

Emerging theories of consumer-driven market innovation, adoption, and diffusion: A selective review of consumer-oriented studies

Branstad, Are¹; Solem, Birgit Andrine Apenes¹

¹Department of Business, History and Social Sciences - University of South-Eastern Norway

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Elsevier. Online in *Journal of Business Research* on 16. June 2020, available online:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.01.028>

Branstad, A. & Solem, B. A. (2020). Emerging theories of consumer-driven market innovation, adoption, and diffusion: A selective review of consumer-oriented studies. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 561-571.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.01.028>

Emerging theories of consumer-driven market innovation, adoption, and diffusion: A selective review of consumer-oriented studies

Are Branstad* and Birgit A. Solem**

Abstract:

This study argues for a redefinition of the consumer's role in market innovation and suggests new patterns of consumer adoption and diffusion of market innovations. In this study of the consumer-oriented literature, we identify and compare three underlying market innovation logics: (1) the incumbent legitimator logic, where market innovation is about established providers' expansion or creation of new markets through collaboration with external stakeholder groups (2) the consumer activist logic, where market innovations are created as a result of market activism from consumers, and (3) the market co-creator logic, where markets are expanded or created through institutional change initiated by providers' and consumers' co-creation practices. Through examples from the digitalisation of local food markets, we discuss managerial implications of using each of the three market innovation logics as a perspective-taking lens.

Keywords: Market innovation; Adoption; Diffusion; Co-creation; Consumers;

Institutional theory

*Are Branstad (corresponding author). University of Southeast Norway (USN), School of Business, Dept. of Business. Box 235, 3603 Kongsberg, Norway. Visiting address: Raveien 215, 3184 Borre, Norway. Office nr. +4731009106. e-mail address: ab@usn.no

****Birgit A. Solem. University of Southeast Norway (USN). School of Business, Dept. of Business. Box 235, 3603 Kongsberg, Norway. Visiting address: Raveien 215, 3184 Borre, Norway. Office nr. +47 31 00 89 93. e-mail address: Birgit.A.Solem@usn.no**

The authors acknowledge support from the Oslofjord regional research fund, grant number 245902

Emerging theories of consumer-driven market innovation, adoption, and diffusion: A selective review of consumer-oriented studies

1. Introduction

Of the five Schumpeterian types of innovation (Schumpeter, 1934), the “introduction of new products” and the “opening of new markets” have received most attention in business research (Garcia & Calantone, 2002). Normally, these are simply termed “product innovation” and “market innovation”, respectively. While product innovation primarily focuses on innovation in goods and services, market innovation traditionally covers innovation in all types of marketing activities in existing (Grimpe, Sofka, Bhargava, & Chatterjee, 2017) or new markets (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005).

There is a long tradition of viewing the *firm*, or the provider, as the source of innovation in both product and market innovation (Schumpeter, 1934; Hauser, Tellis, & Griffin, 2006). However, in terms of products, the firm is no longer considered the only source of innovation, since consumers now are more closely integrated into firms’ innovation processes (Chesbrough, 2003; Bonner & Walker, 2004; Kristensson, Gustafsson, & Archer, 2004). Through the recent years’ intensive research on open and user innovation (West & Bogers, 2014), the importance of consumers in product innovation is now much better understood (Gemser & Perks, 2015).

Our understanding of consumers as a source of market innovation is, however, not yet well elaborated. Many still consider market innovation as innovation in the levers used to operate pre-existing markets rather than innovation of and in the markets themselves (Johne, 1999). In this traditional perspective, well-established companies initiate and sustain market

innovation processes through market power and economies of scale. Often, market expansion is complemented by innovations in instruments such as products, price, promotion, and distribution channels (McCarthy, 1981). This market innovation logic is therefore characterised by the consumer adopting offerings that are initiated and marketed by the firm, following the pattern of the traditional product lifecycle (PLC) model and the classic diffusion of innovation (DoI) theory for product innovation (Rogers, 1962), as known from traditional marketing literature (Bass, 2004). Recent developments have questioned this understanding of market innovation and some have suggested that markets are produced or created (Araujo, 2007; Callon, 2016). For breakthrough product innovations, firms' market creation activities may require just as high efforts and costs as product development (O'Connor and Rice, 2013). Here, market innovation involves the enactment of new markets or significant changes in existing markets. While the literature so far has mostly been occupied with the innovating role of regulators and selling firms, there is an increasing interest in understanding consumers as market innovators. Still, the state of the art parallels the situation in early open innovation research: Business users (i.e., buying firms in the ecosystem of the selling firm) have been the users given most attention. In this literature, business users take various roles such as market innovation stimulators (Muller & Zenker, 2001), cooperative market developers (Snehota & Håkansson, 1995), market-forming buyers (Hingley, 2005), and market creators (Nenonen et al., 2014). The direct influence from the consumer or end user as the adopter of market innovation is, naturally, not focused on in this literature.

Instead, the role of consumers in market innovation has recently gained interest in the field of consumer culture (e.g., Humphreys, 2010). For example, using the metaphor of marketplace drama, Giesler (2008) studied the dramatic changes in the music market created through consumer and producer conflicts. He later made similar observations about how the market

for Botox treatments evolved as a chain of brand image battles between companies, consumers, and non-consumers (Giesler, 2012). Similar exploratory and qualitative studies of the role of consumers in market innovation have been conducted on the yoga (Ertimur & Coskuner-Balli, 2015), street fashion (Scaraboto & Fischer, 2012), handcrafted beer (Kjeldgaard et al., 2017), community-supported agriculture (Press & Arnould, 2011), and legal cannabis (Kjellberg & Olson, 2017) markets, amongst others.

The studies above demonstrate consumer-driven innovation processes, where consumers are *active agents* in shaping existing or new markets (Harrison & Kjellberg, 2016). They emanate from consumer-oriented literature, which may contribute to develop more consumer-oriented perspectives on market innovation and consequently increase our understanding of consumer adoption and diffusion. However, theoretical development is still in progress and few attempts have been made to synthesise the literature or analyse how it contributes to improving academic or managerial knowledge of adoption and diffusion.

In this article, we contribute to closing this knowledge gap by integrating insights from 17 empirical studies of market emergence processes, taking the most influential source, Ashlee Humphreys's article from 2010 as our point of departure. This influential article explicitly analysed a market innovation process through an adoption and diffusion lens. The institutional perspective on market innovation adoption processes therein (Humphreys, 2010) provided an alternative to the assumptions about consumers found in classical adoption theory (Venkatesh, Thong, & Xu, 2012) and diffusion theory (Peres, Muller, & Mahajan, 2010). Building on that alternative perspective, we delineate empirical findings, perspectives, and concepts from the selected studies into three distinct market innovation logics we denote "the

incumbent legitimator logic”, “the consumer activist logic”, and “the market co-creator logic”.

The article is organised as follows: First, we present a theoretical framework as a basis for consumer-driven market creation by studying the consumer-oriented literature. Second, we identify three distinct market innovation logics from the selected studies, focusing on the significant role of the consumer in the market innovation process. Third, we seek patterns of consumer adoption and diffusion that correspond to these three logics. Finally, we suggest how managers and entrepreneurs could use the three market innovation logics as alternative lenses of interpretation to better understand the unique characteristics of different market innovation processes. Managers could also use these lenses to more effectively notice market changes and new phenomena that might disrupt their current business models.

2. Theoretical framework

Different theoretical foundations have been applied in consumer-oriented studies of market emergence and –innovation. One such foundation is institutional theory which understands the market as a field of social forces and the consumer as an actor led by social norms.

Another is the economic sociology of markets which sees the market as a socio-material accomplishment in which consumers engage in networks to pursue market interests.

Institutional theory concerns the understanding of the deeper social structures, or institutions, which govern the behaviour of individuals and organisations (Scott, 1995). The term “institutions” refers to persistent practices, understandings, and rules shared by market system actors in an organisational field (Scaraboto & Fischer, 2012; see also Lawrence & Phillips, 2004). Thus, within the frame of institutional theory, we understand markets as organizational

fields (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Greenwood, Oliver, Suddaby, & Sahlin-Andersson, 2008), and institutions are regarded as “rules of the game” within these markets. To survive and thrive, actors seek to obtain legitimacy within the market’s given institutional framework. Legitimacy is achieved when the actions of a social actor are perceived as appropriate according to the formal and informal rules of the institution (Suchman, 1995).

The process of legitimisation often leads to conformity amongst the market actors, which innovations tend to disrupt. Thus, market dynamics occur at the institutional level as diverging or competing ideas and practices. Institutional work is conceptualised as “actions aimed at creating, maintaining, or disrupting practices, understandings, and rules shared by actors in an organization field” (Dolbec & Fischer, 2015: 1450). The concept is central to understand how consumers contribute to sustain and change markets. More specifically, institutional change is often traced to institutional entrepreneurs (i.e., dedicated individuals and groups who intentionally seek to change the rules) who challenge institutions using symbolic and field-specific forms of capital. Rather than exclusively study market structures and purely economic rationality, the institutional view takes more into account the underlying logics that guide consumers’ and groups’ actions in the market.

The *economic sociology of markets* concerns the process of market formation, and mobilisation of actors to take market roles. Economic sociology studies may also be denoted “translational studies” (Callon, 1986), since innovation processes involve coordination of networks of change agents who transform activities, knowledge, technologies, materials, etc. This perspective complements institutional theory by focusing on activities of market actors in a micro perspective. Thus, institutional- and translational-oriented studies may be complementary. For instance, building legitimacy can be seen as a precursory stage to the

actual exchange of goods or services in markets (Kjellberg & Olson, 2017). In this paper, we leverage institutional theory and the economic sociology of markets to widen the scope of possible theoretical perspectives on market innovation, as there is a need to go beyond the classical adoption and diffusion frameworks. Furthermore, we review consumer-oriented literature to explore how these theoretical perspectives can assist in developing new theories of consumer adoption and diffusion of market innovations.

3. A selective review of consumer-oriented literature

We apply the term *selective review* to distinguish our approach from quantitative and formal reviews that comprehensively monitor research (see Booth Sutton, & Papaioannou, 2016 for a table overview). We have qualitatively analysed the literature on consumer-driven market innovation through a selection of 17 empirical works in the field of consumer-oriented studies. Our research objective, to synthesise findings on consumer adoption and diffusion in market innovation processes, defines the scope of our literature review. This includes studies of consumers involved in processes of market innovation who adopt, or negotiate the adoption of, a new market practice. The literature search process took all works referencing Humphreys (2010) as its point of departure. Table 1 below displays our literature search and selection process. Inclusion criteria were defined so that only articles that a) contained empirical studies of market extension/innovation processes, b) considered the role of consumers in the marketing processes, and c) were written in English would be selected. As a result, all the selected studies explore the role of consumers in market creation through various qualitative research methods, covering a wide range of markets.

Insert table 1 about here

Table 1 shows the three-step protocol (browse reading, full-text reading, and analysis) designed to select the articles. The purpose of the selection protocol was to secure the validity of the papers selected for analysis. The first author read titles and abstracts of all articles obtained from the search, selecting articles that matched the inclusion criteria. Then, both authors made a full-text reading and, based on the inclusion criteria, agreed on articles to include for further analysis. Finally, the content of the articles were analysed more deeply and condensed in a table format (see table 2).

Our first Google scholar search for articles referencing (Humphreys, 2010), returned 213 articles. The first author assessed these articles with regards to the inclusion criteria, focusing initially on titles and abstracts. 23 articles that satisfied the first inclusion criteria by describing the characteristics of consumer communities, cultures, and tribes, or by studying consumer activism, were selected for a full-text reading. However, the full-text reading disclosed that not all of them considered processes that could be called market innovation, creation, extension, or evolution; these articles were discarded. Ultimately, 11 articles were kept for analysis (including Humphreys (2010)).

We also included one additional study (Giesler, 2008) that was not in the original list of articles referencing Humphreys (2010). This article matched our selection criteria and was a central point of reference for other studies we had selected. In addition to including this study, we performed a second round of literature search in Google scholar, this time searching for articles referencing both (Humphreys, 2010) and (Giesler, 2008). From this search, 88 articles returned from a broad scope of scientific journals (not only consumer culture studies) and, again, the title and abstract of these 88 articles were assessed by the first author in terms of

the inclusion criteria. 11 articles were selected for a full-text reading and, finally, 2 were included for analysis.

To ensure no relevant studies were excluded, the first and second author browsed title and abstracts of research articles issued in 2017, 2018, and 2019 in the following journals: *Journal of Business Research*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *Journal of Marketing*, *Marketing Theory*, *Consumption markets & culture*, and *Journal of Macromarketing*. These browse readings were done in two rounds (December 2017 and March 2019). 12 articles from the browse reading were kept for full-text reading, and 3 of these were kept for analysis.

Our analysis initially charted the methodological (research questions, data collection methods, research designs), empirical (findings, propositions and claims), and theoretical (institutional, translational, or other) elements manually using generic software (Microsoft Excel). We gave specific attention to findings and claims about the following themes:

- a) the introduction of new elements within markets such as brands or frames of meaning
- b) claims about consumers' roles in shaping or building new market mechanisms, building legitimacy, and/or adopting new ideas or meanings/ideologies
- c) stages of development in the market innovation process
- d) whether the source of influence was firms or other consumers
- e) processes where consumers influenced other actor groups.

In the final analysis, each article was treated as an empirical source of data. Specifically, we searched the articles for claims about the role of the consumer in adoption of market innovations. Some claims appear in quotes from the articles.

Table 2 below lists the final 16 studies on market innovation processes we identified where researchers have considered how consumers take various agentic roles in the process of market creation.

Insert Table 2 about here.

The columns indicate each study's research question, research methods, main findings, and theoretical contribution in order to show commonalities and variations within the field. The studies make extensive use of qualitative interviewing, media content, ethnography, internet content analysis, etc., and commonly concentrate on producer–consumer markets, often on leisure activities, services, or products. The findings reveal various cases of market change such as reframing processes, new brands, entrepreneurship, or new logics. In addition, this column shows important social influences, such as legitimacy, ideologies, narratives, communities, identities, and values. The studies are categorised as following one of the three logics of consumer-driven market innovation. These logics materialised as the result of our review process. Describing the findings and theoretical contributions of each study, we seek to demonstrate that each logic is constituted by a consistent group of studies and that there is a valid correspondence between each study and its underlying logic.

Relatively few consumer-driven market innovation studies refer explicitly to, or relate their findings to, DoI theory (Rogers, 1962); only Humphreys (2010) discusses the relationship directly. The majority of the studies do not explicitly use the term “innovation” to conceptualise their phenomenon of interest, nor the term “diffusion” to name the process of dissemination. However, they refer frequently to market processes such as market change,

market extension, change in institutional logics, or new brands. With a methodological emphasis on qualitative and processual data, these studies provide detailed accounts of interlinked product and market change events. Thus, the innovation and diffusion processes they explore tend to diverge from the assumptions of traditional DoI studies. Giesler (2008), for instance used an anthropological approach to study a consumer-driven market disruption (music downloading) over seven years and arrived at a conflict-driven process model of market change. Martin and Schouten (2013) contrasted their work to that of Giesler (2008) by focusing on the non-conflictual market innovation processes driven by a constellation of interested consumers. Dolbec and Fischer (2015) reported that they studied distributed consumers rather than consumer collectives, and “categories of actors” (e.g., Fatshionistas) rather than products or brands. Thus, in addition to representing market innovation research that diverges from the traditional DoI literature, these studies interrelate in ways that suggest they constitute a common research agenda.

4. An outline of three market innovation logics based on the literature review

Based on our literature review, we suggest that the studies can be organised in accordance with three market innovation logics which we name (1) *the incumbent legitimator logic*, (2) *the consumer activist logic*, and (3) *the market co-creator logic*. Further, we argue that these logics will have implications for how consumer roles in adoption and diffusion of market innovations are conceived.

4.1. *The incumbent legitimator logic*

The incumbent legitimator logic can be characterised by the situation where a firm, using legitimacy and market power, expands an existing market or creates new markets in collaboration with selected suppliers and business partners (Johne, 1999). Regarding the

legitimacy of the new market definition, the firm is not superior or fully autonomous in finding suitable frames of meaning because consumer adoption is a social and institutional process; bounded by existing norms about what is right, normal, and justified.

As an example of this logic in the market innovation literature, Humphreys (2010) shows how dominant firms, through market power and networking, expand the market for casino gambling from being a criminal activity to becoming a legitimate form of entertainment that is consistent with prevalent social norms, beliefs, and values. Humphreys's (2010) study shows that adoption of a new practice is enabled when that practice is legitimised in interaction with societal stakeholder groups. "Communications target not only adopters but other stakeholders as well, such as journalists, politicians, and citizens. In turn, these parties work to legitimate the practice, which further encourages or even legally enables adoption" (Humphreys, 2010: 5). Consistent with the incumbent legitimator logic, this study describes the market creation process as a chain of events that enables adoption on the consumer level after a certain level of socio-cultural, cognitive, and regulatory legitimacy is reached.

Similarly, Wilner and Huff (2017) showed that new vibrator product designs combined with changed media framings of these products created possibilities for new consumer experiences when stigma and taboos of sex and masturbation were partly removed. "This product market is influenced by macro-cultural dynamics including feminism and the intersection of women's sexuality and consumer empowerment, as well as broader cultural shifts related to the acceptance of multiple modes and practices associated with sexuality" (Wilner and Huff, 2017: 264). Following the institutional perspective, legitimisation of markets is a distributed process. Both these studies indicate that consumers influence the societal norms that firms and marketers use to legitimise tabooed practices and enable new market offerings.

Brei and Tadajewski's (2015) study of bottled water is an example of the incumbent legitimator logic used to explain the marketing strategies of companies in the food and nutrition industry to expand the market for bottled water by associating it with purity, good quality, and security. Suppliers of bottled water followed up the expansion process with bottled water products and brands, increasing availability, and adding distribution channels. Led by institutional actors, regulating bodies, and incumbent companies, the market expansion changed the consumers' practices from circumscribed use to everyday consumption of bottled water (Brei & Tadajewski, 2015). Similar to Humphreys (2010), Brei and Tadajewski (2015) emphasise the work of normative and regulating actors in the legitimisation of the market, linking legitimisation "to interactions of producers, consumers and figures outside of traditional marketing channels" (Brei & Tadajewski, 2015: 329). A case in point being the concurrency between consumers', marketers' and others' assumptions of the purity of bottled water. "In other words, this assumption was relayed to consumers and incorporated into their [consumers'] "folk" theories of the social world" (Brei & Tadajewski, 2015: 335).

Our analysis shows that the incumbent legitimator logic can be found in studies where incumbents legitimise a market through different interpretations. As an illustrative example, Ertimur and Coskuner-Balli's (2015) study of the yoga market shows how yoga professionals and brands advocate different frames of understanding of yoga (i.e., institutional logics), such as spirituality, health, religion, and secular ethics. Instead of harnessing a single brand, actors in the yoga market created a new heterogeneous market by legitimating different styles of yoga and promoting their benefits (Ertimur & Coskuner-Balli, 2015). In another yoga study, the same authors show how company brands, journals, and non-profit organisations succeeded in fostering legitimacy for American yoga as a "hybrid product" (Coskuner-Balli &

Ertimur, 2017). Reterritorialisation (i.e., relocation of an offering which is linked to a geographical area) served to legitimise American yoga against purist views of yoga as territorially and culturally bound to India. Both studies of the yoga market innovations illustrate the complexity of the incumbent legitimator logic by emphasising the interpretations of heterogeneous system actors (including consumers) of yoga brands. However, the case is still consistent with the basic notions of the incumbent legitimator logic; strategic action developed by networked market actors to provide consumers with the opportunity to adopt a new practice.

Characteristics of adoption and diffusion in the incumbent legitimator logic

Table 3 illustrates how the unique pattern of adoption and diffusion in the incumbent legitimator logic is conceived through the extended life-cycle process model. The table demonstrates the transformation from a pre-existing market in phase t_0 to a new market in phase t_4 . Humphreys (2010) referred to the following four stages within a market creation process: Innovation stage, local validation stage, diffusion stage, and general validation stage. Nevertheless, the diffusion process is initiated by the incumbent (e.g., through marketing management).

Insert Table 3 about here.

At t_0 , incumbent market actors experience a need to legitimise a new frame of meaning around activities or products. Building legitimacy for an innovation, market actors start at stage $t_1 - t_2$ to engage in the social definitions and institutions, sustaining their relationships to resourceful market system actors (e.g., media firms and influential spokespersons). Although consumers are not actively involved in the earliest stages ($t_0 - t_2$), they influence the societal norms that affect the new frame of meaning. At t_2 lead users become convinced of the new

frame of meaning by the system actors. At t_3 , Lead users influence other consumers (e.g., early adopters, majority) to accept the new frame of meaning. Here, societal norms are integral to word-of-mouth diffusion. At t_4 , consumers in general find this new market as an opportunity to adopt the new practice (e.g., gambling at casinos, taking yoga classes, etc.).

4.2. The consumer activist logic

The consumer activist logic views market innovation processes as a contest between two conflicting fronts, typically represented by a producer (typically an incumbent) and a consumer group. Building on consumer-oriented perspectives, researchers have seen consumers as potential change agents who operate in institutional fields, and thus frame practices according to their ideologies. The consumer activist logic often manifests itself on digital market platforms (e.g., Facebook) and user forums (Giesler, 2008), allowing for user/consumer empowerment. Digital market platforms stimulate the establishment of consumer activism because the consumer side has a clear voice in the market (Labrecque et al., 2013). Instead of just adopting market actors' brands and offerings, the individual user or user groups may adopt an opposite and contesting practice. Such contests could eventually generate new market opportunities (Giesler, 2008, 2012; Kjeldgaard et al., 2017).

The case of music downloading described in Giesler's study from 2008 provides an illuminating example of the battles over two opposing market ideologies. Enabled by the digitalisation of musical media, the practice of music downloading and sharing diffused rapidly in the late 1990s, causing worry in the music business about future profits. Applying a dramaturgical perspective, Giesler (2008) analysed how downloaders legitimised their practice through narrative performances of mythical, subversive, and heroic characters such as "hackers", "pirates", or "pioneers". "I illustrate that markets systematically evolve through the

dramatic moves and countermoves of protagonists and the overarching frame of a dramatic narrative that organizes cultural debates over the proper blending between sharing and owning. (Giesler 2008: 751)". Legitimising music downloading, consumers gradually assumed the role of market activists, a role that culminated in the diffusion of the music downloading site Napster, to which the music industry responded with a "war against downloading" (Giesler, 2008). Over time, the market resistance process ended in a compromise between Napster, and the traditional music business, leading to iTunes as a new commercial platform. Through consumer activism, a compromise between opposing interests evolved, and finally, led to new markets. Later, in 2012, Giesler also showed how consumers evoked negative brand images (i.e., doppelgänger brands) in an activist counterattack to resist offerings from Botox treatment providers. The commercial Botox treatment actors, on the other hand, used legitimising brand images to maintain the brand against the counter images.

In addition to consumer–producer battles, the consumer activist logic also explains how consumer groups become divided and lead to market innovation. According to Hietanen and Rokka (2015), electronic music, or dubstep, emerged as an independent (indie) music scene and a "taste culture" with cultural codes tied to knowledge of music and music technology. In a consumer activist logic, this could be understood through notions of authenticity in music, technological knowledge, and musical taste (Hietanen & Rokka, 2015). The authors argue that: "it is precisely the constant interplay of counteracting market practices that makes up countercultural markets". (...). Furthermore, they state: "We contend that such tensions hold together and energize otherwise fragile and small-scale market configurations" (Hietanen & Rokka, 2015: 1579). Activist consumers defined themselves in contrast to the mainstream music market, always resisting commercial market practices and brands. There were no global

attempts to resolve the divide, because the counterculture market continuously thrived on resisting the commercial market.

The consumer activist logic has also been used in studies of less successful market innovations and of failures of both consumers and producers to adopt new practices. Press, Arnould, Murray, and Strand's (2014) study of ideological antagonism explains why wheat producers did not adopt an organic farming strategy even though they had economic incentives to do so. Press et al. (2014) found an ideological conflict between "productionist" and "organic" strategic orientations and showed that wheat farmers failed to extend the wheat market as a whole because of ideological conflicts. "The "crisis" engages both organic and chemical producers; the industry has not yet moved past this stage" (Press et al., 2014: 106). Although consumers are less in focus in this study, it concurs with the activist logic that renders adoption as a choice between ideological sides.

Characteristics of adoption and diffusion in the consumer activist logic

Table 4 illustrates the unique pattern of adoption and diffusion in the consumer activist logic, proceeding from t_0 to t_4 , in a dialectic process model. The consumer activist logic stresses the dialectic between ideologies played out between groups of consumers and producers in a marketplace. Giesler (2008) identified four stages within the diffusion pattern of this logic: breach, crisis, redress, and reintegration.

Insert Table 4 about here.

T_0 indicates the point in time where market actors dominate the current ideas of the market. At t_1 , the incumbent position is challenged by an opposite idea launched by consumers seeking to

influence fellow consumers. The dominant market actors reacts to the challenge, bringing the market into a conflict. At t_2 , the market is subjected to structural instability; the opposition itself drives the adoption of opposing practices and polarises market actors' opinions. Often, the conflict is reinforced by media coverage. At t_3 , conflicts lay the foundation for diffusion through media debates and user communities, including digital forum activities. T_4 marks the stage when a new or revitalised market which exchange structures are re-established, market stability re-emerges, or conflicts erodes.

4.3. The market co-creator logic

In the market co-creator logic, market innovation is understood as a process whereby collaboration between consumers, producers, regulators, stakeholders etc., create a new market practice that parallels the incumbents' market practices and leads to diversified co-existing offerings. The studies representing this logic focus on highly active consumer groups who characteristically define new consumer and producer roles, often with a non-conflictual mindset towards incumbent firms. Co-created market innovation processes are characterised by consumer enthusiasm and/or a particular interest in a certain phenomenon (Kjeldgaard et al., 2017), or they may be driven by unsatisfied needs (Scaraboto & Fisher, 2012).

Kjeldgaard et al. (2017) illustrated how beer enthusiasts crossed the boundary between traditional consumer and producer roles. Important in this case was the institutional entrepreneurship and collective action of a formalised consumer association, Danske Ølentusiaster (DØE) a “(...) powerful market agent in terms of the structural and cultural make-up of the field” (Kjeldgaard et al., 2017: 54). The association advocated a practice of craftsmanship and promoted diversity in beer types, both of which resonated with other beer enthusiasts who were dissatisfied with offerings of the mainstream market.

Martin and Schouten (2013) documented another case of a market expansion process driven by consumers. Their study showed how consumers took the role of motorsport innovators while incumbent motorsport companies remained passive. Consumers co-created the material and cognitive structures needed to expand the market and influenced the practices of other consumers: “consumers acquired minimotos in a process of distributed diffusion, the spread of adoption through multiple local communities” (Martin & Schouten, 2013: 865).

Biraghi Gambetti, & Pace (2018) found a consumer tribe member taking the role of an embedded entrepreneur driving the formation of a commercial market for Café Racer products. “He is both a consumer who is the expression of the tribe (...) and a producer who is the expression of the marketplace” (Biraghi et al., 2018: 400). Scaraboto and Fischer (2012) illustrated how consumers formed a strong consumer community, called “Fatshionistas”, around the feeling of being underserved by existing fashion companies’ offerings. Fatshionistas acted as institutional entrepreneurs who influenced the wants of other consumers through social media. Their strategy was directed at changing fashion houses’ offerings, which required an institutional change in the valuation of fat bodies: “Through their blog writing, plus-sized consumers manifest their opinion about marketplace practices, share narratives and experiences (...)” (Scaraboto and Fischer, 2012: 1254).

A key feature of the co-creator logic is that it highlight the roles of heterogeneous actors. From the institutionalisation of the internet e-commerce market in China, for instance, Yang and Wang (2013) found internet companies, government, search engines, vendors, consumers, internet service providers among others to be important. This study also clearly showed the roles of heterogeneous nonmarket actors such as trade associations, professional societies, and

governmental agencies contributing to the development of the online shopping market (Yang and Wang 2013).

Viewed through the lens of the market co-creator logic, consumers are seen to be advocates of community interests. Illustrative of this advocacy is Kjellberg and Olson's (2017) study which reports on how consumers were active campaigners for legal medical and recreational cannabis use in certain North American states, enacting regulative legitimacy in this newly established market. For instance, when the state of California proposed to legalise cannabis use, the proposition lacked guidelines for how patients would procure their cannabis. "Without such guidelines, California patients formed collectives that allowed them to safely procure cannabis outside the black market" (Kjellberg & Olson, 2017: 104).

Since there is not necessarily an ideological conflict, incumbents on the reference market and consumer communities may collaborate to pursue common interests. Dolbec and Fischer (2015) showed how influences go both ways between incumbent companies and consumer groups: "(...) the engagement of consumers can lead to changes, including the augmentation and redistribution of institution-maintaining work, such that new routines and activities supportive of the industry become widely adopted and the work once done by select categories of actors in the industry becomes shared across a wider array of actors" (Dolbec and Fischer, 2015: 1448).

Adoption and diffusion patterns in the market co-creator logic

Table 5 presents how the unique pattern of adoption and diffusion in the market co-creator logic is conceived when proceeding from t_0 to t_4 , through an evolutionary process model. We conceptualised four stages by adapting the translation process in Callon's (1986) economic

sociology of markets (see also Martin and Schouten (2013) for an illustration). In the market co-creator logic, the adoption and diffusion pattern reflects the dynamic processes of collaboration between consumers and other actors.

Insert Table 5 about here.

A reference market will exist at t_0 . At t_1 – problematisation – consumers address the absence of offerings or the shortcomings of existing ones. At this point, consumers perceive opportunities to engage in creating new consumer or user experiences. At t_2 , initiators recruit and mobilise resources (e.g., new actors, knowledge, technologies, or materials). Adoption happens as actors commit to new market ideas and practices. At t_3 , diffusion happens when informal leaders, such as institutional entrepreneurs (Scaraboto & Fischer, 2012) or embedded entrepreneurs (Martin & Schouten, 2013; Biraghi et al., 2018), use cultural and social capital to enrol peer consumers and/or producers (e.g., through exchange platforms). In t_4 , the legitimisation stage, actors are founding regulative associations and seeking legitimacy from external market actors. At t_4 , one may talk of a stage of diffusion in which the new market becomes increasingly popular because of its legitimised efficiency in sustaining the functions of the market.

5. Discussion and managerial implications

In this article, we promote the idea that using the lens of market innovation logics can help us gain more insight into market innovations, particularly where PLC models and DoI theory are challenged by the three suggested logics. By employing the institutional view that the rationality of social actors is bounded and enabled by their surrounding social structures, we

have sought to contribute to a new understanding of consumer adoption and diffusion of market innovations.

In our study, we have compared three assumed patterns of adoption and diffusion manifested in three market innovation logics: (1) the incumbent legitimator logic, where market innovation is characterised by the creation and expansion of frames of meaning by established firms and collaborating system actors, (2) the consumer activist logic, where market innovations stem from consumers' market activist roles launching a contradictory ideology, and (3) the market co-creator logic, where market innovations result from consumers' co-creative institutional work to exploit opportunities ignored by incumbents (who are controlling the reference market). We summarise these three market innovation logics in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here.

The incumbent legitimator logic extends the traditional view of market innovations as it includes the influence of social norms on adoption and diffusion, thereby involving external market actors as well as lead users. Although consumers influence the societal norms, consumer adoption of market innovations will occur *after* a marketing process, initiated by the innovating firm. The consumer activist logic takes an even more active view of the consumer. The adoption of a contradictory ideology occurs *spontaneously* as a reaction to the current market ideas. The market co-creator logic views consumers as resourceful and enterprising, thus able to create new markets to amend the shortcomings of the reference market. The adoption of a co-created market happens *early* in a process whereby consumers develop agentic roles. To illustrate the importance of the three suggested logics for

managerial practice, the next section uses *digitalisation of local food markets* as examples from which managers may draw useful implications.

The market innovation logics exemplified through the digitalisation of local food markets

The incumbent legitimator logic can be illustrated using *Amazon Fresh*, which is a business concept whereby Amazon influences stakeholders' and adopters' shopping behaviours and beliefs about online food retailing. Amazon Fresh and local food producers collaborate to normalise and legitimise local food consumption as a safe and rational consumer practice which "(...) makes it fun to eat healthy" (Bezos, 2017). Thus, Amazon responds to a consumer health trend, yet uses market power to normalise and legitimise shopping of online local food to strengthen its own position. A deal with the food retailer Wholefoods gives Amazon access to physical market channels, and prime members get exclusive access to offerings; providing, in turn, Amazon with relationships to new stakeholders. Together with the media, Wholefood and Amazon underscore the negative framings of industrially processed food. Here, consumers adopt the local food concept by accepting the frame of meaning (i.e., local food, healthy food) through new online offerings in the market. The diffusion is initiated through the grocery chains' media campaigns and sustained by convincing lead users and collaborators.

The local food retail and social enterprise *Food Connect* may serve as an example of market innovation following the *consumer activist logic* as it offers a new ethical and sustainable food system for producers and consumers (e.g., Food Connect Sheds). Food Connect's rhetoric is sharply antagonistic to how large supermarket chains dominate established food markets. Much like the narratives of combating corporate villains found in Giesler (2008), Food Connect's story is rooted in events where local food cooperatives "had been completely

taken over by corporate executives, gradually demutualised and then corporatised to withstand the onslaught of supermarket power and its pressure on prices” (Rose, 2017). Moreover, membership requires adherents to adopt a set of ethically guided food market actions, routines and standards. Here, adoption involves buying from, and interacting with, alternative local food communities as a form of protest against corporate food chain structures. Diffusion is a conflict-ridden process, initially driven by community peers and online community actors who recruit new members with similar activist views. If the conflicts escalate, the role of media outside the communities may contribute to further diffusion of the alternative food system. According to the consumer activist logic, “food activists” employ online networks to challenge traditional food value chains’ interpretation of what local food is (e.g., Schneider, Eli, Dolan, & Ulijaszek, 2017).

The Nordic local food phenomenon REKO-rings¹ may illustrate the market co-creator logic. Here, the role of digital platforms (i.e., Facebook) is to facilitate and create direct interactions between food market actors of various kinds (e.g., producers, consumers, or administrators) without the cost of traditional value chain intermediaries (Närvänen & Leipämaa-Leskinen, forthcoming). As digital platforms, the REKO-rings develop parallel markets to the traditional food markets; providing market channels to local producers, and supplying products that meet the interests of food-oriented consumers (e.g., “Foodies” as described by Ulver, (2019)). Occasionally, consumers become small-scale producers or take on market-coordinating roles. Here, adoption is about consumers’ and producers’ learning and acceptance of new institutional practices and roles stemming from enthusiasm around local food consumption, ecological farming, and animal welfare. Diffusion happens through new memberships resulting from peer invitations and social networking with media as an integral part of the

¹ The REKO-ring phenomenon originated in Finland. Currently, around 300 REKO-rings exist in the Nordic countries with approximately 1.2 million active consumers and producers.

actors' system. Thus, driven by unmet interests and enthusiasm for local food, rather than value conflicts, REKO-ring actors have commenced processes of problematisation and mobilisation paralleling the empirical cases presented in table 2, and in accordance with the adoption and diffusion pattern in table 5.

6. Conclusion

This paper elaborates on different market innovation logics underlying market innovation processes. It shows that consumer-oriented literature adds substantive knowledge about adoption and diffusion of market innovations beyond that of traditional adoption and diffusion theory. Further, our study shows not only that adoption and diffusion processes are shaped by institutions, but also that consumers are active agents in redefining the rules of the game. Our study of the consumer-oriented literature illustrates how adoption decisions can ultimately be based on acceptance, rejections, or creations, rather than through rational choices between pre-produced offerings. Moreover, by highlighting three characteristics of diffusion processes – firm-initiated collaboration, ideological battles, and recruitment of committed members – our study works to extend diffusion perspectives that merely considers information diffusion.

Our advice to marketing managers is to explore the model of the consumer as an active part in shaping new markets. To choose a preferred market role, marketing managers may take the three logics as different lenses through which they can interpret market information. This multiplicity of market perception could enable more informed market strategies, for instance when to ignore, engage with, or compete with influential consumer groups. To thrive and survive, marketing managers are suggested to follow and engage in online forums and social media platforms, containing discourses and behavioural patterns that may affect their current market.

References

- Araujo, L. (2007). Markets, market-making and marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 7(3), 211–226.
- Bass, F. M. (2004). Comments on “a new product growth for model consumer durables the bass model”. *Management Science*, 50(12_supplement), 1833–1840.
- Bezos, J. (2017, July 25). *Amazon is Building its Grocery Empire*. Retrieved October 18, 2019, from <https://medium.com/syncedreview/amazon-is-building-its-grocery-empire-a705631dd2bc>
- Bonner, J. M., & Walker, O. C. (2004). Selecting influential business-to-business customers in new product development: relational embeddedness and knowledge heterogeneity considerations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(3), 155–169.
- Booth, A., Sutton, A., & Papaioannou, D. (2016). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Brei, V., & Tadajewski, M. (2015). Crafting the market for bottled water: A social praxeology approach. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(3/4), 327–349.
- Biraghi, S., Gambetti, R., & Pace, S. (2018). Between tribes and markets: The emergence of a liquid consumer-entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Research*, 92, 392–402.
- Callon, M. (1986). Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St. Brieuc Bay. In John Law (Ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge*, (pp. 196–223). London: Routledge.
- Callon, M. (2016). Revisiting marketization: From interface-markets to market-agencements. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 19(1), 17–37.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Coskuner-Balli, G., & Ertimur, B. (2017). Legitimation of hybrid cultural products: The case of American yoga. *Marketing Theory*, 17(2), 127–147.

- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American sociological review*, 147–160.
- Dolbec, P. Y., & Fischer, E. (2015). Refashioning a field? Connected consumers and institutional dynamics in markets. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(6), 1447–1468.
- Ertimur, B., & Coskuner-Balli, G. (2015). Navigating the institutional logics of markets: Implications for strategic brand management. *Journal of Marketing*, 79(2), 40–61.
- Garcia, R., & Calantone, R. (2002). A critical look at technological innovation typology and innovativeness terminology: A literature review. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 19(2), 110–132.
- Gemser, G., & Perks, H. (2015). Co-Creation with Customers: An Evolving Innovation Research Field. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 32(5), 660–665.
- Giesler, M. (2008). Conflict and compromise: Drama in marketplace evolution. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(6), 739–753.
- Giesler, M. (2012). How Doppelgänger Brand Images Influence the Market Creation Process: Longitudinal Insights from the Rise of Botox Cosmetic. *Journal of Marketing*, 76(6), 55–68.
- Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R., & Sahlin, K. (2008). The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism, London: SAGE Publications Ltd, doi: 10.4135/9781849200387
- Grimpe, C., Sofka, W., Bhargava, M., & Chatterjee, R. (2017). R&D, marketing innovation, and new product performance: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 34(3), 360–383.
- Harrison, D., & Kjellberg, H. (2016). How users shape markets. *Marketing Theory*, 16(4), 445–468.

- Hauser, J., Tellis, G. J., & Griffin, A. (2006). Research on innovation: A review and agenda for marketing science. *Marketing Science*, 25(6), 687–717.
- Hietanen, J., & Rokka, J. (2015). Market practices in countercultural market emergence. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(9/10), 1563–1588.
- Hingley, M. K. (2005). Power to all our friends? Living with imbalance in supplier–retailer relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 34(8), 848–858.
- Humphreys, A. (2010). Megamarketing: The creation of markets as a social process. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(2), 1–19.
- Humphreys, A., & Carpenter, G. S. (2018). Status Games: Market Driving Through Social Influence in the US Wine Industry. *Journal of Marketing*, 82(5), 141–159.
- Johne, A. (1999). Successful market innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 2(1), 6–11.
- Kim, W., & Mauborgne, R. (2005). Blue ocean strategy: How to create uncontested market space and make the competition irrelevant. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press
- Kjeldgaard, D., Askegaard, S., Rasmussen, J. Ø., & Østergaard, P. (2017). Consumers' collective action in market system dynamics: A case of beer. *Marketing Theory*, 17(1), 51–70.
- Kjellberg, H., & Olson, D. (2017). Joint markets: How adjacent markets influence the formation of regulated markets. *Marketing Theory*, 17(1), 95–123.
- Kristensson, P., Gustafsson, A., & Archer, T. (2004). Harnessing the creative potential among users. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(1), 4–14.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Phillips, N. (2004). From Moby Dick to Free Willy: Macro-cultural discourse and institutional entrepreneurship in emerging institutional fields. *Organization*, 11(5), 689–711.

- Martin, D. M., & Schouten, J. W. (2013). Consumption-driven market emergence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(5), 855–870.
- McCarthy, E. J. (1981). *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach* (7th ed.). Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Muller, E., & Zenker, A. (2001). Business services as actors of knowledge transformation: The role of KIBS in regional and national innovation systems. *Research Policy*, 30(9), 1501–1516.
- Närvänen, E., & Leipämaa-Leskinen, H. (2017, June). Collaborative market practices within a consumer-driven local food service system. Proceedings of the 5th Naples Forum on Service, Naples, Italy.
- Nenonen, S., Kjellberg, H., Pels, J., Cheung, L., Lindeman, S., Mele, C., Sajtos, L., & Storbacka, K. (2014). A new perspective on market dynamics: Market plasticity and the stability–fluidity dialectics. *Marketing Theory*, 14(3), 269–289.
- O'Connor, G. C., & Rice, M. P. (2013). New market creation for breakthrough innovations: Enabling and constraining mechanisms. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(2), 209–227.
- Peres, R., Muller, E., & Mahajan, V. (2010). Innovation diffusion and new product growth models: A critical review and research directions. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 27(2), 91–106.
- Press, M., & Arnould, E. J. (2011). Legitimizing community supported agriculture through American pastoralist ideology. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 11(2), 168–194.
- Press, M., Arnould, E. J., Murray, J. B., & Strand, K. (2014). Ideological challenges to changing strategic orientation in commodity agriculture. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(6), 103–119.
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe

- Rose, E.-K. (2017, June 26). *Nearly a Teenager*. Retrieved October 18, 2019, from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/nearly-teenager-emma-kate-rose/>
- Scaraboto, D., & Fischer, E. (2012). Frustrated Fatshionistas: An institutional theory perspective on consumer quests for greater choice in mainstream markets. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(6), 1234–1257.
- Schneider, T., Eli, K., Dolan, C., & Ulijaszek, S. (2017). Introduction: Digital food activism—food transparency one byte/bite at a time? In Schneider, T., Eli, K., Dolan, C., & S. Ulijaszek (Eds.), *Digital Food Activism* (pp. 1–24). New York: Routledge.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest and the Business Cycle*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Snehota, I., & Håkansson, H. (Eds.). (1995). *Developing relationships in business networks*. London: Routledge.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.
- Ulver, S. (2019). From Mundane to Socially Significant Consumption: An Analysis of How Foodie Identity Work Spurs Market Formation. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 39(1), 53–70.
- Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS quarterly*, 36(1), 157–178.
- West, J., & Bogers, M. (2014). Leveraging external sources of innovation: A review of research on open innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(4), 814–831.

Wilner, S. J. S., Huff, A. D. (2017). Objects of desire: The role of product design in revising contested cultural meanings, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 33(3–4), 244–271.

Yang, G., & Wang, R. (2013). The Institutionalization of an Electronic Marketplace in China, 1998–2010. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(1), 96–109.

Table 1 Search and selection protocol

	Search	Returned titles	Articles kept after browse reading	Articles kept after full-text reading*	Articles kept for analysis
1. round December 2017	Humphreys 2010	213	23	12	11**
	5 journals' 2017 volumes	Ca. 200	5	2	2
2. round March 2019	Humphreys 2010 + Giesler 2008	88	11	8	2
	7 journals' 2017 - 2019 volumes	Ca. 200	7	3	1
* One article included after full-text reading: (Giesler, 2008)					17
**Including (Humphreys, 2010)					

Table 2 Studies on market innovation processes

Authors' Names (in alphabetical order by first author) and Article's Title	Research Question and Methods	Findings on Market Change	Theoretical Contribution to Market Innovation Logic
Studies drawn mainly from an Incumbent legitimator Logic			
Brei, V., & Tadajewski, M. (2015). Crafting the market for bottled water: A social praxeology approach.	<p><i>How were consumer values influenced to support consumption of bottled water (BW) in France?</i></p> <p>Analysis of advertising and other marketing material. Field observations at BW sponsored events. Semi-structured interviews with BW consumers.</p>	Finds that influential institutional actors like bottled water companies, doctors, pediatricians, and the medical community invoked discourses of purity, nature, and health associated with bottled water, juxtaposing these with the risks of tap water consumption. New market possibilities followed, and practices surrounding bottled water were affirmed through gastronomic and medical discourses.	Uses Bourdieu's conceptual triangle of social fields, forms capital, and habitus to focus on market development as bound by social structures. Emphasises non-individual factors, such as structures of field relations and institutional actors to analyse framing mechanisms and struggles over symbolic meaning of bottled water.
Coskuner-Balli, G., & Ertimur, B. (2017). Legitimation of hybrid cultural products: The case of American Yoga.	<p><i>By what strategies are hybrid cultural products legitimised?</i></p> <p>Qualitative analysis of content in newspapers, texts and books, magazine articles, secondary interviews and industry reports</p>	Shows how American yoga was introduced in the US and became a legitimate hybrid form of yoga. American yoga was imbued with moral, cognitive, and pragmatic legitimacy by the discursive efforts (i.e., framings) of established market actors such as yoga instructors, experts, and media.	Builds on institutional theory and the concept of cultural hybridity taken from globalisation theory. Hybridisation nominates the process of remarketing a geographically and culturally bounded brand through legitimisation efforts. Hybridisation engenders conflict between celebratory and purist framings.
Ertimur, B., & Coskuner-Balli, G. (2015). Navigating the institutional logics of markets: Implications for strategic brand management	<p><i>What are the implications of multiple logics for strategic brand management in the yoga market?</i></p> <p>Archival study, qualitative interviews with founders of yoga brands, field observation, and netnography.</p>	Uncovers four different logics (spirituality, medical, fitness, and commercial) and the tensions between them. Institutional entrepreneurs engage in debates and arguments over spirituality, religion, and health, navigating the complex organisational field of the yoga market. The tensions and negotiations give rise to multiple yoga brands.	Applies institutional theory to study the dynamics between multiple logics in the yoga market. The theory conceptualises the market as organisational fields where service producers' use of multiple field logics lead to market evolution. Emphasises conflicting logics between service producers rather than conflicts between consumers and producers.
Humphreys, A. (2010). Megamarketing: The creation of markets as a social process.	<p><i>What is the role of social legitimisation in the process of market creation?</i></p> <p>Newspaper articles, press releases, and interviews covering the period 1980–2007</p>	Traces the legitimization of casino gambling driven by casinos, hotels, and media reframed it as entertainment and business activity, and disassociated it from criminal behaviour. Gaining legitimacy, casino gambling actors found extended business opportunities, broadened the scope of the market, and bridged activities with other market actors.	Proposes that the market creation process is embedded within society's value system. Goes beyond the utilitarian theory of action which assumes individual utility improvement by the new product or service/practice.

Humphreys, A., & Carpenter, G. S. (2018). Status Games: Market Driving Through Social Influence in the US Wine Industry.	<i>How do firms drive markets to gain competitive advantage without technological innovation?</i> Ethnographic analysis of producers, distributors, retailers, wine critics, and consumers (wine enthusiasts).	Processes of social influence are channelled through relationships between wine value chain actors and actors outside the value chain. Through a range of different activities firms influence actors in- and outside the value chain. Consumers are intimidated by the complex and ambiguous nature of wine experiences, thus highly receptive to influences.	Introduces the concept of driving markets as a perspective on sustainable competitive advantage. Winning the status game in the wine market is a source competitive advantage that does not rely on disruptive innovation.
Wilner, S. J. S. & Huff, A. D. (2017). Objects of desire: The role of product design in revising contested cultural meanings.	<i>How has mainstream media shifted the framing of vibrators in the U.S.?</i> Analysis of representative texts of 37 national mainstream lifestyle magazines, and television series transcripts.	Vibrators as sex toys were found to develop in three stages of mutual influence between product designs, media frames, and normative legitimacy. Producers developed new designs to break away from old frames of meaning. Shows sequences of mutual influences between design choices and changes in normative legitimacy.	Combines perspectives from framing theory and product design (i.e., the materiality of the branded objects). Show that activation of culturally preferred codes can be an influential force on consumer acceptance and legitimacy of the new product design. Solicits a focus on careful product design for producers in emerging markets.
Studies drawn mainly from a Consumer Activist Logic			
Giesler, M. (2008). Conflict and compromise: Drama in marketplace evolution.	<i>How can a dramaturgical/theatrical perspective explain how the music market evolves?</i> In-depth interviews. Longitudinal study of music hackers' personal narratives of downloading practice and conflicting discourses.	Found that music downloaders' stories evolved over time as responses and attacks on the music industry's attempts to control music downloading and sharing. Consumers act against what they see as corporate desire to own music.	Builds on consumer counter-culture theory to interpret the evolution of music market practices as a marketplace drama. Marketplace evolution goes through a sequence of antagonistic performances: Breach, crisis, redress, and reintegration. These stages evolve in a dialectic pattern of conflicting interests and discourses between activist consumers and music industry actors.
Giesler, M. (2012). How doppelgänger brand images influence the market creation process: Longitudinal insights from the rise of Botox cosmetic.	<i>What was the role of brand mediation in the market creation process for Botox treatment?</i> In-depth interviews with 32 Botox-using middle-class women, Allergan's promotional materials, printed and online media content.	Finds that the innovating firm that promoted Botox treatment and the customers of the treatment were met with contesting brand images from non-consumers. Such brand-mediated conflicts over nature-technology relationships within the nation's culture influenced the innovation's marketing success over time.	Uses actor-network theory to explain the Botox treatment market-creation process as a chain of battles over brand images between companies, consumers and non-consumers. Market evolution as a progressive sequence of brand image contestations following a dialectic pattern, where each brand image is followed by a reaction.
Hietanen, J., & Rokka, J. (2015). Market practices in countercultural market emergence.	<i>How do the practices of influential consumers-producers shape the electronic music (Dubstep) market?</i> Ethnographic fieldwork in music communities involving in-depth interviews, participant observation, online media, documentaries and video footage.	Finds that a tension exists between the global mainstream music market and the local countercultural music market. Market-shaping and market-restricting practices aim to resist commercial market practices of large music industry players.	Combines practice theory and actor network theory to describe countercultural market practices on a micro level. Authenticity in musical experience and a dialectical opposition to mainstream music markets is the central driver for members of a musical "scene". Such scenes can be viewed as emerging markets, however it is key to the practice perspective that the dialectic opposition is sustained in the members' practices rather than resolved.

Press, M., Arnould, E. J., Murray, J. B., & Strand, K. (2014). Ideological challenges to changing strategic orientation in commodity agriculture.	<i>How do farmers develop strategic orientations within the wheat product market?</i> Interviews with wheat farmers using chemical or organic farming processes.	Finds an unresolved conflict existing between two strategic orientations to wheat production (“productionist” and “organic”). Wheat producers do not adopt an organic strategy, even though it appears to be economically attractive.	From consumer ideology literature, the article adopts the concept of ideology to explain market change as a dialectic process between opposing strategic orientations. Ideologies shape strategic orientations in markets to the extent that they overrule economic incentives to adopt certain practices. According to conflict theory, the market will develop through different stages.
Studies drawn mainly from a Market co-creator Logic			
Biraghi, S., Gambetti, R., & Pace, S. (2018). Between tribes and markets: The emergence of a liquid consumer-entrepreneurship.	<i>What social and technological shifts facilitate consumer entrepreneurship?</i> Personal interviews, analysis of website data, participant observation.	Emerging from the tribal consumer community of Cafè Racers, an entrepreneur translates tribal aesthetics through curatorship, product management, lean logistics etc., to customers beyond the Cafè Racer community.	Elaborates the role of the embedded entrepreneur as a catalyst of market formation by using the concept of “liquidity” to describe the consumer tribe and the entrepreneur as a co-created market infrastructure.
Dolbec, P. Y., & Fischer, E. (2015). Refashioning a field? Connected consumers and institutional dynamics in markets.	<i>What is the role of interconnected consumers' institutional work in the field of fashion?</i> Written texts (e.g., fashion books, newspaper articles), online sources (e.g., fashion blogs and forums) and qualitative interviews with fashion bloggers, street photographers, designers and buyers.	Studies the fashion photography Through fashion blogging, contented consumers unintentionally created a new logic of availability and affordability in the fashion market. The fashion bloggers and their followers acted primarily out of enthusiasm and interest for fashion, often as represented by the mainstream fashion press. Imperfectly emulating the mainstream press, connected consumers created new ways of thinking on online platforms.	Builds on institutional theory and organisational field theory when analysing the institutional work performed by highly engaged consumers. Argues that contended consumer's institutional work can, unintentionally, bring about market change. Shows the aggregate market effects of activities by interconnected consumers that have no explicit change agenda.
Kjeldgaard, D., Askegaard, S., Rasmussen, J. Ø., & Østergaard, P. (2017). Consumers' collective action in market system dynamics: A case of beer.	<i>How do consumers' collective actions work to change market dynamics?</i> In-depth interviews with key members of the organisation “the Danish Beer Enthusiasts” and participant observation in events amongst beer enthusiasts.	Follows the consumer-driven establishment of a formal organisation DØE committed to fortify consumer interests in the beer market. Formed by beer enthusiasts, DØE became more formalised and acted as strategic player in the field by triggering several publicly valued beliefs about beer and beer brewing.	Takes an institutional perspective to highlight the importance of institutional logics for market transformations. Uses the strategic action field concept to analyse meso-level market changes; showing how consumers may take highly active roles in changing institutional logics. By forming alliances with other industry actors and gaining legitimacy, a new organisation may shape the taste structures of a market such as the beer market
Kjellberg, H., & Olson, D. (2017). Joint markets: How adjacent markets influence the formation of regulated markets.	<i>How do adjacent markets influence market (re)formation?</i> Informal interviews with actors involved in cannabis exchange. Participant observation in market exchange. Archival	Found a growing dynamic between the arguments and product innovations by consumers and producers on the one hand, and US states' legal and regulatory efforts on the other. Consumers' normalising efforts drew on arguments from medicine and health markets. Market exchange practices and images were drawn from a	Combines institutional theory's emphasis on normative and regulatory legitimacy with the sociology of markets' stress on market representation and enactment. Markets adjacent to the legal cannabis market work as templates for regulation, monitoring, and organising of market exchanges. These adjacent markets of influenced how actors

	study of news flashes, press releases, and newspaper and journal articles.	combination of other markets. Practices were subject to various regulations invoked from other regulated markets.	(consumers and small scale producers, licenced sellers) develop market practices.
Martin, D. M., & Schouten, J. W. (2013). Consumption-driven market emergence.	<i>How do new niches develop harmoniously within existing markets?</i> Personal interviews with racers, race promoters, spectators, part importers/builders etc., plus participant observation at motor races and events.	Explores the market of Mini motorbikes emerging through consumers' enthusiasm for motorsport on bikes for children. Follows the growth of local rider communities and online "meta-communities", forming the basis for insider entrepreneurs, race tracks, organized races, magazines etc. The mini motorbike market evolved without the intervention of incumbent companies.	Through actor-network theory's emphasis on translation, problematisation, and mobilisation processes, the study explains market emergence as a process of consumer-driven market emergence. Such a market consists of networked actors, including material objects, that work together to create and assemble resources, regulate activities and legitimise practices.
Scaraboto, D., & Fischer, E. (2012). Frustrated Fatshionistas: An institutional theory perspective on consumer quests for greater choice in mainstream markets.	<i>Why and how do marginalised consumers mobilise to seek greater inclusion in and more choice from mainstream markets?</i> Analyses blogposts from 10 blog sites, mail correspondence, newspaper articles, and Fatshionista community texts.	Found that the marginalised group of consumers with fat bodies coalesced through discussing fashion and unmet consumption needs on online communities. A collective identity, expressed through the concept of Fatshionistas. Individual institutional entrepreneurs emerged at online communities and inspired consumers further to attempt to change existing market offerings.	Applies institutional theory to the field of fashion to explore consumer agency through seeking legitimacy for new practices. Emphasises consumers' institutional work to achieve regulatory, normative, and cultural-cognitive legitimacy. Illustrates how consumers can leverage logics from an adjacent field to justify their pursuit of change within a particular market.
Yang, G., & Wang, R. (2013). The Institutionalization of an Electronic Marketplace in China, 1998–2010.	<i>How have Chinese consumers adopted the novel notion of shopping on the Internet? Who contributed to or hindered the creation of a functional e-marketplace in China?</i> Analyses 932 Chinese news articles from 1998 to 2010 and secondary data using word search engines to help identify critical events in the evolution of the electronic marketplace in China	Identifies key actors in the institutionalisation of the internet e-commerce market: Internet companies, government, search engines, vendors, consumers, internet service providers among others. Finds that cultural, normative and cognitive legitimacy was challenged by internet shopping. Illustrates the legitimation of new consumer roles such as buying online (not from physical shop), selling to other consumers, participating in forums, mixed with legislative and technological development.	Combines institutional theory's stress on legitimacy for new practices with actor-network theory's emphasis on problematisation, and mobilisation. Identifies the contribution of many nonmarket actors such as trade associations, professional societies, governmental agencies to the actor-network building up around online shopping technologies and practices. Market growth and criminal internet actors create new problems that bring new practices, technologies and actor groups into play.

Table 3 Adoption and diffusion patterns of the incumbent legitimator logic

t ₀ – Pre-existing stage: There is a need to legitimise a new frame of meaning around activities or products	t ₁ – Innovation stage: Incumbent legitimator cooperate with system actors creating new frames of meaning based on societal norms	t ₂ – Local validation stage: The system actors cooperate to target lead users with the new frame of meaning	t ₃ – Diffusion stage: Lead users influence other consumers to adopt the new frame of meaning (e.g., early adopters, majority)	t ₄ – General validation stage: The new market frame is diffused to a considerable number of consumers
---	--	---	---	---

Table 4 Adoption and diffusion patterns of the consumer activist logic

t ₀ – Pre-existing stage: Market actors dominate the current ideas of the market	t ₁ – Breach: A consumer activist group launches a contradictory ideology against the current ideas	t ₂ – Crisis: Conflicts escalates between consumer activists and dominant market actors, opening the adoption of new practice	t ₃ – Redress: Conflicts lay the foundation for diffusion through media debates and user communities	t ₄ – Reintegration: A new or revitalised market is established; stability re-emerges, or conflicts erodes
---	--	--	---	---

Table 5 Adoption and diffusion patterns of the market co-creator logic

t ₀ – Pre-existing stage: Market actors dominate a reference market	t ₁ – Problematisation: Entrepreneurial consumers seek opportunities ignored by incumbents controlling the reference market	t ₂ – Mobilisation: Adoption occurs through enrolment of mutually dependent actors in market exchange	t ₃ – Organisation: Diffusion happens through recruitment of new consumers and producers on the exchange platform or network	t ₄ – Legitimation: The co-created market is legitimised and operates in parallel to reference market
--	--	--	---	--

Table 6 Market innovation logics, market characteristics, actor roles, adoption, diffusion and process models

	Incumbent legitimator logic	Consumer activist logic	Market co-creator logic
Market innovation characteristics	Firms initiate new frames of meaning through market power and alliances	Consumers/users as activists enable market innovation through market contests	Actor networks enable market innovation through institutional work and value co-creation
Actor roles	The consumer as acceptor, producer as initiator; both bounded and enabled by institutions	The consumer as activist, producer as object of activism	The consumer and producer as co-creators with multiple and shifting roles
Adoption	Adoption as a normative choice between pre-existing and new understandings of the market	Adoption as the choice between ideological sides in a contested market	Adoption as the self-interested commitment to a joint practice
Diffusion	Diffusion as a firm-initiated collaboration process with market system actors and lead users	Diffusion as ideological battles between consumers and firms extending through media and user communities	Diffusion as recruitment of mutually dependent actors on exchange platforms
Process model	Extends the life-cycle process model (i.e., the PLC and DoI)	Corresponds to a dialectic process model	Corresponds to an evolutionary process model