That is, national  
39  
40 banks' efforts to introduce global efficiencies by geographic diversification ironically triggered  
41  
42 resource partitioning and entrepreneurialism to preserve the community logic in banking.  
43  
44 Integrating ecology but also category theory Jourdan (forthcoming) finds that firms that are  
45  
46 specialized to an institutional logic have organizational survival advantages which increase when  
47  
48 the evolution of conflicting institutional logics in the industry (population) decrease. Greve and  
49  
50 Zhang (2017) linked institutional logics to firm power coalitions to examine firm strategic  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 choice. In the context of Chinese firms, the strength of the effects of firm coalitions changed as  
4 the market logic gained dominance. Not surprisingly, investors were skeptical of firms with high  
5 state ownership engaging in the strategy of mergers and acquisitions--as it is consistent with a  
6 market, not a state institutional logic.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12           Organizational decisions however may not depend on differences in one institutional  
13 logic versus another, but instead on the effects of a constellation of institutional logics (Goodrick  
14 and Reay, 2011), such as in the cases of innovation in venture-backed firms (Pahnke, Katilla, and  
15 Eisenhardt, 2015) and innovation in product design (Dalpiaz, Rindova, and Ravasi, 2016).  
16 Greenwood, Diaz, Li and Lorente (2010) for example investigated the influences of multiple  
17 institutional logics on corporate downsizing in Spanish manufacturing firms, a strategy  
18 motivated by the market logic. In regions where the influence of the Catholic church (religion  
19 logic) was strong, with its emphasis on family values, the strategy of corporate downsizing was  
20 moderated, even during economic down turns. This study is important because moderation in the  
21 adoption of orthodox market principles did not result solely from the typical source of state  
22 regulation, but from the influences of other institutional orders, in their study, religion. Building  
23 on the idea of one logic constraining or moderating the effects of another, Lee and Lounsbury  
24 (2015) examined how the community logic, operationalized as differences in conservative and  
25 liberal political ideology, amplified or dampened the influences of state and market institutional  
26 logics in shaping firms' toxic waste emissions. In a rare international comparison case, Kuipers  
27 (2015) demonstrated how screen translators aired the same television show, but strategically  
28 varied its contents for audiences in France, Italy, Netherlands and Poland. The key point is that  
29 in spite of the globalization of the media industry, national norms persisted because translators'  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 guiding institutional logics were not determined solely by transnational global media companies,  
4 but moderated by technological and organizational differences that varied by national contexts.  
5  
6

7  
8 **Conflicting Institutional Logics Within Organizations.** In parallel to the first stream of  
9 research demonstrating the *consequences* of multiple logics *on* organizational decisions, another  
10 vein of research examines organization and management processes to solve the problems created  
11 by competing and conflicting institutional logics *within* organizations (Besharov and Smith,  
12 2014). Notably, Battilana and Dorado (2010) examined micro-finance, an organizational form to  
13 exploit new market opportunities to sell banking services to the poor. The bank recruiting  
14 employees with no prior experience in either the market or the state welfare logic was more  
15 successful than the bank hiring employees with prior experience in either finance or social work.  
16 This clean slate approach was more successful because managers socialized individual  
17 employees early on from the ground up to value integration of both logics and therefore  
18 mitigated the conflict that interfered with productive working relationships. Micro-finance also  
19 has been investigated in terms of how the variable gender interacts with different institutional  
20 orders to support or suppress outreach to marginal categories of people (Zhao, Yanfei, and Wry,  
21 2016). Moreover, banks' ability to raise funds for micro-finance lending differs by the type of  
22 institutional logic associated with the fund, e.g., financial (market) and development (state)  
23 logics (Cobb, Wry and Zhao, 2016).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Also, within the social welfare domain, Pache and Santos's (2013) showed how non-  
46 profit organizations managed conflicting logics by selectively coupling intact elements of  
47 different logics. Over identification with the commercial logic, a strategic misfit, diminished  
48 legitimacy and motivated organizations to adopt "Trojan horse" practices by incorporating  
49 categorical elements from the social welfare logic to offset legitimacy losses. In another case of  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 logic misfit related to the public-private Cambridge Energy alliance, Jay, (2013) showed that  
4  
5 logic contradiction creates paradoxes that motivate actors to create hybrid organizational forms.  
6  
7 Paradox is defined in the sense that the organization was deemed a success when viewed through  
8  
9 the lens of one logic and a failure when viewed through the lens of another logic.  
10  
11

12 Hybridization and selective coupling, however are not the only mechanisms to manage  
13  
14 conflicting institutional logics. A series of studies examine other mechanisms, for example truces  
15  
16 in health care (Reay and Hinings, 2009), geographic distance in financial services (Lounsbury,  
17  
18 2007), and balancing logics in the reinsurance industry (Smets et al. 2015). In Lounsbury's  
19  
20 (2007) study of the mutual fund industry, the Boston trustee (professional logic) and the New  
21  
22 York performance (market logic) resulted in alternative practices and products whose differences  
23  
24 were maintained by geographic separation. In Smets, Jarzabkowski, Burke and Spee (2015)  
25  
26 study of reinsurance trading at Lloyd's of London, actors responded to conflicting logics by  
27  
28 segmenting, bridging, and demarcating. Actors used these mechanisms to achieve a dynamic  
29  
30 balance that rendered institutional logics complementary by maintaining the distinction between  
31  
32 conflicting logics, but also retaining the benefits of their interdependence. Individuals'  
33  
34 management of co-existing logics became ritualized in a "continual balance of dynamic tension,"  
35  
36 which dampens incentives for blending or segregating of institutional logics.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Yet, in some cases of conflicting institutional logics, actors must authentically maintain  
43  
44 their identity to effectively co-produce. Jourdan, Durand, and Thornton (2017) examined how  
45  
46 actors engaged in symbolic interaction and deferent behavior to respond to the strain of  
47  
48 conflicting institutional logics. The authors integrate Goffman's (1956) classic theory with  
49  
50 institutional logics in a mixed methods study of the population of French film producers and  
51  
52 financiers. Financiers traditionally mocked for their focus on money rather than aesthetics are  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 vitally needed for financing films. These financiers cannot employ previously reviewed  
4 mechanisms (i.e. hybridize, selectively decouple or switch their identity) as they are stigmatized  
5 actors and must perform their functional role of bankers. By expressing deference certain  
6 financiers are able to cooperatively position themselves in enemy territory to co-produce films.  
7  
8 The investment funds more likely to engage in deferent behavior had more bankers on their  
9 board, hence a greater need for “presentation of self” and to symbolically manage their image  
10 through deference. Deferent financiers were less inclined to lock-in their identity by making  
11 public pronouncements committing to strict financial goals and were caught up in the ritual whirl  
12 of the Cannes film festival awards circuit. While, deferent financiers were able to build social  
13 capital with film producers, it was only at the price of decrementing profits. This study measured  
14 the conditions of capital conversion (from financial to social capital) in a context of conflicting  
15 institutional logics.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 In sum, this vein of research identifies a variety of empirical instantiations and theoretical  
32 mechanisms that organizations employ when hosting multiple and conflicting logics.  
33

34 Hybridization (Batillana and Dorado, 2010), selective coupling (Pache and Santos, 2013),  
35 geographic separation (Lounsbury, 2007), balancing (Smets et al, 2015) and deferent behavior  
36 and symbolic interaction (Jourdan et al, 2017) form the repertoires of organizational actions.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Influencing Institutional Change.** Through their actions, organizations trigger changes in  
44 institutional logics and shifts in institutional logics precipitate changes in organizations, opening  
45 interesting areas for investigation. Thornton, Jones and Kury (2005) compared three industries,  
46 publishing, architecture, and accounting, and revealed differences in the patterns of institutional  
47 change. The practices of publishers were shaped by market rationalization based in an  
48 evolutionary model; architects were influenced by a duality of professional logics associated  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with a cyclical model, and accountants exhibited a punctuated equilibrium model activated by  
4 economic scandals and cycles and state regulation. This comparative analysis revealed that  
5  
6 different types of organizations and industries face different constraints and opportunities in their  
7  
8 efforts to undergo and influence institutional change.  
9  
10

11  
12 Suddaby and Greenwood (2005) documented in an ethnography at the micro level how  
13  
14 institutional entrepreneurs used rhetorical strategies for their own benefit to initiate a new  
15  
16 organizational form integrating accounting and legal services: They exposed contradictions in  
17  
18 logics and framed those contradictions using vocabulary with narrative fidelity with broader  
19  
20 templates in the institutional environment to make the innovation palatable to audiences. In their  
21  
22 inductive case study of the wind energy field in Colorado, York, Hargrave, and Pacheco (2016)  
23  
24 found that social movement organizations (SMOs), electric utility firms, hybrid organizations,  
25  
26 and policy makers responded differently to the incompatibility between economic and ecological  
27  
28 pressures. When SMOs initially failed to convince utility firms by using economic arguments  
29  
30 (market logic), SMOs switched tactics to engage utility firms using ecological arguments  
31  
32 (community logic). Once succeeding in convincing utility firms and hence altering the balance of  
33  
34 power in the field, hybrid organizations then emerged. In some domains, institutional logics  
35  
36 share jurisdiction, albeit in ongoing tension. In Dunn and Jones (2010), the competing  
37  
38 institutional logics of care and science continued to coexist as they were identified with two  
39  
40 different types of professionals engaged in an ongoing jurisdictional tension to control the  
41  
42 medical educational space. The two logics co-existed in varying prevalence to one another over  
43  
44 time because of exogenous forces including an increase in the female composition of medical  
45  
46 schools, the advent of rival public health programs, and the heightened public discourse on  
47  
48 managed care.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           What matters in these different views of institutional change, is that actors at any level  
4  
5 have some capability to adjust their reference to the dominant institutional logic, therefore  
6  
7 affecting its valence in the market or field and opening an alternative for conformity to and  
8  
9 deviance from it. For instance, Durand and Jourdan (2012) in an earlier study of investment  
10  
11 funds in the French Film industry examined to what extent organizations respond favorably to  
12  
13 demands from minority resource suppliers that hold an unconventional institutional logic. They  
14  
15 found that a favorable response to actors espousing a minority logic decreases the influence of  
16  
17 the dominant actors in the market, alters the social structure of resource suppliers, and promotes  
18  
19 the emergence of new institutional logics. In effect, this form of “alternative conformity” is used  
20  
21 by firms occupying a minority position as a soft control strategy towards dominate firms in the  
22  
23 market. Jones and Livne-Tarandach (2008) through textual analysis identify words that are  
24  
25 available in the architect’s cultural tool kit that capture the institutional logics of different  
26  
27 institutional orders. They found that architectural firms deploy multivalent keywords that bridge  
28  
29 institutional logics to allow for multiple meanings so as to be appealing to the interests of  
30  
31 multiple and diverse audiences. Lepoutre and Valente (2012) in a multi-case inductive study of  
32  
33 the Belgian horticulture industry explain how organizations become desensitized and immune to  
34  
35 the symbolic and material carriers of institutional logics, thereby losing their moorings and  
36  
37 making organizations prone to engage in a deviant logic.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44           Pushing further the idea of institutional logics as strategic resources, Durand, Szostak,  
45  
46 Jourdan and Thornton (2013) analyze how three institutional logics, formalism, modernism, and  
47  
48 managerialism in the French design industry are resources organizations use to leverage strategic  
49  
50 choices. Firms with a lower degree of competence and a broader industrial scope are more likely  
51  
52 to add the managerialism logic to their strategic repertoire or tool kit. These firms abandon their  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 association with their original institutional logic, becoming purists in managerialized industrial  
4 design, which is distinct if not foreign from their artistic and technical roots. Interestingly, high  
5 status firms trigger institutional change in the industry by adding the managerialism logic to their  
6 repertoire, yet they maintain reference to their original logic (either functionalist or formalist)  
7 and by doing so do not undermine their social position and advantage.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 As the institutional logics' research agenda evolved, more emphasis has been placed on  
13 how institutional heterogeneity allows individual and organizational actors to manipulate the  
14 conflicts and complementarities of the categorical elements of the institutional orders of society.  
15 Yet, two fundamental precepts of this perspective have been challenged.  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 The first critique is based on arguments that people have limited capacity to apprehend  
21 contradiction, challenging a central mechanism of action in the institutional logics research, that  
22 conflict in logics reveals contradictions and paradoxes that motivate action. Voronov and Yorks  
23 (2015) identified "blockages and facilitators" of people's capacity to apprehend institutional  
24 contradiction. This critique however ignores prior research on attention and sense making that  
25 exposes institutional contradictions, for example Nigam and Ocasio (2010) examined event  
26 sequencing around the Clinton Health Care reform initiative and how it triggered actors' sense-  
27 making. Along the same line, Clemente, Durand, and Roulet (2017) reposition institutional  
28 change in the context of the macro-historical context by associating changes in attention,  
29 cognition, status, and identity to decisions to combine or switch logics, which lies the  
30 groundwork for organizational and individual decisions, labelled ex post as historical events.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 The second issue concerns the idea that rationality does not stem from external ordering  
51 principles such as institutional orders. Studying the development of spiritual self-accountability,  
52 administrative accounting, and record keeping in the Jesuit Order, Quattrone (2015) argues that  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Jesuit principles of rationality were unfolding based on “procedural rationality.” He defines  
4 procedural rationality as continuous interrogations stemming from rhetorical practices used to  
5 classify, recall, and invent knowledge. In essence, Quattrone (2015) questions the need for a  
6 substantive logic to ascertain the relationships between means and ends and suggests that actors  
7 develop the conditions to sanction their later behavior. The generalizability of Quattrone’s  
8 arguments deserve caution due to the narrow scope conditions of the Catholic Church and the  
9 significant gap in historical time between the 16<sup>th</sup> century and the advent of modern and well-  
10 established institutions in society. Yet, the Jesuit case cautions institutional logics researchers to  
11 think more seriously about the bottom-up processes of institutionalization and post hoc sense  
12 making.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 At the same time, investigators are increasingly focusing on bottom up processes and  
27 attentional cues prior to decision-making that explain if individuals and organizations follow the  
28 principles of institutional logics blindly or not. Experimental designs are emerging in the  
29 literature to explore the psychological schema by which societal institutional logics shape action.  
30  
31 Glaser, Fast, Harmon and Green (2016) integrate theory from dynamic constructivism in social  
32 psychology with the institutional logics perspective, and show that subjects, exposed to a cue that  
33 is associated with a particular institutional logic, activate logic consistent schema, making the  
34 logic cognitively salient and accessible. For example, subjects primed to cues of a market logic  
35 justified past actions as more self-interested relative to subjects exposed to a family logic cue.  
36  
37 The authors further demonstrate that subjects exposed to market logic cues exerted more effort  
38 on a self-interest task than subjects exposed to a family logic cue.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 As the more recent research indicates, the focus of the institutional logics research is  
52 moving inside and between organizations in a market to examine how normative impositions  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 combine with cognitive cues and mechanisms to explain behavior. Moreover, it is noteworthy  
4 that interest in the cognitive determinants of choices in the context of markets ribbed with  
5 institutional logics delineates a clear interface between the institutional logics perspective and the  
6 research on categories as subsequently discussed.  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 12 13 **I.2. Categories: from types to goals**

14  
15 Categories in the context of markets and organizations “provide a cognitive infrastructure that  
16 enables evaluations of organizations and their products, drives expectations, and leads to material  
17 and symbolic exchanges” (Durand & Paoletta, 2013: 1102). Categories are the symbolic and  
18 material attributes of products, firms, and industries that are both shared among actors and that  
19 distinguish these entities from others (Carruthers & Stinchcombe, 1999; Douglas, 1986;  
20 Zerubavel, 1991). An early harbinger of the categories research is the work on genres and styles  
21 in cultural fields that facilitate recognition and assessment (e.g., the study of popular music by  
22 Peterson and Kern, 1996). Zuckerman’s (1999) research on securities analysts hallmarks the  
23 initial theoretical formulation of the categories research, introducing the concepts of the  
24 “categorical imperative” and the illegitimacy discount in which firms that fit within identifiable  
25 categories are privileged and those that do not are penalized. In the following review, we  
26 examine how organization scholars explain category formation, the consequences of belonging  
27 to one or many categories, and the strategic behavior of actors in relation to category systems.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 **Formation of Categories.** Categories do not exist independently of the actors that use them. By  
47 the same token, category systems, which are the assemblage of categories coordinated in a  
48 setting, are a result of multiple actors participating in their institutionalization. Organizations and  
49 other market actors, such as intermediaries and raters, are the primary producers and suppliers of  
50 categories. These actors influence whether new categories are integrated into, supplant, or exit  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the category system. As a result, category formation precedes and conditions the phenomena of  
4 study in organization and management research, as categories imply that actors identify, assess,  
5 and transact with others.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 A category is “a class about whose meaning an audience segment has reached a high  
11 level of intentional semantic consensus” (Hannan et al., 2007: 69). When “enthusiasts” are  
12 convinced and convince others that a category can be defined by certain traits and their members  
13 do not share multiple identities, the category becomes accepted and used as a shortcut for  
14 identifying and evaluating audiences. As Negro et al., (2010: 14) notes, “the formation of  
15 consensus among audiences on which label to apply to sets of producers or offers is the seed of  
16 categorization systems.” Category formation therefore lies in an audience’s capacity to agree  
17 that a new category is contrasting and is distinguishable from existing categories. Once  
18 established, actors use the category as a referent for membership and evaluation (Fleisher, 2009).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Navis & Glynn (2010) in the context of the satellite radio industry developed a different  
31 elaboration of how a new category emerges by sanctification by multiple audiences. For them,  
32 producers use rhetorical strategies to make both their offering identifiable and distinct from  
33 rivals and to make the category appear coherent. They announce and materialize future business  
34 implications of the category by using linguistic frames to aggregate a collective identity. For  
35 instance, analysts attend to events that manifest the emergence of the category, investors concur  
36 in analysts’ decisions, and the media feature the apparition of the new category. Once the  
37 category appears institutionalized, producers focus on their distinctive traits, and modulate  
38 gradients of membership vis-à-vis the new category to distinguish themselves from rival  
39 category members. Analysts become sensitive to inter-firm differences, investors’ behavior  
40 becomes specific, and media mentions refer to individualized firms and leaders.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Ruef & Patterson (2009) studied the dynamic relationships between producers and  
4  
5 evaluators in examining the basis of industrial category formation. They found that firms needed  
6  
7 to belong to crisp categories to obtain bank credit when the industrial classification system  
8  
9 became institutionalized, but not beforehand. In the early post-civil war period, the classification  
10  
11 system was simple, the local correspondents of Dunn & Company were untrained attorneys, and  
12  
13 contestation of the evaluations happened recurrently, therefore firms did not need to belong to  
14  
15 crisp categories. During the later period of the late 1880s to 1900, the industrial taxonomy  
16  
17 became multi-level and more precise, the evaluators were professional credit reporters, there  
18  
19 were few contestations of evaluations, and the category system become effective in disciplining  
20  
21 and sanctioning firms that spanned categories. This article is of particular interest because it  
22  
23 details the mechanisms that motivate evaluators to discern businesses' creditworthiness as a  
24  
25 function of their professionalization and the institutionalization of the nomenclature. It also  
26  
27 indicates that category systems are produced and maintained by the actors themselves.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 In their review, Durand and Khairi (2017) observe that prior research does a poor job of  
34  
35 integrating the various factors that influence category formation. As one of many views, the  
36  
37 ecological perspective of category formation does not generalize well across all research contexts  
38  
39 because categories are created not only by audience's enthusiasts, but also by producers, media,  
40  
41 and critics (Hannan et al, 2007; Negro et al, 2011). On the other hand, the work of producers that  
42  
43 ally, and then differentiate their strategies after the category has been accepted by market actors  
44  
45 as proposed by Navis and Glynn (2010) or Kennedy (2008), is one other possibility. Finally, the  
46  
47 ex nihilo creation of category systems and nomenclatures (as in Ruef and Patterson, 2009 or  
48  
49 Espeland and Sauder, 2007) is a relatively rare instance of unbalanced power in favor of raters  
50  
51 and intermediaries over candidate organizations. In an effort to reconcile the multiple sources of  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 category formation (from audiences, producers, and intermediaries), Durand and Khaire  
4  
5 distinguish two types of category formation. First, category emergence proceeds from “elements  
6  
7 extraneous to an existing market. Categories emerge when the existing classification system and  
8  
9 categorical structure of markets do not sufficiently account for material novelties sponsored by  
10  
11 innovators.” Second, category creation occurs where actors delineate new “cognitive boundaries  
12  
13 around a subset of elements within a preexisting category system.” In their summative effort, the  
14  
15 authors describe the nature of novelty, origin, organizational agency, mechanisms for distinction,  
16  
17 basis of discourse, legitimacy, and outcomes for each type of category formation. They identify  
18  
19 the respective roles of the different actors (audience, organizations, intermediaries) that explain  
20  
21 why categories are formed and do or do not gain traction in the system.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Consequences and antecedents of membership in one versus multiple categories.**

28  
29 Independent of the various explanations for category formation, the effects of category  
30  
31 membership on organizations follow two lines of reasoning. Categories are lenses by which  
32  
33 audiences identify and then evaluate producers and their offerings (Zuckerman, 1999): audiences  
34  
35 organize their expectations and evaluations of how well candidates perform along the dimensions  
36  
37 that define a category. However, there is disagreement in the research literature on how the  
38  
39 processes of identification and evaluation take place. From an ecological perspective, in the case  
40  
41 of a new producer or product, audiences automatically recognize the characteristics and  
42  
43 boundaries of the new category, positively sanctioning it if it coincides with the prototype and  
44  
45 negatively sanctioning it if it does not. For instance, Hsu, Hannan and Kocak (2009) directly  
46  
47 associate a producer’s grade of membership in a category with an audience’s expectations about  
48  
49 this category: the lower the grade of membership, the less attention an audience will pay to the  
50  
51 producer. Furthermore, the attributions of an audience relative to a producer with multiple  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 category memberships, as in the case of fuzzy identity, coincides with a lower evaluation of  
4 competence of the producer (i.e., competence is spread thinner across categories). Therefore,  
5 category spanning is negatively sanctioned on the basis of three accounts: 1) the cognitive  
6 ambiguity generated by multiple memberships (i.e., it is costlier to process meaningful offerings  
7 that belong to diverse classes); 2) the identity ambiguity (i.e., it is more difficult to determine  
8 who are the producers that span categories); and 3) the competence ambiguity (i.e., a generalist is  
9 supposed to be less proficient than a specialist at the task level).

19 Using the U.S. feature film industry and the context of Ebay auctions, Hsu et al. (2009)  
20 make a case that increasing niche width for a film (i.e., spanning genres) decreases its appeal and  
21 box-office success. Moreover, for a potential seller, to identify with multiple labels in describing  
22 an Ebay item decreases the odds of an auction's success. Within their contexts, "generalists are  
23 penalized not because generalization indicates poor skills, but because generalists are less than  
24 full members of the category" (Hsu et al., 2009:166). In an effort to address competence  
25 ambiguity, Leung and Sharkey (2013) explicitly adopt measures to control for underlying  
26 differences in capabilities across producers that would render category spanners' offerings less  
27 appealing or of lower quality. Given a change in a crowd-funding website's policy, they created  
28 a matched sample of loans that were listed before and after the removal of category labels. This  
29 research design enabled a test of whether a category-spanning penalty would stem from  
30 perceptual differences rather than from quality-based differences (which became unobservable  
31 after the category labels were removed). They found that before the information was removed,  
32 prospective lenders judged a loan as less attractive when its promoters belonged to multiple  
33 groups and that the category labels associated with the loan significantly increased the penalty of  
34 not finding lenders. After removing the loan labels, the negative effect of multiple membership

1  
2  
3 remained significant, which they interpreted as “strong evidence of the perceptual underpinnings  
4 of the multiple-category discount” (Leung and Sharkey, 2013:181).  
5  
6

7  
8 These studies illustrate that the category-spanning penalty is automatic because it relies  
9 on an extremely powerful and common cognitive mechanism: preference for familiarity with  
10 existing prototypes (Mervis and Rosch, 1981). While preference for familiarity is omnipresent in  
11 everyday life, when dealing with organizations and economic matters, authors argue this  
12 cognitive mechanism needs to be complemented by other mechanisms that lead to different  
13 forms of categorization processes (Durand and Paolella, 2013; Durand and Boulongne, 2017).  
14 These scholars call for greater contextualization of who is categorizing and why, and suggest  
15 examining the contingencies of the categorical imperative by introducing alternative approaches,  
16 including causal models and goal-based categorization (Schneiberg and Berk, 2010; Durand and  
17 Paolella, 2013; Durand et al., 2017).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Responding to this call, the second approach to the processes of identification and  
32 evaluation stems from different cognitive mechanisms than automatic association with  
33 prototypes, focusing instead on how the attention to and evaluation process can be costly and  
34 effortful (Barsalou, 1985; 1991). Two versions of this research coexist. A long existing approach  
35 conceives of categorization as an ongoing socio-cognitive process. Porac et al. (1989) contended  
36 that organizations often ignore information outside of their category and self-select membership  
37 based on their social ties. In this view, categorization is a set of confirmatory information loops  
38 that influence decisions and reinforce the existing category system, which can lead to isolation  
39 and lock-in of suboptimal strategic paths as the case of the waning Scottish knit-wear industry  
40 illustrates (Porac et al, 1989). Glynn and Navis (2013: 1127) underline that categorization is “not  
41 purely cognitive but socio-cultural as well because it is anchored in the context in which  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 categorization occurs.” There often is an explicit effort on the part of audiences to make  
4  
5 themselves understood by producers. For instance, Weber et al. (2008) documented how  
6  
7 consumers and some farmers co-elaborated the features of grass-fed meat and dairy products  
8  
9 around authenticity, sustainability, and naturalness of cattle products. The convergence of  
10  
11 category content ensued through mobilization of consumers to promote the category in multiple  
12  
13 social settings and the engagement of producers, resulting in greater membership purity. In  
14  
15 another study, because of differences in professional rules, understandings, and definitions,  
16  
17 Granqvist and Laurila (2011) described how two audiences (scientists and futurists) have been in  
18  
19 open conflict to determine and classify objects in the nanotechnology’s category system. These  
20  
21 studies have provided a richer birds-eye-view of categorization as an effortful social process,  
22  
23 suggesting that multiple category memberships represent transient stages and identity in the  
24  
25 making, which may not be automatically penalized. In sum, categories are tools and resources  
26  
27 for social actors to interact and elaborate their collective identity in correspondence and in  
28  
29 opposition with other social actors.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35         The other vein of research that views categorization as an effortful social process  
36  
37 proceeds from a less constructivist perspective. Broadly speaking, this research suggests that  
38  
39 audience members are heterogeneous and make use of distinct theories of value, defined as “how  
40  
41 audiences identify issues and solutions, ascribe value, and rank solution providers” (Paoletta and  
42  
43 Durand, 2016: 333). Referring to market analysts, Zuckerman (1999:1431) seeded the idea that  
44  
45 “industry-based category structure is contingent on the prevalence of a theory of value” which  
46  
47 pushes organizations to conform to categorical imperatives. To elaborate, this branch of the  
48  
49 category literature does not pose that the core cognitive mechanism for identification and  
50  
51 evaluation of an entity (an organization, a product) is central tendency, as in the ecological view  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 of categorization. Indeed, central tendency is associated with prototypes and automatic  
4 processing of informational cues, and therefore leads to penalizing identity and competence  
5 ambiguity. By contrast, the core cognitive mechanism associated with theories of value is  
6 conceptual combination, which corresponds to an audience's ability to assemble categorical  
7 features in an effort to better achieve their specific needs or goals. When evaluators observe and  
8 combine an entity's features to match the idealized functionalities that they seek (Barsalou, 1985;  
9 1991), they value this entity more favorably almost independently of its typicality.

19 Therefore, for this branch of research on categories, there is no need to require *ex ante*  
20 that prototypes exist and that audiences expect the precise exhibition of prototypical features. In  
21 market economies, audience members who search to fit their needs seek out entities that are  
22 original, specific, or unprecedented, and thus do not necessarily attend to a typical supplier, but  
23 instead to an atypical one. In a longitudinal study of corporate law firms located in three markets  
24 (New York, London, and Paris), contrary to the ecological view (Hannan et al, 2007; Hsu et al,  
25 2009; Negro et al, 2011), Paoletta and Durand (2016) found that there is a positive association  
26 between category spanning and performance of these firms. They explain that for sophisticated,  
27 singular, and high-stakes cases, clients find that the more attractive suppliers combine multiple  
28 practices. However, this positive relationship becomes statistically insignificant when social  
29 evaluation (i.e., rankings of corporate law firms) mediates the direct effect between category  
30 spanning and performance. Hence, social evaluation, taken as a proxy for audiences' theory of  
31 value, is not a neutral assessment of category spanning. It mediates the relationship between  
32 category spanning and performance, and depending on contexts can represent most of the effect  
33 between category spanning and performance. In the same spirit, Rhee and Fiss (2014) provide  
34 evidence that audiences (stock market in their case) react differently about the same events

1  
2  
3 (announcement of poison pills) depending on the framing around the event and the main speaker  
4 making the announcement.  
5  
6

7  
8 Zuckerman (2017) expands on the idea of categorization as a tool for social evaluation.  
9  
10 He contextualizes his seminal 1999 concept of “categorical imperative” to other settings beyond  
11 stock markets, a specialized case that is likely an exception rather than the rule. He suggests that  
12 in other settings where evaluators have more leeway, play a lesser role, and organizations are  
13 more easily distinguished from their products, the discount for category spanning may not be as  
14 operative. For example, by comparison stock markets are contexts where evaluators have low  
15 freedom, are extremely influential, and organizations are closely tied to their products.  
16  
17 Categorization is therefore a tool to realize actors’ theories of value, and to make transparent the  
18 goals they pursue. A fundamental implication of this revision of the categories perspective is that  
19 categorical purity is only one instance among many possible options. In particular, the concept of  
20 purity becomes less important if audiences can screen candidates’ past performance or assess  
21 their status. In sum, the validity of the categorical imperative argument depends on the  
22 availability of alternative screens, the usefulness of the category system for the evaluator, and the  
23 willingness and competence of candidates to be screened out, among other conditions. Hence,  
24 categorization is a useful tool for audiences to identify and value what they prefer to consume,  
25 and various conditions can enhance pressures for purity or innovation and unconventionality.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 **Conformity to and Deviance from categories as strategic behavior.** The effect of relaxing  
46 previous assumptions that category systems are a given and that actors automatically process  
47 informational cues to favor prototypical entities opens “the golden cage of categorical  
48 membership norms within which organizations are held” (Durand and Kremp, 2016: 86). This  
49 new view has spawned research on categories and strategic decision making that advances well  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 beyond the key concepts of specialism and generalism in ecology theory. In this newer vein of  
4 research, categorization becomes an intentional process at the level of actors, for example a  
5 producer, an audience member, an intermediary, that pursue personal and situated goals and  
6 objectives. Economic valuation and exchanges are therefore more accurately represented in the  
7 full light of how actors in markets recombine cues, rearrange meaning, and generate new  
8 offerings that upend the existing market order.  
9

10  
11 While market intermediaries can facilitate transactions by alleviating category ambiguity  
12 (Glynn and Lounsbury, 2005; Rao et al, 2005), it is not necessarily beneficial to be a full-fledged  
13 member of a category with tight and precise boundaries. Pontikes and Barnett (2015) for  
14 example account for the strategic benefit for producers of lenient categories, those categories  
15 with blurry boundaries and indefinite meaning. Lenient categories because they are under-  
16 specified offer flexibility to producers to modify their strategies as their identity and business  
17 model develops. Furthermore, Pontikes and Kim (2017) showed how technology software  
18 producers operating under the Gartner ranking system categorize themselves relative to how  
19 analysts categorized the same firms. They discovered that both producers and analysts are  
20 strategic in their categorizing, but the producers' behavior dominated the interaction while  
21 analysts' assessments only weighed in secondarily.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Category age also affects both the likelihood of category spanning and the certainty of  
43 whether or not there are penalties for spanning categories. If categories are mature, for example  
44 more than 10 years old, penalties are more likely. Hence Pontikes and Kim (2017) demonstrate  
45 that category consensus can be quite variable because of the idiosyncrasies of the interplay  
46 between the strategies of intermediaries and producers. Earlier, Fleischer (2009) in focusing on  
47 intermediaries' evaluation provided rich evidence of why and how conflict of interests generated  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 category ambiguity. She examined the equity rating systems of U.S. brokerage firms prevalent at  
4  
5 the end of the 1990s and found that when rating system firms receive fees from candidate  
6  
7 brokerage firms, raters do not provide objective information on the market. More precisely, they  
8  
9 strategically develop categories with overlapping content and which therefore lack the capability  
10  
11 for unequivocal interpretation.  
12  
13

14 Other research also has taken a social process and social constructionist approach.  
15  
16 Kennedy (2008) for example stressed the importance of referring to existing legitimate rivals to  
17  
18 carve out a category and to be acknowledged as a new category member. This work and others  
19  
20 (Jones et al, 2012; Wry et al, 2011) are important for two reasons: because of its focus on the  
21  
22 agentic nature of organizations within the dynamic nature of categorical systems to discipline  
23  
24 and sanction; and for demonstrating how actors' normative and cognitive processes can  
25  
26 collectively reshape category boundaries, membership conditions, and key outcomes (Kennedy  
27  
28 et al, 2010). Along these lines, Hsu and Grodal (2015) present a convincing account of why  
29  
30 taken-for-granted product categories open space for producers to decouple their actions from  
31  
32 what customers expect. Their study of the light cigarette market provides evidence that  
33  
34 nonconformity with the politically correct expectations of reduced tar and nicotine content did  
35  
36 not expose cigarette producers to penalties. As the category of light cigarette became  
37  
38 institutionalized, it became a cognitive shortcut that consumers recognized and for which they  
39  
40 did not make the effort to reevaluate its meaning and characteristics. Eventually, this lack of  
41  
42 evaluation provided a lever for tobacco companies to increase the degree of tar and nicotine to  
43  
44 comparable levels as those of classic cigarettes.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 The most recent research associates category formation with strategy making under  
52  
53 various mechanisms. For example, the construction and imposition of labels such as  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 nanotechnology (Granqvist et al 2013), the tactics of category detachment, emulation, and  
4  
5 sublimation to make products advance on the status ladder, e.g., the case of Italian grappa  
6  
7 (Delmestri and Greenwood, 2016), and the expression of a symbolic narrative around material  
8  
9 artifacts (Khaire and Wadhvani, 2010). With the development of research on the strategic  
10  
11 possibilities of actors' acknowledgment and detachment from categories and category systems,  
12  
13 there is an increase in focus on the idea of "optimal distinctiveness" (see Zhao et al, 2017;  
14  
15 Zuckerman, 2016 for a review). In parallel, different types of empirical indicators are being  
16  
17 developed that advance the measurement of categorical membership beyond the simpler  
18  
19 calculation of distances from average traits (referred to as grade of membership or alignment).  
20  
21 Kim and Jensen (2011) refined indicators that hierarchize categorical traits on a *market identity*  
22  
23 *order*, assessing the distance of interspersing conventional (classics) and unconventional opera  
24  
25 repertoires. Likewise, Durand and Kremp (2016) offer a measure of *conventionality* that  
26  
27 expresses the over-representation of the most common features observed in a given category in  
28  
29 the context of U.S. symphonic orchestras' repertoires.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Overall, categorical membership results from multiple interrelated strategic choices: such  
36  
37 as positioning product and service offerings in a category system, undermining the existing  
38  
39 category system, advancing membership grade in the system or alternatively appearing as  
40  
41 (un)conventional, favoring lenient versus crisp categorical membership, leading or following  
42  
43 intermediaries' categorization, and so on. All of these strategic choices are compatible with the  
44  
45 institutional logics perspective, as we subsequently examine.  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 II. OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

51 Both streams of research share common interests in analyzing the disciplinary mechanisms of  
52  
53 markets from a cognitive and normative perspective. The genealogy of the two perspectives  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reveals similarities in conceptual development and legacies based in their original theoretical  
4 formulations. For example, institutional logics work developed in reaction to the limits of studies  
5 of structural isomorphism in organizational fields (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) and two stage  
6 models of practice diffusion (Davis and Greve, 1997) to focus on contextual studies of  
7 institutional heterogeneity of practice diffusion and cultural meaning systems (Thornton, Ocasio,  
8 and Lounsbury, 2012). The categories research began as a reformulation of organizational  
9 ecology and thus inherited selective and structural properties of ecological theory, i.e., not being  
10 a pure member of a category leads to extinction (Hannan et al, 2007). Logics and categories  
11 share common definitions and characteristics, for example logics as patterns of symbolic and  
12 material elements used and manipulated by individuals and organizations; and categories as  
13 interfaces of cognitive agreement about symbolic and material entities. We take stock of their  
14 commonalities, examine compatibilities and discrepancies between the two approaches, and  
15 underline how to exploit them in future research.

## 32 33 34 **II.1. Compatible assumptions**

35  
36 The two approaches share compatible assumptions with respect to actors and actors' social and  
37 economic environment; we elaborate on these common assumptions by reference to specific  
38 studies.

39  
40  
41  
42  
43 **Actor level.** At the core of the institutional logics perspective are the concepts of *bounded*  
44 *rationality* and *the structure and focus of attention*, foundational principles of the Carnegie  
45 School of decision making theory (Ocasio, 1997; Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012,  
46 chapter 4). Likewise, in category research, rationality is bounded, and stimuli trigger the  
47 activation of cognitive mechanisms that make individuals acknowledge and assess entities  
48 (Hannan et al, 2007; Hsu et al, 2009). Moreover, institutional logics and categories both embody  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *semantic content* that actors interpret, an important factor to understanding logics and categories'  
4 maintenance and change (Hiatt, Sine and Tolbert, 2009; Lowenstein, Ocasio, and Jones, 2012;  
5 Ocasio, Loewenstein, Nigam, 2015). For instance, Dunn and Jones (2010) studied the conflicting  
6 vocabulary emblematic of the differences in the care and science institutional logics shaping  
7 health care education. Jones and her colleagues pioneered work to measure differences in  
8 rhetorical strategies of architects (Jones and Livne-Tarandach, 2008) representing the emergence  
9 of a new category, modern architecture (Jones, Maoret, Massa, and Svejnova, 2012). Rao et al  
10 (2005) is an example of how categories embody and reflect specific meanings in use; they  
11 studied the degree to which the semantic content of words in recipes, not only in terms of the  
12 ingredients, but also the culinary techniques, was rooted in one of two categories, traditional  
13 versus nouvelle cuisine. They found after fifteen years, the categorical boundary between the two  
14 category types became porous, that is the boundary could no longer be used as a yardstick to  
15 separate the old from the new.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 In addition to sharing assumptions about bounded rationality, the structure of attention, and  
34 semantic content, both perspectives also assume that *actors and decision makers are situated*,  
35 with consequences for judgment and ability to maneuver (Townley, 2002). For instance,  
36 Almandoz (2012) documented that during down market cycles bank founders with a background  
37 in the community logic were more likely to follow through and successfully found banks than  
38 founders with a finance background, i.e., knowledge and socialization to a community logic  
39 versus a market logic produced different founding rates. Pahnke, Katilla, and Eisenhardt (2015)  
40 showed how different funding sources associated with different institutional logics, for example  
41 corporate venture capital (corporate logic), state funding (state logic), and institutional venture  
42 capital (professions logic), had different effects on the innovation of young firms. Because  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 institutional venture capital is organized according to a professional logic, it was more effective  
4  
5 in supporting innovation than alternative sources of funding associated with the state and the  
6  
7 corporate logic. The argument is partnership networks compared to corporate hierarchies and  
8  
9 state bureaucracies can respond faster and are more adaptable to the need for start-up firms to  
10  
11 pivot from their original business plans. Likewise, from category research, Durand, Granqvist  
12  
13 and Tyllstrom (2017) explicate the dimensions and situated context of the sense-making process  
14  
15 of categorization. Actors have needs and interests that influence their use of prototypes and goal-  
16  
17 derived categories. The authors stress that the entity to be categorized need not be fixed once and  
18  
19 for all, and that the entity exists in both material and symbolic forms that are sensitive to varying  
20  
21 interpretations. Thus, the act of categorization varies as well as the context of categorization, for  
22  
23 example in public versus private and habitual versus exceptional contexts, and this variation can  
24  
25 have significant impact on the antecedents and consequences of categorization processes (Grodal  
26  
27 and Kahl, 2017).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 A consequence of these similarities is that the logics and the categories perspectives  
34  
35 converge on the idea that market actors are not doomed to selection processes, but can actively  
36  
37 cooperate and co-work their institutional and categorical environments. For instance, in  
38  
39 situations where actors identities are incommensurate, past research on institutional logics  
40  
41 demonstrates strategies such as hybridization (Batillana and Dorado, 2010; Pache and Santos,  
42  
43 2013), state mandated truces (Reay and Hinnings, 2009) and logic switching (McPherson and  
44  
45 Sauder, 2013) enable cooperation for a better good. These studies suggest remedies for resolving  
46  
47 conflicting institutional logics such as giving up one's identification with their home logic or  
48  
49 establishing interaction rituals to defer to prominent actors (Jourdan et al, 2017).  
50  
51  
52

53 Category research also investigates how actors co-build categories under competitive  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 conditions. Wang, Wezel, and Forgues (2016) for example studied the conflict between the  
4 hotel's category and hoteliers' reaction to consumers' evaluation to understand the competitive  
5 and cooperative pathways that exist between a producer (the hotelier), a platform (TripAdvisor),  
6 and consumers. Navis and Glynn (2010) showed how producers cooperate rather than compete in  
7 the presence of resource scarcity in order to foster the emergence of the essential traits of a  
8 category. Following their insight, Sonenshein, Nault, and Odobaru (2017) in a qualitative study  
9 examined how food truck operators created a strategic group identity that involved both  
10 cooperative and competitive behaviors. Cooperation was needed to help members achieve the  
11 central tendencies of food truck group identity, but competition revealed who achieved the ideal  
12 or highest regarded tendencies of the group. This evidence redirects existing theory on  
13 competitive dynamics and strategic groups in that incumbent firms helped new members to enter  
14 the market, resource scarcity led to cooperation, and competition focused on status within the  
15 group, not price.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 **Historical and social environment contexts.** Beyond sharing common underlying assumptions  
35 at the actor's level, both perspectives consider historical and social influences primarily as  
36 moderators of the main relationships. Institutional theory suggests that through the historical  
37 process of institutionalization, the more mature a field, the more the dimensions of institutional  
38 logics are likely to cohere and be impactful on individual and organizational behavior (Ruef and  
39 Paterson, 2009; Tolbert and Zucker, 1983). This is why longitudinal research designs are  
40 preferred in institutional analysis and needed to validate and advance the scope conditions of the  
41 two perspectives. Shipilov, Greve, and Rowley (2010) employing a two-stage model provided  
42 evidence of the long-term impact of prevailing institutional logics in explaining the adoption of  
43 Canadian corporate board practices in a mature field. They found in the second-wave of  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 diffusion, practices were more likely to be adopted by those organizations in which the  
4  
5 corporation's logic had prompted adoption in the first wave, the second wave serving to  
6  
7 complete a fuller repertoire of the categorical elements of the first wave institutional logic. Note,  
8  
9 these findings are contrary to prior neo-institutional research explaining practice diffusion as  
10  
11 either for efficiency in the first wave and legitimacy in the second (Tolbert and Zucker, 1983), or  
12  
13 mimetic isomorphism and board interlocks in mature fields (Di Maggio and Powell, 1983). As  
14  
15 expressed by Meyer and Hollerer (2016: 381) elsewhere: "commitment to a logic-defining  
16  
17 concept primes the later commitment to a logic-extending concept."  
18  
19

20  
21         Historical contextualization reinforces the explanatory power of category systems as  
22  
23 well. Indeed, as noted, agents in a mature categorical system are more likely to rely on  
24  
25 prototypes and established nomenclatures than on goal-derived categories to determine the value  
26  
27 of items and transactions. For instance, Khaire and Wadhvani (2010) describe the genesis of the  
28  
29 Indian modern art category. To elaborate the discourse about Indian modern art, agents  
30  
31 connected the dots between the characteristics of the local Indian artwork and established criteria  
32  
33 of value that were prevalent in the global art world. This connection related the aspirations of  
34  
35 potential patrons, such as social climbing and belonging to an enlightened elite, to the traditional  
36  
37 features of Indian craftsmanship and cultural symbols. Artists consolidated these connections by  
38  
39 integrating the codes of producers in the global art market with selected intermediaries and  
40  
41 channel partners to further procure and legitimate identity in these circuits.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47         As illustrated by these studies, both perspectives account not only for the effects of how  
48  
49 historical conditions moderate the effects of logics and categorical systems, they emphasize how  
50  
51 social position and social attributes play a major role in how institutional logics are instantiated  
52  
53 and category systems evolve. As such, they shed light on how actors retain features and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 characteristics that constitute the institutional orders and logics that weigh on actors in the future  
4  
5 (Clemente et al, 2017). For instance, Quattrone (2015) analyzed over several centuries how the  
6  
7 Jesuit order produced large-scale routines and governing principles that coincided with a  
8  
9 superordinate unfolding logic. In these selection and retention processes, not all actors are  
10  
11 equally endowed with influence and power.  
12  
13

14  
15 In the category research stream, Sharkey (2014) defends the point that organizations may  
16  
17 derive status not simply from demonstrations of quality but also by association with highly-  
18  
19 valued membership in certain industry categories. Examining U.S. corporate earnings  
20  
21 restatements over a decade, her research demonstrates that investors reacted less negatively to  
22  
23 earnings restatements announced by firms which were associated with higher-status industries.  
24  
25 Therefore, the consequences of violations differ as a function of the expectations raised by an  
26  
27 actor's membership in categories, positional centrality in the social structure, and high or low  
28  
29 standards of quality. Likewise, Bowers and Prato (2017) find evidence that changes in category  
30  
31 systems in a market lead to displacement in actors' status. New categories introduced by a third  
32  
33 party (analysts, raters) generate new and exogenous opportunities to stand out and be socially  
34  
35 promoted for an unchanged level of quality, offering some actors unearned status and associated  
36  
37 benefits. Finally, among many studies providing evidence of the role of status in how actors  
38  
39 instantiate institutional logics, Durand and Jourdan (2012) in studying film producers and  
40  
41 financiers established that when the holders of a minority logic were not socialized with the  
42  
43 dominant incumbents, their countervailing influences against the incumbents were stronger. As  
44  
45 minority logic holders, that is the bankers financing movie projects, increased association with  
46  
47 incumbent producers and centrality in the network of film producers, their countervailing  
48  
49 influence faded away.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## II.2. Complementarities: Opportunities for research

Identifying compatible assumptions between the institutional logics' and categories' perspectives suggests that by ignoring either approach, scholars risk omitting important factors that could contribute and perhaps modify their analyses. This section identifies areas of complementarity and avenues for future research at three levels: the inter and intra variance at the audience level, the formation and recombination processes at the category and logic level, and the actor's identity at the organizational level.

**Inter- and intra- audience variance.** The categories and institutional logics literatures have emphasized how heterogeneous audiences use different categorical systems as cues to form judgments (Pontikes, 2012; Lounsbury, 2007). They often typify actors' expectations relative to a prototype or a dominant logic. On the grounds of inter-audience variance and intra-audience homogeneity, Pontikes (2012) demonstrates that venture capitalists positively view categorical ambiguity whereas clients sanction it. Lounsbury (2007) associates mutual fund types based on differences in an institutional logic, trustee or professional logic versus. Performance or market logic, to the type of contract fund administrators established with independent professional management firms. He finds that the heterogeneity of funds as measured by past strategy and performance, (i.e., growth or non-growth) triggers differences in contracting as a function of the competition between the trustee and performance logics.

Categories research has investigated intra-audience variance. Kovacs, Carroll, and Lehman (2013) for instance studied consumer preferences using more than a million reviews on 18,000 restaurants and found that for the same level of quality, consumers assign higher authenticity ratings to independent- and family-owned restaurants. However, their findings raise the question of how they defined the institutional environment. Is independent and family too

1  
2  
3 narrow a definition for explaining authenticity as a category? The institutional logics perspective  
4 suggests that focusing solely on one or two categorical dimensions, i.e., independent and family  
5  
6 can bias results because the basis of identity, legitimacy, norms, attention and other elements  
7  
8 may be based on a broader set of institutions. If these researchers integrated the institutional  
9  
10 logics and categories perspectives in their research design and analysis, it may include, not just  
11  
12 professional and family logics, but also “authentic” restaurants that draw on the community logic  
13  
14 or the religion logic, such as restaurants, bakeries, and wineries run by various community  
15  
16 associations and religious monasteries. Greens in San Francisco run by the Tassajara monks is a  
17  
18 well-known restaurant that would be left out of the authors’ analysis and as a result may bias  
19  
20 findings and reduce the scope conditions of the theory. Another example of the enrichment  
21  
22 between the institutional and category research is prompted by Weber et al. (2008). The  
23  
24 authenticity, sustainability, and naturalness of the category of grass-fed meat and dairy products  
25  
26 is unlikely to occur solely based on the co-elaboration between farmers and consumers. Similar  
27  
28 to the example of categorical types of cuisine (Rao et al, 2003), one can argue that issues of the  
29  
30 sacredness and purity of food are not just the domain of the beef industry, but also manifest from  
31  
32 other or larger institutional environments, in the case of grass-fed meat and dairy products, in  
33  
34 community, professional, and religious institutional logics.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Different audience members mobilize different categories and members’ ability to  
43  
44 identify categories stems from possessing different theories of value to motivate and explain  
45  
46 needs and aspirations (Zuckerman, 1999; 2017; Paoletta and Durand, 2016). Scholars  
47  
48 acknowledging this point also add that audiences can be constituted by multiple theories of value  
49  
50 and that members from different audiences can share common theories of value (Durand and  
51  
52 Boulongne, 2017). For example, some pro-environment consumers and investors may share the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 same theory of value while not being part of the same audience type. In theory, they may  
4  
5 observe identical institutional logics despite being typed as belonging to different audiences: for  
6  
7 instance, both investors and clients may value a community logic over a corporate logic. As  
8  
9 research on organic food and nanotech categories illustrates (Granqvist and Ritvala, 2016),  
10  
11 producers as well as public authorities and audiences may have convergent interests in having a  
12  
13 goal-based category imposed to set the stage for sane competition. If no clear prototype emerges  
14  
15 to stabilize market expectations, producers and audience members may disengage. While the  
16  
17 category research to date has not ventured into the particularization of individual theories of  
18  
19 value within audiences, evidence suggests that audience homogeneity exists across audience  
20  
21 types (Hahl, Zuckerman, and Kim, 2017). Sharing and instantiating the same institutional logic is  
22  
23 a potential explanation for this inter-audience homogeneity. Hence, a first complementarity  
24  
25 between the two research streams at the level of audiences indicates that the institutional logics  
26  
27 framework may explain differences in theories of value within an audience and similarities in  
28  
29 theories of value across audiences.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 As noted previously, early studies in the institutional logics perspective focused on the  
36  
37 influences of a dominant logic (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999). Hence, by stressing the prevailing  
38  
39 logic, there has been potential to erroneously pre-fixing audience properties and therefore  
40  
41 potentially misunderstanding the existing degrees of heterogeneity and agency in the population.  
42  
43 For instance, in their study of organizational resistance, Marquis and Lounsbury (2007) assume  
44  
45 that out-of-town and generalist banks are all likely to instantiate a performance logic as distinct  
46  
47 from local and community banks. Yet, the institutional logics perspective does not assume that  
48  
49 individuals have or use the same valuation criteria across institutional orders, nor have the equal  
50  
51 capacity to recognize institutional contradictions (Battilana and Dorado, 2010; Voronov and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Yorks, 2015). The intrinsic coherence of an institutional logic is not an iron cage. The categories  
4 perspective provides the mechanisms explaining why some features and elements are more  
5 noticed, salient, and valuable for audience members (Paolella and Durand, 2016; Smith and  
6  
7 Chae, 2017) and therefore offers a contributive addition to the institutional logics perspective.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Therefore, we argue that associating the dual concepts of dominant and multiple  
13 institutional logics and category systems and references used by audiences can specify a richer  
14 set of the assumptions and scope conditions for both perspectives. Institutional logics provide a  
15 set of frames that specify the criteria that guide how and why audience members express theories  
16 of value. Hence, there is great potential to advance categories scholarship by using the  
17 institutional logics comparative subsystem framework to classify theories of value for multiple  
18 audiences. Reciprocally, applying categories theory to institutional logics research provides a  
19 new way to explain why some actors may be more capable than others in handling multiple  
20 conflicting institutional logics and engaging in logic switching and recombination. The question  
21 may be a function of either how much an actor values one categorical element over another or  
22 which cognitive mechanism the actor uses (i.e., central tendency, conceptual combination) in a  
23 given situation. Future research geared toward understanding assessment, likeability,  
24 preferences, adoption and any action resulting from valuation can likely benefit from  
25 acknowledging the coexisting influences of category systems and institutional logics on the  
26 antecedents of the outcomes under study. The crux of this problem is to account for both inter-  
27 group homogeneity and intra-group heterogeneity in theories of value, without committing  
28 inextricable particularization such that findings do not generalize.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 **Logic and Category Levels: Formation and Recombination.** Research suggests that category  
53 emergence proceeds from “elements extraneous to an existing market” (Durand and Khaire,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2017). Moreover, changes in institutional logics lead to new category creation and to new  
4  
5 meaning of existing categories (Ruef, 1999; Ocasio and Joseph, 2005). Yet, the few studies that  
6  
7 connect these two threads of knowledge truncate the analysis to the later stages of  
8  
9 institutionalization and miss the opportunity to connect the dots on the origin of the category  
10  
11 itself. For instance, Rao, Monin and Durand (2003) in their study of the categories of classic and  
12  
13 nouvelle cuisine, argued that social identity movements explained the shift in categories in the  
14  
15 culinary profession. The authors identified four mechanisms linked to this change: the  
16  
17 sociopolitical legitimacy of food critics as activists, the theorization of new roles, the prior  
18  
19 defections by peers and gains to peers, and gains to defectors as identity-discrepant cues. Note  
20  
21 the mechanisms the authors identified do not foreshadow why the social identity movement led  
22  
23 to the emergence of the nouvelle cuisine category. It is not obvious that such a movement, which  
24  
25 upended the theatre, fiction books, and movie fields could also revolutionize the culinary field, a  
26  
27 distant field on many accounts (e.g., manual versus intellectual, imitative versus innovative,  
28  
29 collective versus individual creation).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 By comparison, Jones, Maoret, Massa and Svejenova (2012) investigated the formation  
36  
37 of a new category, rooting its account in an analysis of institutional logics. They used network  
38  
39 analysis of actors' vocabulary to identify institutional logics and how these logics shaped the  
40  
41 creation of a new category called modern architecture. By examining the centrality of key words  
42  
43 and their relation to material practices from 1870 to 1975, they delineated two variants of a  
44  
45 professions logic, modern organic, associated with the analog of nature, and modern functional,  
46  
47 associated with the analog of industry. Jones et al. (2012) provide evidence of how architects  
48  
49 embodying these two types of institutional logics battled over the definition and boundaries of  
50  
51 the category of modern architecture. The comparison of these two studies suggests that  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 knowledge of the instantiation of institutional logics can inform the analysis of category  
4  
5 emergence and creation.  
6

7  
8         Research on the decomposability of an institutional logic into categorical elements  
9  
10 (Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury, 2012; Battilana and Lee, 2014) offers another avenue for  
11  
12 better understanding how and why the content of an institutional logic evolves and its use  
13  
14 changes over time. Through the processes of transposition and reinterpretation, actors are  
15  
16 capable of assembling categorical elements from different institutional orders to modify an  
17  
18 institutional logic. For instance, Purdy and Gray (2009) describe the development of dispute  
19  
20 resolution practices over two decades, identifying how actors engaged in four processes  
21  
22 (transformation, bridging, grafting, and exit). The category research can advance understanding  
23  
24 the elaboration and change in institutional logics beyond description of these processes by  
25  
26 uncovering the general mechanisms for how and why decision makers orient their organization  
27  
28 in one direction or another. For example, understanding how audience members select reference  
29  
30 groups to establish their comparisons (Smith and Chae, 2017), how they assess category valence  
31  
32 and combination (Vergne, 2012), and whether they find value in enforcing crisp versus lenient  
33  
34 categories (Leung and Sharkey, 2013; Pontikes and Barnett, 2015) provide fodder to a  
35  
36 description of the process at play in institutional logics' evolution.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42         In sum, research is needed to uncover the regularities explaining why, how, and when  
43  
44 new categories emerge from adjacent or more distant institutional logics; who are the actors that  
45  
46 bridge across institutional logics; and the reasons emergent categories pertain to the prevalent  
47  
48 category system. The same questions about category creation, initiated by incumbent  
49  
50 organizations seeking to regenerate the conditions that make their theory of value preeminent in  
51  
52 a market (Durand and Khaire, 2017) can be addressed by the institutional logics' lens.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Accordingly, the categories approach brings new light to the reasons why certain actors assemble  
4 and rearrange dimensions of logics. Categories research provides concepts (e.g. prototypes, goal-  
5 based categories, contrast, spanning, ambiguity, leniency, grade of membership), mechanisms  
6 (e.g., central tendency, familiarity, conceptual combination), measurements, and relationships  
7 that complement the explanation of why hybrid organizations strive and decay beyond the more  
8 traditional institutional explanations rooted in identity and legitimacy and other social processes  
9 and cultural accounts. Therefore, future research targeting the first stages of category formation  
10 and the recombination within and across institutional logics will benefit from a greater  
11 integration of the two literatures.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 **Actors' identity:** Both perspectives have a theory of organizational identity based in contrast  
25 effects, i.e., contrasting focal organizational traits and characteristics relative to predominant  
26 categories and alternative institutional logics. Both perspectives argue that decision makers span  
27 and stretch categories and logics selectively and strategically (Battilana and Dorado, 2010; Kim  
28 and Jensen, 2011; Durand et al, 2013; Pontikes and Kim, 2017). While the two perspectives  
29 complement each other on what makes an organization's identity coherent and conform to  
30 expectations or at odds and deviant, the two perspectives have not been used much in concert to  
31 study organizational identity, a reason being that while complementary, their approaches begin at  
32 different origin points.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The categories literature adheres to a bottom up process in which product characteristics  
46 aggregate up to the organization to determine organizational identity. For instance, Kim and  
47 Jensen (2011) aggregate the different opus performed by opera houses to characterize market  
48 identity and the corresponding expectations of audiences. Hsu (2006) compounds multiple  
49 movies produced to typify whether or not a producer is a generalist or specialist. However, doing  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 so fails to account for how organizations instantiate logics that audiences recognize and  
4  
5 comprehend from the larger institutional environment, i.e., independent of the aggregation of  
6  
7 product features. This bottom-up method ignores well established theory and empirical findings  
8  
9 in neo-institutional theory in which organizations are inscribed by generalized facts prevalent in  
10  
11 their larger institutional environments (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Anteby, 2010; Jourdan et al,  
12  
13 2017). And this inscription may be independent, if not inconsistent with identification processes  
14  
15 stemming from the aggregation of observable cues at lower levels of analysis –such as products,  
16  
17 repertoires, or business portfolios (Negro et al, 2010; Kim and Jensen, 2011; Smith, 2011;  
18  
19 Paolella and Sharkey, 2017).  
20  
21  
22  
23

24         While in theory not limited to only top down processes (see Thornton, Ocasio, and  
25  
26 Lounsbury, 2012 chpt 4), many studies in the institutional logics literature do not account for the  
27  
28 bottom-up aspects of audiences. Rather, institutional logics research emphasizes the more  
29  
30 generalizable dimensions of logics, focusing on whether organizations respect them or not (e.g.,  
31  
32 bases of identity, authority, governance, etc.) as illustrated by the case of business actors  
33  
34 involved in production of cultural products (Rao et al, 2005; Jones et al, 2012; Shymko and  
35  
36 Roulet, 2017).  
37  
38  
39

40         One potential advance with promise is to capture both bottom up and top down aspects of  
41  
42 organizational identity. The categorical elements that form the basis of organizational identity in  
43  
44 institutional logics research are not well developed. The aggregative measures used in categories  
45  
46 research could be easily transposed into the institutional logics perspective to express with more  
47  
48 fine-grained attention how organizations instantiate the multiple categorical elements of a logic.  
49  
50 Moreover, the sources of legitimacy, identity, authority, etc., are likely to vary by different  
51  
52 classifications of actors. Not all actors even within an institutional order may share a common  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sense of legitimacy, identity, and authority, nor use the same vocabulary—these categorical  
4 elements may vary to differing degrees for example by different audiences and producers as a  
5 function of their receptivity to various normative constraints imposed by an institutional logic.  
6  
7 Exploiting this complementarity is therefore promising in elaborating this macro to micro and  
8 micro to macro interaction to define organizational identity, why it changes over time (in the  
9 absolute and for a specific audience), and what consequences this entails for the organization's  
10 choices and outcomes.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **II.3. Differences: Opportunities for Research**

21 We underlined the compatibility of assumptions across the two research streams and some  
22 promising complementarities. However, some striking differences between the two research  
23 fields are worth mentioning as they could appear as limiting the prospects of further integration;  
24 namely: each theory is more developed at a different level of analysis; the two perspectives  
25 account for conflict differently; and use different methods of analysis and approaches to data.  
26  
27 These differences provide opportunities for future research.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 **From Theory Level Differences to Boundary Conditions.** An obvious and consequential  
38 difference between the categories and institutional logics literatures is the level of analysis at  
39 which each theory has developed. Most of the categories research is meso-level theory; i.e., an  
40 intermediate level that consists in organization-to-organization or organization-to-individual  
41 level theorizing. The institutional logics perspective is a meta-theory that encapsulates  
42 institutional orders, logics, organizations, and individual behavior. It is often integrated with  
43 other meso- and lower-level theories and concepts to produce meaningful refinement in scope  
44 conditions of existing theorizing, for example theories of attention (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999;  
45 Thornton 2001, 2002), paradox (Jay, 2013), dynamic constructivism (Glaser et al, 2016),  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 symbolic interaction (Jourdan, Durand, & Thornton, 2017), political coalitions (Greve and  
4 Zhang, 2017), ecology (Marquis and Lounsbury, 2007), agency theory (Chung and Luo, 2008),  
5  
6 path dependence (Shipilov, Greve, and Rowley, 2010), and cultural sociology (McPherson and  
7  
8 Sauder, 2013; Battilana and Dorado, 2010). This asymmetry has implications for further  
9  
10 integration to expand the capacity for multi-level theory and empirical research.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 One view on this asymmetry is that the explanatory power of each theory depends on  
16  
17 conditions of the other. Categories are a basic unit of cognition and a conduit through which  
18  
19 institutional logics shape cognition (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008). Thus, the categories  
20  
21 perspective is conceptually connected with institutional logics' theory and can contribute to  
22  
23 enrich it. As previously expressed, research on categories provides theoretical concepts and  
24  
25 mechanisms (Jones et al., 2012; Durand and Boulongne, 2017; Jancsary, Meyer and Hollerer,  
26  
27 2017) that explain how institutional logics are identified as available to individuals and  
28  
29 organizations to access and activate. The concepts, theoretical mechanisms, and stylized facts  
30  
31 brought about by the categories research (consistently replicated results as reviewed in section  
32  
33 I.2) help to better identify the basic organizing principles and expectations for the institutional  
34  
35 logics' perspective: after several decades of research on categories, we know the reasons why  
36  
37 central tendency or conceptual combination prevails, when actors employ analogies or refer to  
38  
39 ideals instead of prototypes, how category system's properties (contrast, inclusiveness) and  
40  
41 actors' characteristics (status, expertise) influence the main relationships of interest. This  
42  
43 knowledge dovetails well with the institutional logics perspective and could further develop its  
44  
45 scope conditions and explanatory power.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Reciprocally, how actors constitute category systems, mobilize categories, and evaluate  
52  
53 entities depend on which institutional logics are salient, invoking some interpretations of the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 situation, but not others (Lounsbury, 2007; Quattrone, 2015). Notably, two views in the  
4  
5 categories literature, the goal-based approach (Durand and Paoella, 2013; Granqvist and Ritvala,  
6  
7 2016; Zuckerman, 2017) and the socio-constructivist view (Granqvist et al, 2013; Grodal &  
8  
9 Kahl, 2017) suggest advances by using the institutional logics perspective to anchor cognition in  
10  
11 an institutional context. Therefore, to explain why actors mobilize certain categories, which  
12  
13 categorical features are more meaningful, what degree of ambiguity actors can tolerate, scholars  
14  
15 need to understand and account for the presence and salience of some institutional logics over  
16  
17 others. Hence, there are situations where category theory precedes over institutional logics theory  
18  
19 in explaining phenomena, notably when there is no conflict in norms and values in a situation.  
20  
21 Likewise, when prototypes of the category system are established and actors are identified,  
22  
23 category theory may have low explanatory power, while the institutional logics perspective  
24  
25 probably accounts for most of the variance of the phenomena under study. In the middle case,  
26  
27 both theoretical perspectives likely account for a significant share of the explanation. Overall, the  
28  
29 differences in level of theorization which are revealed by an integrated approach represent an  
30  
31 opportunity for a clearer delineation of the validity of both research perspectives.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Role of conflict.** Scholars have highlighted the role that institutions play in legitimating and  
39  
40 sustaining “common cognitive understandings” e.g., as expressed as labels, vocabularies, and  
41  
42 categories (Cornelissen et al., 2015: 14). As previously reviewed, characteristics of the  
43  
44 institutional context trigger activation of cognitive mechanisms by reference to linguistic and  
45  
46 visual properties that connote norms and values associated with the situation (Glaser et al. 2016).  
47  
48 However, considerable research on categories does not account for these nuanced connotations  
49  
50 and how they may conflict with other interpretations (particularly the branch of category studies  
51  
52 rooted in prototype research). Most of the prototype research is limited to examining  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 informational signals that trigger cognitive mechanisms (Hsu, 2006; Hsu et al, 2009; Negro et al,  
4 2011). For instance, Wry, Jennings, and Lounsbury (2014) focused on the effects of the ‘header-  
5 modifier,’ i.e., how a key word or lead term as in ‘cat house’ or ‘mobile phone’ modifies  
6 cognitive perceptions. They found that depending on how the ‘header-modifier’ applies, some  
7 new ventures will be more likely to be funded than others. Notably, when a scientific venture  
8 combines commercial acumen, it is more likely to be funded than when a commercial team  
9 strives to associate with scientists. This linguistic property triggers cognitive mechanisms and  
10 actions; however, it is not embedded in a broader institutional context where values may be more  
11 or less subject to conflict.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24         Recent studies on market categories examine moral and value-laden features more  
25 susceptible to igniting discord among audiences (Vergne, 2012). These studies broaden the  
26 definition of a goal to include the underlying “ideals” of the goal, for example by focusing on  
27 environmental footprints and human rights protections as features of a category. For instance, the  
28 research on socially responsible investment (SRI) funds shows how differences in goal ideals  
29 differentiate the ability of asset managers to compete in shaping a new category (Arjalies, 2010).  
30 With the idea of moving this research beyond attentional stimuli and consonant or discrepant  
31 cues, what if the categorical imperative and related categorical principles were analyzed from an  
32 institutional and social normative perspective? Here, there is interesting research to build on to  
33 better understand the value-laden features of market categories and their potential impact on  
34 social processes that affect theoretical mechanisms and scope; for example, with the research on  
35 practice and proscribed exchanges (e.g., cadaver trade in Anteby, 2010) and the  
36 institutionalization of illegitimate products (e.g., erotic movies in the 1970s in Jensen, 2010). In a  
37 rare study tackling the idea of normative and political conflict and domination, Quinn and Munir  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (2017) identify how a hybrid category (impact investing) led an organization to establish and  
4 perpetuate unequal power relations in exploiting natural resources. They studied the case of  
5 forest exploitation in Sub-Saharan Africa (Uganda) and land disputes between a portfolio  
6 company from a UK-based impact investment fund and local communities. In analyzing the  
7 imperatives weighing on the fund's activity reporting, and the subsequent actions it undertook to  
8 maximize its impact, they state: "as powerful organizing devices, categories are political and  
9 cultural productions fraught with contention" (Quinn and Munir, 2017:115).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 A key difference between the categories and institutional logics research is that the logics  
20 perspective has dealt with normative and value conflicts (e.g., Friedland and Alford, 1991;  
21 Thornton and Ocasio, 1999). Institutional logic scholars have integrated research in cognitive  
22 and social psychology and have studied (at least) three approaches that are relevant to this  
23 discussion. First, Nigam and Ocasio (2010) revealed how attention and sense making are  
24 triggered by events in the institutional environment in the context of sensitive political issues.  
25  
26 Second, Suddaby and Greenwood (2005) showed how actors exposed contradictions in  
27 institutional logics to gen-up a rhetorical narrative for and against a new organizational form.  
28  
29 And third, how some actors, but not others are able to express themselves to make some logic  
30 categorical elements more salient, attended to, and convictional than others: McPherson and  
31 Sauder (2013) evidenced how court room professionals "hijack" institutional logics of their  
32 opponent to make the court room docket progress efficiently. They found that of all the  
33 professionals, the psychologists were significantly less likely to switch and take the logic of the  
34 other in negotiating the case compared to the lawyers and probation officers. This suggests that  
35 not all logics are as available and accessible to any actor and that logics are not neutral in how  
36 cognition is activated; some logics are more malleable to moving and switching in different  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 contexts, while others are intractable.  
4

5           The idea of examining both the cognitive mechanisms and the institutional context  
6 concurrently, not in isolation, in future research is therefore central to understanding the  
7 transposition of categorical elements of institutional logics. For the institutional logic literature, it  
8 contributes to understanding the (cognitive) limits of actors to use institutional logics as a  
9 cultural tool kit. Theories of value can be conceptualized as orthogonal to the vertical  
10 institutional orders and explain the categorical elements of values and behaviors in an industry,  
11 market, and other environments. Reciprocally, for the category literature, institutional logics  
12 embed actors in a socialized and institutional context, paving the way for broadening the  
13 investigation and inclusion of more contentious categorical features in the analyses. For the  
14 categories research, the institutional logics perspective identifies different valuation criteria, how  
15 categories fit together in a system of meaning, and how these systems conflict and can find ways  
16 of resolution; for example via resistance (Marquis and Lounsbury, 2007; McDonnell and King,  
17 2013), deference (Jourdan et al, 2017), rhetoric and other discourse tactics (Suddaby and  
18 Greenwood, 2005). The tight and loose coupling of categories within an institutional order can  
19 indicate the weakness and stability of categories of an institutional logic and its level of  
20 resilience to replacement by another logic. It can show the social and political influence on  
21 vocabularies and provide a theory of regulation and change of category definitions (Lowenstein,  
22 Ocasio and Jones, 2012), all phenomena that deserve more research.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 **Methods: Better Measures for Better Findings.** Another striking difference between the two  
48 perspectives consists in the type of methods employed. The research on institutional logics aims  
49 at understanding the effects of multiple institutional logics over longer periods of time (Dunn and  
50 Jones, 2010; Jones et al, 2012), whereas the category research draws on cross sectional and  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 relatively shorter time periods, i.e., on the spot evaluation or choice, or a few years of  
4  
5 observation, a decade at most. As noted, because research on institutional logics covers longer  
6  
7 periods of time, it is able to unearth the origins and varied meanings of categories, the breadth of  
8  
9 categorical boundaries, and the true (or not) challenges of hybridization and boundary spanning  
10  
11 (Battilana and Dorado, 2010; Quinn and Munir, 2017; Paoella 2017). This longitudinal and  
12  
13 more dynamic research design complements the categories literature which remains largely  
14  
15 focused on settings where category systems are fixed or where there is a simplification of the  
16  
17 institutional context, such as in a study of one industry or a product category.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22         Researchers in the categories literature have made strides toward conceptual and  
23  
24 methodological refinement in understanding the multiple combinations of features that define a  
25  
26 category. Authors like Carroll, Hannan, Hsu, Kocak, Negro and Pontikes have no doubt built  
27  
28 rich and reproducible techniques to assess categorical purity, contrast, and spanning effects,  
29  
30 among other traits. Paoella and Durand (2016) have attended to the vertical structure of category  
31  
32 systems and suggested the construct of “inclusiveness” which represents the co-occurrence of n-  
33  
34 uplets of categories (duos, trios, etc.) in the entire universe of all observable data. For instance,  
35  
36 the association of some duos (practice A and practice D) could be less represented than some  
37  
38 trios (A, B and C) in the entire set of n-uplet offerings present in a given year in the market.  
39  
40

41  
42         The operationalization of these more advanced methods in the categories literature can  
43  
44 enrich the institutional logics research. Institutional logics research has used case studies to  
45  
46 describe and infer relationships among the constitutive elements of a logic and the way that an  
47  
48 actor instantiates the logic. While there are studies that provide evidence of the processes of the  
49  
50 recombination of logics’ elements that lead to hybridization, comparatively speaking their  
51  
52 identification and operationalization are not at the same level of refinement and systematic  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 analysis as in the categories literature. Furthermore, this lack of precision could lead to under-  
4  
5 specification of each organization's or audience's particularities under consideration. Hence, we  
6  
7 advocate for the development of multi-method research. Alongside cases and qualitative  
8  
9 evidence, large longitudinal datasets provide a sound approach to investigate the association  
10  
11 between factors of interests (e.g., panel-data regression analysis). Other investigations can  
12  
13 complement them, i.e., specific forays using other appropriate techniques in order to probe  
14  
15 causation between factors. For instance, identification techniques such as instrumented variables,  
16  
17 matched sampling, and difference-in difference strengthen the estimation of directional effects.  
18  
19 At the finer levels of analysis, when approaching individuals in their capacities to apprehend  
20  
21 categories and institutional logics' elements, randomized controlled trials, experimental designs,  
22  
23 but also text mining techniques to name a few are of value to probe the attentional, cognitive,  
24  
25 and linguistic mechanisms that actors activate in specific situations. In sum, future research  
26  
27 should gain from associating the two approaches not only at theoretical and phenomenological  
28  
29 levels, but also by combining their methodological strengths.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

## 36 **Conclusion**

37  
38 This review has motivated the benefits of integrating knowledge, concepts, and methods from the  
39  
40 categories and institutional logics literatures. These two fields have not been integrated before  
41  
42 for reasons that wane nowadays. First and foremost, as noted previously, the intellectual roots of  
43  
44 the logics and categories perspectives stem from two theoretical traditions in organization and  
45  
46 management studies that textbooks long viewed as distinct, institutional and ecological theories.  
47  
48 It has taken time for research to dispel unproductive questions and debates this theoretical  
49  
50 bifurcation encouraged, such as whether or not organizations adapt (institutional theory) or are  
51  
52 selected out of the population (ecology theory). Second, as expressed above, there exist  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 differences in methods' conventions and sophistication between the two research traditions. As  
4  
5 more cross-over scholars ignore these differences and academic demands for evidence increase,  
6  
7 multi-method research proves advantageous to circumscribe the factors of influence and their  
8  
9 direction. Third, under the steam of new generation scholar cohorts, the dividing lines between  
10  
11 the neo-institutional and organizational ecology scholarship legacies atrophy. Moreover, with the  
12  
13 continuing professionalization of field of business strategy new opportunities are available to  
14  
15 apply and merge knowledge of institutions and categories in market settings. This paper  
16  
17 materializes the convergence between these two streams, and the fertilization of current and new  
18  
19 fields it begets.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 The first part reviewed the institutional logics research, starting with the influence of  
25  
26 institutional logics on organizations, the way organizations deal with multiple institutional  
27  
28 logics, and how they mobilize them to induce institutional change. The review of the categories  
29  
30 research was organized around the formation of categories, the consequences and antecedents of  
31  
32 belonging to one versus multiple categories, and conformity and deviance from categories as  
33  
34 strategic behavior.  
35  
36

37  
38 The second part of the review focused on the compatibility of the underlying assumptions  
39  
40 of the two literatures with the intent to lay the ground work for identifying the complementarities  
41  
42 between the two perspectives that may suggest opportunities for future research. Compatible  
43  
44 assumptions were identified and discussed at the actor level, in terms of bounded rationality, the  
45  
46 structure and focus of attention, semantic content, and decision makers as situated; and at the  
47  
48 historical and social environmental context (mostly) as moderators of main effect relationships.  
49  
50 Table 1 synthesizes our presentation.  
51  
52

53  
54 *Insert Table 1 about here*  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Areas for future scholarship gleaned from these complementarities included, inter and  
4 intra audience variance in which the crux of many of the issues highlighted in the review suggest  
5 the need for better theories of value to explain inter-group homogeneity and intra-group  
6 heterogeneity. One of the clear benefits of integration of the two perspectives gleaned from the  
7 reviews is that institutional logics can help explain differences in theories of value within an  
8 audience and similarities in theories of value across audiences. Future research along these lines  
9 holds promise to correct the over-generalization of the categorical imperative across markedly  
10 different institutional contexts, since market analysts' theory of value has strict boundary  
11 conditions (Zuckerman, 2017). Research has shown that different audiences mobilize different  
12 categories and identification mechanisms which likely proceeds from each audience possessing a  
13 different theory of value, i.e., a theory of value motivates and explains the needs and aspirations  
14 of audience members (Paoella and Durand, 2016). In theory, the categorical imperative will  
15 likely vary depending on which institutional logics are salient in the particular context, a  
16 question yet to be examined empirically. While the categories research has been applied in many  
17 market-based settings, the review of the institutional logics research highlights that markets are  
18 only one institutional order in society and market based practices are often influenced by non-  
19 market forces (Greenwood et al. 2010), suggesting an opportunity to expand the scope conditions  
20 of category theory.

21  
22 The categories research can measurably add to the institutional logics perspective by  
23 helping to define the illusive concepts of legitimacy and identity, which are central to any  
24 institutional logic. Both the concepts of legitimacy and identity have been difficult to measure,  
25 perhaps because of their taken-for-granted importation from neo-institutional theory. The  
26 categories research argues that legitimacy stems from categories' characteristics and identity

1  
2  
3 from the degree of membership in categories, and provides methods to measure and test their  
4 effects. More importantly, there has been slow progress in developing new generalizable  
5 concepts and employing more sophisticated methods of analysis in the institutional logics  
6 perspective. Category researchers developed concepts and theoretical mechanisms that can be  
7 immensely useful to solve this problem: for instance, central tendency in association with  
8 prototypes, grade of membership, fuzzy identity, and category spanning penalty; but also, goal-  
9 based categorization, conceptual combination, theory of value and conventionality. By  
10 comparison, current measures of institutional logics are crude, e.g., qualitative case studies,  
11 historical time periods, geographical regions, actors' functional backgrounds, excepting the  
12 newer content analytic research on vocabularies (Jones et al., 2012), the priming of logics in  
13 experimental designs (Glaser et al, 2016), and the techniques of visual imageries and semantic  
14 networks (Meyer et al. 2016).

15  
16  
17 In sum, three types of consequences emerge from analyzing the findings of this review.  
18 Failing to span these literatures will stall both perspectives due to unspecified mechanisms,  
19 processes, and contexts. On mechanisms, institutional logics can provide the groundings for  
20 actors' theory of value for categories research and categories can help institutional logics  
21 researchers define the categorical elements of the inter-institutional system that underlie concepts  
22 such as the sources of legitimacy and identity. On processes, the institutional logics perspective  
23 can help explain the emergence, creation, and change in the meaning of categories. The  
24 categories research can help explain how institutional logics become instantiated in a market.  
25 On context, categories researchers are interested in inter and intra audience variance and  
26 expanding their ability to define and assess a fuller set of influences of the institutional  
27 environment. The institutional logics perspective can help to specify the heterogeneity of the  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 institutional environment, particularly outside the market context. The categories research can  
4 help institutional logics researchers identify the distinctions between the producers and audiences  
5 of institutional orders and their evaluation proclivities.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Overall, the mutual enrichment and cross-fertilization between two fast-growing streams  
11 of research in organization and management studies promises to reveal unobserved and  
12 previously unobservable sources of explanation to multiple sociological, political, and economic  
13 phenomena.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Institutional Logics and Market Categories: Compatibilities, Complementarities, and Differences**

<b>Compatible Assumptions</b>	
Actors	Bounded Rationality Structure & Focus of Attention depend on cues and stimuli Actors & Decision Makers are situated Actors influence material and symbolic elements of the inter-institutional and market category systems Competitive Conditions result from actors' positioning vis-à-vis institutional logics and market categories
Contexts	Historically Contingent: importance of context maturity to explain phenomena Socially Contingent: importance of social structure and actor position to explain phenomena
<b>Complementarities</b>	
Audience Variance	IL contributes to CL by explaining the origins of audience members' theories of value. CL contributes to IL by explaining how and why actors pay attention to cues and signals and the resulting interpretations and actions. Integration benefits: more comprehensive explanations of inter- and intra- audience heterogeneity and resulting behaviors
Formation and Recombination	IL contributes to the explanation of how and why categories form and category systems evolve CL provides concepts and mechanisms that contribute to explaining the presence, reinforcement, and waning of IL's constitutive elements Integration benefits: explaining category formation and the recombination within and across institutional logics
Actors' Identity	IL contributes to CL by theory and empirical evidence of top-down processes shaping organization identity (influences of legitimacy, authority, etc.) CL contributes to IL by theory and empirical evidence of bottom-up processes that constitute organizational identity (aggregation of product features) Integration benefits: micro to macro and macro-to-micro processes of actors' identity's constitution, change, and outcomes
<b>Differences</b>	
Levels	IL is a 'meta' theory and CL is a 'meso' theory Benefits of integration: identifying the conditions of the theoretical and empirical validity of each research perspective and reinforcing their explanatory power
Role of Conflict	IL theorizes conflict as an explanatory mechanism, CL has mostly ignored conflict



	Benefits of integration: accounting of the cognitive mechanisms associated with conflict and expansion of research scope to product and market settings influenced by values, ideologies, and normative principles.
Methods	IL uses case studies and longitudinal correlational studies. CL uses multi-settings, correlational, but also experiments, matched samples, and causal identification techniques Benefits of integration: Advocating for multi-method studies where correlational studies are complemented with at least another method (e.g., qualitative, textual, computational linguistics, causal identification, etc., depending on research questions and study design issues).

## References

- Almandoz, J. (2012). Arriving at the starting line: The impact of community and financial logics on new banking ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1381-1406.
- Almandoz, J. (2014). Founding teams as carriers of competing logics: When institutional forces predict banks' risk exposure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(3), 442-473.
- Anteby, M. (2010). Markets, morals, and practices of trade: Jurisdictional disputes in the US commerce in cadavers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 606-638.
- Arjaliès, D. L. (2010). A social movement perspective on finance: How socially responsible investment mattered. *Journal of business ethics*, 92, 57-78.
- Barsalou, L. W. (1985). Ideals, central tendency, and frequency of instantiation as determinants of graded structure in categories. *Journal of experimental psychology: learning, memory, and cognition*, 11(4), 629.
- Barsalou, L. W. (1991). Deriving categories to achieve goals. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 27, 1-64.
- Battilana, J. & Dorado, S. (2010). Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6): 1419-1440.
- Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing—Insights from the study of social enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 397-441.
- Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), 364-381.
- Bhappu, A. D. (2000). The Japanese family: An institutional logic for Japanese corporate networks and Japanese management. *Academy of management Review*, 25 409-415.
- Bowers, A., & Prato, M. (2017). The Structural Origins of Unearned Status: How Arbitrary Changes in Categories Affect Status Position and Market Impact. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 0001839217727706.
- Carruthers, B. G., & Stinchcombe, A. L. (1999). The social structure of liquidity: Flexibility, markets, and states. *Theory and Society*, 28(3), 353-382.
- Chung, C. N., & Luo, X. (2008). Institutional logics or agency costs: The influence of corporate governance models on business group restructuring in emerging economies. *Organization Science*, 19(5), 766-784.
- Clemente, M., Durand, R., & Roulet, T. (2017). The Recursive Nature of Institutional Change: An Annales School Perspective. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 26, 17-31.
- Cobb, J. A., Wry, T., & Zhao, E. Y. (2016). Funding financial inclusion: Institutional logics and the contextual contingency of funding for microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 2103-2131.
- Cornelissen, J., & Durand, R. (2012). More than just novelty: Conceptual blending and causality. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 152-154.

- 1  
2  
3 Cornelissen, J. P., Durand, R., Fiss, P. C., Lammers, J. C., & Vaara, E. (2015). Putting  
4 communication front and center in institutional theory and analysis. *Academy of*  
5 *Management Review*, 40(1), 10-27.  
6  
7 Dalpiaz, E., Rindova, V., & Ravasi, D. (2016). Combining logics to transform organizational  
8 agency: Blending industry and art at Alessi. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(3),  
9 347-392.  
10  
11 Davis, G. F. & Greve, H. R. (1997). Corporate Elite Networks and Governance Change in the  
12 1980s. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1): 1-37  
13  
14 Delmestri, G., & Greenwood, R. (2016). How cinderella became a queen theorizing radical  
15 status change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(4), 507-550.  
16  
17 DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism  
18 and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*,  
19 48(2): 147-160  
20  
21 Douglas, M. (1986). *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.  
22  
23 Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation  
24 of care and science logics in medical education, 1967–2005. *Administrative Science*  
25 *Quarterly*, 55(1), 114-149.  
26  
27 Durand, R. & Boulongne, R. (2017). Advancing Category Research: Theoretical Mapping and  
28 Under-Reserched Areas. Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T., & Meyer, R, eds.  
29 *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (SAGE Publication, London).  
30  
31 Durand, R., Granqvist, N., & Tyllström, A. (2017). From Categories to Categorization: A Social  
32 Perspective on Market Categorization. In *From Categories to Categorization: Studies in*  
33 *Sociology, Organizations and Strategy at the Crossroads* (pp. 3-30). Emerald Publishing.  
34  
35 Durand R. & Jourdan J. (2012) Jules or Jim: Alternative conformity to minority logics, *Academy*  
36 *of Management Journal*, 55(6): 1295-1315  
37  
38 Durand, R., & Khaire, M. (2017). Where Do Market Categories Come From and How?  
39 Distinguishing Category Creation From Category Emergence. *Journal of Management*,  
40 43(1), 87-110.  
41  
42 Durand, R., & Kremp, P. A. (2016). Classical deviation: Organizational and individual status as  
43 antecedents of conformity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(1), 65-89.  
44  
45 Durand, R., & Paoletta, L. (2013). Category stretching: Reorienting research on categories in  
46 strategy, entrepreneurship, and organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies*,  
47 50(6): 1100-1123.  
48  
49 Durand, R., Szostak, B., Jourdan, J., & Thornton, P. (2013). Institutional logics as strategic  
50 resources. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 39, 165-201.  
51  
52 Espeland, W. N., & Sauder, M. (2007). Rankings and reactivity: How public measures recreate  
53 social worlds. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 1-40.  
54  
55 Fleischer, A. (2009). Ambiguity and the equity of rating systems: United States brokerage firms,  
56 1995–2000. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(4), 555-574.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Frieldand, R. & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing Society Back in: Symbols, Practices, and  
4 Institutional Conditions. Powell W.W., DiMaggio P. J., eds. *New Institutionalism in*  
5 *Organizational Analysis* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago), 232-266.  
6  
7 Geng, X., Yoshikawa, T., & Colpan, A. M. (2016). Leveraging foreign institutional logic in the  
8 adoption of stock option pay among Japanese firms. *Strategic Management Journal*,  
9 37(7), 1472-1492.  
10  
11 Glaser, V. L., Fast, N. J., Harmon, D. J., & Green Jr, S. E. (2016). Institutional frame switching:  
12 How institutional logics shape individual action. In *How Institutions Matter!* (pp. 35-69).  
13 Emerald Group Publishing Limited.  
14  
15 Glynn, M. A., & Lounsbury, M. (2005). From the critics' corner: Logic blending, discursive  
16 change and authenticity in a cultural production system. *Journal of Management Studies*,  
17 42(5), 1031-1055.  
18  
19 Glynn, M. A., & Navis, C. (2013). Categories, identities, and cultural classification: Moving  
20 beyond a model of categorical constraint, *Journal of Management Studies*, 50: 1124-37.  
21  
22 Goffman, E. (1956). The nature of deference and demeanor. *American Anthropologist*, 58(3),  
23 473-502.  
24  
25 Goldberg, A., Hannan, M. T., & Kovács, B. (2016). What does it mean to span cultural  
26 boundaries? Variety and atypicality in cultural consumption. *American Sociological*  
27 *Review*, 0003122416632787.  
28  
29 Goodrick, E., & Reay, T. (2011). Constellations of institutional logics: Changes in the  
30 professional work of pharmacists. *Work and Occupations*, 38(3), 372-416.  
31  
32 Granqvist, N., & Laurila, J. (2011). Rage against self-replicating machines: Framing science and  
33 fiction in the US nanotechnology field. *Organization Studies*, 32(2), 253-280.  
34  
35 Granqvist, N., Grodal, S., & Woolley, J. L. (2013). Hedging Your Bets: Explaining Executives'  
36 Market Labeling Strategies in Nanotechnology. *Organization Science*, 24(2): 395-413.  
37  
38 Granqvist, N., & Ritvala, T. (2016). Beyond prototypes: Drivers of market categorization in  
39 functional foods and nanotechnology. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(2), 210-237.  
40  
41 Greenwood, R. Raynard, M. Kodeih, F. Micelotta, E.R. & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional  
42 Complexity and Organizational Responses, *Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 317-371  
43  
44 Greenwood, R., Diaz, A. M., Li, S. X., & Lorente, J. C. (2010). The multiplicity of institutional  
45 logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization Science*, 21(2),  
46 521-539.  
47  
48 Greve, H. R., & Zhang, C. M. (2017). Institutional logics and power sources: Merger and  
49 acquisition decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(2), 671-694.  
50  
51 Grodal, S., & Kahl, S. J. (2017). The Discursive Perspective of Market Categorization:  
52 Interaction, Power, and Context. In *From Categories to Categorization: Studies in*  
53 *Sociology, Organizations and Strategy at the Crossroads* (pp. 151-184). Emerald  
54 Publishing Limited.  
55  
56 Hahl, O., Zuckerman E. & Kim M. (2017). Why Elites Love Authentic Lowbrow Culture:  
57 Overcoming High-Status Denigration with Outsider Art, *American Sociological Review*,

- 1  
2  
3 Hannan M. T., Polos L., Carroll G. R. (2007). *Logics of organization theory: Audiences, codes,*  
4 *and ecologies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 5  
6 Hiatt, S., Sine, W. D., & Tolbert, P. S. (2009). From Pabst to Pepsi: The Deinstitutionalization of  
7 Social Practices and the Creation of Entrepreneurial Opportunities. *Administrative Science*  
8 *Quarterly*, 54(2009): 635-667
- 9  
10 Hsu, G. (2006). Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audiences' reactions to spanning genres  
11 in feature film production. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3), 420-450.
- 12  
13 Hsu, G., & Grodal, S. (2015). Category Taken-for-Grantedness as a Strategic Opportunity The  
14 Case of Light Cigarettes, 1964 to 1993. *American Sociological Review*, 80, 28-62.
- 15  
16 Hsu, G., Hannan, M. T., & Koçak, Ö. (2009). Multiple category memberships in markets: An  
17 integrative theory and two empirical tests. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), 150-169.
- 18  
19 Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2015). The impact of corporate social responsibility on investment  
20 recommendations: Analysts' perceptions and shifting institutional logics. *Strategic*  
21 *Management Journal*, 36(7), 1053-1081.
- 22  
23 Jancsary, D., Meyer, R. E., Höllerer, M. A., & Barberio, V. (2017). Toward a Structural Model  
24 of Organizational-Level Institutional Pluralism and Logic interconnectedness *Organization*  
25 *Science*.
- 26  
27 Jay, J. (2013). Navigating paradox as a mechanism of change and innovation in hybrid  
28 organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1), 137-159.
- 29  
30 Jensen, M. (2010). Legitimizing illegitimacy: How creating market identity legitimizes  
31 illegitimate products. In *Categories in markets: Origins and evolution* (pp. 39-80).  
32 Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- 33  
34 Jones, C., & Livne-Tarandach, R. (2008). Designing a frame: Rhetorical strategies of architects.  
35 *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1075-1099.
- 36  
37 Jones, C., Maoret, M., Massa, F. G., & Svejenova, S. (2012). Rebels with a Cause: The  
38 Formation, Consentation and Expansion of the de novo Category Moderns Architecture,  
39 1870-1975. *Organization Science*, 23(2012): 1523-1545.
- 40  
41 Jourdan, J., Durand, R., & Thornton, P. (2017). The Price of Admission: Organizational  
42 Deference as Strategic Behavior, *American Journal of Sociology*, 123 (1): 232-275.
- 43  
44 Jourdan, J. (*forthcoming*). Institutional Specialization and Survival: Theory and Evidence from  
45 the French Film Industry, *Strategy Science*.
- 46  
47 Kennedy, M. T. (2008). Getting counted: Markets, media, and reality. *American sociological*  
48 *review*, 73(2), 270-295.
- 49  
50 Kennedy, M. T., Lo, J., & Lounsbury, M. (2010). Category Currency: The changing value of  
51 conformity as a function of ongoing meaning construction. In G. Hsu, O. Kocak, & G.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Negro (Eds.), *Categories in Markets: Origins and Evolution. Research in the Sociology*  
4 *of Organizations*, Vol. 31: 369-397. Binlgey, UK: Emerald.
- 5  
6 Khaire, M., & Wadhvani, R. D. 2010. Changing Landscapes: The construction of meaning and  
7 value in a new market category- Modern Indian Art. *Academy of Management Journal*,  
8 53(6): 1281-1304.
- 9  
10 Kim, B. K., & Jensen, M. (2011). How Product Order Affects Market Identity Repertoire  
11 Ordering in the US Opera Market. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(2): 238-256.
- 12  
13 Kovács, B., Carroll, G. R., & Lehman, D. W. (2013). Authenticity and consumer value ratings:  
14 Empirical tests from the restaurant domain. *Organization science*, 25 458-478.
- 15  
16 Kuipers, G. (2015). How national institutions mediate the global: Screen translation, institutional  
17 interdependencies and the production of national difference in four European countries.  
18 *American Sociological Review* 80(5): 985-1013.
- 19  
20 Lee, B. H., Hiatt, S. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2017). Market Mediators and the Trade-offs of  
21 Legitimacy-Seeking Behaviors in a Nascent Category. *Organization Science*.
- 22  
23 Lee, M. D. P., & Lounsbury, M. (2015). Filtering institutional logics: Community logic variation  
24 and differential responses to the institutional complexity of toxic waste. *Organization*  
25 *Science*, 26(3), 847-866.
- 26  
27 Lepoutre, J. M., & Valente, M. (2012). Fools breaking out: The role of symbolic and material  
28 immunity in explaining institutional nonconformity. *Academy of Management Journal*,  
29 55(2), 285-313.
- 30  
31 Leung, M. D., & Sharkey, A. J. (2013). Out of sight, out of mind? Evidence of perceptual factors  
32 in the multiple-category discount. *Organization Science*, 25(1), 171-184.
- 33  
34 Loewenstein, J., Ocasio, W., & Jones, C. (2012). Vocabularies and vocabulary structure: A new  
35 approach linking categories, practices, and institutions. *Academy of Management Annals*,  
36 6(1), 41-86.
- 37  
38 Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the  
39 professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 289-307.
- 40  
41 Lounsbury, M., & Beckman, C. M. (2015). Celebrating organization theory. *Journal of*  
42 *Management Studies*, 52(2), 288-308.
- 43  
44 Marquis, C., & Lounsbury, M. (2007). Vive la résistance: Competing logics and the  
45 consolidation of US community banking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 799-820.
- 46  
47 McDonnell, M. H., & King, B. (2013). Keeping up appearances: Reputational threat and  
48 impression management after social movement boycotts. *Administrative Science*  
49 *Quarterly*, 58(3), 387-419.
- 50  
51 McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in action: Managing institutional complexity in  
52 a drug court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2), 165-196.
- 53  
54 Merton, R. K., Brown, L., and Cottrell. (1959) *Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects*. New  
55 York: Basic Books.
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Mervis, C. B., & Rosch, E. (1981). Categorization of natural objects. *Annual review of*  
4 *psychology*, 32(1), 89-115.  
5  
6 Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and  
7 ceremony. *American journal of sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.  
8  
9 Meyer, R. E. & Hollerer, M. A. (2016). Laying a smoke screen: Ambiguity and neutralization as  
10 strategic responses to intra-institutional complexity. *Strategic Organization*, 14: 373-406.  
11  
12 Micelotta, E., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (2017). Pathways of institutional change: An  
13 integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 0149206317699522  
14  
15 Mizruchi, M. S., & Fein, L. C. (1999). The social construction of organizational knowledge: A  
16 study of the uses of coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism. *Administrative science*  
17 *quarterly*, 44(4), 653-683.  
18  
19 Navis C, Glynn MA. (2010). How new market categories emerge: temporal dynamics of  
20 legitimacy, identity, and entrepreneurship in satellite radio, 1990–2005. *Administrative*  
21 *Science Quarterly* 55: 439–471.  
22  
23 Negro G., Hannan M. T., Rao H. (2011). 'Category Reinterpretation and defection: Modernism  
24 and Tradition in Italian wine making'. *Organization Science*, 22, 1449-1463.  
25  
26 Negro, G., Koçak, Ö., & Hsu, G. (2010). Research on categories in the sociology of  
27 organizations. In *Categories in markets: Origins and evolution* (pp. 3-35). Emerald Group  
28 Publishing Limited.  
29  
30 Nigam, A., & Ocasio, W. (2010). Event attention, environmental sensemaking, and change in  
31 institutional logics: An inductive analysis of the effects of public attention to Clinton's  
32 health care reform initiative. *Organization Science*, 21(4), 823-841.  
33  
34 Ocasio, W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic management journal*,  
35 187-206.  
36  
37 Ocasio, W. Thornton, P. H. & Lounsbury, M. (2017). *The Institutional Logics Perspective: A*  
38 *New Approach to Culture, Structure, and Process*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.  
39  
40 Ocasio, W., Mauskopf, M., & Steele, C. W. (2016). History, society, and institutions: The role of  
41 collective memory in the emergence and evolution of societal logics. *Academy of*  
42 *Management Review*, 41(4), 676-699.  
43  
44 Ocasio, W., Loewenstein, J., and Nigam, A. (2015). 'How Streams of Communication Reproduce  
45 and Change Institutional Logics: The Role of Categories'. *Academy of Management Review*.  
46 40(1): 10-27  
47  
48 Okhuysen, G., & Bonardi, J. P. (2011). The challenges of building theory by combining lenses.  
49 *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 6-11.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a res-  
4 pons to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 972-1001.  
5  
6 Pahnke, E. C., Katila, R., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2015). Who takes you to the dance? How  
7 partners' institutional logics influence innovation in young firms. *Administrative Science*  
8 *Quarterly*, 60(4), 596-633.  
9  
10 Paolella L., & Durand, R. (2016) Category Spanning, Evaluation, and Performance: Revised  
11 Theory and Test on the Corporate Law Market. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59:  
12 330-351  
13  
14 Paolella, L., & Sharkey, A. (2017). Forging Consensus: An Integrated View of How Categories  
15 Shape the Perception of Organizational Identity☆. In *From Categories to Categorization: Studies in Sociology, Organizations and Strategy at the Crossroads* (pp. 327-353).  
16 Emerald Publishing Limited.  
17  
18 Peterson, R. A., & Kern, R. M. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore.  
19 *American sociological review*, 900-907.  
20  
21 Phillips, D. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2001). Middle-status conformity: Theoretical restatement and  
22 empirical demonstration in two markets. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107: 379-429.  
23  
24 Pontikes E. G. (2012). 'Two sides of the same coin: How Category Leniency affects multiple  
25 audience evaluations'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57, 81-118.  
26  
27 Pontikes, E. G., & Barnett, W. P. (2015). The persistence of lenient market categories.  
28 *Organization Science*, 26(5), 1415-1431.  
29  
30 Pontikes, E. G., & Kim, R. (2017). Strategic categorization. In *From Categories to*  
31 *Categorization: Studies in Sociology, Organizations and Strategy at the Crossroads* (pp. 71-  
32 111). Emerald Publishing Limited.  
33  
34 Porac, J. F., Thomas, H., & Baden- Fuller, C. (1989). Competitive groups as cognitive  
35 communities: The case of Scottish knitwear manufacturers. *Journal of Management*  
36 *studies*, 26(4), 397-416.  
37  
38 Porac, J. F., Wade, J. B., & Pollock, T. G. (1999). Industry categories and the politics of the  
39 comparable firm in CEO compensation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(1), 112-144.  
40  
41 Purdy, J. M., & Gray, B. (2009). Conflicting logics, mechanisms of diffusion, and multilevel  
42 dynamics in emerging institutional fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 355-380.  
43  
44 Quattrone, P. (2015). Governing social orders, unfolding rationality, and Jesuit accounting  
45 practices: A procedural approach to institutional logics. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,  
46 60(3), 411-445.  
47  
48 Quinn, Q. C., & Munir, K. A. (2017). Hybrid categories as political devices: The case of impact  
49 investing in frontier markets. In *From Categories to Categorization: Studies in Sociology*,  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3           *Organizations and Strategy at the Crossroads* (pp. 113-150). Emerald Publishing Limited.  
4  
5 Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine  
6 as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American journal of sociology*, 108(4),  
7 795-843.  
8  
9 Rao H., Monin P., & Durand R. (2005). 'Border crossing: Bricolage and the erosion of  
10 categorical boundaries in French gastronomy'. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 968-991.  
11  
12 Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics.  
13 *Organization studies*, 30(6), 629-652.  
14  
15 Rhee, E. Y., & Fiss, P. C. (2014). Framing controversial actions: Regulatory focus, source  
16 credibility, and stock market reaction to poison pill adoption. *Academy of Management*  
17 *Journal*, 57(6), 1734-1758.  
18  
19 Ruef, M. (1999). Social ontology and the dynamics of organizational forms: Creating market  
20 actors in the healthcare field, 1966–1994. *Social Forces*, 77(4), 1403-1432.  
21  
22 Ruef M., Patterson K. (2009). 'Credit and Classification: The Impact of Industry Boundaries in  
23 Nineteenth-century America'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 486-520.  
24  
25 Saka-Helmhout, A., Deeg, R., & Greenwood, R. (2016). The MNE as a challenge to  
26 institutional theory: Key concepts, recent developments and empirical evidence. *Journal of*  
27 *Management Studies*, 53(1), 1-11.  
28  
29 Schneiberg, M., & Berk, G. (2010). From Categorical Imperative to Learning by Categories:  
30 Cost Accounting and New Categorical Practices in American Manufacturing, 1900-1930,  
31 *Categories in Markets: Origins and Evolution. Research in the Sociology of*  
32 *Organizations*, Vol. 31: 255-292. Bingley, UK: Emerald.  
33  
34 Selznick (1957) *Leadership in Administration*. University of California Press  
35  
36 Sharkey, A. J. (2014). Categories and Organizational Status: The Role of Industry Status in the  
37 Response to Organizational Deviance 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(5), 1380-  
38 1433.  
39  
40 Shipilov, A. V., Greve, H. R., & Rowley, T. J. (2010). When do interlocks matter? Institutional  
41 logics and the diffusion of multiple corporate governance practices. *Academy of*  
42 *Management Journal*, 53(4), 846-864.  
43  
44 Shymko, Y., & Roulet, T. J. (2017). When does Medici hurt da Vinci? Mitigating the signaling  
45 effect of extraneous stakeholder relationships in the field of cultural production. *Academy*  
46 *of Management Journal*, 60(4), 1307-1338.  
47  
48 Smets, M., Jarzabkowski, P., Burke, G. T., & Spee, P. (2015). Reinsurance trading in Lloyd's of  
49 London: Balancing conflicting-yet-complementary logics in practice. *Academy of*  
50 *Management Journal*, 58(3), 932-970.  
51  
52 Smith, E. B. (2011). Identities as lenses: How organizational identity affects audiences'  
53 evaluation of organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56: 61-94.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Smith, E.B. & Chae H. (2017) The Effect of Organizational Atypicality on Reference Group  
4 Selection and Performance Evaluation, *Organization Science*, forthcoming  
5  
6 Sonenshein, S., Nault, K., & Obodaru, O. (2017). Competition of a Different Flavor: How a  
7 Strategic Group Identity Shapes Competition and Cooperation. *Administrative Science*  
8 *Quarterly*, forthcoming.  
9  
10 Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative*  
11 *science quarterly*, 50(1), 35-67.  
12  
13 Thornton, P. H. (2001). Personal versus market logics of control: A historically contingent  
14 theory of the risk of acquisition. *Organization Science*, 12(3), 294-311.  
15  
16 Thornton, P. H. (2002). The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: Conflict and conformity in  
17 institutional logics. *Academy of management journal*, 45(1), 81-101.  
18  
19 Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions*  
20 *in higher education publishing*. Stanford University Press.  
21  
22 Thornton, P. H., Jones, C., & Kury, K. (2005). Institutional logics and institutional change in  
23 organizations: Transformation in accounting, architecture, and publishing. In  
24 *Transformation in cultural industries* (pp. 125-170). Emerald Group Publishing.  
25  
26 Thornton, P. H. & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional Logics and the Historical Contingency of  
27 Power in Organizations: Executive Succession in the Higher Education Publishing  
28 Industry, 1958-1990. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3): 801-843.  
29  
30 Thornton, P. H. & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional Logics. R. Greenwood, R., Oliver,  
31 C., Lawrence, T., and Meyer, R., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational*  
32 *Institutionalism* (SAGE Publication, London), 99-129  
33  
34 Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W. & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The Institutional Logics Perspective:*  
35 *Foundation, Research, and Theoretical Elaboration.*, (Oxford University Press, UK).  
36  
37 Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of  
38 organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative science*  
39 *quarterly*, 22-39.  
40  
41 Townley, B. (2002). The role of competing rationalities in institutional change. *Academy of*  
42 *Management Journal*, 45(1), 163-179.  
43  
44 Vasudeva, G., Alexander, E. A., & Jones, S. L. (2014). Institutional logics and  
45 interorganizational learning in technological arenas: Evidence from standard-setting  
46 organizations in the mobile handset industry. *Organization Science*, 26(3), 830-846.  
47  
48 Vergne, J.-P. (2012). Stigmatized categories and public disapproval of organizations: a mixed  
49 methods study of the global arms industry 1996-2007. *Academy of Management Journal*,  
50 55(5): 1027-1052.  
51  
52 Vergne, J.-P., & Wry, T. (2014). Categorizing Categorization Research: Review, Integration and  
53 Future Directions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51:56-94.  
54  
55 Voronov, M., & Yorks, L. (2015). "Did You Notice That?" Theorizing Differences in the  
56 Capacity to Apprehend Institutional Contradictions. *Academy of Management Review*,  
57 40(4), 563-586.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Wang, T., Wezel, F. C., & Forgues, B. (2016). Protecting Market Identity: When and How Do  
4 Organizations Respond to Consumers' Devaluations?. *Academy of Management Journal*,  
5 59(1), 135-162.  
6
- 7 Weber, K., Heinze, K. L., & DeSoucey, M. (2008). Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the  
8 movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,  
9 53(3), 529-567.  
10
- 11 Weber, M. [1922] 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Guenther  
12 Roth and Claus Wittich (Eds.) Berkeley: University of California Press.  
13
- 14 Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimizing nascent collective identities:  
15 Coordinating cultural entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 449-463.  
16
- 17 Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Jennings, P. D. (2014). Hybrid Vigor: Securing Venture Capital by  
18 Spanning Categories in Nanotechnology. *Academy of Management Journal*, in press: doi:  
19 10.5465/amj.2011.0588.  
20
- 21 York, J. G., Hargrave, T. J., & Pacheco, D. F. (2016). Converging winds: Logic hybridization in  
22 the Colorado wind energy field. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 579-610.  
23
- 24 Zerubavel, E. (1991). *The Fine Line: Making Distinctions in Everyday Life*. Free Press: New  
25 York, NY.
- 26 Zhang, J. and Luo, XR (2013) Dared to Care: Organizational Vulnerability, Institutional Logics,  
27 and Multi-National Corporations' Social Responsiveness in Emerging Markets,  
28 *Organization Science*  
29
- 30 Zhao, E. Y., Fisher, G., Lounsbury, M., & Miller, D. (2017). Optimal distinctiveness:  
31 Broadening the interface between institutional theory and strategic management.  
32 *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1), 93-113.  
33
- 34 Zhao, E. Y., & Wry, T. (2016). Not all inequality is equal: Deconstructing the societal logic of  
35 patriarchy to understand microfinance lending to women. *Academy of Management*  
36 *Journal*, 59(6), 1994-2020.  
37
- 38 Zuckerman E. W. (1999). 'The Categorical Imperative: Securities Analysts and the Illegitimacy  
39 Discount'. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 1398-1438.  
40
- 41 Zuckerman, E. W. (2016). Optimal Distinctiveness Revisited. In *The Oxford Handbook of*  
42 *Organizational Identity* (p. 183). Oxford University Press.  
43
- 44 Zuckerman, E., W. (2017). "The Categorical Imperative Revisited: Implications of Recognizing  
45 Categorization as Theoretical tool" in R. Durand, N. Granqvist, & A. Tyllstrom (Eds),  
46 From Categories to Categorization: Studies in Sociology, Organizations and Strategy at the  
47 Crossroads, *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 31-70  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60