

Editorial for the Special Issue:
Using shaping-strategies to thrive in the age of disruption

Taking stock of shaping strategies: From firms driving markets for business performance to diverse actors shaping systems for sustainability

Kaj Storbacka, Hanken School of Economics (Finland)

Suvi Nenonen, Stockholm School of Economics (Sweden)

Linda D. Peters, Nottingham University Business School (UK)

Roderick J. Brodie, University of Auckland Business School (New Zealand)

Abstract

Digitalization, globalization, and environmental awareness make the operating environments inherently systemic, complex, and volatile. Hence, research on shaping strategies, i.e., agentic efforts to influence how the operating environment evolves, is gaining increased attention both in marketing and strategic management. The special issue focusing on “Using shaping-strategies to thrive in the age of disruption” aims to take stock of, digest and reduce what is known about shaping strategies, and highlight gaps impeding progress in our understanding. Before summarizing the papers in the special issue, we first explore a set of questions by a cross-fertilization of literatures, namely: (1) what is being shaped, (2) why are shaping strategies pursued, (3) when is shaping done, (4) who is the shaper, (5) how is the shaping done, and (6) what are its consequences? For each of these questions, we explore what is known from extant research and simultaneously generate a research agenda as a foundation for future research directions.

Keywords: shaping strategy, market-shaping, operating environment, market formation, market transformation, sustainability

1. Introduction

Agentic efforts to influence how the operating environment evolves have gained interest both in strategic management and strategic marketing, notably under the terms “shaping strategies” (Helfat, 2021) and “artificial evolution” (Patvardhan & Ramachandran, 2020) in the former, and “market-shaping” (Nenonen et al., 2019a), “market innovation” (Sprong et al., 2021) and “service ecosystem design” (Vink et al., 2021) in the latter.

Despite the heterogeneous origins of shaping strategy research, most definitions of shaping strategies highlight similar points: (1) the agency of the focal actor(s) (Nenonen & Storbacka, 2021), (2) a purposive process (Nenonen et al., 2019a; Patvardhan and Ramachandran, 2020), and hence (3) they proactively influence the direction of the organization–environment co-evolution (Helfat, 2021). While the level and exact manifestations of intentionality may vary (Hawa et al., 2020; Patvardhan & Ramachandran, 2020), what unites shaping strategies is the intention to move *beyond adapting to one’s* operating environment (Helfat, 2021).

The phenomenon is near-universal. All operating environments undergo multiple, often conflicting shaping efforts. For that reason alone, the actions by focal actors lack full Austinian performativity (MacKenzie, 2004), or perfect causation of their system-level consequences. Causation between focal actors and their operating environments is not only imperfect but bi-directional. Furthermore, operating environments – which include their component actors and elements – evolve through an interplay of not only deliberate shaping efforts and indeed reactive adaptation on the one hand, but spontaneously emerging system properties on the other (Vargo et al., 2022). Emergence in general denotes the advent of properties qualitatively different from, and not reducible to, previous system elements (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Deacon, 2006). Recent works both in marketing (Nenonen et al., 2019a; Vargo et al., 2022; Vink et al. 2021) and management (Levinthal, 2020; Patvardhan &

Ramachandran, 2020) recognize this duality of deliberate actions on actor level and spontaneous emergence on system level.

Literature on shaping strategies began accumulating in earnest in the early 2000s and continues to burgeon. Recently there have been efforts to consolidate our understanding of shaping strategies. Helfat (2021) underscores firm–market co-evolution and draws the basic conceptual line between shaping and adaptation. Vargo et al. (2022) select emergence as their starting point and portray shaping as the fourth-order emergence characterizing all social systems, coexisting with the omnipresent lower orders of emergence: specifically of novel system properties, novel patterns, and reactive reproduction. Sprong et al.’s (2021) literature review identify six thematic clusters in the area of market innovation research, while Flaig et al.’s (2021a) qualitative meta-analysis distills a three-phased generic market-shaping process. Nenonen and Storbacka (2021), meanwhile, take a theoretical approach and provide an overview of seven prevalent theoretical perspectives on market-shaping.

These advances notwithstanding, we propose that shaping strategy research would benefit from a more comprehensive conceptual stock take, abstracting from theoretical divisions but enhancing knowledge of the concept and phenomenon (Jaakkola, 2020). Thus, in this editorial we *summarize the current understanding of shaping strategies and outline avenues for future research*.

Given the theoretical heterogeneity and fragmentation of shaping strategy literature, we have chosen to ask a relatively atheoretical set of questions: (1) what is being shaped, (2) why are shaping strategies pursued, (3) when is shaping done, (4) who is the shaper, (5) how is the shaping done, and (6) what are its consequences? We hope that this structure offers a meaningful structure “to guide the reader toward a better understanding of the focal phenomenon and provide a foundation for insights about future research directions” (Palmatier et al., 2018, p. 4). The six questions form the rows of Table 1.

Table 1. Shaping strategy research: current understanding and gaps

Theme	Current research covers	Gaps requiring future research
What is being shaped?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Call it what you will”: multiple labels that vary depending on the literature stream (e.g., market, industry, ecosystem, field, network) • Commonality across labels: context or operating environment of the shaping actor • Some shaping strategies seek to form a “new” operating environment whereas others pursue transforming “existing” ones • Multiple nested layers: micro – meso – macro, or micro –lower meso –upper meso – macro • Elements or processes: offerings, exchanges, actor-networks, technologies and infrastructures, representations, norms • Some typologies of shaping strategies that are based on the current or desired state of the operating environment, and/or the elements being shaped 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variations in the performative power of the different elements or processes over the development of the operating environment: which elements or processes are particularly influential under certain conditions, and under certain contextual contingencies • Patterns or configurations of shaping activities leading to changes in the operating environment
Why pursue shaping strategies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation behind shaping strategies often left implicit • Improved business performance as the commonest (implicit or explicit) motivation of firms • Some evidence of the use of shaping strategies for improved social outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifying and quantifying the “spillover” effects (positive and negative) of shaping strategies to other actors • Motivations of non-firm actors to pursue shaping strategies • Use of shaping strategies for sustainability, especially improved environmental outcomes • Balancing the different and potentially conflicting motivations (economic, social, environmental) of shaping strategies for sustainability
When is shaping done?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of shaping strategies vis-à-vis the state of the operating environment: Conceptual works suggest timing the shaping initiatives in times of instability or discontinuity • Timing of shaping strategies vis-à-vis other actors: Choice between being a first mover or a (fast) follower depends on, e.g., the extent of network effects and the importance of complementary actors and assets • Shaping strategies have a prolonged character, and hence may be better suited to complement other (shorter-term) strategic initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical research about the timing of shaping strategies (both vis-à-vis the state of the operating environment and the other actors), especially about failed shaping strategies • “Ecology of strategies on an actor level”: how shaping strategies and other strategic initiatives co-exist and interact in organizations • How fast different types of operating environments can be influenced through shaping strategies

Table 1. Continued

Theme	Current research covers	Gaps requiring future research
Who is the shaper?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heterogeneous actors are pursuing shaping strategies such as commercial firms, consumers, industry associations, public actors, nation states; existing research biased towards commercial firms • Shaping strategies can be pursued individually or collectively; existing research biased towards individual shaping • Some typologies of the different roles that actors can assume in shaping processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public actors (including nation states and supranational organizations) as active shapers of market – not simply regulators fixing market failures and creating specialist marketplaces • Industry or trade associations as active shapers of the operating environment, not simply passive voices of the industry • Collective shaping of the operating environment, including the dynamics and tensions • Empirical, longitudinal research about the dynamics of the actors' roles in shaping processes • Influence of relational characteristics of the focal actor (e.g., power, ownership structure) on the decision to pursue shaping strategies and/or the preferred role in shaping processes
How is shaping done?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Shaping strategy as a process” characterized by three phases: origination or infusion, mobilization or formation, and stabilization or retention • “Shaping strategy as a practice” which views shaping strategies as institutional work, especially institutionalization and legitimization of shaped systems • Securing and synchronizing collective engagement of other relevant actors • Organizational and individual antecedents of shaping strategies including organizational capabilities and individual characteristics; reflexivity on both levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial stages of shaping strategies such as developing a vision, translating a vision into value proposition(s), the relationship between “vision” and “value proposition” concepts • Links and overlaps between “product/service innovation,” “business model innovation” and “shaping strategies” • How to orchestrate or manage the engagement of other actors as part of shaping strategies • Ongoing active maintenance of shaped systems, including forms that are non-collaborative or coercive • Spatial aspects of shaping strategies • “Ecology of shaping strategies” and the interactions between multiple shaping strategies
What are the consequences of shaping?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new or shaped operating environment, often bifurcating from and co-existing with the previously existing one(s) • Emergence as a systemic antecedent and outcome of shaping strategies, as well as something that takes place in parallel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interactions between shaping strategies and lower orders of emergence • Deliberate ethical assessment of intended and unintended negative consequences of shaping strategies, including on environmental and social sustainability

2. What is being shaped?

The *object of shaping strategies bears many labels* in different disciplines or literature streams. Marketing often refers to a “market” or “(service) ecosystem”; whereas strategic management may refer to both “markets” and “industries”; and economic sociology variously to “markets”, “fields”, “networks”, and so on (Möller et al., 2020). As we cover a multitude of literature streams, we will follow the example of Möller et al. (2020) and refer to the object using a “wide and neutral” construct, i.e., the ‘operating environment’ that shaping strategies try to influence. The operating environment can be seen as a context for value co-creation and as a complex adaptive system (Holbrook 2003; Mele et al., 2015; Nenonen et al., 2019a; Vargo et al., 2017).

Differentiating between creating a “brand new” operating environment and an “old” operating environment that has simply been changed is challenging. Some instances of shaping are indeed more akin to the *formation* of an operating environment where none existed before, around a new technology or idea (cf., Lee et al., 2018; Mason et al., 2017; Moeen et al., 2020), whereas others resemble the *transformation* of a recognizable existing operating environment (cf., Geiger & Gross, 2018; Kindström et al., 2018; Pontikes & Rindova, 2020). “Transformation” need not imply dramatic change but rather serves as shorthand for everything that is not formation.

To better understand what aspects of the operating environment are being targeted for (trans)forming, many theoretical perspectives implicitly or explicitly divide it into three nested levels or layers: micro, meso and macro. Möller et al. (2020) go further and conceptualize the operating environment as *four nested layers: actors (micro), focal ecosystems (lower meso), business fields (upper meso), and socio-economic-technological systems (macro)*. Splitting the meso layer better guides strategy makers through a

subjectivity-objectivity dilemma: Each actor perceives the operating environment somewhat differently, yet it is a shared social context. According to Möller et al. (2020), micro and lower meso layers are more subjective, upper meso and macro more inter-subjective or even objective.

A complementary perspective on the operating environment focuses *on the elements or processes* comprising it. Exact categorizations depend on one's theoretical perspective. However, most conceptualizations include elements such as: the offering to be exchanged and its qualification and/or pricing; mode of exchange; actors involved in the exchange; other actors in the network; technologies and infrastructure; representations of the operating environment such as terminology and statistics; and legal or moral norms guiding actors' behavior (cf., Harrison & Kjellberg, 2016; Kindström et al. 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Nenonen et al., 2019a).

Plainly, the object of shaping strategies relates to the subject – the shaping actor. Being commercial, a firm often chooses to influence the operating environment indirectly by innovating business model elements, assuming these micro-level changes will flow onto the meso and macro levels over time (cf., Biggemann et al., 2013; Holloway & Sebastiao, 2010; Storbacka & Nenonen, 2011). Shaping strategies can target the demand (cf., Burr, 2014) and/or supply side (cf., Ozcan & Hannah, 2020; Ulkuniemi et al., 2015) of the operating environment. Public actors, in particular and in contrast, may directly target the “rules of the game” on the meso or macro levels. Examples include influencing regulations (Mountford & Geiger, 2020). Furthermore, different elements' performative power over the development of the operating environment likely varies with context. Further research could illuminate respective elements' power under specific conditions.

A few *typologies of the content of shaping strategies* – which elements are being shaped – have emerged. For example, Humphreys and Carpenter (2018) categorize shaping

strategies by the “basis of competition” (technological innovation vs. symbolic leadership), while Jaworski et al. (2020) differentiate shaping strategies by the focus of shaping efforts (cultural vs. functional). Flaig et al. (2021b), on the other hand, propose a typology based on the shaping intention (defensive vs. offensive) and perception of the operating environment (stable vs. unstable). All three typologies could inform further empirical research into the effectiveness of varying configurations of elements targeted under different conditions. Towards that end, Nenonen et al. (2019a) found that of 21 successful market-shaping firms none had addressed either a sole element or all elements. This suggests shapers need to identify patterns or configurations of elements to shape. Explicating such patterns would repay research effort.

3. Why pursue shaping strategies?

Curiously enough, beyond the aim to do more than merely adapt to one’s operating environment (Helfat 2021), the exact motivation of shaping strategies is left implicit in much literature. Why exactly do organizations pursue shaping strategies? Many studies highlight benefits for the shaping firm such as improved financial performance or market share (cf., Gavetti et al., 2017; Kumar et al., 2000; Stathakopoulos et al., 2022; Tang et al., 2021; Van Vuuren & Wörgötter 2013), sometimes also called entrepreneurial rents (Alvarez, 2007) or influence rents (Keyhani et al., 2015). Thus, we may assume a leading motivation behind commercial firms’ shaping strategies is improved *business performance*.

Importantly, as shaping strategies alter the operating environment – and these alterations impact also other actors – performance improvements need not be limited to the focal shaper. The concept of stakeholder synergy, whereby value can be not only co-created but synergistically shared among stakeholders (Tantalo & Priem, 2016), suggests that actual benefits of a shaping strategy pursued by a commercial firm may spill over as improved

outcomes to customers, suppliers, channel partners and even competitors. So far though, little research qualifies or quantifies the spillover (business) performance outcomes that could make investments in shaping strategies much more attractive.

However, whereas current management and marketing research predominantly portrays shapers as firms, non-firm actors actively shape their operating environments too, and managers need to grasp this reality. Thus, we posit that the motivations behind shaping strategies are more numerous and heterogeneous than merely improved competitive advantage and business performance. Even within firms' own initiatives, one might expect the mounting pressures for corporate social responsibility and sustainability reporting to motivate shaping strategies aimed to improve non-financial bottom lines.

Whatever the reason, the literature about shaping strategies for *improved environmental and social outcomes* remains slender, especially in mainstream marketing and management (Nenonen & Storbacka, 2021). Hence recent calls to broaden the scope of shaping strategies in practice and research from a sole focus on economic improvement to sustainability (Sheth & Parvatiyar, 2021). The first empirical studies answering this call are now emerging. They explore the application of shaping strategies for social change (Kullak et al., 2022; Tarnovskaya et al., 2022) and increased resilience (Beninger & Francis, 2021; Fehrer & Bowe, 2022). However, environmental motivations behind shaping strategies remain largely unresearched. To better grasp the use of shaping strategies for environmental and social sustainability, two research streams outside mainstream marketing and management look particularly promising. First, the economics of innovation has developed theories about mission-oriented innovation. This goes beyond fixing market failures to expressly shaping market systems for inclusive growth and environmental sustainability (Mazzucato, 2016, 2022; Mazzucato & Ryan-Collins, 2022). Second, the corpus on strategic agency in sustainability transitions literature is maturing apace (Novalia et al., 2018; Werbeloff et al.,

2016). In their systematic review of the latter, Koistinen and Teerikangas (2021) find growing interest over 2014–2018 in agentic efforts to influence the operating environment for increased sustainability – but that this research is scattered and theoretically fragmented.

Further research is needed on *how to balance the business, social and environmental objectives of shaping strategies*. Notably, emerging evidence suggests that even when environmental and social benefits are pursued, economic growth remains the main motivation (Giuliani et al., 2021). Work on “contested markets” (cf., Debenedetti et al., 2021; Dorobantu et al., 2017), where “the legal, cultural, and moral legitimacy of the plural logics are in flux and in tension and where market actors try to shape the market via adopting series of institutional work” (Coscuner-Balli et al., 2021, p. 663), as well as “moral markets” (Georgallis & Lee, 2020), “concerned markets” (Geiger et al., 2014) and “concerned innovation” (D'Antone et al., 2017) may help research into balancing increasingly heterogeneous objectives of shaping strategies.

4. When is shaping done?

Would-be shapers need to the *timing of their initiatives in relation to the state of the operating environment*. Systemic operating environments differ in their capacity to take and retain form at different times (Nenonen et al., 2014). Viable systems typically exhibit both high compatibility between system elements and several feedback loops that act as stabilizing mechanisms (Peters et al., 2020). Stable operating environments relatively resist shaping attempts; disrupted ones are relatively amenable to them. Therefore, it is much easier to nudge a disrupted operating environment in a specific direction than move a stable one in any direction (Nenonen & Storbacka, 2020a). These insights suggest that actors wanting to engage in shaping strategies should time their efforts to periods of instability or discontinuity, when their operating environment is being disrupted or is in turmoil (Luksha, 2008; Nenonen

& Storbacka, 2020a; Pedersen & Ritter, 2022). Empirically though, too little literature studies the timing of shaping strategies' implementation vis-à-vis the operating environment. Hence answering our question of when shaping *is done* needs empirical investigation to integrate and confirm or contest the work on when it *should be done*. Studies of failed shaping strategies would particularly help us understand timing and actor–operating environment co-evolution (Ozcan & Santos, 2015).

The *timing of the shaping strategies should also be considered in relation to the actions of other actors*. Even if the operating environment is in flux, and hence receptive to shaping efforts, should the shaper strive to be the first mover or a follower? Considerable research studies the first mover/fast follower dilemma for those entering new markets or launching innovations in various industrial contexts (cf., Chiu et al., 2006; Katila & Chen, 2008; Markides & Geroski, 2004; Posen & Chen, 2013; Posen et al., 2013). Furthermore, there is evidence that operating environments exhibiting network effects, such as platform-based markets, may encourage first (or early) mover advantages (Iansiti & Levien, 2004; McIntyre & Srinivasan, 2017). On the other hand, if the operating environment requires complementary assets and/or actors to work efficiently, it would be wise to postpone implementing shaping strategies until these complementarities have emerged (Adner, 2012; Adner & Kapoor, 2010). However, because studies still concern market entry (“market” mostly denoting a geographical area or product category) or product launch, they alone cannot guide timing for shaping strategies.

Empirical research on *shaping strategies suggests they are slow* (Baker & Nenonen, 2020; Humphreys, 2010; Maciel & Fischer, 2020; Storbacka & Nenonen, 2015). Typically, shaping strategies took years to significantly change operating environment. Hence shaping seems best suited for longer-term strategies and as a complement to shorter-term competitive strategies. Yet again, literature on how exactly long-term shaping strategies and other

strategic initiatives (both long and short term) co-exist and interact is slight. Furthermore, how fast the operating environment changes (or can change) is likely to vary. Hence, more research on the speed of change in various contexts would aid decision making.

5. Who is the shaper?

When it comes to identifying which *types of actors* implement shaping strategies, the shaping strategy literature has two common biases. First, research has centered on commercial firms as the focal actors shaping or driving the market (Jaworski et al., 2000; Narver et al., 2004; Nenonen et al. 2019a). However, as aspirations to shape the operating environment are not confined to firms: consumers (Dolbec & Fischer, 2015; Martin & Schouten, 2014; Scaraboto & Fischer, 2013), industry associations (Cropper & Bor, 2018; Prokopovych 2015), public actors (Kaartemo et al., 2020; Mountford & Geiger, 2020) and nation states (Mazzucato, 2016; Nguyen & Özçaglar-Toulouse, 2021) also pursue shaping strategies. The recent calls to broaden shaping strategies from economic improvement to increased sustainability (Sheth & Parvatiyar, 2021) will require more research on the shaping strategies of public actors, including nation states and supranational organizations such as the European Union (EU). This is particularly relevant if/when the climate emergency causes public actors to expand their roles from fixing market failures with regulation and creating specialist marketplaces (e.g., carbon emission trading scheme) to also proactively forming new and transforming existing market systems for improved sustainability (Mazzucato & Ryan-Collins, 2022).

Second, much of the research has focused on the *shaping efforts by a single actor*. However, both formation (Baker & Nenonen, 2020; Maciel & Fischer, 2020) and transformation (Lee et al., 2018; Randhawa et al., 2022; Struben et al., 2020) of operating environments commonly require collective efforts by a multitude of actors – either in loose,

informal consortia or under the auspices of more formal multi-actor organizations. To better understand *collective shaping*, much could be learned from the rich literature on social movements. These are typically loosely organized group actions, involving both individuals and organizations, pursuing (or resisting) social or political changes in the operating environment (Scott & Marshall, 2009; see Georgallis & Lee, 2020 in a market entry context). Furthermore, scrutinizing how industry or trade associations deliberately pursue shaping strategies would tease apart the passive, “voice of the industry” stance they are often assumed to take and a more active shaping (Rajwani et al., 2015).

Our definition of shaping strategies requires focal actors to exercise their agency to influence the direction of the organization–environment co-evolution. However, this agency can manifest in several forms – hence some interest in the *different actor roles in shaping strategies*. Nenonen and Storbacka (2020a) differentiate “shapers” (who lead the shaping efforts) from “supporters” (who consciously participate in the necessary collective action). In their examination of whether actors support/oppose a vision, and are active/passive, Flaig and Ottoson (2022) identified six roles: “driver”, “supporter”, “missionary”, “catalyzer”, “rival”, and “detractor”. More empirical and longitudinal research is needed – especially as roles are likely fluid over the shaping process.

The choices between different actor roles in shaping strategies may also be explained by *actors’ relational characteristics, such as relative power position and ownership structure* (of especially commercial firms). Even though research on “keystone actors” (Zahra & Nambisan, 2012; Poblete et al., 2022) ventures that power differences may significantly explain why certain actors choose particular shaping roles, scant research explicitly examines power in shaping strategies. Similarly, extant research has largely assumed all commercial firms are the same, regardless of ownership structure. However, enthusiasm for (risky and

long-term) shaping strategies may well vary between family-owned, stock-listed, venture capitalist-funded, or cooperative companies. This is another promising avenue for research.

6. How is shaping done?

How shaping strategy processes unfold was relatively unexplored until recent publications. A common feature, independent of the theoretical foundations is to divide the process of change in complex systems into three or four phases (Giddens, 1984; Johnson et al., 2006; Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Möller, 2010; Storbacka & Nenonen, 2011; Flaig et al.'s (2021a). Building on Storbacka & Nenonen (2011), we explore *three phases of shaping strategies*: origination, mobilization, and stabilization.

Origination activities relate to developing a vision and value proposition for the desired change and altering the core product and business model as needed (Flaig et al., 2021a). Altogether, more study is needed to understand this initial phase (Liljenberg, 2022). For example, very little work explicitly and solely examines visions behind shaping strategies. Existing typologies suggest visions vary widely: Patvardhan and Ramachandran (2020) distinguish by levels of intentionality (intentional forward-looking vs. less intentional emergent shaping), while Hawa et al. (2020) mark a difference between present-oriented and future-oriented shaping intentions. Moreover, research into market-scoping for early-stage technologies suggests that under certain conditions a clear market vision may be undesirable (Molner et al., 2019). We also know little about how shaping visions translate into value propositions (Kindström et al., 2018; Nenonen et al., 2020) – or how exactly the terms “vision” and “value propositions” relate in shaping strategies. Investigating visioning and value propositioning as processes, instead of outcomes, could offer valuable insights. Furthermore, studying the sites where the acts of imagination or visioning occur would probably bear fruit (Gümüşay & Reinecke, 2022). Theoretically, sense-making and sense-

giving have already been applied to shaping strategy processes (Kleinaltenkamp et al., 2022). They could also illuminate the origination phase.

The *mobilization* phase involves mobilizing other actors, developing the network and cultivating a collective identity through images, stories and language (Flaig et al., 2021a; Henneberg et al., 2006; Möller, 2010; Storbacka & Nenonen, 2011). Interesting research questions concern the potential links between these mobilization activities and the product and business model innovations listed under infusion activities. For example, what are the sequences and configurations of these activities – product vs. business model vs. market innovation – and how do they vary with context? Besides the activities outlined by Flaig et al. (2021a), research indicates that securing the engagement of other actors – potentially including competitors but also going beyond them – and synchronizing their collective engagement may be crucial to mobilization (Fehrer et al., 2020; Kleinaltenkamp et al., 2021; Nenonen et al., 2019a; Storbacka, 2019). Despite the considerable interest in customer, actor, and stakeholder engagement over recent years (cf., Aksoy et al., 2021; Beckers et al., 2018; Brodie et al., 2011, 2019; Harmeling et al., 2017; Pansari & Kumar, 2017; Storbacka et al., 2016), there is insufficient research on how exactly to orchestrate or manage this engagement.

The *stabilization* phase of shaping strategies involves making the new or shaped operating environment more resilient by, for instance, institutionalizing supportive practices and norms, and stopping it unravelling (Flaig et al., 2021a; Storbacka & Nenonen, 2011). The institutionalization and legitimization aspects of shaping strategies are widely researched (Dolbec & Fischer, 2015; Humphreys, 2010; Scaraboto & Fischer, 2013; Slimane et al., 2019; Vargo et al., 2015). But how actors proactively maintain the new or shaped operating environment has largely escaped attention: Emerging evidence suggests it may occur through

deliberately non-collaborative means such as threats of exclusion or coercion (Baker & Nenonen, 2020; Breidbach & Tana, 2021; Flaig et al., 2021b).

Despite many “How” contributions taking an implicit or explicit process perspective, *the distinction between “strategy process” and “strategy as a practice”* (Whittington, 2007) is as nontrivial among shaping strategies as it is among other strategies. Since many scholars have applied practice theories to markets (Hietanen & Rokka, 2015; Kjellberg & Helgesson, 2017; Martin & Schouten, 2014), it is unsurprising that several studies conceptualize shaping strategies as institutional work (Baker et al., 2019; Kaartemo et al., 2020; Koskela-Huotari et al., 2016; Fehrer et al., 2020; Nenonen et al., 2019b). Like other research streams applying the institutional work perspective, there is no universally accepted list of the forms of institutional work available to actors pursuing shaping strategies (Kaartemo et al., 2020). Instead, many studies use the three institutional pillars (regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive; Scott, 2013) or the work’s purpose (creating, maintaining, and disrupting institutions; Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006) to categorize institutional work observed in shaping strategies. The various forms of maintenance work could especially help augment our understanding of strategies aimed at retaining the shape of markets or other systems. Furthermore, the spatial turn of social sciences suggests that spaces have agency in social practices (Warf & Arias, 2009). Yet rarely have researchers examined the spatial aspects of shaping strategies. As a rare exception, Holmes et al. (2021) probe the spatial dimensions of market-making practices and suggest the concept of “spatio-market practices”.

Even though scholars of shaping strategies acknowledge that the operating environment is subject to ongoing and overlapping efforts to shape and re-shape it (Araujo, 2007; Kjellberg & Helgesson, 2006), sparse research investigates the “ecology of shaping strategies”, namely *interactions between these multiple shaping efforts*. However, Geiger and

Kjellberg (2021) propose three ways shaping strategies may intertwine: sequential interrelation, mutual reinforcement, and interference.

7. What are the consequences of shaping?

If successful, the obvious consequence of shaping strategies is *a new or shaped operating environment*. However, as discussed under “What”, a further neat dichotomy of “new” meaning brand-new (formed) vs “shaped” (transformed) operating environments is often unforthcoming. Overlapping and multilevel social systems like markets seldom oblige by exhibiting a clear and complete shift of state. More often, shaping strategies generate bifurcations: A new or modified post-shaping system branches out and at least temporarily co-exists with – rather than wholesale replaces – the pre-shaping system (Azimont & Araujo, 2007; Diaz Ruiz & Makkar, 2021; Kjellberg & Olson, 2017; Rosa et al., 1999).

Managerially and theoretically, it is crucial to acknowledge *emergence as a key consequence of shaping strategies*. The creation of “new” markets has sometimes been described as emergence, especially if the process has been less intentionally directed and/or the focal actors have been entities other than firms (Hietanen & Rokka, 2015; Martin & Schouten, 2014). However, a systems theory perspective allows us to be more analytical about emergence (for early applications relevant to shaping strategies, see Ehret, 2013; Peters, 2016). Emergence can be defined as the advent of phenomena that arise from the interactions among system elements but are qualitatively different from, and not reducible to, those elements (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Deacon, 2006). Vargo et al. (2022) conceptualize four orders of emergence: the first leading to novel system elements, the second to novel behavioral patterns, the third to reproduced system properties, and the fourth to deliberately shaped system properties. Under that conceptualization, shaping strategies beget fourth-order emergence, requiring reflexive actors who are aware of the system and their role in

(re)producing it and able to envision alternative system states. We believe this conceptualization opens interesting avenues for researching the intended and especially unintended consequences of shaping strategies. Accordingly, we call for further work on how shaping strategies interact with lower orders of emergence.

The negative consequences of shaping strategies require *explicit ethical assessment*. They can spring from both intentional shaping and spontaneous, lower-order emergence, so intentionality is not a sufficient criterion to differentiate positive from negative outcomes (Cova et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2007; Tóth et al., 2022). Nascent research applying ethical or critical perspectives to shaping strategies has turned up, such as exclusion (Cova et al., 2021; Geiger & Gross, 2018), opportunism (Yngfalk, 2019), exploitation of power and/or information asymmetries (Mele & Russo Spena, 2021) and conflict (Mele et al., 2018). Despite these advances, better understanding of the ethics of shaping strategies is needed, not least because the object of shaping strategies, the operating environment, is ubiquitous.

8. Summary of the Special Issue Articles

In a recent editorial, Lindgreen and Di Benedetto (2017, p. 1) argue that IMM aims to serve as a “functional bridge between academic theory and practitioner applications, even as it maintains stringent standards for scientific rigor”. To do so in the context of shaping-strategies, this special issue offers parsimonious explanations that create a platform for managerial action (Nenonen et al., 2017). It contains work that focus on synthesizing current research streams related to shaping-strategies and/or providing a comprehensive and managerially applicable framework on the subject.

The eight papers included in the special issue consist of four empirical papers and four conceptual papers. In Table 2 we summarize the focus of the articles using the above developed structure: (1) what is being shaped, (2) why are shaping strategies pursued, (3) when is shaping done, (4) who is the shaper, (5) how is the shaping done, and (6) what are its consequences?

Table 2. Summary of Special Issue articles

Title	Purpose	Article focus					
		What	Why	When	Who	How	Consequences
<i>Innovation Intermediaries as Collaborators in Shaping Service Ecosystems: The Importance of Dynamic Capabilities</i>	... how do the roles and dynamic capabilities of innovation intermediaries contribute to shaping service ecosystems	•	•		•		
<i>Market-Shaping Roles - Exploring Actor Roles in the Shaping of the Swedish Market for Liquefied Gas</i>	... to provide further granularity to the systemic view of markets in order to better understand current market-shaping processes		•		•	•	
<i>Unintentionality in Market Shaping- A Multiple Case Study of Touring Exhibitions from New Zealand, Australia, and the UK</i>	... to explain how variances occur between the intentional and unintentional outcomes of market shaping			•		•	•
<i>Shaping Market Systems for Social Change in Emerging Economies</i>	... to understand how market systems are collectively shaped for social change in an emerging economy context	•	•		•		
<i>The Market-Shaping Potential of Crisis Management</i>	... how an organization's crisis management engages in purposive actions aimed at changing the market elements			•		•	
<i>Sense-based Perspective on Market Shaping: Theorizing Strategies for the Origination and Propagation of New Resource Linkages</i>	... how market-shaping actors originate new resource linkages, and how these actors propagate such new resource linkages					•	
<i>Contextual Agility Informing Market Shaping</i>	... to better grasp how firms do shape, and could shape, markets					•	
<i>Engagement-driven Institutionalization: Shaping Markets through Synchronizing Multiple Actors' Engagement Dispositions and Behaviors</i>	... how does collective engagement emerge and facilitate institutional change within market shaping			•		•	•

In the empirical paper *Innovation Intermediaries as Collaborators in Shaping Service Ecosystems: The Importance of Dynamic Capabilities*, Krithika Randhawa, Ralf Wilden and Melissa Akaka address the gap in our understanding of the roles and capabilities of market shapers and their wider service ecosystem intermediaries. Using data from multiple cases within a healthcare service ecosystem, they expand their exploration of market shaping beyond that of the focal actor perspective alone to include the many service providers that may act as supporters of innovation in the service ecosystem through configuring organizational resources and relationships, and through supporting ecosystem governance by adapting institutional arrangements. They provide insights into both the shaper and supporter roles innovation intermediaries undertake, acknowledging that they have a vital part to play not only in the stabilization of institutional arrangements but also in providing more innovative ecosystem configuration and governance opportunities. Specifically, they explore the market shaping capabilities of the wider ecosystem (rather than focal actors alone) as collaborators may offer a system-level perspective and may be able to sense opportunities for co-designing innovation at a macro, or ecosystem wide, level.

Market-Shaping Roles - Exploring Actor Roles in the Shaping of the Swedish Market for Liquefied Gas, by Alexander Flaig and Mikael Ottosson, is a longitudinal case study that follows the Swedish market for liquefied gas over three years. They maintain that previous work on understanding market-shaping roles and the heterogeneity of market actors have mostly been aggregated into overarching practices, processes, or activities. It remains unclear how the differences in market actors' market-shaping engagement translate back into specific roles. They discover that roles depend on the different levels in market-shaping engagement towards a focal market vision that ultimately relates to the disposition, behavior and influence displayed by the specific actors. Within this process they identify and delineate six market-

shaping roles: the Market Driver, Market Supporter, Market Missionary, Market Rival, Market, Catalyzer, and Market Detractor. The study makes three contributions to our understanding of market shaping. First, it provides six empirically derived market-shaping roles conceptualizations which give insights into the behavior of market actors in market shaping processes and enhances the understanding of actor-driven market-shaping. Second, it contributes to the actor engagement literature by investigating market-shaping processes through an actor engagement lens. Third, it reveals that roles are not only created through specific actions, expectations, or intentions, but are created and performed through a focal market actor's actions embedded in the context of a focal market vision and other market actors' behavior.

In an empirical paper, *Unintentionality in Market Shaping – A Multiple Case Study of Touring Exhibitions from New Zealand, Australia, and the UK*, Zsófia Tóth, Sergio Biggemann and Martin Williams examine the issue of unintentionality in market shaping with special regard to bifurcation points (where new structures and forms of order may emerge spontaneously), representational practices, and shared mental models. In the context of three case studies of touring museum exhibitions on indigenous cultures, they found that the intended outcomes of market shaping actions are potentially overshadowed by actualities that operate through feedback loops. These may reshape and redefine the role of an organization by broadening the market, bringing in new stakeholders, and creating new market segments - thus questioning the value elements of a market offering. They contribute to the market shaping debate by arguing that these inherent unintended occurrences - often not recognized and the result of prior and entrenched experiences – may hamper the development of alternative shared mental models. It is only when new parties and new resources are put in place that new shared mental models emerge, where unintended

occurrences have the ability to ‘shake up’ certain market practices, and also to help the stabilization of other market conditions (e.g., anti-racist practices).

Shaping Market Systems for Social Change in Emerging Economies, by Franziska Kullak, Julia Fehrer, Jonathan Baker, Herbert Woratschek and Joana Sam-Cobbah, is an empirical paper that examines how market systems are collectively shaped for social change in an emerging economy context. The perspective of markets they take is that they are complex and adaptive social systems – specifically social entrepreneurial ecosystems. Their work highlights the important role of collective action by actors striving for social change and demonstrates how a social entrepreneurial network can create a new market system that leads to improved social and societal well-being. They contribute to our understanding of market shaping by offering a holistic conceptualization of market systems for social change which sheds light on the complex interplay of bottom-up social entrepreneurial action, top-down government action, and the role of meso-level structures in shaping markets for social change in emerging economies. In support of this, they offer a two-stage framework comprising of five market-shaping patterns (combinations of institutional work types performed by one or more actors) that facilitate the formation of a market system for social change. This framework helps clarify the dynamics of market-shaping and presents a strategic viewpoint for practitioners, policymakers, and scholars to consider when aiming for systemic change in the direction of social purpose and ethical market practices. They stress that a market-systems perspective requires managers and social entrepreneurs to move from strategizing about their business to strategizing about the wider network in which they are embedded. Thus, collective social entrepreneurial activism will likely deliver better results than individual action. This consideration is especially important in emerging economies where social enterprises must compensate for government and market failures.

The Market-Shaping Potential of Crisis Management is a conceptual paper by Carsten Lund Pedersen and Thomas Ritter and makes two main contributions to the market-shaping literature. First, they introduce the paradox of “reactive market shaping,” which suggests that reactive crisis management is not meant to shape markets but may still do so. Second, they develop a conceptual framework that combines two dimensions and four managerial options: resilience (robustness and recovery) and responsiveness (ad hoc problem solving, and reconfiguration) from the crisis management and strategic management literatures respectively to explore how they can inform market-shaping opportunities. While resilience and responsiveness are reactive behaviors in light of a crisis, and market shaping is a proactive behavior aimed at developing a market into its future form, they contend that companies can leverage a crisis as a market-shaping opportunity and that the set of market shaping choices at their disposal is predicated upon their crisis management. They posit four main managerial implications of their conceptual framework. First, executives need to recognize the market-shaping potential of crisis management—what is done in response to a crisis may have long-term impacts on the market’s future functioning. Second, beyond their cognitive openness to engaging in market shaping and their readiness to do so, executives must analyze their own crisis-management options. Third, the four options are not only available to one’s own organization—competitors can also apply them. Fourth, customers may also initiate market shaping. Therefore, executives must monitor customers and their expectations for new exchanges and new standards that emerge from crisis-management initiatives.

Sense-based Perspective on Market Shaping: Theorizing Strategies for the Origination and Propagation of New Resource Linkages is a conceptual paper by Michael Kleinaltenkamp, Ingo Oswald Karpen and Moritz Jan Kleinaltenkamp. It builds on view that the meaning which market actors ascribe to resources defines their value as well as the

potential for and the value of new resource linkages. They argue that meaning is the unit of analysis upon which the potential and actual value of resources and their linkages ultimately rest. Thus, without meaning shaping there is no market shaping. They ask, how do market shaping capabilities actually become expressed in practice to shape markets. To address this question, they develop a novel sense-based perspective of sensemaking, sensegiving, and sensebreaking and delineate four generic strategies that market shapers may enact to originate and propagate new resource linkages and shape markets: inspirational, expansive, authoritative and suppressive. These origination and propagation strategies capture generic patterns of interaction that market shapers might employ to express their capabilities and attempt to shape markets in accordance with their preferences. Implications include managers putting more emphasis on the relationship that natural environments, technologies and emotions might have with the meaning processes determining new resource linkages. For researchers this new emphasis on embodiment provides a foundation for more holistic analyses of market shaping phenomena.

Another conceptual paper, *Contextual Agility Informing Market Shaping* by Anders Liljenberg, focuses on the aptitude of an organization to see what others do not see as a precursor to strategizing. The purpose of this research is to better grasp how firms do shape, and could shape, markets. He labels this aptitude contextual agility, defined as the prompt, responsive, and informed preparedness to act in relation to a group of interdependent market conditions. Contextual agility entails a reactive and unorthodox aspect of entrepreneurship which is anchored in creative market representations and decreases the risk of spending resources in vain on shaping strategies which do not resonate very well with how a market could be made sense of. Liljenberg maintains that the focus of market shaping lay in the agency of firms, his notion of contextual agility is concerned more with the readiness to act anchored in unique sensemaking geared at market opportunities. He recognizes that while the

two concepts are overlapping in the sense that contextual agility informs market shaping by complementing the strategic scaffold upon which agency is planned and executed, the contribution of contextual agility resides in its potential to inspire market shaping as representational practices are translated into exchange practices. Thus, allowing for considerations such as shaping effectiveness and efficiency.

Engagement-driven Institutionalization: Shaping Markets through Synchronizing Multiple Actors' Engagement Dispositions and Behaviors is a conceptual paper by Michael Kleinaltenkamp, Jodie Conduit, Carolin Plewa, Ingo Oswald Karpen and Elina Jaakkola, which seeks to address the lack of research on the mechanisms that facilitate the process of institutionalization in market shaping by specifically focusing on the role of engagement dispositions and behaviors in this process. They maintain that actor engagement can function as a catalyst for market shaping, as emerging dispositions and behaviors synchronize and diffuse through the network until they are collectively embraced and accepted by most actors. Their paper seeks explicitly to explain, using the theory of practice-driven institutionalism (the collective performance of institutions through situated, emergent and generative practices); (1) the mechanisms that drive institutional change within market shaping; and (2) the mechanisms through which collective engagement of various actors emerges for such institutional change. They develop a process model of engagement-driven institutionalization that consists of three stages: (1) the synchronization of collective dispositions and behaviors, (2) the development of temporal stability of these behaviors through self-reinforcing mechanisms resulting in practices, and (3) the ensuing institutional change for market shaping. Managerially, they propose that the model could be used in generating a joint understanding of the mechanisms that drive institutional change within market shaping and that this would build the foundation for a coherent and consistent implementation of activities required to progress the process and achieve the desired shaping of markets.

References

- Adner, R. (2012). *The wide lens: A new strategy for innovation*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Adner, R., & Kapoor, R. (2010). Value creation in innovation ecosystems: How the structure of technological interdependence affects firm performance in new technology generations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(3), 306-333.
- Alvarez, S. A. (2007). Entrepreneurial rents and the theory of the firm. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(3), 427-442.
- Aksoy, L., Banda, S., Harmeling, C., Keiningham, T. L., & Pansari, A. (2021). Marketing's role in multi-stakeholder engagement. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 39(2), 445-461.
- Araujo, L. (2007). Markets, market-making and marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 7(3), 211-226.
- Azimont, F., & Araujo, L. (2007). Category reviews as market-shaping events. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36(7), 849-860.
- Baker, J. J., & Nenonen, S. (2020). Collaborating to shape markets: Emergent collective market work. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 85, 240-253.
- Baker, J. J., Storbacka, K., & Brodie, R. J. (2019). Markets changing, changing markets: Institutional work as market shaping. *Marketing Theory*, 19(3), 301–328.
- Beckers, S. F., Van Doorn, J., & Verhoef, P. C. (2018). Good, better, engaged? The effect of company-initiated customer engagement behavior on shareholder value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46(3), 366-383.
- Beninger, S., & Francis, J. N. (2021). Collective market shaping by competitors and its contribution to market resilience. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 293-303.

- Biggemann, S., Kowalkowski, C., Maley, J., & Brege, S. (2013). Development and implementation of customer solutions: A study of process dynamics and market shaping. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(7), 1083-1092.
- Bourgeois III, L. J. (1980). Strategy and environment: A conceptual integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 25-39.
- Breidbach, C. F., & Tana, S. (2021). Betting on Bitcoin: How social collectives shape cryptocurrency markets. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 311-320.
- Brodie, R. J., Fehrer, J. A., Jaakkola, E., & Conduit, J. (2019). Actor engagement in networks: Defining the conceptual domain. *Journal of Service Research*, 22(2), 173-188.
- Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Jurić, B., & Ilić, A. (2011). Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 252-271.
- Burr, T. C. (2014). Market-widening: Shaping total market demand for French and American bicycles circa 1890. *Marketing Theory*, 14(1), 19-34.
- Capra, F. & Luisi, L. (2014). *The systems view of life: A unifying vision*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chiu, Y. C., Chen, B., Shyu, J. Z., & Tzeng, G. H. (2006). An evaluation model of new product launch strategy. *Technovation*, 26(11), 1244-1252.
- Coskuner-Balli, G., Pehlivan, E., & Üçok Hughes, M. (2021). Institutional work and brand strategy in the contested cannabis market. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 41(4), 663-674.
- Cova, B., Ivens, B. S., & Spencer, R. (2021). The ins and outs of market shaping: Exclusion as a darkside? *Journal of Business Research*, 124, 483-493.

- Cropper, S., & Bor, S. (2018). (Un) bounding the meta-organization: co-evolution and compositional dynamics of a health partnership. *Administrative Sciences*, 8(3), 42.
- D'Antone, S., Canning, L., Franklin-Johnson, E., & Spencer, R. (2017). Concerned innovation: The ebb and flow between market and society. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 64, 66-78.
- Deacon, T.W. (2006). Emergence: The hole at the Wheel's Hub. In Clayton, P. & Davies, P. (eds.) *The Re-Emergence of Emergence: The Emergentist Hypothesis from Science to Religion*, (pp. 111-150). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Debenedetti, A., Philippe, D., Chaney, D., & Humphreys, A. (2021). Maintaining legitimacy in contested mature markets through discursive strategies: The case of corporate environmentalism in the French automotive industry. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 92, 332-343.
- Dolbec, P. Y., & Fischer, E. (2015). Refashioning a field? Connected consumers and institutional dynamics in markets. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(6), 1447-1468.
- Dorobantu, S., Henisz, W. J., & Narthey, L. (2017). Not all sparks light a fire: Stakeholder and shareholder reactions to critical events in contested markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62(3), 561-597.
- Ehret, M. (2013). Emergence of business markets—A critical realist foundation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(3), 316-323.
- Fehrer, J. A., & Bove, L. L., (2022). Viewpoint: Shaping Resilient Service Ecosystems in Times of Crises – A Trans-Tasman Perspective. *Journal of Services Marketing*, in press

- Fehrer, J., Conduit, J., Plewa, C., Li, L. P., Jaakkola, E., & Alexander, M. (2020). Market shaping dynamics: interplay of actor engagement and institutional work. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 35(9), 1425-1439.
- Flaig, A. & Ottosson, M. (2022). Market-shaping roles – exploring actor roles in the shaping of the Swedish market for liquefied gas. *Industrial Marketing Management*, forthcoming.
- Flaig, A., Kindström, D., & Ottosson, M. (2021a). Market-shaping phases—a qualitative meta-analysis and conceptual framework. *AMS Review*, 11(3), 354-374.
- Flaig, A., Kindström, D., & Ottosson, M. (2021b). Market-shaping strategies: A conceptual framework for generating market outcomes. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 96, 254-266.
- Gavetti, G., Helfat, C. E., & Marengo, L. (2017). Searching, shaping, and the quest for superior performance. *Strategy Science*, 2(3), 194–209.
- Geiger, S., & Gross, N. (2018). Market failures and market framings: Can a market be transformed from the inside? *Organization Studies*, 39(10), 1357-1376.
- Geiger, S., & Kjellberg, H. (2021). Market mash ups: The process of combinatorial market innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 124, 445-457.
- Geiger, S., Harrison, D., Kjellberg, H., & Mallard, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Concerned markets: Economic ordering for multiple values*. Cheltenham: UK Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Georgallis, P., & Lee, B. (2020). Toward a theory of entry in moral markets: The role of social movements and organizational identity. *Strategic Organization*, 18(1), 50-74.
- Giddens A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Chicago, Ill: Polity Press.

- Giuliani, E., Tuan, A., & Calvimontes Cano, J. (2021). Creating Shared Value Meets Human Rights: A Sense-Making Perspective in Small-Scale Firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 173(3), 489-505.
- Gümüşay, A. A., & Reinecke, J. (2022). Researching for Desirable Futures: From Real Utopias to Imagining Alternatives. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(1), 236-242.
- Harmeling, C. M., Moffett, J. W., Arnold, M. J., & Carlson, B. D. (2017). Toward a theory of customer engagement marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(3), 312-335.
- Harrison, D., & Kjellberg, H. (2016). How users shape markets. *Marketing Theory*, 16(4), 445-468.
- Hawa, J., Baker, J., & Plewa, C. (2020). Composing markets: A framework of intentionality in market-shaping. *Journal of Business Research*, 121, 47–57.
- Helfat, C. E. (2021). What does firm shaping of markets really mean? *Strategy Science*, 6(4), 360-370.
- Henneberg, S. C., Mouzas, S., & Naudé, P. (2006). Network pictures: Concepts and representations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(3/4), 408–429.
- Hietanen, J., & Rokka, J. (2015). Market practices in countercultural market emergence. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(9/10), 1563-1588.
- Holbrook, M. B. (2003). Adventures in complexity: An essay on dynamic open complex adaptive systems, butterfly effects, self-organizing order, coevolution, the ecological perspective, fitness landscapes, market spaces, emergent beauty at the edge of chaos, and all that jazz. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2003(6), 1-57.

- Holloway, S. S., & Sebastiao, H. (2010). The role of business model innovation in the emergence of markets: a missing dimension of entrepreneurial strategy? *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, 6(4), 86-100.
- Holmes, T., Fernandes, J., & Palo, T. (2021). ‘Spatio-market practices’: conceptualising the always spatial dimensions of market making practices. *AMS Review*, 11(3), 316-335.
- Hulland, J. (2020). Conceptual review papers: revisiting existing research to develop and refine theory. *AMS Review*, 10(1), 27-35.
- 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.
- Iansiti, M., & Levien, R. (2004). *The keystone advantage: what the new dynamics of business ecosystems mean for strategy, innovation, and sustainability*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26.
- Jaworski, B. J., Kohli, A. K., & Sarin, S. (2020). Driving markets: A typology and a seven-step approach. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 91, 142-151.
- Johnson, C., Dowd, T. J., & Ridgeway, C. L. (2006). Legitimacy as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32(1), 53–78.
- Kaartemo, V., Nenonen, S., & Windahl, C. (2020). Institutional work by market-shaping public actors. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 30(4-5), 401-435.

- Katila, R., & Chen, E. L. (2008). Effects of search timing on innovation: The value of not being in sync with rivals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(4), 593-625.
- Keyhani, M., Lévesque, M., & Madhok, A. (2015). Toward a theory of entrepreneurial rents: A simulation of the market process. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(1), 76–96.
- Khan, F. R., Munir, K. A., & Willmott, H. (2007). A dark side of institutional entrepreneurship: Soccer balls, child labor and postcolonial impoverishment. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1055–1077.
- Kindström, D., Ottosson, M., & Carlborg, P. (2018). Unraveling firm-level activities for shaping markets. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 68, 36-45.
- Kjellberg, H., & Helgesson, C. F. (2006). Multiple versions of markets: Multiplicity and performativity in market practice. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(7), 839-855.
- Kjellberg, H., & Olson, D. (2017). Joint markets: How adjacent markets influence the formation of regulated markets. *Marketing Theory*, 17(1), 95-123.
- Kleinaltenkamp, M., Conduit, J., Plewa, C., Karpen, I. O., & Jaakkola, E. (2021). Engagement-driven institutionalization in market shaping: Synchronizing and stabilizing collective engagement. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 99, 69–78.
- Kleinaltenkamp, M., Karpen, I. O., & Kleinaltenkamp, M. J. (2022). A sense-based perspective on market shaping: Theorizing strategies for the origination and propagation of new resource linkages. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 100, 145-156.
- Koistinen, K., & Teerikangas, S. (2021). The debate if agents matter vs. the system matters in sustainability transitions—A review of the literature. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2821.

- Koskela-Huotari, K., Edvardsson, B., Jonas, J. M., Sörhammar, D., & Witell, L. (2016). Innovation in service ecosystems—Breaking, making, and maintaining institutionalized rules of resource integration. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 2964-2971.
- Kullak, F. S., Fehrer, J. A., Baker, J. J., Woratschek, H., & Sam-Cobbah, J. (2022). Shaping market systems for social change in emerging economies. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 100, 19-35.
- Kumar, N., Scheer, L., & Kotler, P. (2000). From market driven to market driving. *European Management Journal*, 18(2), 129–142.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (2nd Ed., p. 215-254). London, UK: Sage.
- Lee, B. H., Struben, J., & Bingham, C. B. (2018). Collective action and market formation: An integrative framework. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(1), 242-266.
- Levinthal, D. A. (2020). Editorial Introduction: The special issue on strategies for market creation and transformation. *Strategy Science*, 5(3), 147-148.
- Liljenberg, A. (2022). Contextual agility informing market shaping. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 102, 229-239.
- Lindgreen, A., & Di Benedetto, A. (2017). The future of Industrial Marketing Management. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 67, 1–4.
- Luksha, P. (2008). Niche construction: The process of opportunity creation in the environment. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2(4), 269-283.
- Maciel, A. F., & Fischer, E. (2020). Collaborative market driving: How peer firms can develop markets through collective action. *Journal of Marketing*, 84(5), 41-59.

- MacInnis, D. J. (2011). A framework for conceptual contributions in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 136-154.
- MacKenzie, D. (2004). The big, bad wolf and the rational market: portfolio insurance, the 1987 crash and the performativity of economics. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 303-334.
- Markides, C. C., & Geroski, P. A. (2004). *Fast second: How smart companies bypass radical innovation to enter and dominate new markets*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Martin, D. M., & Schouten, J. W. (2014). Consumption-driven market emergence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(5), 855-870.
- Mason, K., Friesl, M., & Ford, C. J. (2017). Managing to make markets: Marketization and the conceptualization work of strategic nets in the life science sector. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 67, 52–69.
- Mazzucato, M. (2016). From market fixing to market-creating: a new framework for innovation policy. *Industry and Innovation*, 23(2), 140-156.
- Mazzucato, M. (2022). Financing the green new deal. *Nature Sustainability*, 5(2), 93-94.
- Mazzucato, M., & Ryan-Collins, J. (2022). Putting value creation back into “public value”: from market-fixing to market-shaping. *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, DOI: 10.1080/17487870.2022.2053537.
- McIntyre, D. P., & Srinivasan, A. (2017). Networks, platforms, and strategy: Emerging views and next steps. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1), 141-160.
- Mele, C., & Spina, T. R. (2021). The dark side of market practices: a concerned view of diesel gate in the automotive market system. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 41(2), 332-355.

- Mele, C., Nenonen, S., Pels, J., Storbacka, K., Nariswari, A., & Kaartemo, V. (2018). Shaping service ecosystems: Exploring the dark side of agency. *Journal of Service Management*, 29(4), 521-545.
- Mele, C., Pels, J., & Storbacka, K. (2015). A holistic market conceptualization. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 100-114.
- Moen, M., Agarwal, R., & Shah, S. (2020). Building industries by building knowledge: Uncertainty reduction over industry milestones. *Strategy Science*, 5(3), 147-291.
- Möller, K. (2010). Sense-making and agenda construction in emerging business networks – how to direct radical innovation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(3), 361-371.
- Möller, K., Nenonen, S., & Storbacka, K. (2020). Networks, ecosystems, fields, market systems? Making sense of the business environment. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 90, 380-399.
- Molner, S., Prabhu, J. C., & Yadav, M. S. (2019). Lost in a universe of markets: Toward a theory of market scoping for early-stage technologies. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(2), 37-61.
- Mountford, N., & Geiger, S. (2020). Duos and duels in field evolution: How governments and interorganizational networks relate. *Organization Studies*, 41(4), 499-522.
- Narver, J. C., Slater, S. F., & MacLachlan, D. L. (2004). Responsive and proactive market orientation and new-product success. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(5), 334-347.
- Nenonen, S., Brodie, R. J., Storbacka, K., & Peters, L. D. (2017). Theorizing with managers: how to achieve both academic rigor and practical relevance? *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(7/8), 1130–1152.

- 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.
- Nenonen, S., & Storbacka, K. (2020a). Don't adapt, shape! Use the crisis to shape your minimum viable system—And the wider market. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 88, 265-271.
- Nenonen, S., & Storbacka, K. (2021). Market-shaping: navigating multiple theoretical perspectives. *AMS Review*, 11(3), 336-353.
- Nenonen, S., Storbacka, K., & Frethey-Bentham, C. (2019b). Is your industrial marketing work working? Developing a composite index of market change. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 80, 251-265.
- Nenonen, S., Storbacka, K., & Windahl, C. (2019a). Capabilities for market-shaping: Triggering and facilitating increased value creation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 47(4), 617-639.
- Nenonen, S., Storbacka, K., Sklyar, A., Frow, P., & Payne, A. (2020). Value propositions as market-shaping devices: A qualitative comparative analysis. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 87, 276-290.
- Nguyen, A., & Özçaglar-Toulouse, N. (2021). Nation branding as a market-shaping strategy: A study on South Korean products in Vietnam. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 131-144.
- Novalia, W., Brown, R. R., Rogers, B. C., & Bos, J. J. (2018). A diagnostic framework of strategic agency: Operationalising complex interrelationships of agency and institutions in the urban infrastructure sector. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 83, 11-21.

- Ozcan, P., & Hannah, D. (2020). Forced ecosystems and digital stepchildren: Reconfiguring advertising suppliers to realize disruptive social media technology. *Strategy Science*, 5(3), 193-217.
- Ozcan, P., & Santos, F. M. (2015). The market that never was: Turf wars and failed alliances in mobile payments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(10), 1486-1512.
- Palmatier, R. W., Houston, M. B., & Hulland, J. (2018). Review articles: Purpose, process, and structure. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46(1), 1-5.
- Pansari, A., & Kumar, V. (2017). Customer engagement: the construct, antecedents, and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(3), 294-311.
- Patvardhan, S., & Ramachandran, J. (2020). Shaping the future: Strategy making as artificial evolution. *Organization Science*, 31(3), 671–697.
- Pedersen, C. L., & Ritter, T. (2022). The market-shaping potential of a crisis. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 103, 146-153.
- Peters, L. D. (2016). Heteropathic versus homopathic resource integration and value co-creation in service ecosystems. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 2999-3007.
- Peters, L. D., Nenonen, S., Polese, F., Frow, P., & Payne, A. (2020). Viability mechanisms in market emergence: Prerequisites for market-shaping. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 35(9), 1403-1412.
- Poblete, L., Kadefors, A., Rådberg, K. K., & Gluch, P. (2022). Temporality, temporariness and keystone actor capabilities in innovation ecosystems. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 102, 301-310.
- Pontikes, E. G., & Rindova, V. P. (2020). Shaping markets through temporal, constructive, and interactive agency. *Strategy Science*, 5(3), 149-159.

- Posen, H. E., & Chen, J. S. (2013). An advantage of newness: Vicarious learning despite limited absorptive capacity. *Organization Science*, 24(6), 1701-1716.
- Posen, H. E., Lee, J., & Yi, S. (2013). The power of imperfect imitation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(2), 149-164.
- Prokopovych, B. (2015). The emergence of new markets for environmental services: The role of US shellfish industry associations. *Organization & Environment*, 28(4), 414-435.
- Randhawa, K., Wilden, R., & Akaka, M. A. (2022). Innovation intermediaries as collaborators in shaping service ecosystems: The importance of dynamic capabilities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 103, 183-197.
- Rajwani, T., Lawton, T., & Phillips, N. (2015). The “Voice of Industry”: Why management researchers should pay more attention to trade associations. *Strategic Organization*, 13(3), 224-232.
- Rosa, J. A., Porac, J. F., Runser-Spanjol, J., & Saxon, M. S. (1999). Sociocognitive dynamics in a product market. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(4_suppl1), 64-77.
- Ruiz, C. D., & Makkar, M. (2021). Market bifurcations in board sports: How consumers shape markets through boundary work. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 38-50.
- Scaraboto, D., & Fischer, E. (2013). Frustrated fatshionistas: An institutional theory perspective on consumer quests for greater choice in mainstream markets. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(6), 1234-1257.
- Scott, J., & Marshall, G. (Eds.). (2009). *A dictionary of sociology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, R.W. (2013). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Sheth, J. N., & Parvatiyar, A. (2021). Sustainable marketing: Market-driving, not market-driven. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 41(1), 150-165.
- Slimane, K. B., Chaney, D., Humphreys, A., & Leca, B. (2019). Bringing institutional theory to marketing: Taking stock and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, 105, 389-394.
- Sprong, N., Driessen, P. H., Hillebrand, B., & Molner, S. (2021). Market innovation: A literature review and new research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, 123, 450-462.
- Stathakopoulos, V., Kottikas, K. G., Painesis, G., Theodorakis, I. G., & Kottika, E. (2022). Why shape a market? Empirical evidence on the prominent firm-level and market-level outcomes of market-driving strategy. *Journal of Business Research*, 139, 1240-1254.
- Storbacka, K. (2019). Actor engagement, value creation and market innovation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 80, 4–10.
- Storbacka, K., Brodie, R. J., Böhmman, T., Maglio, P. P., & Nenonen, S. (2016). Actor engagement as a microfoundation for value co-creation. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 3008-3017.
- Storbacka, K., & Nenonen, S. (2011). Scripting markets: From value propositions to market propositions. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(2), 255-266.
- Storbacka, K., & Nenonen, S. (2015). Learning with the market: Facilitating market innovation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 44, 73-82.
- Struben, J., Lee, B. H., & Bingham, C. B. (2020). Collective action problems and resource allocation during market formation. *Strategy Science*, 5(3), 245-270.

- Tang, T. Y., Zhang, S. K., & Peng, J. (2021). The value of marketing innovation: Market-driven versus market-driving. *Journal of Business Research*, 126, 88-98.
- Tantalo, C., & Priem, R. L. (2016). Value creation through stakeholder synergy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(2), 314–329.
- Tarnovskaya, V., Hånell, S. M., & Tolstoy, D. (2022). Proactive Corporate Sustainability via Social Innovation—A Case Study of the Hennes & Mauritz Grand Challenge in Bangladesh. *Sustainability*, 14(2), 599.
- Tóth, Z., Biggemann, S., & Williams, M. (2022). Unintentionality in market shaping—A multiple case study of touring exhibitions from New Zealand, Australia, and the United Kingdom. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 103, 117-129.
- Ulkuniemi, P., Araujo, L., & Tähtinen, J. (2015). Purchasing as market-shaping: The case of component-based software engineering. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 44, 54-62.
- Van Vuuren, J., & Wörgötter, N. (2013). Market driving behaviour in organisations: Antecedents and outcomes. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 16(2), 115–141.
- Vargo, S. L., Koskela-Huotari, K., Baron, S., Edvardsson, B., Reynoso, J., & Colurcio, M. (2017). A systems perspective on markets—Toward a research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 79, 260-268.
- Vargo, S. L., Wieland, H., & Akaka, M. A. (2015). Innovation through institutionalization: A service ecosystems perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 44, 63-72.
- Vargo, S.L., Peters, L., Kjellberg, H., Koskela-Huotari, K., Nenonen, S., Polese, F., Salerno, D. and Vaughan, C. (2022). Emergence in marketing: An institutional and ecosystem

framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*,

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-022-00849-8>.

Vink, J., Koskela-Huotari, K., Tronvoll, B., Edvardsson, B., & Wetter-Edman, K. (2021).

Service ecosystem design: Propositions, process model, and future research agenda.

Journal of Service Research, 24(2), 168-186.

Warf, B. & Arias, S. (2009) *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. New York,

NY: Routledge.

Werbelloff, L., Brown, R. R., & Loorbach, D. (2016). Pathways of system transformation:

Strategic agency to support regime change. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 66, 119-128.

Whittington, R. (2007). Strategy practice and strategy process: family differences and the

sociological eye. *Organization Studies*, 28(10), 1575-1586.

Windahl, C., Karpen, I., & Wright, M. (2020). Strategic design: orchestrating and leveraging

market-shaping capabilities. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 35(9), 1413-1424.

Yngfalk, C. (2019). Subverting sustainability: market maintenance work and the reproduction

of corporate irresponsibility. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 35(17-18), 1563-1583.

Zahra, S. A., & Nambisan, S. (2012). Entrepreneurship and strategic thinking in business

ecosystems. *Business Horizons*, 55(3), 219-229.