

1

3 THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AU :1
5 ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS: AU :2
7 CONSIDERING FIELD AND
9 ECOLOGICAL APPROACHES

11

13 Omar Lizardo

15

17 **1. INTRODUCTION: COMPARISON GOES**
19 **UNDERGROUND**

21 The “first generation” (Lammers, 1978, p. 486) of comparative analysis of AU :3
23 organizations in sociology (e.g., Blau, 1965; Stinchcombe, 1959) focused on
25 the “nuts and bolts” of organizational structure as the key criterion with
27 which to derive organizational typologies (Perrow, 1967; Pugh, Hickson, &
29 Hinings, 1969). This initial cohort of analysts saw the intrinsic features – or
“organizational attributes” (Blau, 1965, p. 326) – constitutive of the
“technical core” of the organization, such as features related to the
organization of the production process (Perrow, 1967) or the structure of
allocation of discretion and authority (e.g., Etzioni, 1961), as the royal road
to the development of a cogent approach to comparative analysis of
organizations.

31 As has been noted by most observers of the field, organizational theory
33 moved from a focus on the “innards” of the organization and from a

35 **Studying Differences between Organizations: Comparative Approaches to**
Organizational Research

37 **Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 26, 117–151**

Copyright © 2009 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

39 ISSN: 0733-558X/doi:10.1108/S0733-558X(2009)0000026007

1 concern with either establishing concomitant variation across generically
2 defined organizational attributes (Blau, 1965) or toward the development of
3 typologies based on the co-occurrence of certain typical structures across
4 industries and institutional locations (Perrow, 1967) and toward a study of
5 the crucial role played by the organizational environment during the 1970s
6 and 1980s (Scott, 2001).¹ This paradigmatic shift had the effect of negating
7 what was the key conceptual innovation that united the intellectual project
8 the first generation of comparativists, which was their conception of organi-
9 zations “as a class of *generic* phenomena, apart from their institutional
10 environment” (Lammers, 1978, p. 487). This led to the waning of an exclu-
11 sive focus on features of internal organizational structure as definitional of
12 organizational “types.” This also resulted in a relative abandonment of the
13 explicit comparative projects characteristic of this first generation of orga-
14 nizational analysis in favor of population or field-level studies in which the
15 comparative focus became secondary.

The emergence of institutional (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer &
17 Rowan, 1977) and ecological (Hannan & Freeman, 1977) theories took
18 either the institutional field or the organizational population as the unit of
19 analysis. Although this shift of focus does not in principle dictate a defo-
20 calizing of comparison,² in practice it means that most research done under
21 this umbrella can only focus on the dynamics of a single population or
22 institutional field at a time. Thus, more implicit types of comparative
23 analysis of the same population or field across time replace the cross-
24 sectional comparison of organizational types at a single moment in time.³
25 This resulted in the replacement of static variance-explained cross-sectional
26 models for dynamic process models designed to explain change or the
27 genesis of systematic phenomena that recur across time, such as episodes of
28 organizational founding and disbanding (Tuma & Hannan, 1984).

29 In addition, the key mechanism isolated by institutional theory – the
30 diffusion of organizational forms and practices through “mimetic isomor-
31 phism” – explicitly discourages a comparative focus. The key phenomenon
32 to be explained becomes the *lack* of observed diversity among organizations
33 in institutional fields (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977;
34 Powell, 1991). Without a direct focus on diversity there can be no basis for
35 comparative analysis (Hannan & Freeman, 1986). In this respect, organi-
36 zational ecology remains somewhat unique among the second-generation
37 theories of organization that took the environment as their focus. Although
38 influenced by institutional concerns with the cognitive legitimation of
39 organizational forms organizational ecology (Hannan & Freeman, 1989), it
also retained an interest in the first-generation concern with explaining

1 the origins and reproduction of diversity in organizational populations
(Hannan & Freeman, 1986).

3 The ecological concern with the origins and reproduction of distinct
organizational forms led to the development of “field-level” theories not
5 only of “isomorphism” but also of the social, technological (Tushman &
Anderson, 1986), and cultural segregation mechanisms that systematically
7 produce and reproduce enduring form diversity in organizational popula-
tions (Hannan & Freeman, 1986). Out of the various theory fragments of
9 organizational ecology, the most successful empirical program of research
that emerged from this concern with form-segregation processes is Carroll’s
11 (1985) location-based model of resource-partitioning (Swaminathan, 1998).
In this model, mature industries are conceptualized as embedded in a dual
13 resource-space. Part of the resources space consists of a resource-rich region
(the “market center”) conducive to large-scale production and economies of
15 scale (Peli & Nooteboom, 1999). The market center is separated from a
relatively less resource-rich region more conducive to small-scale production
17 and the development of organizational forms that differ in identity,
technology, and the routine arrangement of tasks from those that occupy
19 the market center. In this regard, theories of form-segregation necessarily
retain the analytic requirement to engage in some form of typologizing of
21 organizational structures and are thus conducive to comparative analysis.

More recent theoretical developments in organizational ecology (e.g.,
23 Hannan, Pólos, & Carroll, 2007) have brought a renewed concern with the
development of a more rigorous conceptualization of organizational forms
25 in particular and “social forms” in general (Hannan et al., 2002). These
newly reformulated theoretical strands are also distinctive in focusing on the
27 dynamics of origin and transformation of the “social codes” that define
those forms. This line of thinking can be thought of as having recovered the
29 relevance of the first generation’s concern with establishing the organiza-
tion-level features that can best serve to ground the comparative analysis
31 (e.g., social codes and feature values definitional of form-identities).⁴ A
particular advantage of moving the discussion toward codes and the
33 audiences that define and enforce them, is the fact that in this respect recent
ecological thinking has moved beyond the somewhat static “realism” of the
35 first generation of comparativists who sought to delineate typologies based
on what was perceived as enduring, non-negotiable features of organiza-
37 tions. Ecological theories of social forms, instead define the features that
make organizations distinct from another as social constructed cognitive
39 schemes used by interested audiences to categorize and thus draw
distinctions in the organizational landscape. This means that there is now

1 an opportunity to integrate the comparative analysis of organizational
forms with cognate lines of thinking in the sociology of culture.

3 I would argue that the project comparative analysis of organizations is
now inseparable from the overall project of developing a general theory of
5 the genesis and dynamics of social forms (Pólos, Hannan, & Carroll, 2002).
Accordingly, a comparative, “social constructionist” analysis of organiza-
7 tional forms – and the processes through which form-diversity is created and
sustained – replaces the earlier project based on developing organizational
9 types based on “realist” (and usually taken as exogenous) criteria associated
with technology, production processes, and authority structures. The “social
11 codes” that serve to define form-identities in the eyes a given set of interested
audience members are conceived as purely “intensional” (i.e., semantically
13 constituted) entities.⁵

The key implication of this analytical shift is that the material, techno-
15 logical, and power-laden aspects of organizations are not of a different
fundamental character as the cultural constructed external “formal
17 structures” that organizations present to interested constituencies in the
environment. This transcends the problematic distinction of early institu-
19 tional theory between an exogenous, functionally determined “technical
core,” and a culturally constituted “formal structure” (Baron, 2004; Dobbin,
21 1994). This project also becomes tightly linked to recent theory and research
on the role of “audiences” in defining, selecting, and enforcing allegiance to
23 those codes (Zuckerman, 1999). This break with the residual allegiance to a
view of technology and task structure as exogenous non-cultural material
25 prevalent in first-generation styles of analysis carries important analy-
tical implications (Dobbin, 1994). Thus, the attempt to develop a coherent
27 comparative analysis of organizational forms becomes coextensive with the
broader project of the sociology of culture in general and the production of
29 meanings within and about organizations in organizational fields.

This theoretical reorientation of the field carries with it many oppor-
31 tunities as well as its possible share of pitfalls. In this chapter, I attempt to
examine how recent developments in the conceptualization of social forms
33 organizational theory can be informed by a long-standing tradition in
cultural sociology (which draws from both French and American influences)
35 concerned with the study of “fields of cultural production,” and which
served as one of the primary inspirations for early statements of the
37 institutional approach (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). I argue that there has
been an unacknowledged convergence in terms of interests and analytical
39 constructs in cultural sociology and organizational theory that deserves to
be evaluated and developed. I will argue that this convergence has occurred

1 on four primary registers: (1) proposals as to what the primary unit of
2 analysis and comparison should be; (2) the conceptualization of the broad
3 types of organizational structures and production strategies that we
4 should expect to observe as a result of location-based processes of form-
5 segregation; (3) the significance of alternative regimes of valuation fostered
6 and sustaining by interested constituencies in sharpening divisions in the
7 organizational landscape; and (4) conceptual models of the relationship of
8 social position and patterns of taste among consumer-audiences.

9 In what follows, I will note that though there has certainly been a great
10 share of common ground developed independently (once the job of concep-
11 tual translation is done), field and production approaches in the sociology of
12 culture have a distinctive set of emphases that I believe can provide some
13 analytical structure to outstanding limitations in the developing ecological
14 approach to the study of social forms.

17 **2. FIELDS AND WORLDS AS THE BASIC UNIT OF** 18 **ANALYSIS**

21 Probably the most clear (and so far under-appreciated) source of
22 convergence between production and field strategies and ecological
23 approaches is in considering the “field,” “world,” or “domains” as a
24 common unit of analysis. This is a somewhat remarkable development, since AU :4
25 these lines of research have proceeded somewhat independently from one
26 another, and yet have largely come to an agreement as to what the adequate
27 unit of observation is, and more importantly have come to be defined in
28 largely similar ways. Hannan et al. (2007, p. 34) defined a domain as
29 “culturally bounded slices of the social world, such as agriculture, art,
30 finance, medicine and sport” keyed around a focal type of product and an
31 associated collection of producers. They note the clear family resemblance
32 between this definition of domain and Howard Becker’s definition of a
33 world as “... all of those people and organizations whose activity is
34 necessary to produce the kind of events and objects which that world
35 characteristically produces” (Becker, 1976, p. 703). Bourdieu construct of
36 fields is essentially convergent with that of “domain” and “world.” As
37 Benson (1999, p. 464) notes, “Bourdieu sees society as differentiated into a
38 number of semiautonomous fields (e.g., fields of politics, economics,
39 religion, and cultural production) governed by their own “rules of the
40 game” and offering their own particular economy of exchange and reward.”

1 The field construct has of course always been part of second-generation
2 institutional theories, which were inspired by Bourdieu's work from the start
3 (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Martin, 2003).

4 Settling on the world or the field as the unit of analysis carries many
5 analytic advantages. The most important of which is the reconceptualization
6 of the organizational environment as primarily composed of audiences of
7 which consumers of the products of organizational activity are only one
8 subset. This puts the analytical focus on the actors that claim *membership*
9 within the field and which are also in charge of setting its boundaries (e.g.,
10 sorting outsiders from insiders). This boundary setting process is important
11 because it is precisely these largely symbolic demarcations that are respon-
12 sible for producing the discontinuities in the social structure that lead
13 to form-segregation, and thus to the development of alternative ways to
14 organize the production of material and symbolic goods. This is because
15 audiences not only participate in organizational worlds as consumers, but
16 are also in charge of "policing" and monitoring conformity of produ-
17 cers with the relevant social-codes definitional of organizational forms
18 (Zuckerman, 1999). They are the agents in charge in reproducing differences
19 and of producing discontinuities in the organizational landscape. I will
20 argue below that ecological analyses of social forms and field theories
21 of cultural production provide complementary ways to theorize the role of
22 "audiences" (e.g., critics, gatekeepers, enthusiasts, and consumers) as key
23 players in producing cultural innovation and institutional change.

24 The concern with the specific role of audiences as "gatekeepers" of the
25 social codes organizational forms has been a recent development in
26 organizational theory (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; Hannan et al., 2007;
27 Hsu & Hannan, 2005; Pólos et al., 2002). This has been spurred by
28 Zuckerman's (1999) demonstration of the interdependence between produ-
29 cers, audiences and specialized evaluation mechanisms. Zuckerman shows
30 that producers who crossed categorical boundaries and thus violated
31 audience expectations were punished with devaluation by the relevant
32 gatekeepers. As we will see later, a focus on the interaction between
33 producers and audiences has always been a part of both the production
34 of culture and the field perspectives especially in the crucial role that
35 "production for producers and critics" versus "production for non-producer
36 consumers" across organizational form types and the difference in incentive,
37 monitoring, and evaluation systems that follow from that (Bourdieu, 1993;
38 Crane, 1976; Hirsch, 1972). This analytical distinction is essentially the same
39 as the one between "insider versus outsider" audience members in the most
40 recent formulation of the ecological approach (Hannan et al., 2007).

3. FIELD THEORY VERSUS ECOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF FORM-SEGREGATION

Theory fragments in organizational ecology concerned with the emergence of form-segregation in organizational populations usually point to some process of niche-based segregation or “partitioning” (Carroll, 1985; Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000). Most organizational populations are seen as tending toward a “generalist-specialist” (Carroll, 1985) or more recently “center-periphery” (Hannan et al., 2007) differentiation. Center organizations tend to be large, technology-intensive, mass-production organizations, which put out products designed to reach as broad of an audience as possible (thus targeting the “modal” consumer). Organizations near the periphery of the niche on the other hand specialize in reaching smaller (but sometimes more upscale and thus exclusive audiences) which come to expect a product that is customized to their localized tastes and expectations. Partitioning in mature industries is sustained by the inability of center and near-center producers to capture peripheral niches, as these producers lack the skill, credibility, and perceived “authenticity” to craft a product that can appeal to expert and “insider” audiences that usually occupy the periphery of the niche (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000).

Surprisingly, Pierre Bourdieu’s (1980, 1983, 1985, 1993) field theory of culture production and Crane’s (1976) production-inspired analysis of the commonalities and differences of the reward systems prevalent in science, art, and religion rely on an account of form-segregation and partitioning dynamics that is very similar to that deployed by organizational theorists of social forms (Pólos et al., 2002). In essence, Bourdieu argues that participants within mature symbol-production fields are forced to differentiate themselves largely by adopting either of two divergent output strategies: restricted and large-scale production. This classification is essentially the same as Crane’s differentiation between independent and hetero-cultural reward systems, and converges nicely with the characteristics and orientations of center and peripheral producers (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; Swaminathan, 2001).

The field and production formulation of this distinction, however, offers a more self-conscious attempt to develop this difference as a framework for the comparative analysis of organizational forms (Crane, 1976).⁶ It is also concerned with explicitly outlining the social and symbolic *mechanisms* that produce segregation and boundaries in the organizational landscape. Attention to these more meso-level mechanisms is sometimes obscured by the propensity to take a top-down view of the process on the part of

1 ecologists, in spite of the fact that recent attempts to introduce the role
2 of interested audiences into the theory have done much to mitigate this
3 limitation.

4 According to Bourdieu (1983), “restricted” production is characterized by
5 the fact that the intended audience is primarily composed of other producers
6 and expert insider audiences. Producers presume that the potential receivers
7 of the cultural object are equipped with the necessary – usually socially
8 scarce and ritually policed – interpretative skills and cognitive dispositions
9 to properly “decode” the object (Bourdieu, 1983). This type of production is
10 characterized by institutional conditions that encourage little or no symbolic
11 demarcation between producers and their audiences. This is mostly because
12 members of the audience are expected to (primarily) be fellow producers-
13 peers. However, the symbolic demarcations between members of the social
14 world and all outsiders tend to be strong, and constantly renewed and
15 demarcated.

16 The dominant “reward system” among producers in restricted production **AU:5**
17 worlds is best characterized – following Crane as independent with cultural
18 innovations being produced “... for an audience of fellow innovators.
19 Innovators themselves set cognitive and technical norms and allocated
20 symbolic and material rewards” (Crane, 1976, p. 721, italics added). In
21 Bourdieu’s (1993) terms restricted production fields enjoy relative autonomy.
22 Members of restricted production subfields draw robust ritual boundaries
23 between themselves and members of subfields that engage a broader swath of
24 consumers in ways that are more consonant with production for the market
25 (DiMaggio, 1987). Fields of restricted production – such as “avant garde”
26 artworlds (Crane, 1989) or traditional scientific communities (Crane, 1976)
27 are distinguished by their high degrees of theorization (Strang & Meyer,
28 1993) and symbolic elaboration regarding the technique, process, and the
29 resulting features of the cultural objects produced. In fields of restricted
30 production, there exist pressing concerns regarding how that cultural object
31 “fits in” with the extant historical network of valued cultural objects within
32 the audience segment composed mainly of other producers, evaluators, and
33 committed enthusiasts. Bourdieu is in this respect in complete agreement
34 with Becker, who notes that a core concern of artworlds is precisely to
35 constantly determine who fits in as an artist (or what fits in as “art”) and
36 what is to be excluded from this definition (Becker, 1974).

37 In terms of the routine evaluation of products and producers and in
38 terms of the allocation of status, restricted production field represent an
39 “inversion” (Bourdieu, 1983) of the logic dominant in fields governed by
“mass production” standards. These fields are invariably characterized by

1 the devaluing of material and economic capital (and economic indicators
2 of success, such as mass appeal) in favor of more ethereal forms of cultural
3 and symbolic (reputational) capital – “the economic world reversed” in
4 Bourdieu’s (1983) terms. Restricted production fields are thus concerned
5 mainly with “authenticity” and symbolic worth over economic profitability
6 (Baron, 2004; Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; Peterson, 2004). For those
7 organizations embedded in the restricted production field, the objects and
8 performances that are produced therein come to be primarily valued due to
9 their “uniqueness” as defined by insider audiences and specialized gate-
10 keepers along with conformity to the internally generated (i.e., producer-
11 devised and producer-controlled) criteria of value within the field in
12 question. Cultural products emanating from restricted production subfields
13 are in this manner protected from being judged in terms of more generalized
14 and field-exogenous criteria such as profitability or “practical” usefulness
15 (Benson, 1999). This serves to segregate standards of value and categor-
16 ical distinctions used in restricted production fields from those used in
17 the society at large, thus increasing their “resonance” and “distinctiveness”
18 (Baron, 2004; Hsu & Hannan, 2005).

19 The standards of value, which reign in large-scale production fields are
20 more likely to be isomorphic with the exogenous environment (where princi-
21 ples of “usefulness,” practicality and profitability make objects valuable).
22 The predominant reward system in large-scale production is heterocultural,
23 displaying “the supremacy of economic rewards over symbolic rewards”
24 (Crane, 1976, p. 722). Large-scale producers are concerned instead with the
25 manufacturing of cultural objects for general consumption by audiences
26 who are expected to be external to the field and not for restricted consump-
27 tion by a relatively small cadre of “insiders.” In this sense, large-scale
28 production is mass production for the market and is thus dominated by the
29 logic of profitability, scale advantages in production, and increasing market
30 share. This is what Bourdieu (1993) refers to as the “heteronomy” which
31 chronically confronts those cultural producers who are oriented toward the
32 market.

33 In large-scale production, we find more bureaucratic and managerial
34 restriction on artistic autonomy and thus relatively less emphasis on
35 innovation for innovation’s sake (DiMaggio, 1977). Rather than creators
36 controlling production and reward standards, “entrepreneurs and bureau-
37 crats set norms for innovative work, consumers allocate material rewards
38 and entrepreneurs of bureaucrats allocate material rewards” (Crane, 1976,
39 p. 722). The most important way in which large-scale production differs
40 from restricted production is connected to the differing stances that

1 producers in the former production regime take with respect to audiences
 (Hannan et al., 2007; Hsu & Hannan, 2005). In particular, I refer to the fact
 3 that in large-scale production primarily non-producers and non-enthusiasts
 become the primary intended audiences for the product and not the fact that
 5 the logic of mass-market production for profit is dominant (Bourdieu,
 1983).

AU :6

7 In the substantive context of artworlds and fields of cultural production,
 this is an important distinction, insofar as artists who engage in restricted
 9 production gain field-specific reputational capital allocated by fellow
 producers and high-status evaluators according to standards that are
 11 defined by recognized peers and other insider-audience members and
 gatekeepers. Both Becker and Bourdieu agree that it is the relative
 13 autonomy of actors in the particular field of activity in question to develop
 standards that determine the value of their activity that signals the key
 15 difference between autonomous “art” and other forms of cultural pro-
 duction. In Becker’s view, non-artistic forms of production – which he refers
 17 to as “craft” – whether it takes place in the economic or private (not for
 profit) realm, is characterized by the fact that for the activity in question – in
 19 Becker’s example the case of the serving of meals at a restaurant or a private
 gathering,

21

[u]tility is measured by a standard which lies *outside* the world that is or might have been
 23 constructed around the activity itself. For there is a world of haute cuisine and etiquette
 which treats enjoyment of food and its service as *ends in themselves*, the measurement of
 25 utility referring to standards developed and accepted by knowledgeable participants in
 that world. (Becker, 1978, p. 864, italics added)

27 Thus, large-scale production is closer to the “craft” (although most large-
 scale production is of course technology intensive and favors mechanization
 29 and economies of scale) pole of the Becker’s (1978) art/craft continuum,
 whereas restricted production is closer to the “art” end of the dimension.
 31 In large-scale production, there is no expectation that the potential
 consumer has specialized (or socially scarce) dispositions and abilities to
 33 decode the cultural object in question. This feeds backs into the cultural
 production process, resulting in producers being pressured and coaxed into
 35 by patrons and industry managers (DiMaggio, 1977) into crafting cultural
 objects devoid of hard-to-decode features. These are products capable
 37 of being appreciated and consumed by the “modal” individual (Carroll,
 1985; Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000). This is consonant with the ecolog-
 39 ical observation that organizations which are able to gain control of the
 “market center” are able to reap advantages from economies of scale by

AU :7

1 producing largely homogenous products (Carroll, 1985; Hannan et al., 2007,
p. 211).

3 Because restricted production is production primarily for other producers
and select audience enthusiasts, the social distance between producers
5 and consumers is smaller. This explains why specialist organizations appear
to have an informational (i.e., “learning”) advantage in crafting products
7 that most effectively conform to the taste expectations of their (smaller)
audiences (Bourdieu, 1993; Swaminathan, 2001). In field and production
9 theories, this “learning” and “informational” advantage is not seen as
paramount in explaining the advantages that peripheral organizations have
11 over center and near-center organizations. Instead, the analytic focus is on
the fact that cultural objects assembled under a large-scale production
13 regime are subject to criteria of evaluation that are external to those devised
by members of the subfield composed of those producers whose primary
15 orientation is toward other producers.⁷ These standards tend to be centered
on such “universal” criteria of success as sales volume and profitability and
17 not on “insiders” standards related to autonomously derived measures of
aesthetic worth and merit.

19 This has repercussions whenever there is an attempt to compare cultural
goods or performances produced within these two contrasting regimes.
21 When the distinction has been symbolically elaborated, the products
produced in these diverging circumstances may in fact be “incommensura-
23 ble.” Products crafted under a large-scale production regime have more
difficulty being acknowledged as valuable or worthy of consideration by
25 members of the field of restricted production. The reason for this is that such
commonly used commensuration rods and criteria of success as sales volume
27 or market share are rejected within the restricted production field by default.
This means that products crafted by center and near-center organization
29 lack a coherent place within the internal symbolic reputation system
generated by restricted producers and allocated by selected gatekeepers and
31 specialized judges of quality within the restricted production field (Bourdieu,
1993). That is, they are “worthless” given internally generated standards of
33 value. By the same token, given their relatively modest success according to
market-based criteria products crafted in the restricted production subfield
35 may be judged as “failures” even if they are “critical darlings” within the
restricted production subfield.

37 Thus, from within the autonomous standards set by restricted producers
mass produced products are invariably subject to devaluation ritual degra-
39 dation (Garfinkel, 1956). This devaluation is in many cases orthogonal
to the objective “quality” of the product. For instance, Carroll and

1 Swaminathan (2000) find that large beer mass producers find trouble
2 entering the restricted field of microbrew production, even when their
3 products are objectively difficult to distinguish from established microbrews.
4 This suggests that symbolic boundaries drawn from the periphery toward
5 the market center may be hard to eradicate and are not reducible to
6 technological discontinuities or learning differences among different organi-
7 zations. When the partition between large-scale and restricted production is
8 consolidated, the mere fact of having been crafted with an eye toward mass
9 distribution and having been intended (as perceived by critical evaluators) to
10 appeal to the market center is sufficient grounds for devaluation and
11 rejection by peripheral actors.

12 However, even though the boundaries between large-scale and restricted
13 production are usually of considerable ritual strength and symbolic import
14 there is always intercourse and some degree of leakage between the two
15 subfields. This can happen due to the fact that producers originating in
16 restricted production move into large-scale production (being tempted by
17 the “siren’s song” of commercial success). We may also observe large-scale
18 producers attempting to engage in some form of restricted production (e.g.,
19 major movie studios entering the independent film market). Sometimes
20 producers may engage in both production strategies simultaneously, a clear
21 case of what has recently been referred to as “category-spanning” (Hsu &
22 Hannan, 2005). This sets off an implicit need for specialized agents in charge
23 of determining which products are worthy of consideration among insider
24 audiences and experts and which ones should be rejected outright. To deal
25 with this structurally induced demand for symbolic demarcation, restricted
26 production fields open the opportunity for insiders in charge of ascertaining
27 the “place” of certain cultural objects within the historical accounts relevant
28 to the field, and gatekeepers in charge of policing boundaries (usually
29 recruited from the pool of non-producer audience enthusiasts).

30 These gatekeepers and specialized evaluators are in charge of rationing
31 access to the reputational resources that are desired by members of the
32 field (i.e., journal editors, gallery curators; see White and White (1993)
33 and Bourdieu (1987) for historical accounts of the emergence of this
34 institutionalized valuation system in 19th century art). They attempt to
35 make sure that “commercial” producers are not able to usurp the symbolic
36 rewards that should be exclusively set aside for those producers dedicated to
37 the non-commercial values of the restricted production subfield. Critical
38 gatekeepers and other expert insider audience members are decisive in
39 sustaining discontinuities in the organizational landscape, both by ensuring
40 that restricted producers are punished with ritual devaluation when they

1 attempt to enter the market center, and by making it difficult for center
2 organizations to gain acceptance within the restricted production artworld.

3 Music historian William Weber (1977) sees the entire division between
4 serious and popular music which emerged in mid-19th century Europe (and
5 which is fully institutionalized today) as being largely due to the action of a
6 set of insider audience members which advocated for the erection of this
7 boundary where little previous differentiation had existed:

8
9 A key element in the public was particularly responsible for the change. During the late
10 eighteenth century there had emerged . . . a corps of highly trained, sometimes semi-
11 professional listeners who poured their energies into advocating the music they regarded
12 as the bastion of serious music culture. They learned the entire classical repertoire, wrote
13 about it for magazines and newspapers, and went unfailingly to orchestral and chamber-
14 music concerts, often in leadership capacities. While during the early decades of the
15 century their activities had an old-fashioned and rather esoteric air, at mid-century a new
16 generation of accomplished listeners arrived which knew how to speak persuasively to
17 the larger public. Most important of all, they respected true professional standards of
18 performance as their predecessors had not. After 1850 they became the dominant force
19 among musical amateurs and shaped concert life to their model. These connoisseurs did
20 not put up with any chatter in the concert hall . . . Two new worlds of present-oriented
21 popular music now appeared as a counterpoise against the hardening conservatism of
22 classical concert life. Operetta halls were one leading scene; the song fests at Parisian
23 cafes and London music halls were another. The latter two, in fact, constituted early
24 forms of the modern nightclub. By 1870 one can indeed say that the modern categories
25 of popular and classical music had come into place. (Weber, 1977, pp. 19–20)

AU :8

25 4. AUDIENCES AND OPPOSITIONAL STANDARDS 26 OF EVALUATION

27 4.1. Hedonic and Transcendent Conceptions of Value

28
29 It is clear from the discussion so far, that field theories of production require
30 a theory of divergent conceptions of the value and worth. Podolny and Hill-
31 Popper (2004) have noted how the concept of value has played a rather
32 attenuated role in the scientific study of organizations in particular and social
33 theory in general. They introduce a very useful distinction between what they
34 call “hedonic” and “transcendent” conceptions of value. Hedonic concep-
35 tions of value are those that have “the strongest affinity with the prevailing
36 view of markets.” That is they are keyed toward monetary and pecuniary
37 ideas of worth, easily translatable into “liquid” monetary equivalents
38 (Carruthers & Stinchcombe, 1999). Transcendent conceptions of value on the
39 other hand are purposefully defined as different (and sometimes superior to)

1 the crass reduction of worth into commensurable market terms. Instead
 3 “objects enter into consumer’s assessment . . . primarily for the purpose of
 5 enhancing the understanding of the meaning of the focal work and not for
 7 the purpose of developing a common standard against which multiple works
 9 may be compared” (Podolny & Hill-Popper, 2004, p. 95).

11 Podolny and Hill-Popper conceive of the hedonic-transcendent binary as
 13 organizing consumer choices in a wide variety of organizational fields, and
 15 thus as having a potentially critical impact in our understanding of the
 17 dynamic of organizational populations. I argue that culture production and
 19 field approaches are distinctive because just as Podolny and Hill-Popper
 21 (2004) they make conception of values – and in Bourdieu’s (1993) rendering,
 23 conflict over the dominant value definition – in symbol-producing “worlds”
 25 central to our understanding of key processes of organizational form genesis
 27 and segregation.

17 4.2. *Clashing Codes versus Clashing Valuation Standards*

19 According to field and production approaches, product “appeal” for both
 21 “insider” and “outsider” audiences in mature industries is largely driven
 23 by the extent to which products and producer intentions can be positioned
 25 on some sort of evaluative dimension (e.g., in the arts this would be
 27 “commercial” versus “for its own sake”). This is in contrast with the largely
 29 cognitive account given in recent ecological of the origins of product appeal
 (e.g., Hsu & Hannan, 2005). In terms of Parsons and Shils’ (1951) original
 analytical differentiation, although the account of the origins of product
 appeal in organizational ecology concentrates on the cognitive orientations
 of actors toward products, field approaches emphasize the normative (and
 sometimes expressive) orientation.

31 For instance, Hannan et al. (2007) propose that the appeal of a product
 33 decreases when a producer is perceived to have (fuzzy) membership more
 35 than one category. The reason for this is that “membership in multiple
 37 (nonnested) categories likely confuses the audience and makes a producer
 appear to fit poorly to any of the schemata that an agent applies to the
 categories” (Hannan et al., 2007, p. 108, italics added).⁸ The field pers-
 39 pective offers a different (and more specific) account of the devaluation
 process, which acknowledges that some form of cognitive boundary
 spanning is necessary but not sufficient for devaluation to occur.

The ecological approach relies on a purely cognitive mechanism linked to
disagreement or *dissensus* generated by inability to attach unambiguous

1 feature values to the category labels associated with a given producer
(Hannan et al., 2007). Both field and ecological approaches agree that
3 devaluation happens as a result of category straddling, but differ in their
detailed conceptualizations as to the underlying mechanism. From the field
5 perspective, disagreement brought about as a result of an inability to place a
given producer securely in a categorical slot is ~~neither~~ necessary but not
7 sufficient to produce devaluation. Instead, devaluation is likely to occur
when gatekeeping audiences perceive an attempt by a producer to claim
9 simultaneous membership in two *already oppositionally evaluated* produc-
tion styles (e.g., the large-scale and restricted production fields). This
11 ambiguous placement has to be interpreted as an attempt to appeal to both
expert-insiders and outsider mass audiences.

13 This means that empirically, devaluation will be more likely to be observed
either when (1) mass producers attempt to claim features values that have
15 been developed in restricted production subfields (e.g., commercial art
claiming “avant garde” credibility); or (2) when small-scale, peripheral pro-
17 ducers violate the expectations of other peer producers or critical gate-
keepers *within the restricted-production segment* of the artworld by crafting
19 products that are perceived by those insider evaluators as clearly designed for
commercial gain. This could be done, for instance, by suppressing or atten-
21 nuating those product features that require socially scarce and ritually
policed aptitudes (Bourdieu, 1984) – more likely to be found among insider
23 audiences – to be appropriated by consumers. This signals to internal gate-
keepers that the producer is attempting to appeal to external constituencies
25 with the expectations of economic (hedonic) rewards rather than being
produced with an eye toward gaining internal (transcendent) symbolic re-
27 wards bestowed by peers and expert critics (Bourdieu, 1993; Crane, 1976).

The field account shares with the recent ecological account an emphasis
29 on the negative consequences of boundary spanning for product reception.
However, notice that in contrast with the *undirected* expectations of the
31 ecological account, the field approach offers a more specific prediction: it
is not the crossing of any categorical boundary that produces devaluation.
33 Instead, devaluation happens only in fields that have experienced some form
of partitioning, and in which there has been an opportunity to develop
35 alternative and strictly oppositional valuation orders (usually keyed to the
transcendent hedonic distinction) with transcendent values dominating in
37 the periphery and hedonic values dominating at the center.⁹ Furthermore,
the field account acknowledges that these valuation dynamics already
39 presuppose the existence of specialized gatekeeper groups in charge of
developing, elaborating, and ascertaining the value of cultural products, but

1 also in charge of establishing the criteria of membership within the circle of
 3 objects recognized by expert audiences. That is, field theory specifies that
 5 valuation and devaluation always occur according to the autonomous
 7 standards set in the (peripheral) field of restricted production by expert
 9 audiences who command largely symbolic forms of authority and resources.
 Lay (non-expert) audiences, especially those located near the market center,
 are instead dependent on expert gatekeepers for guidance in terms of
 forming their own valuation standards (Holbrook, 1999); their opinions (or
 purchasing power) carry little weight within the restricted production field.

11

4.3. *Value and the Emergence of Organizational Forms*

13

15 Thus, one way in which culture production and field approaches can inform
 17 ecological and institutional understandings of the organizational dynamics
 19 is precisely by putting the issue of value conflict squarely at the forefront of
 21 the analysis. This is consistent with the recent emphasis of “competing
 23 logics” in the organizational literature, and with the dual definition of logics
 25 as involving both cognitive components as well as “[competing] *valuation*
 27 *orders* that structure the decision-making and the practices of the players in
 a product market” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 805, italics added). In
 Bourdieu’s field analysis, standards of evaluation are thus constitutive of
 audience expectations and structure the perception of producer categories.
 Therefore, one of the primary “segregating mechanisms” across organiza-
 tional forms in symbol-producing worlds will be keyed to different
 conceptions of value, such that when one organizational form violates the
 social codes associated with a particular conception of value, it will be
 subject to devaluation and rejection by insider audiences.

29

In this regard, field and culture production approaches can begin to
 reconnect such “internal” and “structural” features of organizations as
 reward systems (Crane, 1976), as an important indicator of form and
 therefore a possible clue to establishing discontinuities in the organizational
 landscape (Baron, 2004). For instance, it is clear that the “commercial”
 versus “non-commercial” or “market” versus “authenticity” dichotomy
 reappears in various organizational populations with a frequency that
 suggests that it is not an accidental feature, but which appears to be
 constitutive of organizational domains that have achieved some level of
 maturity and partitioning in market-dominated societies.¹⁰ This division
 even appears in certain organizational fields that were not even initially
 conceived as product or service markets in the first place. Invariably,

39

1 however, producer oriented to non-market values come to segregate
2 themselves from those perceived as adopting organizational identities closer
3 to the market pole.

4 Lounsbury (2005) provides an apt instance of this last dynamic. He finds
5 two “competing logics” in the U.S. recycling advocacy field since the 1960s –
6 better thought of as two alternative social codes defining the “recycling
7 advocacy group” form – which clearly fit the peripheral-transcendent-
8 versus center-hedonic partition characteristic of artworlds and mature indus-
9 tries. On the one hand, there is the initial group of social-movement-like
10 organizations that conform to a “holistic logic” in which recycling is
11 conceived as inherently tied to the transcendent goals of restructuring
12 society and the economy and which favor not-for-profit structures – that is,
13 the “drop-off” center – staffed by volunteers organically connected to the
14 local community. On the other hand, there are the late-coming organiza-
15 tions that obey a “technocratic logic” in which recycling is conceived as a
16 profit opportunity and recyclables are thought of as commodities like
17 anything else. These organizations relied on paid professional staff with a
18 focus on profit and a search for efficient solutions to growing demand for
19 waste disposal thus taking advantage of economies of scale (Lounsbury,
20 2005, p. 77). Consistent with the notion that social forms come to be
21 “partitioned” along the hedonic-transcendent binary as fields mature, the
22 emergence of the for-profit technocratic model did not completely replace
23 the original “holistic” one, but instead a consolidation of the split between
24 the different forms with “many grassroots recyclers, such as those from
25 California, Oregon, and Washington, celebrate the proliferation of recycling
26 practices, while simultaneously lamenting its contemporary social organiza-
27 tion as a ‘market’” (Lounsbury, 2005, p. 80).

AU:10

28 The question then becomes, why does this division reappears everywhere?
29 If technological and relational discontinuities in the social structure were
30 the primary relevant factor in generating diversity in organizational forms
31 (Hannan & Freeman, 1986; Tushman & Anderson, 1986), then we should
32 not expect such a recurrent distinction as that between transcendent “art” and
33 “authenticity” versus hedonic “commerce” and “profitability” to emerge with
34 such recurrent consistency. Not only that, but the fact that certain technologies
35 themselves become symbolically charged as emblematic of this value-laden
36 differentiation – that is, the association between authenticity and “craft”-
37 like production methods against “modern” technology-intensive methods
38 in such apparently disparate arenas as cuisine (Johnston & Baumann, 2007),
39 beer (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000), wine (Swaminathan, 1998), and country
40 music (Peterson, 2004) – suggests that technological (and social network)

1 discontinuities maybe (under certain specifiable conditions) be a *result* and not
 3 a precondition of form-segregation in certain organizational fields generated
 by orientation toward antithetical conceptions of value.

5 This means that in practice, the emergence of a specific discontinuity in
 the social structure (e.g., network relations) or technologies of production
 7 cannot be taken as “exogenous” to the field in question, with form-
 segregation as the dependent outcome. Instead, it is important to establish
 9 whether these discontinuities are themselves generated by the previous
 development of competing valuation orders that prescribe or proscribe
 11 association with other actors in the field or which recommend or condemn
 the use of certain production technologies. William Weber’s (1977) analysis
 13 of the development of the “popular” versus “serious” music divide suggests
 that competing valuation standards that extolled the transcendent virtues
 15 of serious music over the hedonic triviality of popular music were *first*
 developed by quasi-expert enthusiasts, and *then* relational (keyed to socio-
 economic differences in the audiences for different types of performances)
 17 and organizational discontinuities followed. In this respect, the approach
 followed by Ruef (2000) in which the analyst first constructs and defines a
 19 cultural space defined through discourse generated by field insiders, and
 then ascertains the emergence of specific bundles of organizational forms
 21 and technological systems consistent with these emergent definitions is to be
 recommended over approaches that define either social or economic factors
 23 as “exogenous” to the field in question and as facilitating the emergence
 of new forms without much in the way of symbolic mediation (e.g.,
 25 Delacroix & Solt, 1988).

27

4.4. *Conceptions of Value and Resource Partitioning*

29

As we have seen, location-based arguments of form differentiation converge
 31 with field approaches in distinguishing between two ideal-typical production
 strategies. Only recently however, has there been a concern with connecting
 33 the process of how the standards of valuation presupposed by large-scale
 mass production characteristic of center organization come to be
 35 oppositionally associated to those favored by peripheral organizations
 (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000; see also Hannan et al.’s (2007) brief
 37 discussion of “code clash” (pp. 109–110)). In particular, very little attention
 has been paid to the fact that (as we saw earlier) mass production implies
 39 some form of generalized or “hedonic” value standard, whereas specialist
 production can more readily create localized or internally generated

1 standards of value that in many ways are designed to deny any attempt at
2 commensuration with standards imposed by outsiders. This “value
3 dynamic” implicating producers, audiences, and select insiders can serve
4 as a key criterion with which to differentiate producers located in different
5 niche locations within an industry.

6 The closest approximation to a general value standard in contemporary
7 market societies is that associated with profitability and sales volume.
8 Institutional entrepreneurs inevitably realize the leveling power of market
9 criteria of value – what Podolny and Hill-Popper refer to as “hedonic”
10 standards – and attempt to apply them to all organizations within an
11 industry. This leads those organizations in the periphery who engage in
12 restricted production to attempt to “defend” themselves against audiences
13 external to the insider circle to impose such generalized criteria of value
14 within the field of restricted production. Most of the concern with such
15 “post-materialist” value standards espoused by restricted-production orga-
16 nizations such as “authenticity” can be explained by this defense through
17 symbolic demarcation mechanism. In contrast with the “transcendent”
18 conception of value dominant in subfields of restricted production, large-
19 scale production is characterized by the dominance of the hedonic form
20 (Podolny & Hill-Popper, 2004). Thus, the type of cultural innovation (or
21 lack thereof) observed in large-scale production fields is “parasitic, bor-
22 rowing from . . . other types if the gatekeepers think that these innovations will
23 be of interest to a larger audience” (Crane, 1976, p. 722).

24 In addition, recruitment of producers from the periphery to the center is a
25 constant threat to the internally generated value standards of the restricted
26 production field. This means that there is a constant need to deploy inter-
27 nally generated mechanisms of social control to prevent this sort of migra-
28 tion from restricted to large-scale production to threaten the integrity of
29 oppositionally defined communities of producers in the periphery. These
30 include punishing those producers who “defect” from the restricted pro-
31 duction field and begin to engage in large-scale production through the
32 withdrawal of “insider” reputational capital. Threats of defection also lead
33 to a renewed emphasis to demarcate symbolic boundaries that separate
34 restricted from large-scale production strategies through processes of ritual
35 degradation and reclassification of selected large-scale producers as “sell-
36 outs” or “hacks.” These social control mechanisms are likely to figure
37 prominently in the perpetuation of social, technological, and symbolic
38 discontinuities in the organizational landscape.

39 Gilmore (1988), for instance, analyzed the relational, organizational, and
40 symbolic discontinuities that organize the contemporary “serious” music

1 artworld in New York. He finds a tripartite division separating a
 3 mainstream “midtown” world dedicated to “repertory programming” (the
 5 established canonical set of classical music composers born before the 20th
 7 century) and depending on resources from patronage on the part of mostly
 9 consumer elites. This “market center” is separated from two distinct
 11 peripheral sites in which composition is created by performers *for* other peer
 producers not for ticket-buying lay audiences: one an “academic subworld,”
 which “supports gradual aesthetic change and emphasizes monolithic forms
 of culture activity (i.e., dominant paradigms)” and the other a downtown
 “avant-garde subworld,” which “supports radical aesthetic change and
 emphasizes pluralistic forms of cultural activity.”

Both of the peripheral subworlds operate according to the logic specified
 13 by field-theory as applying to the field of restricted production: reputation is
 15 distributed internally by other peer-producers or specialized gatekeepers,
 and is keyed to transcendent value that denigrate more mainstream
 (economic) signals of success (especially in the downtown subworld). In
 17 particular, the downtown avant-gardist subworld is organized around an
 aesthetic logic of “permanent revolution” in which producers distinguish
 19 themselves from one another by favoring radical departures from accepted
 practice (Bourdieu, 1993). This subworld is therefore the site of more
 21 vigorous attempts at innovation in social and cultural forms. Thus, though
 the midtown subworld is mostly a *performer* oriented and keyed to the
 23 “virtuoso” instrumental skills of reproducing compositions from the dead
 masters, the downtown and uptown peripheral subworlds are *composer*-
 25 oriented worlds keyed to 20th century classical musical codes that require
 years of specialized training to even begin to appropriate (meaning that the
 27 “audience” is almost entirely made up of expert insiders). This means that
 barriers to entry into the academic (and specially) the downtown subworlds
 29 are stronger, and require a total rejection of the mainstream – repertory
 oriented – values that govern the midtown subworld. Consistent with the
 31 field and ecological accounts, Gilmore (1988) finds that any kind of
 “straddling” between the boundaries that separate each subworld is highly
 33 penalized, with producers unable to sustain such “incoherent identities”:

35 The alternative concert identities represented by different subworlds need not be mutually
 37 exclusive, but in practice they are. Composers are clearly differentiated in the New York
 concert world by Uptown and Downtown designations and performers are differentiated
 by Repertory and Contemporary designations. The significance of these associations is
 39 clear when performers and composers try to change subworlds or to integrate activities in
 the two subworlds simultaneously. Such “cross-over” participants experience problems in
 recognition and acceptance with established participants. (Gilmore, 1988, pp. 214–215)

1 The reasons why these symbolic social control mechanisms must be
2 recurrently activated are tied to the very processes that link different
3 structural locations within worlds. If they meet with some measure of
4 commercial success members of restricted-production fields are likely to be
5 induced to enter into large-scale production and thus move closer to what
6 Bourdieu (1993) refers to as the “heteronomy” of the market. The market –
7 and the mass public located at the center of the niche – thus serves as a
8 constant symbolic menace to the existence of small-scale production fields
9 and to the identity codes created by producers therein (Holbrook & Addis,
10 2007). As Crane (1976, p. 729) argued, “the dominant trend in modern
11 societies is for independent . . . systems to turn into heterocultural systems
12 rather than vice versa.” Owing to this contrast “threat” of defection (and
13 thus blurring of the boundaries between the different production styles),
14 members of restricted production fields react quickly with symbolic
15 devaluation directed at any potential overture to larger outsider audiences.

16 Empirical evidence for the existence of this insider-devaluation social
17 control mechanism in fields of restricted production is extensive. For instance,
18 Bourdieu (1996, p. 129) notes that in the late 19th century French literary
19 field, the reputation of Emile Zola among Parisian literary cognoscenti and
20 critics suffered just as his novels began to reach a wide audience. Crane (1989)
21 shows that as the market for the initially esoteric modernist styles of art grew
22 among upwardly mobile segments of the upper-middle class during the 1960s
23 and 1970s, critical devaluation of the styles that enjoyed currency among
24 these segments – minimalism, pop-art – swiftly followed. Those artistic styles
25 that remained inaccessible to insider class fractions (i.e., conceptual art)
26 retained critical appeal. In the Parisian fashion world, the Pierre Cardin house
27 quickly lost symbolic standing and was ultimately stripped of its *haute couture*
28 status by gatekeepers of the Parisian fashion artworld when it began to attach
29 its brand name to a broader range of commercial products beyond luxury
30 apparel (i.e., perfumes, handbags, jewelry). The design house Hermes in
31 contrast continues to derive high symbolic profits and retain its standing as a
32 “luxury” company because of the fact that “never in its history did it give
33 in to the *temptation* of outsourcing or licensing” (Djelic & Ainamo, 1999,
34 p. 629, italics added). Carroll and Swaminathan (2000) note the legiti-
35 macy cost that specialist microbrewers pay in the eyes of gatekeepers and
36 controllers of symbolic rewards within the microbrewery community as they
37 achieve success and begin to grow in size.

38 This is similar to the dynamic of audience devaluation following violation
39 of default identity codes emphasized in the more recent ecological account
(Hannan et al., 2007), except that it ties what counts as “default” to an

1 explicit theory of evaluation rather than to a purely cognitive theory in which
 3 default simply means “consistent with past expectations.” According to field
 5 and production theory, because reputation is more tightly connected to
 7 conformity with identity codes for specialist producers, and because audien-
 9 ces in these subfields are composed of relatively more influential producer-
 11 peers and gatekeeper-critics, this devaluation following an identity-code
 13 process should be more salient for peripheral than for “center” organizations.
 15 This is consistent with Hsu and Hannan’s (2005, p. 482) proposal that in **AU:11**
 17 cultural domains where “resonance and authenticity” are primary concerns
 (as in fields of restricted production), audiences are more likely to strengthen
 the expected “defaults” (i.e., taken for granted expectations of conformity
 with established identity categories and the social codes that pertain to them).
 Consistent with this argument, Swaminathan (2001) finds that small-scale
 “farm wineries” that attempt to increase sales by adopting the characteristics
 of mass production wineries increase their mortality hazard. These are
 precisely the same type of wineries that are more dependent on critical
 evaluation and word-of-mouth reputation for sales.

19

21 **5. PRODUCERS, APPEAL, AND CONSUMER** 23 **DYNAMICS**

25

27 *5.1. Sociological Determinism in the Space of Positions*

29

31 Both field and ecological approaches share a heuristic “sociological
 33 determinism” in conceptualizing the relationship of social position and
 35 patterns of taste among consumer-audiences. This is a feature of Bourdieu’s
 37 (1984) field theory of consumer behavior in distinction, which is now shared
 with the ecological conceptualization of the audience space (Mark, 2003).
 According to the latest ecological conception of the audience

39

the members of the audience differ somewhat in tastes in a way that makes the offerings
 of category members more or less intrinsically attractive. Extensive sociological research
 reveals that social-demographic position influences tastes. Nonetheless, the audience
 members at a social position also generally differ somewhat in tastes. We build a
 simplified model in which each social position possesses a prototypical taste, but the
 tastes of individual members at the position match the proto-typical taste to varying
 degrees. (Hannan et al., 2007, pp. 174–175)

41

In this formulation, each cultural product has a projected audience; the
 expected probability that an audience member located in a specific position

1 in social space will engage the product increases whenever producers
2 attempt to craft products that correspond to the tastes and expectations of
3 the typical audience member for that region of social space. In this respect,
4 both field and ecological approaches do away with conceptions of the rela-
5 tionship between producers and audiences that rely on either the “creation”
6 of demand for symbolic goods by way of audience manipulation – for
7 example, the Frankfurt School model (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1979) – or
8 the “rational” response of producers to some sort of perceived demand for
9 specific goods – the standard neo-classical model of the market summarily
10 rejected by White (1981). Instead, “The producers are led by the logic of
11 competition with other producers ... to produce distinct products which
12 meet the different cultural interests which the consumers owe to their class
13 conditions and [social] position” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 231).

14 The ecological and field theories converge in various ways in their
15 conceptualization of the relationship of producers and audiences. Both
16 reject one-directional models that focus either on the producer side or the
17 consumer side, in favor of a dynamic model that pays attention to the
18 interaction between producers and audiences. Ecological approaches
19 highlight the process through which producers adopt category labels and
20 social codes definitional of form-identities. These identities are expected to
21 conform to audience’s expectations and to the role that the symbolic goods
22 produced in these fields play in defining consumer identities. These
23 consumer identities are conceptualized as being linked to definite social
24 positions (Bourdieu, 1984; Hannan et al., 2007). In spite of these points of
25 commonality, there are essential differences in emphasis in the processes and
26 mechanisms that are deemed as central.

27 In the ecological formulation, the producer space is defined in terms of the
28 socio-demographic audience space (i.e., the position of a focal producer in
29 the space of producers is literally defined as a fuzzy set of social positions in
30 which that producers’ product is expected to have “intrinsic appeal”). The
31 socio-demographic audience space on the other hand is treated as
32 “primitive” and therefore is not symmetrically defined according to features
33 of the products produced in the producer space. Instead, tastes are taken to
34 be somehow distributed over the audience space so that particular tastes can
35 be mapped to particular locations in that space. This leads to the
36 undesirable consequence that though organizational identities and category
37 labels corresponding to products are treated as falling under the general
38 theory of “social forms,” the social positions of the audience that define the
39 organizational and category niches are not themselves treated as social
40 forms. Yet, field analysis maintains that “highly educated,” “young,” “old,”

insert "even"

1 “male,” or “female” are as much social forms as anything else. In fact the
 3 basic field insight is that the meaning (and consensually defined identity
 5 social positions (Holt, 1998).

7

9

5.2. Audiences and Producers One Space or Two?

11 Field theory suggests a more symmetric treatment of the audience space.
 13 Instead of taking as a given that “audience members can be characterized by
 15 values on some features” (Hannan et al., 2007, p. 175) and thus taking the
 17 meaning of those feature values as exogenous, a field approach proposes
 19 that those socio-demographic positions acquire meaning by way of how they
 21 are mapped into a space of product characteristics. Accordingly, the
 relevant categorical schemas that define what it is to be an occupant of a
 social position (i.e., a given vector of socio-demographic characteristics) are
 defined by the established labels associated with the multidimensional space
 of the features of symbolic goods that correspond to the typical
 consumption profile (and indicator of the Weberian notion of a “style of
 life”) of members of that position (Bourdieu, 1984).

23 It also follows that just as there are dynamics of competition and niche
 25 segregation in the producer space, similar competitive dynamics should be
 27 observed in the audience space (Mark, 2003). That is, the “meaning” of
 29 what it is to occupy a particular social position should change with the
 31 shifting consumption habits of occupants of the typical occupants of that
 33 position. The motivation to change consumption patterns is itself
 35 explainable by attempts of audience members to keep their consumption
 37 profiles distinct from members of positions that are nearby in social space
 (Bourdieu, 1984). For instance, the schematic “label” associated with what
 it means to be a member of the audience which occupies a position
 associated with “college education” has shifted overtime from one that
 primarily associated this position with the exclusive consumption of
 products that used to be labeled as “fine art” to one that associates this
 position in social space with the inclusive consumption of all kinds of
 aesthetically defined objects from both the for-profit and non-profit culture
 production fields. This is the group of high-status audiences for the arts that
 have been labeled as “omnivores” (Bryson, 1996; Peterson, 1992).

39 Changing definitions of the identity labels associated with being an
 occupant of a social position can then feedback into competitive struggles in

1 the producer space, so that arts-dissemination organizations interested
2 in capturing this slice of the younger highly educated audience must now
3 come up with offerings concordant with this “multicultural” logic, rather
4 than remaining tied to the exclusive promotion of Euro-American artistic
5 products (Fridman & Ollivier, 2002; Rawlings, 2001). Furthermore,
6 the emergence of “intrinsic appeal” for “commercial art” among highly
7 educated persons” – previously derided as “mass culture” by older elites
8 (Macdonald, 1953) – has opened up an opportunity for a set of producers to
9 be able to engage this audience segment (i.e., Hollywood film studios;
10 Baumann, 2007), which did not exist when the definition of the “highly
11 educated” position was premised on the rejection of commercially produced
12 art (DiMaggio, 2000; Peterson, 1997).

AU:12

13 The field approach thus differs from the ecological one in endogenizing
14 the demand for symbolic goods and providing a theory of the emergence
15 of intrinsic appeal for different goods among members of different socio-
16 demographic positions. It does this by postulating a set of competitive
17 dynamics among members of audiences who occupy different social posi-
18 tions for exclusive ways to define what it is to be a member of that position
19 through unique consumption profiles that become definitional of the mean-
20 ing of that position (Bourdieu, 1984, pp. 230–235). This may serve to address
21 a weakness of the ecological account of taste as currently formulated: the
22 fact that the “appeal” of a product to a position is defined as being largely
23 exogenous to the theory of producer competition. The current ecological
24 formulation follows a *de gustibus non est disputandum* logic, with intrinsic
25 appeal simply defined as “a function that maps triples of producers,
26 audience-segment members and time points to the [0,1] interval” (Hannan
27 et al., 2007, p. 72). None of the postulates of the current formulation take
28 the intrinsic appeal of an offering to a position as itself a function of the
29 dynamics of competition in organizational domain in question.

30 The field approach also goes beyond simply proposing a generic mecha-
31 nism of “competition” among audiences as an engine of differentiation
32 (Mark, 2003), because it also offers a theory that predicts the expected
33 direction of this differentiation. It does this by drawing on the same mecha-
34 nism of value differentiation discussed above. From the field-theoretic pers-
35 pective, there are positions in social space that are biased toward products
36 produced under a “transcendent” conception of value logic, whereas other
37 social positions are friendlier to the market considerations usually favored
38 by generalist producers. This approach can bring specificity to recent
39 theoretical considerations of the role of audiences in processes of form-
emergence.

1 For instance in discussing Carroll and Swaminathan's (2000) research on
2 American breweries, Hsu and Hannan (2005, p. 482) noted that the success AU :13
3 of the microbrewery movement was due partly to the fact that "*some*
4 American consumers found the appeal of the authentic quality and values of
5 craft beer compelling (*italics added*).” However, the question becomes:
6 *which* social positions were more likely to find appeals to authenticity
7 compelling? Although it is possible to think of the answer to this question as
8 being something that can be left to empirical adjudication on a study-by-
9 study basis, field theory suggests that a more systematic and generalizable
10 formulation is feasible. Recent research suggests that across a wide variety
11 of products and industries, the type of audience that is attracted to appeal of
12 “authenticity,” “originality,” and “craft” values is essentially the same:
13 young, highly educated members of symbol and culture production
14 occupations (Bourdieu, 1984; Holt, 1998, 2002; Johnston & Baumann,
15 2007; Thompson & Arsel, 2004).

16 What is the explanation for this recurrent phenomenon? The field approach
17 conceives of certain social positions as being attracted to the products
18 produced by specialist, transcendent-value-oriented organizations, and repelled
19 by the commercialized products produced by center and near-center
20 organizations precisely due to the (perceived) social distance between audience
21 members as occupiers of certain positions and producers as occupiers of
22 a certain position in the production space. In addition, the intrinsic appeal
23 of the product of an organization for a given social position may change not
24 because of any action that can be associated with those organizations, but
25 simply because members of a different social position come to be perceived
26 as being interested in the product by members of a focal social position.

27 Bourdieu (1984) argues that members of certain occupations that have
28 high educational requirement but relatively little access to economic and
29 political power (i.e., intellectuals, artists) will be more likely to be attracted
30 to peripheral “craft” offerings and be repelled by “commercial” (center or
31 near-center) offerings, because “craft” organizations occupy a position in
32 the field of production (peripheral) that is similar to the one that they
33 occupy in socio-demographic space in relation to more economically and
34 politically powerful groups (Bourdieu, 1984, pp. 223–224). From this point
35 of view, the “intrinsic appeal” of an organization’s offering depends on
36 more than “engagement” and other informational factors (e.g., whether the
37 consumer is “aware” of the offer), but is also a function of the way that that
38 organization’s category label is perceived as being consistent or concordant
39 with the category labels that occupants of a given social position associate
with their position in social space (hence, the importance of considering

1 social positions as themselves social forms subject to processes of
2 categorization and codification).

3 In this way, the field approach predicts that rather than being arbitrary or
4 simply “intrinsic,” (which clearly begs the question) the appeal of particular
5 symbolic goods to certain social positions will be predictable *ex ante*,
6 because members of specific social positions will, under specifiable
7 circumstances (e.g., a partition in socio-demographic space between two
8 competing sources of status, such as economic (hedonic) versus cultural
9 (transcendent) resources) be positively oriented to the same broadly defined
10 set of producer category labels. This positive orientation is itself recoverable
11 from the logic of valuation that governs the field of social positions.

12 For instance, members of certain professions – symbolic producers – see
13 themselves as being driven by transcendent standards of value and cast others
14 as being driven purely by hedonic standards (Bourdieu, 1984; Lamont, 1992).
15 Field theory predicts that members of these types of occupations find
16 themselves more likely to be attracted to goods produced by organizations
17 that emphasize comparably transcendent production values (e.g., “authen-
18 ticity”) over those that emphasize technical prowess or more commercially
19 defined standards (e.g., “over one billion sold”; “America’s number one
20 Network”). As DiMaggio (1996, p. 162) notes in summarizing the field
21 hypothesis, members of culture and symbol-producing occupations tend to

22 adopt an aesthetic that permits them to use their cultural resources to the full and, at the
23 same time, by justifying the rejection of the most lavishly expensive cultural forms,
24 makes a virtue of economic necessity. Thus academics and other highly educated
25 professionals tend to prize affordable but arcane avant-garde and oppositional forms,
26 whereas managers and owners of capital may prefer costly but accessible canonical high-
27 culture art and Broadway plays.

28 These considerations can be used to build a sharper account of the
29 “ecology of the overall audience” which can be used to gain a better
30 conceptualization of the “coevolution of populations of producers and
31 audiences” (Hsu, Hannan, & Kocak, 2007, p. 28).

32

33

34 6. CONCLUSION

35 In this chapter, I have argued that recent formulations of organizational
36 ecology around the notions of social codes, identity, and audiences
37 represents the latest in a striking process of convergence with cognate
38 approaches to the study of symbol-production worlds in the sociology of
39

1 culture. The emerging conversation between these approaches can be
 3 furthered and be taken beyond the selective appropriation of certain ideas
 5 and concepts from the “production” paradigm on the part of organizational
 7 scholars (e.g., Greve, Pozner, & Rao, 2006). In addition, we can begin to use
 9 the insights from field and production perspectives to inform the
 11 sophisticated framework for the analysis of social forms recently systematized by ecological theorists (e.g., Hannan et al., 2007). The interaction between featured-based definitions of form-identities, standards of value, social-movement-like processes in the creation of new forms, and audience dynamics can be improved through a consideration of production of culture and field formulations of these processes.

13 Because standards of value elaborated and developed by interested insiders
 15 come to partially influence what some actors within the field find worth
 17 striving for (and therefore the strategic and organizational decisions that are
 19 relevant for attaining those goals), the field perspective provides an analytically useful approach for the comparative analysis of forms of valuation (some of which may be antithetical to market definitions of worth; Bourdieu, 1983) across organizational forms. The same also applies to recent connections in organizational theory between departure from accepted “social codes” definitional of organizational form-identities and social control processes of devaluation and enforcement of established identity codes (i.e., devaluation processes). The field approach is thus largely consonant with recent calls for a more nuanced treatment of value and identity in organizational studies (Baron, 2004; Podolny & Hill-Popper, 2004), as well as a somewhat limiting cognitive focus of the ecological theory of social forms.

27 The field approach also provides a useful take on the dynamics of partitioning as not only involving niche segregation in an exclusively resource-based sense, but also by bringing back a concern with what has been called the “identity value” of extant organizational forms within a symbolic *hierarchy* of forms of evaluation. From the field perspective, actors
 31 come to acquire certain cultural connotations as desirable precisely due to their connection with either hegemonic
 33 strategies of framing and definition of product categories and form-identities. This converges with recent ecological treatments of similar phenomena (Hannan et al., 2007; Pólos et al., 2002; Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000). In this sense, the center/periphery distinction maps neatly to the field distinction between dominant (large-scale) and dominated (restricted) production strategies, and the temporal dynamics of change whereby previously
 39 dominated strategies become dominant and newly dominated actors enter the field (Bourdieu, 1993). This can provide a more substantive explanation

Line 40: Replace
 "substantive" with
 "satisfactory"

Line 39: Replace "dominated"
 with "inducted"

Line 39: Replace
 "and" with "as"

1 of how exactly is it that certain organizational fields putatively structured
 3 usually associated with social movements (and organizational fields structured
 5 around movement-like logics may come to later acquire market-like
 7 characteristics; Lounsbury, 2005). Furthermore, it allows us to better understand
 9 how innovation at the level of organizational process, technology, and structure (e.g., form-identities) come to be tied to oppositional (and thus expressive) meanings of these codes (e.g., craft versus technology-intensive production).

11 Most importantly, the ecological and field accounts provide complementary versions of a viable strategy for the comparative study of organizations. Recall that the first generation typological and attribute-based analysis
 13 of covariation floundered precisely when more systematic attention began to be paid to the institutional environment. Institutional studies lost the comparative edge, but brought a concern with tracing more detailed, richer accounts of process that took the historical, and cultural constitution of
 15 organizational fields seriously. However, institutional analyses have the disadvantage of having to focus on one institutional field (or organizational population) at a time and thus lose the *cross-institutional* comparative edge
 17 keyed to recurrent organizational structures and dynamics that was the signature of early comparative approaches. They thus fail to cash in on the key insight of the first generation of comparativists: that there might be
 19 “generic” features common to organizations that cut across institutional location. The main analytical weakness of for first generation attempts
 21 resulted from the fact that they were ambiguous in their conceptualization of what these generic “feature-bundles” were, invariably deciding to concentrate on those parts of the organization that were seen
 23 “real” and thus exempt from cultural constitution. This is a distinction that has been deconstructed in recent attention to the cultural sociology of organizations (Dobbin, 1994).

Line 32: Replace "constructed" with "generated"

31 Both field and ecological analyses bring back a concern with organizational features, but this time reconceived as ~~social constructed~~ cognitive
 33 constructions created and enforced by interested agents within organizational fields. They thus combine the strengths of the first generation of
 35 comparative analysis with the analytical gains garnered from the cultural and institutional turns in organizational theory. Organizations are thus
 37 social forms, and are defined as bundles of specific conceptions of how to organize. Field theory conceives of these conceptions as the object of
 39 symbolic struggle (and not just cognitive ordering), because they serve to define the identity of given organizational actors and also serve to give them

Line 32: Replace "social" with "socially"

1 a place (or location) in the field. This location is defined *relative* to that
 3 invariably comes to be organized along some sort of oppositional evaluative
 5 dimension. Authoritative insider audiences within fields are key, because
 7 they serve to define, elaborate, and most importantly to *bestow differential*
 9 *value* on certain feature bundles and to devalue others. The fate of
 11 organizational actors and producers within fields is thus tied to these
 13 evaluation contests, and by implication to struggles for control over those
 15 positions that are in charge of establishing the standards of classification
 17 and valuation.

11 This overall framework thus provides a basis for comparison across orga-
 13 nizational worlds, not only in terms of the relative degree of *consolidation* and
 15 *elaboration* of producer categories, but also in terms of the relative degree of
 17 *symbolic potency* and overall reach of different standards of evaluation. For
 19 instance, fields and worlds may differ in the extent to which there are explicitly
 21 defined role-positions within the insider-audience space (e.g., full-time critics)
 23 that are in charge of defining and ascertaining compliance with the social
 25 forms that are prevalent within as well as linking this compliance to the value
 27 standards with which they are associated. Other fields for instance may have a
 29 more diffuse, informal gatekeeping system in which the labor of cognitive
 definition and evaluation is more evenly distributed among a set of producer-
 peers (as in science). Fields may also differ in the strength the boundary
 separating organizations in the center of the market from peripheral pro-
 ducers, and thus in the extent of intercourse and exchange between producers
 associated with the two ideal-typical styles of production identified earlier
 obtains. Finally, fields may differ in the extent to which devaluation is
 resorted to as a social control strategy, and in the extent to which peripheral
 producers depend on symbolic rewards to establish position and membership.

AU:14

31 UNCITED REFERENCES

33 Lawrence & Lorsch (1967); Leblebici, Salancik, Copay, & King (1991);
 Peterson & Anand (2004); Stinchcombe (2002); Woodward (1965).

35

37 NOTES

39 1. This observation, however, is not meant to obscure the fact that early
 comparativists (such as Crozier (1964) and Udy (1970)) took special care to place
 their typological analyses in a larger historical and societal context.

1 2. It is possible for instance to think of a comparative analysis of two or more
populations or institutional fields.

3 3. Models incorporating some form of temporal heterogeneity have become the
bread and butter of institutional analysis (Schneiberg & Clemens, 2006).

5 4. Recent ecological thinking also retains the more institutionalist concern with
the key role played by the organizational environment. It also preserves the
methodological strategy of taking the organizational population as the unit of
7 analysis.

9 5. That is, social codes are essentially meaningful entities and not “brute” (i.e.,
“extensional”) material facts; for analytical clarification on this distinction, see
Searle (1995).

11 6. The analytic differentiation between restricted and large-scale production
fields was initially developed for the study of cultural production. However, the
general characterization of the dynamics that create this partition in symbol-
13 production industries appears to carry more general applicability beyond the study
of artworlds, as any field of production appears to have the capability to acquire the
characteristic dynamics of an “artworld” (Baumann, 2001; Johnston & Baumann,
15 2007; Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003).

17 7. These are the “insider” audiences composed of “enthusiasts” and “activists”
in Hannan, Polos, and Carroll’s (2007, p. 38) terms.

19 8. Hannan, Polos, and Carroll also refer to a more normative process when they
note that “interesting possibilities arise when categories come in opposing pairs, as in
the case of ‘microbrewer’ and ‘(industrial) brewer’ ... When the schemata for
21 categories class, attempts at spanning them will confuse identities and likely lead to
devaluation” (p. 111, italics added). Field theory suggests that this oppositional
arrangement with binary categorical classifications being mapped into different ends
of a normative value continuum is the norm rather than the exception.

23 9. This obtains as long as the market is dominant institution in society as a whole.

25 10. As Bourdieu (1993, p. 82) notes, “[t]he opposition between the ‘commercial’
and the ‘non-commercial’ reappears everywhere. It is the generative principle of most
of the judgments which, in the theatre cinema, painting or literature, claim to
27 establish the frontier between what is and what is not art, i.e. in practice between
‘bourgeois’ art and ‘intellectual’ art, between ‘traditional’ and ‘avant-garde’ art.”

31 REFERENCES

33 Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (1979). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. New York: Herder and Herder.
Baron, J. N. (2004). Employing identities in organizational ecology. *Industrial and Corporate
Change*, 13, 3–32.

35 Baumann, S. (2001). Intellectualization and art world development: Film in the United States.
American Sociological Review, 66, 404–426.

37 Baumann, S. (2007). *Hollywood highbrow: From entertainment to art*. Princeton: Princeton
University Press.

39 Becker, H. S. (1974). Art as collective action. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 767–776.

Becker, H. S. (1976). Art worlds and social types. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 19, 703–718.

Becker, H. S. (1978). Arts and crafts. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 862–889.

- 1 Benson, R. (1999). Field theory in comparative context: A new paradigm for media studies. *Theory and Society*, 28, 463–498.
- 3 Blau, P. M. (1965). The comparative study of organizations. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 18, 323–338.
- 5 Bourdieu, P. (1980). The production of belief: Contributions to an economy of symbolic goods. *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 261–293.
- 7 Bourdieu, P. (1983). The field of cultural production, or: The economic world reversed. *Poetics*, 12, 311–356.
- 9 Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Translated by R. Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 11 Bourdieu, P. (1985). The market of symbolic goods. *Poetics*, 14, 13–44.
- 13 Bourdieu, P. (1987). The historical genesis of a pure aesthetic. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 46, 201–210.
- 15 Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 17 Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 19 Bryson, B. (1996). Anything but heavy metal: Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 884–900.
- 21 Carroll, G. R. (1985). Concentration and specialization: Dynamics of niche width in populations of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 1262–1283.
- 23 Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the U.S. brewing industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 715–762.
- 25 Carruthers, B. G., & Stinchcombe, A. L. (1999). The social structure of liquidity: Flexibility, markets, and states. *Theory and Society*, 28, 353–382.
- 27 Crane, D. (1976). Reward systems in art, science, and religion. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 19, 719–734.
- 29 Crane, D. (1989). *The transformation of the avant-garde: The New York art world, 1940–1985*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 31 Crozier, M. (1964). *The bureaucratic phenomenon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 33 DiMaggio, P. (1977). Market structure, the creative process, and popular culture: Toward an organizational reinterpretation of mass-culture theory. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 11, 436–452.
- 35 DiMaggio, P. (1987). Classification in art. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 440–455.
- 37 DiMaggio, P. (2000). Social structure institutions and cultural goods: The case of the United States. In: G. Bradford, M. Gary & G. Wallach (Eds), *The politics of culture* (pp. 38–62). New York: New Press.
- 39 DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147–160.
- Djelic, M.-L., & Ainamo, A. (1999). The coevolution of new organizational forms in the fashion industry: A historical and comparative study of France, Italy, and the United States. *Organization Science*, 10, 622–637.
- Dobbin, F. R. (1994). Cultural models of organization: The social construction of rational organizing principles. In: D. Crane (Ed.), *The sociology of culture* (pp. 117–142). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Fridman, V., & Ollivier, M. (2002). Caviar for the general or the erosion of cultural hierarchies. *Society and Leisure*, 25, 37–54.

- 1 Garfinkel, H. (1956). Conditions of successful degradation ceremonies. *American Journal of Sociology*, 61, 420–424.
- 3 Gilmore, S. (1988). Schools of activity and innovation. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 29, 203–219.
- Greve, H. R., Pozner, J.-E., & Rao, H. (2006). Vox Populi: Resource partitioning, organizational proliferation, and the cultural impact of the insurgent microradio movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 802–837.
- 5 Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 929–964.
- 7 Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1986). Where do organizational forms come from? *Sociological Forum*, 50–72.
- 9 Hannan, M. T., Pólos, L., & Carroll, G. R. (2007). *Logics of organization theory: Audiences, codes and ecologies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 11 Hirsch, P. M. (1972). Processing fads and fashions: An organization-set analysis of cultural industry systems. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77, 639–659.
- 13 Holbrook, M. B. (1999). Popular appeal versus expert judgments of motion pictures. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26, 144–155.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Addis, M. (2007). Taste versus the market: An extension of research on the consumption of popular culture. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34, 415–424.
- 15 Holt, D. B. (1998). Does cultural capital structure American consumption? *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25, 1–25.
- 17 Holt, D. B. (2002). Why do brands cause trouble? A dialectical theory of consumer culture and branding. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 70–90.
- 19 Hsu, G., & Hannan, M. T. (2005). Identities, genres and organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 16, 474–490.
- 21 Hsu, G., Hannan, M. T., & Kocak, O. (2007). *A formal theory of multiple category memberships and two empirical tests*. Research Paper No. 1968. Stanford School of Business.
- 23 Johnston, J., & Baumann, S. (2007). Democracy versus distinction: A study of omnivorousness in gourmet food writing. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113, 165–204.
- Lamont, M. (1992). *Money, morals, and manners*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 25 Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
- 27 Leblebici, H., Salancik, G. R., Copay, A., & King, T. (1991). Institutional change and the transformation of interorganizational fields: An organizational history of the U.S. radio broadcasting industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 333–363.
- 29 Lounsbury, M. (2005). Institutional variation in the evolution of social movements: Competing logics and the spread of recycling advocacy groups. In: D. McAdam, W. R. Scott & M. Zald (Eds), *Social movements and organization theory* (pp. 73–95). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 31 Macdonald, D. (1953). A theory of mass culture. *Diogenes*, 1, 1–17.
- 33 Mark, N. P. (2003). Culture and competition: Homophily and distancing explanations for cultural niches. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 319–345.
- 35 Martin, J. L. (2003). What is field theory? *American Journal of Sociology*, 109, 1–49.
- 37 Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340–363.
- 39 Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (1951). *Toward a general theory of action: Theoretical foundations for the social sciences*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- 1 Peli, G., & Nooteboom, B. (1999). Market partitioning and the geometry of the resource space. *American Journal of Sociology*, *104*, 1132–1153.
- 3 Perrow, C. (1967). A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. *American Sociological Review*, *32*, 194–208.
- 5 Peterson, R. A. (1992). Understanding audience segmentation: From elite and popular to omnivore and univore. *Poetics*, *21*, 243–258.
- 7 Peterson, R. A. (1997). The rise and fall of highbrow snobbery as a status marker. *Poetics*, *25*, 75–92.
- 9 Peterson, R. A. (2004). The dialectic of hard-core and soft-shell country music. In: S. Frith (Ed.), *Popular music: Critical concepts in media and cultural studies* (pp. 87–99). New York: Routledge.
- 11 Peterson, R. A., & Anand, N. (2004). The production of culture perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*, 311–334.
- 13 Podolny, J. M., & Hill-Popper, M. (2004). Hedonic and transcendent conceptions of value. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *13*, 91–116.
- 15 Pólos, L., Hannan, M. T., & Carroll, G. R. (2002). Foundations of a theory of social forms. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *11*, 85–115.
- 17 Powell, W. W. (1991). Expanding the scope of institutional analysis. In: W. W. Powell & J. D. Paul (Eds), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1–40). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 19 Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., & Hinings, C. R. (1969). An empirical taxonomy of structures of work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *14*, 115–126.
- 21 Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, *108*, 795–843.
- 23 Rawlings, C. M. (2001). ‘Making names’: The cutting edge renewal of African art in New York city. 1985–1996. *Poetics*, *29*, 25–54.
- 25 Ruef, M. (2000). The emergence of organizational forms: A community ecology approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, *106*, 658–714.
- 27 Schneiberg, M., & Clemens, E. S. (2006). The typical tools for the job: Research strategies in institutional analysis. *Sociological Theory*, *24*, 195–227.
- 29 Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 31 Searle, J. R. (1995). *The construction of social reality*. New York: Free Press.
- 33 Stinchcombe, A. L. (1959). Bureaucratic and craft administration of production: A comparative study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *4*, 168–187.
- 35 Stinchcombe, A. L. (2002). New sociological microfoundations for organizational theory: A postscript. In: M. Lounsbury & M. J. Ventresca (Eds), *Social structure and organizations revisited* (pp. 415–433). Amsterdam: JAI Press.
- 37 Strang, D., & Meyer, J. W. (1993). Institutional conditions for diffusion. *Theory and Society*, *22*, 487–511.
- 39 Swaminathan, A. (1998). Entry into new market segments in mature industries: Endogenous and exogenous segmentation in the U.S. brewing industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, *19*, 389–404.
- Swaminathan, A. (2001). Resource partitioning and the evolution of specialist organizations: The role of location and identity in the U.S. wine industry. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 1169–1185.

1 Thompson, C. J., & Arsel, J. (2004). The starbucks brandscape and consumers' (anticorporate)
experiences of glocalization. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 631–642.

3 Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of
power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing
industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 801–843.

5 Tuma, N. B., & Hannan, M. T. (1984). *Social dynamics: Models and methods*. Orlando, FL:
Academic Press.

7 Tushman, M. L., & Anderson, P. (1986). Technological discontinuities and organizational
environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 439–465.

9 Udy, S. H. (1970). *Work in traditional and modern society*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

White, H. C. (1981). Where do markets come from? *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 517–547.

11 White, H. C., & White, C. A. (1993). *Canvases and careers: Institutional change in the French
painting world*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Woodward, J. (1965). *Industrial organization*. London: Oxford University Press.

13 Zuckerman, E. W. (1999). The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy
discount. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 1398–1438.

15

17

19

21

23

25

27

29

31


33

35

37

39

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

	Book: RSO-V026 Chapter: 5	Please e-mail or fax your responses and any corrections to: E-mail: Fax:
---	--	---

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

Disk use

Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

- Scanning (parts of) your article
 Rekeying (parts of) your article
 Scanning the artwork

Bibliography

If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

- The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.**
 ***UNCITED REFERENCES:* This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section.**

Queries and/or remarks

Location in Article	Query / remark	Response
AU:1	The chapter title given “The comparative analysis of organizational forms: Considering field and ecological approaches” is not matching with that given in the table of contents “A comparative analysis of organizational forms: Considering field and ecological approaches”. Please let us know which needs to be followed.	The chapter title should be: "The comparative analysis of organizational forms: Considering field and ecological approaches"

DiMaggio, P. 1996. "Are art-museum visitors different from other people? The relationship between attendance and social and political attitudes in the United States." *Poetics* 24:161-180.

Weber, W. 1977. "Mass Culture and the Reshaping of European Musical Taste, 1770-1870." *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 8:5-22.

Delacroix, J., and M. E. Solt. 1988. "Niche formation and foundings in the California wine industry." Pp. 53–70 in *Ecological Models of Organizations*, edited by G. R. Carroll. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger

Hannan, M. T., and J. Freeman. 1989. *Organizational ecology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lammers, C. J. 1978. "The comparative sociology of organizations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 4:485-510.

1	AU:2	Please check and confirm the short title "The Comparative Analysis of Organizational Forms..." given for the chapter.	See above.
3			
5	AU:3	Following references are not listed in the reference list:	
7		Lammers, 1978; Hannan & Freeman, 1989; Weber, 1977;	
9		Delacroix & Solt, 1988; DiMaggio, 1996.	
11	AU:4	Please check and confirm the change made in sentence "This is a somewhat remarkable development".	OK
13			
15	AU:5	In sentence "The dominant "reward system" among...", there is an occurrence of "italics added" for the quotes, but italics are not appearing in the sentence. Please check.	Remove "italics added"
17			
19			
21	AU:6	Please check and confirm the changes made in sentence "In particular, I refer to the fact..." for correctness.	OK
23			
25	AU:7	Please check the sentence "This feeds backs into the cultural..." for sense clarity.	Leave as is.
27	AU:8	Please check and confirm the change made from "(19-20)" to "Weber, 1977, pp. 19-20".	OK
29			
31	AU:9	In sentence "The reason for this is" and in Note 8, there are occurrences of "italics added" for the quotes, but italics are not appearing in both the sentences. Please check.	Remove "italics added"
33			
35	AU:10	In sentence "Consistent with", please check and confirm the insertion of "Lounsbury, 2005".	OK
37			
39	AU:11	In sentence "This is consistent...", please check and	

1
3
5
7
9
11
13
15
17
19
21
23
25
27
29
31
33
35
37
39

	confirm the change made from “Hannan and Hsu (2005)” to “Hsu and Hannan (2005)”.	OK
AU:12	In sentence “Furthermore, the emergence...”, opening double quotes is missing.	Remove closing double quotes after "persons"
AU:13	In sentence “For instance in discussing...”, please check and confirm the change made from “Hannan and Hsu (2005)” to “Hsu and Hannan (2005)”.	OK
AU:14	Please check the sentence “Fields may also differ in the...” for sense clarity.	Replace "the boundary" with "of the boundary"