



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Frontiers of creative industries

Citation for published version:

Jones, C & Maoret, M 2018, 'Frontiers of creative industries: Exploring structural and categorical dynamics', *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, vol. Frontiers of Creative Industries: Exploring Structural and Categorical Dynamics, no. 55, pp. 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20180000055001>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1108/S0733-558X20180000055001](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20180000055001)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Research in the Sociology of Organizations

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the accepted version of the following article:

Candace Jones, Massimo Maoret, (2018), Frontiers of Creative Industries: Exploring Structural and Categorical Dynamics, in Candace Jones, Massimo Maoret (ed.) Frontiers of Creative Industries: Exploring Structural and Categorical Dynamics (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 55) Emerald Publishing Limited, pp.1 - 16, which has been published in final form at: <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/S0733-558X20180000055001>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**FRONTIERS OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES:
EXPLORING STRUCTURAL AND CATEGORICAL DYNAMICS**

Candace Jones
University of Edinburgh Business School
29 Buccleuch Pl - 2.21
Edinburgh EH8 9JS, United Kingdom
Phone: +44(0)131 6513858
candace.jones@ed.ac.uk

Massimo Maoret
IESE Business School – Strategic Management Department
Avinguda de Pearson, 21 – Q-626
08034 Barcelona, Spain
Phone: +34 (628) 856-140 – Fax: +34 (932) 534-343
mmaoret@iese.edu

Creative industries seek to generate and capture economic value from individuals' creative input and cultural expression. They involve every aspect of our society, from the psychology of creativity, to management organization and practices to laws and public policy (Jones, Lorenzen & Sapsed, 2015). Given the breadth of theoretical perspectives, and also diverse range of empirical phenomena that comprise the creative industries, both scholars and practitioners have enumerated lists of what is or is not a creative industry in their struggle to define the term. Jones and colleagues (2015) offer an integrative perspective on how to re-classify creative industries based on rates of change in semiotic codes and the technical material base of the industry. Scholars and practitioners, however, do agree upon creative industries as a globally important area for both cultural expression and economic vitality of industrialized and emerging nations (Nathan et al., 2015). Creative industries anchor our cultural experience and order our economic lives. They offer products and services that range from prosaic to the sublime and shape what we consume every day, including advertising, art, architecture, music, fashion and wine. Because creative industries are essential to the economies and cultures of the 21st century, their dynamics merit intellectual exploration and greater understanding.

Prior scholarly volumes on creative industries tend to focus either on macro-economic structures or micro-social dynamics. A macro-economic perspective spotlights markets and uncertainty (e.g., Vogel, 1986/2001; Caves, 2000; Menger, 2014), and how that uncertainty creates excess capacity that shapes winner-take-all markets. Contracts and financial tools are devised as solutions to help manage such uncertainty. The macro social perspectives have examined how the demand for continuous product innovations generate fads and fashions (Simmel, 1908) as well as tensions between artistic and utilitarian motives that shape creative practices (Jones & Thornton, 2005; Jones et al., 2016; Lampel, Lant & Shamsie, 2000). The micro-social focus spotlights how individual decision making and interactional dynamics

generate value and creativity judgments, particularly in the context of fairs and festivals (Morean & Strandgaard Pedersen, 2011; Morean & Christianson, 2013). This focus provides a sharp insight into value and evaluative practices in creative contexts, but treats the structural and categorical systems as a backdrop for micro-interactional dynamics. The growth and vibrancy of creative industries, however, also depends on structural and categorical dynamics: social structures that bridge and broker producers, co-producers and audiences and the categorical processes that aid comprehension and stabilize demand for cultural products through evaluation processes (Jones, Svejenova, Strandgaard Pedersen & Townley, 2016).

The present volume offers a set of exemplary scholarly papers that shed light on the structural and categorical dynamics that shape creative industries, illuminating phenomena and enriching our theories of macro-structural conditions and their influence on producer-audience dynamics, with a special emphasis on evaluative practices. This volume captures the dialog that occurred on July 13-15th 2016 at the Creative Industries conference, an intense and delightful two-days, hosted and financed by the University of Edinburgh Business School.

SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND CATEGORIES IN CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

Social structures and categories are two of the key dimensions that pervade creative industries, ranging from agentic actors, whether individuals or organizations, shaping creative products and industries versus being constrained by established categories that shape actors' choices and actions. The social structures include dyadic and triadic role relations, such as producers, intermediaries and audiences - including critics and consumers that have a profound impact on the production and evaluation of cultural products (Peterson & Anand, 2004; Shrum, 1991). The social structure of creative industries shapes not only what is produced, but also who can produce it (Faulkner & Anderson, 1987; Uzzi & Spiro, 2005).

Social structures amplify and depress the evaluations of creativity for cultural products (Cattani & Ferriani 2008), where disconnectedness may generate novel artistic forms such as jazz (Phillips, 2011). Moreover, a change in the social structure from dyad—or the producer-audience interface—to triad is connected intimately with changes in cultural products and forms. For example, the rise of wealthy mercantilists transformed French painting system from dyadic — the painter and French Academy as patron and employer — to triadic of artist-critic-consumer because there was now a market besides the state for paintings (White & White, 1967). This new market structure enabled demand for fundamentally different kinds of paintings, and heralded the rise of Impressionism as an alternative form of art. The value chain of cultural production emphasizes triadic relations, where brokers and brokerage processes central to creative industries, such as shaping product content (Lingo & O’Mahony, 2010) and matching artists to venues (Foster, Borgatti & Jones, 2011). Thus, social structure drives who gains opportunity, recognition and rewards.

Social structures reflect status, as seen in the affiliations of creative individuals (Faulkner & Anderson, 1987), which serves as a proxy for or signal of quality when quality is uncertain and hard to directly assess (Podolny, 1993). Podolny’s contribution was particularly important as it suggested that evaluation mechanisms based on social cues can substitute rational choice models based on objective features of the evaluated candidate (George et al., 2016). Studies have emphasized the producer-audience interface (Zuckerman 1999; Phillips and Zuckerman 2001; Shrum, 1991), whereby members of an audience (e.g. critics and/or consumers) evaluate the quality or worth of a producer’s creative product, which will in turn determine the pattern of consumption of each creative product, as well as the prestige and fame of the producer. Audience evaluations are based on the inter-subjective perceptions of stakeholders and market participants. The fundamental mechanism that links these different structures and roles together is social evaluation through categorization. Social structures may

become tightly coupled with categorization processes, as more central actors are typically of higher status and, also receive greater recognition and awards, which not only amplifies their opportunity to produce, but also shapes reception of their cultural product by audiences.

Indeed, categories underpin and stabilize the “flux of social life” (Douglas 1986, p. 100). Categories define which set of features are perceived as similar, and thus belong together, establishing categorical boundaries that define identities (Bowker & Starr, 1999; DiMaggio, 1987; Rosch & Mervis, 1975). Category research initially emphasized audiences because they are particularly useful to sort quickly the set of producers to be valued, enabling comparisons that are coherent and consistent across different types. In order to evaluate candidates, audiences utilize frameworks to simplify the reality in front of them, these frameworks being categorization systems. For example, the measure of star power, which ranks actors, directors and producers on their ability to generate box office, enacts categories and enforces benefits and penalties. Such commensuration, however, produces a side-effect – that candidates that do not fit cleanly in the taken-for-granted categorical schematization of evaluators suffer a penalty, due to the lower alignment with audience expectations and the higher likelihood of being ignored and disregarded (Zuckerman 1999; Durand and Paoletta 2013).

Zuckerman (1999) labeled this dynamic the “legitimacy discount” due to the “categorical imperative,” which has been found and replicated in movies (Hsu, 2006) and several other creative fields. Zuckerman’s original specification of the categorical imperative between the producer-audience interface rested on two assumptions. First, producers and audiences are assumed as independent and specialized in their roles. That implies that producers are “passive” recipients of audiences’ evaluations, without being able to act strategically and to defy any of the audience judgements. Second, the categorical systems

utilized by audiences are exogenous to the system, and producers cannot act to change or alter the categorical boundaries used by the audiences.

Category research, however, has begun to include the role of the producer as a means of endogenous change in categories. For example, Jones, Maoret, Massa and Svejnova (2012) reveal how architects, as producers, theorized and materialized the new category of modern architecture and fought over its features and boundaries, whereas the critics and clients lagged behind and followed the category creation of producers. Creative products entail production, selection, consumption and diffusion across networks of producers, intermediaries, audiences within and across societies. Thus, understanding how category perceptions get formed, how they can be exploited and how they become institutionalized might help scholars to better understand how creative products become successful, or fail. Several contributions in this volume further our understanding of the category processes that shape social evaluation and how social structures may shape category process.

A RELATIONAL VIEW OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES:

EXPLORING THE INTERACTIONS OF STRUCTURES AND CATEGORIES

In this volume, we have sought to illuminate the macro-structural conditions— structural and categorical—and bring them to the foreground to reveal how they shape the dynamics of creative industries, focusing on the production and evaluation of creative products. The various authors explore to different degree the dynamics of social structures, categories and the interaction between them.

The papers range from a primary focus on structures, such as brokerage styles (Furnari & Rolbina, this volume) to a primary focus on category and evaluation processes (Ody-Brazier, this volume). They represent several theoretical contributions including Furnari and Rolbina's theorizing the enactment of brokerage relations, Godart's elaborating style as a concept that interfaces producers and audiences through evaluation, and Hirsch and

Bajpai's applying the Jones et al. (2015) framework of semiotic and material change in creative industries to categorize the empirical papers in the volume. The empirical papers examine and offer new theoretical and empirical insights into a variety of creative industries, such as architecture (Svejenova & Christianson, this volume), art markets (Sgourev, this volume), advertising (Aadland, Cattani & Ferriani, this volume), the digitization of music (Askin & Mol, this volume) and the history of swing music (Comans & Phillips, this volume) and Champagne wine (Ody-Brazier, this volume). Figure 1 captures the interaction among social structures and categories, and, also the range of contributions to the special issue.

--- INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE ---

Beginning on the most structural approach, Furnari and Rolbina examine the triadic relationship among individual producer-broker-audience and how the relationship is enacted to influence the success of creative projects. The authors take a social network perspective, picturing creative professionals as “brokers” who can use different types of networking styles to ensure the successful implementation of their creative projects. Their insights draw upon Simmel's classic analysis of the triad and marry it with Collins' notion of interaction chains driven by emotion and attention. Thus brokerage is not a purely structural mechanism but involves tactics creative professionals can use to manage brokerage as a process. Furnari and Rolbina assume that artists and funders (in this case, the audience providing resources) have similar motivations regardless of triadic structure and then seek to explain how three distinct brokerage styles—host, catalyst and mediator—lead to distinct interactions and outcomes. They break down their analysis into three general phases of creating processes – the resource gathering phase, the creative development phase and the implementation phase. In each phase, the two authors offer a deep theoretical investigation of brokerage as a process, highlighting how brokers can resolve the fundamental tradeoff between collaboration (delegation) and control by employing a different set of brokerage styles, each of which rests

on different types of interaction rituals. Their theorizing is particularly valuable as it offers a micro-sociological view of the brokerage process, marrying structural and process considerations, and thus contributing to the recent debate of brokerage as process (Obstfeld, Borgatti and Davis, 2014). Their contribution also helps to shed light on the inter-temporal dynamics of the network evolution across different phases of creative projects (Maoret, Massa and Jones, 2011).

Svejenova and Christiansen analyze a renowned Chilean architectural firm, Elemental, which acted as broker between the State agency, who funds housing, and the recipients of that housing. In their analysis of Elemental, the authors reveal how the firm moved from ideation to production through creative leadership, which shifted from a strategy of control strategy to one of co-production. This move was achieved through framing and reframing among key stakeholders: facilitating shared problem definition through multi-modality, integrating these design forms into institutionalized understanding so they had wider resonance, and directing the new strategic frames and architectural model to engage in social innovation: providing public housing. The historical challenge in creative industries is that having a new original idea is a necessary, but not sufficient prerequisite for a new creative product to come to light. Artists with new ideas often fail to gather the necessary resources to complete their creative project, but also to use such resources in order for their plans to become reality. Resource gathering and idea implementation often entail producers to navigate an intricate and complex social space composed by multiple stakeholders, conflicting institutions and overlapping social networks. Invariably, most projects never survive this stage, as newly generated ideas struggle to transition from ideation, towards idea implementation and finally production. Svejenova and Christiansen discuss how artists and creative professionals can become “creative leaders” not only to produce new creative artifacts, but also to ensure that their work has a wider social impact to the focal community.

Sgourev (this volume) introduces the concept of “Monet-ization” to reveal how investors can transform art worlds. He theorizes how new categories in the art market acquire artistic value through the central role of financial investors, who act as brokers and conduits between art and finance, providing a powerful historical analysis of the origins of art markets, from the 17th century Dutch art to the rise of Modern Art in the 20th century. Sgourev highlights the importance in the history of art of collectors with an “investor” profile to solve the problems that plague art markets – the low market liquidity and the scarce support for new, unproven art. The analysis reveals two patterns in which art and finance endogenously impact each other. Sgourev calls the first process “monetization”, or the process of market-making by art investors through which pieces of art acquire a financial value expressed in economic terms. But the author also theorizes a second process – “Monet-ization” – which is much less obvious: it describes how new art pieces get imbued with *artistic* value as they get collected by art investors by juxtaposing the new to the old. As investor-type art collectors get attracted to new unproven artistic categories – which represent opportunistic investments – they associate new pieces to recognized masters in their collections, an association that spills over artistic value from the old to the new making the new commensurable. Sgourev then provides initial support for his theorizing by using quantitative analysis on an extensive dataset on art collectors, showing how investor collectors who tend to collect more broadly are also more inclined to invest in unproven contemporary art. Sgourev also calls into question the independence of the two sides of the producer-audience interface, and does so by exploring the interconnections and interpenetrations of the worlds of art and finance. Because investors reside in both worlds and have a proclivity toward portfolio strategies, they invest widely across a variety of new art forms, and enable the rise of new genres. This process runs counter to what is commonly assumed in the categorical imperative; rather than using established categorical systems to

rate new cultural products, investors end up changing the categorical system as they associate new art forms to the old. This insight points to exciting new directions for studying category dynamics, showing how the emergence and the substantiation of new categories can be driven endogenously by the investing patterns of a sub-set of audience members. In particular, the author challenges the common criticism of the “financialization” of art worlds, highlighting a much richer reciprocal relationship between the domains of art and finance.

Godart (this volume) introduces a theoretical distinction of the concept of “style”, and how styles impact the outcomes of social evaluations. Godart marries a structuralist notion of style with concerns about categories and evaluation processes. He asks how the concept of “style” might affect social evaluations, proposing a “style-based” approach to the study of creative industries. Despite being an important concept for practitioners and evaluators in art and fashion markets, Godart highlights the lack of theoretical importance given to “style” by most academic researchers in creative industries, which rather use the term mostly as a synonym for other theoretical constructs (e.g. categories). After reviewing the usage of the term by sociologists, anthropologists and management scholars, Godart first proposes a definition of style as a “durable pattern of aesthetic choices”, and then advances a series of propositions to connect the role of style in social evaluations. Any given adopted style can vary along five dimensions; its prototypicality, its level of institutionalization, the presence of hybrids, the number of overlapping styles and the level of integration. Each dimension is evaluated by audiences, attributing worth to the element under consideration. Godart, similar to prior research on selection systems that distinguishes outcomes based on whether the evaluation is by consumer, peers or experts (Gemser, Leenders & Wijnberg, 2008), distinguishes the outcomes of such evaluation processes depending on whether the evaluating audience is made of insiders or outsiders to the field. This distinction is particularly interesting as these two sets of stakeholders vary in the level of investment/interest in the

field, and knowledge about it. Invariably, style-based evaluations will lead to very different outcomes if the audience is composed of knowledgeable members of the field (e.g. fashion stylists) or outsiders (e.g. consumers or non-specialized journalists). Together with proposing a new theoretically relevant definition of style for creative industry scholars, the distinction between the mechanisms of internal and external audiences offers new avenues of research for future researchers.

Aadland, Cattani and Ferriani (this volume) explore how social structures—the mutual role of status and social distance—shape evaluative processes. Their study challenges an important assumption of the producer-audience interface, namely the independence between who judges and who is judged. Indeed, in many professional settings audience members and candidates are not specialized roles, but rather the same individuals that alternatively serve on the different sides of the interfaces. This implies that, in many cases, audiences and candidates have a previous history of social interactions that range from communication, to informal relationships to active collaborations, thus reducing the social distance between each other. Aadland and colleagues thus aimed at understanding how the social distance and the social relationships across the interface can affect the ratings put forward by the audience. To do so, they exploit a rich longitudinal dataset on the most important advertising award in the Norwegian advertising field – “The Silver Tag”. This contest selects the best advertising project of the year in Norway. The interesting feature of this setting is that, very often, the rotating jury members are part of the collaboration network of the Norwegian advertising field, and are thus more closely connected to some peers than others. This allowed Aadland and colleagues to test whether social distance matters in the evaluation of the award. The fascinating result is that not only social distance and past positive ties between jurors and candidates positively matter, but matter possibly even more than status-based signals. Thus, Aadland, Cattani and Ferriani seem to have uncovered an

important source of unexplored variance in social evaluations – that is the role played by the underlying social structure cutting across audiences and candidates.

Askin and Mol (this volume) analyze how disintermediation in the music world, where music is selected based on non-human algorithmic mechanisms, creates the dynamics for the importance of authenticity in commensuration and evaluation of music. Askin and Mol suggest that an institutional production of authenticity is an institutional systemic response to the increasing commodification and disintermediation of the social structures in the music field and can grant legitimacy to specific products rendering them fit (or not) for evaluation and consumption. The authors theorize about three types of authenticity – *archetypical*, or being true to one's self; *stereotypical*, or being true to a style; and *prototypical*, or being the originator of a style. They reveal through an historical analysis first how digitization has transformed the phases of cultural production, and then how different processes of authentication were able to change and adapt against the fundamental technological backdrop of digitization. By carefully breaking down their analysis across the five institutional realms, they define the production of culture – namely production, consumption, selection, appropriation and classification. The authors are able to carefully highlight first how the technological changes affects each of these phases, and how the resulting emergence and institutionalization of authenticity can be seen as a counterbalancing process to the commodification of music. Their core insight is that processes of authentication can save the music business from becoming a homogenous art form in which songs are fundamentally indistinguishable from each other, elaborating on the parallel effects of the appropriation of economic value, the need for scarcity and the multi-faceted nature of authenticity.

Coman-Ernstoff and Phillips (this volume) explore category longevity – or what makes a category survive. They look at the field and history of swing music, including

producers, evaluators and intermediaries. They contribute to the study of category dynamics by considering an overlooked aspect of categorical success – longevity. The two authors couple art history methods with a sociological content analysis to study the reasons behind the longevity of “swing”, a musical genre that emerged in the 1930s to enjoy widespread success to our days. Coman-Ernstoff and Phillips propose that swing’s longevity is caused by its *ambiguity*, defined as “multiplicity of meaning.” Swing’s early ambiguity persisted as multiple (and sometime inconsistent) definition of the genre continued, mostly due to the fact that early swing pioneers – while interested in shaping swing music – were not interested in setting up strict definitions to compartmentalize their music against that of other musicians. Their findings corroborate Jones et al. (2012: 1523), who found that “modern architecture” was a term that could not be clearly defined, and that this pluralism, seen in the “multiple conflicting exemplars within “modern architecture”, enhanced adaptability of the category to changing social forces and enabled its longevity of architectural interpretations for over 70 years.” Coman-Ernstoff and Phillips, however, highlight the lack of conflict and contestation over definitions and meanings, in contrast to previous studies that involve professions (e.g., Dunn & Jones, 2010; Jones et al., 2012; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). These conflicting findings highlight the need for defining the scope conditions of category processes and pose interesting questions for future research. The two authors close their chapter applying their own findings to the academic field of creative industries, speculating that the lack of clear boundaries and definitions in our field might be a source of advantage rather than a limitation, as it may have an impact on its longevity and originality.

Ody-Brazier offers an elegant study on how Champagne producers can circumvent social evaluations by taking advantage of the taken-for-grantedness of audiences’ categorization systems. Although the focus is on categorization dynamics, she also assesses how the social structure influences this process. Ody-Brasier asks a simple question: if

audience categorical expectations about candidates are public knowledge, shouldn't the candidates (in her case, Champagne houses) adapt to such expectations and strategically use them to their own advantage? In particular, Ody-Brasier contends an interesting paradox: prototypical Champagne producers, those that are more typically associated to the category of the prestigious wine, are also those that are more likely to "get away" with deviations from industry norms without being noticed and penalized. The logic here is that producers who are more prototypical – still associated to the most traditional families, and coming from traditional Champagne villages – tend to be less scrutinized by consumers and wine critics, and thus are able to sell their grapes to supermarket Champagne brands without being penalized. Ody-Brasier's analyses powerfully combine quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative analysis exploits exogenous variation of increased audience scrutiny due to a 2002 unexpected bankruptcy. The qualitative analysis examines an extensive set of qualitative interviews of CEO and Champagne producers. The data and their results strongly confirm Ody-Brasier's speculation that prototypical category members have the advantage of engaging in actions that are inconsistent with the default expectations about them, using such expectations to their advantage. Her chapter opens a very interesting window for future researchers on the strategic use of categories on part of producers and, potentially, audiences.

Finally, in the Afterword, Hirsch and Bajpai offers a brief history of cultural production and uses Jones et al. (2015) two dimensions of change in semiotic codes and material base (technologies) to classify not only the study of creative industries, change in cultural objects, but also the articles in the volume. They offer concise history of the core concerns of creative industries, and also point toward how works within creative industries can be integrated to show the depth and diversity of research on cultural products, and that research itself is a cultural product.

CONCLUSION: THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

The scholarly contributions of this volume examined a wide range of creative industries – from advertising, to architecture, art, Champagne, fashion and music - exposing the rich and interesting contexts for future studies. Theoretically, this volume explored the structural and categorical dynamics of creative industries, with the articles varying in their focus on social structure and category. One set of articles emphasized a more structural perspective, such as theorizing the micro-interactions of brokerage relations (e.g. Furnari & Rolbina, this volume) and exploring how actors transform a brokerage role from control to co-production to enact creative leadership (e.g. Svejenova & Christiansen, this volume). Another set of articles explored the interaction of social structures and categories. Specifically, they examine how investors enable the new category of abstract art by applying a portfolio strategy that not only funded new art works, but also associated new artwork to established masters in their collections (e.g., Sgourev, this volume); how disintermediation enabled alternative category processes such as authenticity (e.g., Askin & Mol, this chapter) and how social relations shape social evaluation (Aadland et al., this volume). A third set of articles examined categorical dynamics, including: how prototypical producers can trespass categories and avert negative social evaluation (e.g. Ody-Brazier, this volume), how the category of style enables social evaluation (Godart, this volume), and how the ambiguity of a category—Swing music—facilitated its adaptability and flexibility to enable its longevity as a category (Coman-Ernstoff & Phillips, this volume). Finally, the Afterword by Hirsch and Bajpai examine research on creative industries as a form of cultural product and a category itself; they classify the articles by using Jones et al., (2015) dimensions of changes in semiotic codes and changes in material base of credit products.

We believe that the range of contributions open up important and interesting further avenues for research. One future direction is discerning the processes for and the scope conditions of structural positions that create new categories. Furnari and Rolbina highlight

how brokers can resolve the fundamental tradeoff between collaboration (delegation) and control by employing a different set of brokerage styles – each of which rests on different types of interaction rituals – in different phases of the creation process, which should enable greater or lesser degrees of innovation in categories. Svejenova and Christiansen demonstrate how artists and creative professionals can become “creative leaders” not only to produce new categories of creative artifacts, but also to ensure that their work has a wider social impact to the focal community. Askin and Mol reveal that the disintermediation and commodification of cultural products may initiate the demand for a new category—authenticity—by which cultural products are evaluated. In doing so, they extend the work by Peterson (1997) on the role of producers in manufacturing authenticity, and raise important questions about how authenticity is produced and evaluated.

A second future direction is to challenge and extend the assumption of independence in producers and audiences, and how this independence shapes social evaluation. Sgourev also calls into question the independence of the two sides of the producer-audience interface, and does so by exploring the interconnections and interpenetrations of the worlds of art and finance. Aadland, Cattani and Ferriani seem to have uncovered an important source of unexplored variance in social evaluations – that is the role played by the underlying social structure cutting across audiences and candidates.

A third avenue is the how the materiality of cultural products may influence social evaluation. Ody-Brazier’s findings suggest that prototypical members may avert the penalties of category transgression. Champagne (and wine making) are deeply intertwined with the materiality of grapes. What is less clear in the study is whether materiality (grapes) varied between high end and buyers own brand. What were the high-end buyers getting rid of: their lower quality grapes or their excess high-quality stock? Were the processing of grapes (material) different for BOB (buyers own brand) versus high end champagne even if grapes

are the same? The material nature of champagne raises interesting questions for how materiality and category processes may intersect and may complement one another in terms of dynamics and change over time. For example, grapes have short consumption lives: they need to be processed or lost to mildew and degradation. Other cultural products with short lives includes fashion, where fashion houses create different labels to stabilize demand and revenues, and, also sell their excess stock to retail discounters after a certain time period. Is this dynamic of category transgression more likely in domains with short and clear temporal cycles such as when fashion becomes obsolete at the end of the season, and natural foods degenerate if not processed and sold? A fascinating future avenue for exploration is the role of materiality in category processes.

Finally, an important future research stream is defining the scope conditions of categorical dynamics for when and where conflict versus accommodation occurs. The contradictory findings of prior research on categories has focused on penalties for violation (Hsu, 2008; Zuckerman, 1999) and conflict that spurs category expansion and change (Jones et al, 2012). Zuckerman, Kim, Ukanawa and von Rittman (2003) started to specify the conditions of career stage where category violation is not penalized: in the early career a focused identity is rewarded whereas a multivalent or “generalist” identity is penalized whereas in later career, actors have the option to stay focused or developed a more robust and generalist identity. Coman-Ernstoff and Phillips focus on how swing is a multivalent category that allows for flexibility. One key difference with Swing versus films may be the relatively low cost of producing and consuming Swing music, which enables more flexibility because audience members may easily purchase multiple variants of Swing music (shows, albums or songs) by multiple bands. The conflict model, which Coman-Ernstoff and Phillips contrast their findings may also be explained by differences in costs and risks. For example, in professional services, such as designing a building, performing an audit or delivering

healthcare, costs for production and consumption are quite high, and thus, clients more typically select one product (e.g., a zero-sum outcome), which may engender competition and rivalry among producers rather than flexibility for producers and laissez-faire relations for audiences' attention and resources. We believe that this volume offers new insights into creative industries and sparks new areas for research.

REFERENCES

- Bowker, G. C., S. L. Star. 1999. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Cattani, G. & Ferriani, S. 2008. A core/periphery perspective on individual creative performance: Social networks and cinematic achievements in the Hollywood film industry. *Organization Science*, 19 (6), 824-844.
- Caves, R. E. (2000). *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- DiMaggio, P. 1987. Classification in art. *American Sociological Review*, 52(4) 440–455.
- Douglas, M. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY.
- Durand, R. & Paolella, L. 2013. Category stretching: Reorienting research on categories in strategy, entrepreneurship, and organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50 (6), 1100-1123.
- Faulkner, R. R., and A. B. Anderson. 1987. "Short-term projects and emergent careers: Evidence from Hollywood." *American Journal of Sociology*, 92: 879-909.
- Foster, P., Borgatti, S.P. & Jones, C. 2011. Gatekeeper search and selection strategies: Relational and network governance in a cultural market. *Poetics*, 39: 247–265.
- George, Gerard, Linus Dahlander, Scott D. Graffin, and Samantha Sim. 2016. "Reputation and Status: Expanding the Role of Social Evaluations in Management Research." *Academy of Management Journal* 59 (1): 1–13. doi:10.5465/amj.2016.4001.
- Gemser, G., Leenders, M.A.A.M & Wijnber, N.A. 2008 Why Some Awards Are More Effective Signals of Quality Than Others: A Study of Movie Awards. *Journal of Management*, 34:25-54.
- Hsu, G. (2006). Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audience reactions to spanning genres in feature film production. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 420–450.
- Jones, C., Lorenzen, M., & Sapsed, J. 2015. Creative Industries: A typology of change: 3-30. In Jones, Lorenzen and Sapsed (editors), *Oxford Handbook of Creative Industries*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, C., Svejenova, S., Strandgaard Pederson, J. & Townley, B. 2016. Mavericks, Misfits and Mainstreams: Drivers of Innovation in the Creative Industries. *Organization Studies*, 37: 751-768.
- Lampel, J., Land, T., & Shamsie, J. (2000). Balancing act: Learning from organizing practices in cultural industries. *Organization Science*, 11, 263–269.
- Lingo, E.L., O'Mahony, S., 2010. Nexus work: brokerage and creative projects. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55, 47–81.
- Maoret M., Massa F., Jones C. (2011). Toward a projects as events perspective. In *Project-Based Organizing and Strategic Management (Advances in Strategic Management, Volume 28)* (Emerald Group Publishing Limited), 427–444.
- Menger, P-M. 2014. *The Economics of Creativity: Art and Achievement under Uncertainty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Moeran, B. & Christensen, B.T. 2013. *Exploring Creativity: Evaluative Practices in Innovation, Design and the Arts*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Moeran, B. & Strandgaard Pedersen, J. 2011. *Negotiating Values in Creative Industries: Fairs Festivals and Competitive Events*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

- Nathan, M., Partt, A. & Rincon-Aznar, A. 2015. Creative economy employment in the EU and UK: A comparative analysis. Report by NESTA. Available at: <http://www.nesta.org.uk/publications/creative-economy-employment-eu-and-uk-comparative-analysis>
- Obstfeld, D., Borgatti, S.P., & Davis, J. (2014). Brokerage as a Process: Decoupling Third Party Action from Social Network Structure. In *Contemporary Perspectives on Organizational Social Networks*, 135–159. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Peterson, R. A. (1997). *Creating country music: Fabricating authenticity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Peterson, R.A., Anand, N., 2004. The production of culture perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30, 311–334.
- Phillips, D.J. 2011. Jazz and the disconnected: City structural disconnectedness and the emergence of a Jazz cannon, 1897-1933. *American Journal of Sociology* 117 (2), 420-483
- Rosch, E., C. B. Mervis. 1975. Family resemblance: Studies in the internal structure of categories. *Cognitive Psych.* 7(4) 573–605.
- Shrum, W. 1991. Critics and publics: Cultural mediation in highbrow and popular performing arts. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 97(2) 347–375.
- Uzzi, B., & Spiro, J. (2005). Collaboration and creativity: The small world problem. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111, 447–504.
- Vogel, H.L. 1986/2001. *Entertainment Industry Economics: A Guide for Financial Analysis*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- White, H. C., & White, C. A. (1965). *Canvases and careers: Institutional change in the French painting world*. New York: Wiley.
- Zuckerman, E. W. 1999. The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 104(5) 1398–1438.
- Zuckerman, E. W., T.-Y. Kim, K. Ukanawa, J. von Rittman. 2003. Robust identities or nonentities? Typecasting in the feature-film labor market. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(5) 1018–1074.

Figure 1. Map of contributions of this volume.

