Economic Sociology in the New Millennium

Economic sociology is now a sociological specialization with a distinct identity (Smelser and Swedberg 1994). In the twentieth century, it focused on the internal workings of organizations—human relations, organization design, and internal labor markets (Baron and Hannan 1994). Using the economist's "black box" metaphor of the firm as a point of departure, economic sociologists formulated theories of how organizations influence individual action and respond to the environment (Swedberg 1991). These theories are now part of the received wisdom. They have been validated, adopted by other disciplines (Arrow 1998), and developed into original subdisciplines—organization theory and strategic management (Selznick 1957; Thompson 1967; Childs 1973; Emerson 1962; Hannan and Freeman 1977; Kogut and Zander 1996; Meyer and Rowan 1977; Pfeffer and Salancik 1978; DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Granovetter 1985; Mintz and Schwartz 1985; Barney 1991).

After this auspicious focus on internal organization, which originated with Weber, Gouldner, Coleman, Selznick, Coser, Blau, and their students, we see the intellectual focus of the field shifting from firms to markets. Economic sociology must extend its distinctive approach to organizations, states, and markets if it is to widen its understanding of economy and society. What's more, a number of political, economic, technological, and corporate changes have made the boundaries of firms permeable and variable, making markets more consequential because what goes on between firms shapes what goes on within them (Aldrich 1999; Freeland, forthcoming 2000; Haveman 2000). These changes include the "neoliberal" turn in economic poli-

cy, the global integration of product and capital markets, transitions from socialist to capitalist economies, widespread privatization, corporate restructuring, and outsourcing.

We anticipate that these changes will transform the traditional identities, relations, and roles of economic actors, especially firms. New identities will emerge and merge in ways that may alter profoundly how wealth is accumulated and distributed. Consequently, economic sociology is likely to focus on the origins, processes, and consequences of this course of social identification, something we dub identity bricolage. Identity bricolage involves the decomposition of existing identities into their constituent components, and their recombination into a new identity (Lévi-Strauss 1969). Because identities engender distinct modes of action, identity bricolage opens up new lines of action and behavior previously foreclosed to the identities. We see new lines of research in economic sociology revolving around the process by which identity bricolage occurs and its consequences for economy and society. Identity bricolage will also affect economic sociology itself, as it converses and trades intellectual capital with other disciplines, altering its identity and content.

Given our contention that markets will occupy center stage in economic sociology, we provide in this essay some selective predictions and projections, recognizing that the future direction of sociological theory, like society, is often driven by unforeseen developments and unimagined consequences.
New Identities and Roles for Economic Actors in Markets

Conventional wisdom holds that three actors in markets identify three identities that make up the fundamental components of economic activity—production, distribution, and consumption. Suppliers make components and sell them to intermediaries who combine components into goods and market them to consumers who buy them. This textbook image of the "circular flow of goods" theory is the reigning orthodoxy, and much analytical leverage has been gained dissecting the structure of the market in this way. For example, the ratio of sellers to buyers provides a simple but powerful measure of the level of competition in a market or a group's bargaining power (Emerson 1962; Blau 1964; Burt 1992).

We believe that these roles are in the process of being deconstructed into their constituent elements and reconfigured into new roles through identity bricolage. To illustrate how identity bricolage works, consider the example of STATA, a software company that has taken a lead in redefining the traditional "circular flow of goods" model by literally turning customers into suppliers! STATA's customers not only buy its software, they write the software code for the product. The consequences are remarkable for how markets and firms can be organized and how other companies, consumers, and suppliers can appropriate this process in industries as "IT-k-lish" as autos and aerospace.

STATA used to follow the conventional circular flow model to research and develop (R&D) each new version. It would record users' "wish lists" for new routines and then assign company personnel to program the top requests into the next release, which typically had to meet a brisk two-year development-to-release cycle time or the firm lost clients. With the pressure to apply leading technology in published work, however, thousands of skilled users couldn't afford to wait two years for a new version, so they began programming their own routines in STATA's language and circulating them over the web to other STATA customers. To convert the grassroots process of joining the roles of buyers (i.e., users) and suppliers (i.e., programmers) into a formal strategy, STATA offered programming classes over the Internet (at a modest price) and constructed a web site to facilitate the sharing of user-written routines.

Through the bricolage of suppliers and customers, STATA tapped the previously unused intellectual capabilities of each of its buyers, thereby expanding the firm's capabilities. Resources that were dedicated to programming were freed up for improving the program's internal efficiency (i.e., the meta-language) and customer service. STATA's two-year upgrade cycle is now a real-time continuous upgrade system that has greatly expanded the menu of available statistical, graphical, and data management routines. The time that was spent buying new diskettes, ordering by mail, waiting for mail delivery, paying for mail delivery, dealing with passwords, misplacing diskettes, and many other problems is reduced or eliminated. Finally, by servicing specific niches (e.g., hazard modelers versus random effects modelers), STATA creates a new supply of customer roles that can be reassembled in the future, generating a positive cycle of identity bricolage.

What drives bricolage? Obviously, in this case technology has reduced the cost of collaboration among actors, permitting bricolage among identities that were formerly separated by a division of specialized labor. Perhaps more important, STATA's ability to develop a relationship with its customers—a bilateral flow of information and capabilities—has changed the one-way flow from seller to buyer into a two-way flow.

The idea of a two-way rather than one-way relationship of information exchange between actors is a critical issue for economic sociology. In contrast to Fordist mass production, which was characterized by discrete identities and functional roles, the new century is likely to be distinguished by permeable, assimilated relationships among economic actors that are formed and reformed through identity bricolage. In the twentieth century, print, TV, and radio ads aimed to catch the consumer's attention long enough to differentiate the features of a product. The relationship between supplier and customer was didactic, passive, and unilateral. New techniques enable suppliers and customers to develop a two-way relationship. The basic idea is to allow every client or customer, which for large firms number in the tens of thousands, to interact and exchange information about their individual preferences with the firm. In the past, even though research showed the benefits of niche marketing, this level of mass-scale client-specific information was unworkable because of data management problems, regulations, and the corporate conviction that roles and identities were stable.
The determinants of identity bricolage—new information technology, specialized consumer tastes, and two-way relationships—suggest that it could happen in older industries. Because today 30 percent of a new car’s value is in the computer, Daimler-Chrysler plans to make upgrades of a car’s computer as easy as upgrading STATA software. Imagine a world where new models of cars are upgraded via the net. If you don’t want an option when the car is purchased you can upgrade later or download finance, fashion, or medical data. Daimler-Chrysler may even entice their “techy” customers to start writing code. These trends suggest that research for economic sociology are likely to concern the causes and consequences of bricolage and the ways in which embeddedness influences these processes. If relationships become more rather than less important, how are the capabilities to build relationships, trust, reciprocal obligation, private information transfer, and the other features of embedded ties developed (Uzzi 1997; 1999; DiMaggio and Louch 1998)?

New Markets and Old Identities for Economic Actors

Identity bricolage is not a wholly new social process. It involves elements that are familiar to economic sociologists, making economic sociology an excellent source of theory on how markets might unfold in the new century (Baker and Faulkner 1991; White 1992). For example, eBay, a virtual “auction house,” has created new economic identities. Participants put items up for auction on eBay, selling them to the highest bidder. Like Sotheby’s, eBay gets a percentage of the selling price. However, unlike Sotheby’s, eBay’s clients never meet face-to-face. Hence, how do eBay traders know if another trader in the neighboring country or continent is trustworthy and experienced?

To solve the problem of too much anonymity and uncertainty, eBay created public reputations for each trader in its virtual auction house, adopting a mechanism of social governance found in other financial and commodities markets (Carruthers 1996). An eBay trader must “rate” the trader she transacted with, and the rating (called a reputation score) is posted for would-be traders. This creates identities for anonymous traders and encourages trading. Interestingly, while reputation scores solved some problems of uncertainty, they created new ones. With the very rapid rise in the level of eBay trades, traders faced the daunting task of determining the difference between a reputation score of say, 500 versus 557 or between 1200 and 1301. It wasn’t obvious how to gauge reputational metrics. Reputation scores also were being typically on “positive recommendation” because traders avoided posting negative comments that made them look stupid. Consequently, eBay created a new rating system that is based on reputation scores and special collected trading data that ranks traders with a system of stars similar to Dun and Bradstreet AAA, AA, A, BBB, etc., rating system.

This process of market creation is familiar to economic sociologists. Ambiguous information about credibility created a demand for social objectified data—a reputation score. Once reputation scores were developed, however, they spurred a need for another social device—legitimated ranking system—to filter volume objectified but unstratified information. If we look to how markets developed historically—England and the United States, we find a similar cycle of “demand for information” need for interpretation of information”—occurred systematically in market creation (Carruthers 1996). In the nineteenth century, Dun and Bradstreet created and disseminated reputations of companies much as eBay today (Cohen 1998). And like eBay they went to a system of rankings that not only simplified the interpretation of reputation scores but re-established Dun and Bradstreet as a legitimate and authoritative analyst and critic—historically new roles in financial markets. This historic pattern of role emergence to manage problems of interpretation suggests that a similar “critic identity” will arise as roles and identity assimilate require differentiation.

For example, several independent websites have been founded to help traders evaluate reputation scores on eBay and other online trading sites. These critics give qualitative and quantitative interpretations to the eBay-generated reputation scores and add their own unique perspective. At some sites, users pay between one to three dollars for a critic’s review of a trader (Kollock 1999). Certain critics and analysts are already gaining their own reputations, like Janet Maslin—who attract a following of loyal traders who share common sensibilities and a shared identity. It is easy to imagine new identities arising. Perhaps there will someday be a “dealers,” like “art dealers,” who specialize in helping would-be eBay traders to value auctioned goods. eBay customers who have “taste” before they go that Sotheby’s We would also expect “chairs” on its exchange to historically create identity in trades, evaluate the social order of things.
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between a reputation or between 1200 and 30 to gauge reputations also were based on "recommendations" of negative comments. In this way, Sotheby's does for "select clientele." We would also expect eBay to sell virtual "chairs" on its exchange, just as stock markets have historically created chairs to ensure credibility in trades, evaluate products, and stabilize the social order of the market.

**Bricolage within Economic Sociology**

The theoretical identity of the new economistic sociology arguably is built around the idea of *embeddedness.* Since Granovetter's influential 1985 article, "embeddedness" has been used to make sense of the social organization of the economy. Embeddedness has proven, however, to be more of a programmatic statement than a general theory, leading subsequent research to focus on the how, what, when, and where questions (Dacin, Pentrers, and Beal 1999). We view embeddedness arguments as moving forward in micro and macro directions. Various researchers have documented how economic action is embedded in large-scale social institutions (Carruthers 1996; Fligstein 1996; Guillén, forthcoming), social organizations (Biggart and Guillén 1999), the state and law (Roy 1997; Ennas 1995; Schneiber 1999; Carruthers and Halliday 1998), gender relations (Biggart 1989), labor market institutions (Western 1997), and culture (Dimaggio 1994; Dobbin 1994; Zelizer 1994). We expect future work on "macro-embeddedness" to explore the mechanisms that link markets to social institutions, and to understand their consequences. How will new connections between markets and social institutions influence the creation and reproduction of economic inequality (Tilly 1998; Conley 1998)?

Economic sociologists witness new connections between markets and social institutions, and their effects on inequality, in the new knowledge-based industries. These have linked industry with the academy and university, creating through identity bricolage the new role of scientist/entrepreneur. Powell and Owen-Smith (1999) show how resources, rewards, and status traditionally were distributed in biology through academic networks and the university system. An "successful" scientist career involved going to the "right" graduate school, having the "right" dissertation committee, getting a prestigious post-doc, as well as acquiring other forms of social and cultural capital. In this academic system, a successful scientist garnered funding and other resources, acted as an influential "gatekeeper,"

Powell and Owen-Smith show how bio-tech firms were able to appropriate this system of "invisible colleges" through the use of market-based mechanisms of access, rather than traditional means. By granting equity interests to research scientists at major universities, they gained access not only to scientists' own labor, but also to the social networks so critical to the creation and distribution of new knowledge. Thus, bio-tech firms were able to build a new connection between industry and the university around a new social role (the scientist/entrepreneur) and so push forward their own commercially oriented research. The bio-tech industry was in effect subsidized by a university-based system of knowledge production and dissemination. Furthermore, universities were affected by this highly selective injection of market-based money and resources. Now, for example, a bio-tech partnership can make an instant multimillionaire out of a molecular biologist, while an equally distinguished professor of mathematical ecology is excluded from the new and lucrative role of scientist/entrepreneur.

Micro-embeddedness research has looked at how the relationships and networks of persons and firms affect labor, product, and financial markets (Fernandez and Weinberg 1997; Bian 1997; Granovetter 1974; DiMaggio and Louch 1998; Light et al. 1990; Uzzi 1999). As we described above, relationships will remain important in the new century because they are a gateway to new market niches, private information, and bricolage. Valuable work remains to be done on how to categorize and measure relationships (Montgomery 1998). Work also needs to be done on the conditions under which relationships supplant other forms of coordination, how they evolve, and what balance emerges between instrumental and altruistic ends (Powell 1996).

Network analysis is likely to grow in importance even as it sheds its current novelty for the general researcher (Misztal 1994). If we are correct about the process of identity bricolage, then economic sociology needs a research technology that allows for the constant shifting of categories. One way to think of the problem is to view it as analogous to the difference between flat data files and relational data bases (Uzzi
Flat files are normally based on static categorical distinctions that are built into the data structure. They are lists of units that can be defined along categories: firms in the same SIC code, or the same region; managers in the same executive education class; or banks that specialize in small business loans. Knowing the categorical boundaries of a flat file is clear: it's a count of the number of units. In contrast, identifying the boundaries of a relational data base is more difficult because the boundaries are never fixed but depend instead on the “sort” criteria selected by the analyst. This suggests that the boundaries of economic networks such as organizational fields cannot be conceived of properly in conventional terms. Rather, they can be defined only by careful industry studies that identify which relations matter (e.g., board interlocks, joint ventures, alliances, contracts), and the relevant dimensions of variation.

The two forms of embeddedness interact because macro-embeddedness sets the context for micro-embeddedness, and micro-embeddedness can prompt change in macro-structures (Abolafia 1996; Kraatz and Zajac 1996). That is, the institutional context influences which social relationships and networks shape a person's economic action, and individual actions can change the institutional context. Many prominent sociologists have posed the problem of the micro-macro link (e.g., Coleman 1990; Nee 1998) but haven't successfully resolved it. We believe that one of the achievements of economics has been the ability to build macro-models on the basis of consistent micro-foundations. While economists have worked at the two extremes of the micro-macro continuum (rational choice psychology and general equilibrium models), we propose that economic sociology start in the middle ground (organizations and networks) and work its way outward. Building on middle-level research, we can move in the micro direction by using notions of bounded rationality, and borrowing from prospect theory and behavioral decision theory (Kahneman and Tversky 1982). These approaches offer a much more robust model of individual action, and one that can be situated easily within a social and organizational context (Murnighan and Bazerman 1990). In the macro direction, we move outward from organizations and networks to the level of organizational fields and social institutions, where the focus shifts from frictionless adjustment of supply and demand between disconnected actors, to conflictual negotiations among interdependent actors. Such an approach looks at the formal and informal mechanisms of governance (power, status, legitimation) that direct resources and allocate rewards.

How micro- and macro-embeddedness affect each other depends on both the structural position of the economic actor and on the social content of networks and relationships. For example, without a developed legal system or contract law, people often follow culturally appropriate heuristics and rely on "high trust" relationships to conduct their economic transactions (Greif 1989). The absence of formal-legal institutions affects the pattern of micro-embeddedness (Lovejoy and Richardson 1999). Because macro-institutions vary cross-nationally, as do their links to micro-embeddedness, we anticipate rather less convergence toward a generic form of market society than some of the stronger globalization arguments entail (Hollingsworth and Boyer 1997).

**Bricolage between Economic Sociology and other Specialties**

Economic sociology is carving out a distinctive niche that brings it into contact with other sociological specialties—an example of how disciplinary identities are also subject to bricolage. Some of the resulting conversations and interactions, we believe, will sharpen the cutting edge of research. Economic sociology and political sociology, for example, are already enjoying fruitful collaboration. Since many of the conditions for markets are supplied politically (e.g., property rights), political processes and structures continue to influence markets (Campbell and Lindberg 1990; Carruthers and Halliday 1998; Davis and Thompson 1994; Eisele 1996; Stark 1996). Here we discuss the connections joining economic sociology to the sociology of culture, and to stratification research. The first revolves around the fact that markets and industries are not only realms of economic activity, but are comprised of cultural distinction and cognitive categories used to make sense of those economic activities (Carruthers and Stinchcombe 1999; Zuckerman 1999). The second derives from the remarkable ability of markets to create inequality.
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of products present something of a both producers and consumers. Their ad ambiguity make the assessment of ally problematic, for neither group is sure what the critical dimensions and key qualities will be. Alternative and competing definitions of quality can co-exist during an early shake-down period, until one definition becomes dominant and it becomes "obvious" what really matters. For instance, in the fledg- ing automobile industry, it wasn’t clear whether engine size (horsepower), range, speed, reliability, or comfort should be the critical dimensions for car quality. According to Rao (2000), early automobile clubs "socialized" consumers into focusing on reliability by staging public demonstra- tions with production cars that highlighted this particular aspect. They could just as well have staged speed tests that made acceleration and horsepower the key dimensions. The mini- van is now a distinct category of automotive product, but in its origins it sat uneasily between the categories of car and truck, being neither distinctly but rather a bit of both.

Category systems matter because they induce systematic comparisons, not only among products (i.e., which goods are substitutes in the eyes of buyers and which are not?), but also among producers (who is "the competition" for a given firm?). They also foreclose other comparisons (Eplean and Stevens 1998). The fuzziness, ambiguity, and permeability of product bound- aires create the kind of cognitive slack that mark- etors exploit. In the nineteenth century, Listerine was a hair product used to combat dandruff. Now the same product is used as a mouthwash (Settle and Alreck 1986: 101). In one product category, it competed with the pre- curator of Tegrin shampoo; now it combats Scope for market share.

Two research streams focusing on entrepre- neurship and market status hierarchies exemplify the potential benefits of collaboration between economic sociology and cultural sociolo- gy. As ordinarily conceived, entrepreneurs invent new products for existing markets. In contrast, recent work suggests that industry entrepreneurs (yet another new category of actor) devise new markets. Ventresca and Lacey (2000) show how the market for information services emerged and was institutionalized by entrepreneurs who helped to invent new products and methods of production, but also the cognitive frameworks needed to define the product and circumscribe the industry. Such entre- preneurship is as much cultural as economic. Furthermore, many industries possess a social order that mirrors cultural status rankings and similarity induces patterns of emulation and con- formity (Podolny 1993). As Han (1994) explains, low-status firms look upward, emulating their betters. High-status firms, by contrast, differentiate themselves from their peers while basically ignoring their lessers. Status rankings in the market may be an important determinant of inequality and mimesis, but it is easy to overlook these effects without the insights of the sociology of culture.

The study of inequality in markets opens a channel between economic sociology and stratification research, with its long-standing interest in class, race, gender, and power. The tendency for markets to create inequality is apparent at even highly aggregated levels of analysis— income inequality increases as countries undergo the transition from command to market economies (Cornelius and Weder 1996). But while stratification researchers have focused on labor markets, economic sociology can extend the analysis into commodity, housing, and capital markets as well. For instance, Ayres and Siegelman (1995) found substantial price differ- ences between men and women and whites and blacks in the new car market. As compared to whites, African Americans experience discrimina- tion when it comes to getting a mortgage (Massey and Denton 1993), buying a home (Yinger 1995), or obtaining small business loans (Bostic and Lampani 1999: 151; Uzzi 1999). While it is important to assess the magnitude of inequality, the key research question concerns the social processes that create and reproduce inequality. Animus-based theories of discrimina- tion go only so far, and it will be critical to examine the institutional and organizational bases of discrimination. We need to know more about how organizational routines and practices beget discriminatory treatment, and how differential impacts are legitimated through appeals to the market (Nelson and Bridges 1999).

As economic sociology examines the causes of identity bricolage and the consequences for inequality, we may ourselves experience a professional identity "crisis" triggered in part by jurisdictional squabbles over who "owns" what category of issues or empirical phenomenon (Hirsch 1997; Dobbin, forthcoming). Already, a debate is unfolding between traditional Marxists and some of the new economic sociologists over whether or not business organizations remain primarily tools of the capitalist class. The former group urges that sociologists maintain their critical perspective and not be co-opted to serve the
interests of capital. The latter group also recognizes the significance of conflict and inequality, but argues that business and for-profit organizations can be used to increase equality, and that research should distinguish among firms with an eye to promoting positive sum gains. But the fruitfulness of the interchanges with the sociology of culture, political sociology, and stratification research will help rectify two misconceptions about economic sociology: first, that its focus on the “hard facts” of the market make it an inhospitable place for research on the cultural and symbolic aspects of the economy; and, second, that it will not contribute to the traditional sociological critique of power and social inequality.

Conclusion
The twentieth century witnessed economic sociology’s appearance as a subdiscipline with a focus on how organizations allocate resources and affect stratification. Today, the logic of the marketplace has become disproportionately important in structuring social and economic life. We have stressed one particular property of this market change. Identity bricolage involves the reconfiguration and recombination of economic roles and identities to engender new modes of exchange, allocation, and valuation. Such change necessitates a new conceptual apparatus to understand which market identities remain stable, and which are transformed. Bricolage also affects economic sociology, which evolves as a consequence of internal developments and exchanges both with other sociological subdisciplines and disciplines outside of sociology. The economic sociology of the twentieth century pioneered the analysis of organizations. Building on this foundation, economic sociology in the twenty-first century can lead to a new understanding of markets that is both theoretically and empirically substantive, and that situates the economy in society.
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