1. Unpacking researchers’ creativity and imagination in grounded theorizing: An exemplar from IS research. Marlei Pozzebon, Maira Petrini, Rodrigo Bandeira de Mello, Lionel Garreau. *Information and Organization*, 21(4): 177-193. **Abstract:** Although interest in the use of grounded theory methods has been increasing over the last decade, Urquhart, Lehmann, and Myers (2010) take note of the criticism that, in fact, such use has not yet produced higher levels of theory development in IS research. Along these lines, the current essay intends to make two main contributions. The first is to respond to the recent call for more studies developing grounded theorizing in IS research by providing a detailed description of the application of grounded theory methods in an emergent research area that combines IS and sustainability. The second, to extend current interpretations of grounded theory’s basic characteristics by focusing on one important element: researchers’ creativity. We argue that the role of researchers’ creativity and imagination in the implementation of grounded theory methods has rarely been emphasized and should be the subject of further reflection. Although imagination is, from our perspective, inherent and crucial to any cognitive or intellectual process, the fact of being frequently neglected in IS research precludes its mobilization as a more purposeful influence in the process of building new theories.

2. Who decides the shape of product markets? The knowledge institutions that name and categorise new technologies. Neil Pollock, Robin Williams. *Information and Organization*, 21(4): 194-217. **Abstract:** We consider naming and categorization practises within the information technology (IT) arena. In particular, with how certain terminologies are able to colonise wide areas of activity and endure for relatively long periods of time, despite the diversity and incremental evolution of individual technical instances. This raises the question as to who decides whether or not a particular vendor technology is part of a product category. Who decides the boundaries around a technology nomenclature? Existing Information Systems scholarship has tended to present terminologies as shaped by wide communities of players but this does not capture how particular kinds of knowledge institutions have emerged in recent year to police the confines of technological fields. The paper follows the work of one such group of experts—the industry analyst firm Gartner Inc.—and discusses their current and past role in the evolution of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software. We show how they make regular (but not always successful) ‘naming interventions’ within the IT domain and how
they attempt to regulate the boundaries that they and others have created through episodes of 'categorisation work'. These experts not only attempt to exercise control over a terminology but also the interpretation of that name. Our arguments are informed by ethnographic observations carried out on the eve of the contemporary CRM boom and interviews conducted more recently as part of an ongoing investigation into industry analysts. The paper bridges a number of disparate bodies of literature from Information Systems, Economic Sociology, the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge, and Science and Technology Studies.