Americanization and the Development of Management Studies in Canada

By

Kristene E. Coller

A Dissertation Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Business Administration

June 25, 2021, Halifax, Nova Scotia

© Kristine E. Coller, 2021

Approved: Jean Helms Mills, PhD.
Supervisor
Professor Emerita, Saint Mary's University

Approved: Albert Mills, PhD.
Committee Member
Professor Emerita, Saint Mary's University

Approved: Trish Genoe-McLaren, PhD.
Committee Member
Associate Dean, Wilfrid Laurier University

Approved: Jason Russell, PhD.
External Examiner
Associate Professor, Empire State College

Date: June 25, 2021

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my loving and supportive family- we have been on an adventure together that has taken us from one end of the country to the other and on many ups and downs with our health. Ryan, thank you for supporting my dream of pursuing a PhD and being there to pick up the pieces as I worked to complete the dissertation. Thank you to my children Aiden and Devin. This journey began when you were very young, and I hope that if you have learned anything it's that with hard work, sacrifice, and perseverance that you can accomplish whatever you put your mind to.

I greatly appreciate my parents who have always been supportive of my dreams and encouraged (and sometimes pushed) me to accomplish and do more. Thank you to my sisters Nicole and Shannon who, through their library connections, were able to help me with my obscure information requests and editing questions. Thank you, Shannon, for stepping up to help last minute to read through the dissertation. I recognize the time and sacrifice involved in helping me. Thank also to my Grandma. When others told me I was "crazy", and "selfish" to "give up" my family responsibilities to pursue a PhD, you told me I was strong and courageous. Even though you are no longer with us, your words continue to encourage me and have been a source of support as I have fought to complete this program.

I would like to acknowledge the support of Rhonda Dever, Ryan MacNeil, Corinne McNally, Danielle Mercer, Ken Hudson, and Michelle Thomason who have helped make this journey worthwhile. I am so grateful to have each of you in my life throughout this process. The class discussions, regular Skype calls (in the old days), emails and phone calls were a treasured part of this process and I look forward to working on some of the many projects we talked about. Rhonda, I would specifically like to thank you for your pep talks. I can say that without our

regular phone calls and texts I would not have gotten through the program and it certainly wouldn't have been as much fun.

To Jean, Albert and Trish, thank you for your tireless work and comments throughout the formation of this body of work. Your comments and suggestions served to create a document that is far better than what I could have ever created without your guidance and support. I know that I am not always quick to grasp what you were asking of me and I appreciate your patience and suggestions throughout what ended up being a longer timeframe than I had anticipated. Your mentorship and support throughout the ups and downs of life and a PhD are something that I will take forward with me throughout my career. I would also like to thank Jason Russell for his thoughtful comments on the dissertation and questions during the examination process.

Thank you also to the SMK research group (Gabie Durepos, Albert Mills, Jean Helms Mills, Trish McLaren, Amy Thurlow, Terry Weatherbee). I remain in awe of your talent, scholarship, and kindness. You may not realize it, but each of you have been an inspiration to me and I am so lucky to have had the opportunity to learn from and work with each of you.

Although I had always wanted to pursue a PhD, this journey began because of you, Mary Runté. In a short conversation after an evening of teaching you told me about the Saint Mary's program and the unique experience offered there. You support has been unwavering and I am so grateful to have your guidance as I navigate the opportunities in academia.

I would also like to thank EssentialEdits.ca for completing the copy editing. Specifically, I would like to thank Robert Runté for taking the time to highlight the rules of APA formatting and the interest he showed in the material.

As these lengthy acknowledgements suggest, the process of completing a PhD did not occur in insolation. Each individual mentioned above, and many others not listed here, reflect an extensive Actor-Network without whom the body of work that follows could not have happened.

Abstract

Americanization and the Development of Management Studies in Canada

by Kristene E. Coller

Abstract: Using ANTi-History this dissertation sets out to understand the development of management studies in a Canadian context. The dissertation traces 18 human scholars by analyzing Administrative Sciences Association of Canada (ASAC) conference papers and Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences (CJAS) journal articles to explore how actor networks come to develop a model of management studies. Understanding how management studies has seemingly come to represent American values and interests is important to surface other accounts of management studies. The surfacing of other accounts using an amodernist approach revealed the tensions that have existed in Canada between what has come to be seen as 'universal' or 'scientific knowledge' and the importance of providing a venue to protect Canadian identity and scholarship. By examining the actions of the 18 actors across conference and journal articles, analysis reveals how management studies in Canada was influenced by and founded upon American values and traditions.

[June 25, 2021]

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

ANT – Actor Network Theory

AOM – Academy of Management

ASAC – Administrative Sciences Association of Canada

CFDMAS- Canadian Federation of Deans of Management and Administrative Sciences

CJAS – Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences

HEC – Ecole des hautes etudes commerciales de Montreal

IB – International Business

MBA – Master of Business Administration

OB – Organizational Behaviour

SSHRC – Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

SMU – Saint Mary's University

US – United States

Preface

When I was in university completing a Bachelor of Arts degree, I took a number of sociology classes. One class on material culture involved looking for clues in objects that would tell the researcher more about the life and times of the previous owners of the object. One of the assignments for this class was to conduct an interview with someone on a number of given topics. The topic I chose involved interviewing my Grandpa about his experiences on the family farm in Italy. He recounted stories of taking wine in a flask out to the fields with a piece of bread and sausage and walking miles to the city on the weekends to the city house. The conversation eventually turned to Mussolini and the war. This is one of the first lessons I had in how history can be different things to different people, how historical "truths" can be chosen to carefully construct a story and the plurality of history.

I had grown up hearing about the terrible things Mussolini was responsible for. My understanding of Mussolini came from North American textbooks, written by the "winners" of the war. My Grandpa on the other hand told a story where Mussolini was loved by his people and that he cared for them by making sure school age children were fed.

My Dad and I listened to the story with our Canadian perspectives. We both grew up in Canada, he with strong Italian influences and me listening to my Dad but being educated differently. We occupied different times and space and this influenced our understanding of the implications of what we were being told. Try as hard as we might, my Dad and I could never truly know what it was like to live under a dictatorship—we are unable to go back in time, and even then, we would still see things through our contemporary Canadian perspective.

But even this retrospective account, with faded memories of time and age were further obscured by a language barrier. My Dad had to act as translator, much as historians are required to translate from a different time where words and events can often mean different things. Although my Grandpa spoke some English, he was more comfortable speaking Italian. English, however, was more comfortable for my Dad, whose Italian was broken and limited. This highlights a representation of the past where my Dad acted as a translator interpreting what my Grandpa (primary source) said. My act of completing a class assignment was based on my interpretation (or story) of the interpretation of my Grandpa's version of events.

This short personal story highlights some of the problems with coming to understand history. There are many perspectives and different accounts from which to construct an understanding of the social, political, economic considerations of the time. The different accounts addressed the perspectives provided by North American textbooks, the authors who wrote those textbooks, network broadcasts and historians, but there are also the perspectives of Italian and European nations with their own understanding and cultural assumptions. Each account paints a different picture from the other. They are each distinct actors with a unique background and vested interest in the story. As a result of these interests, certain pieces of a story can be chosen to support the perspective of the storyteller. The purpose of this dissertation is to recognize the "human-non-human relationships" (Mills & Helms Mills, 2018, p. 42) and their impact on our understanding of management knowledge.

Regrettably, I have forgotten much of the story shared by my Grandpa but the impact this conversation had on my early adulthood has not been lost on me. It continues to shape my thoughts on history (alongside other experiences) and the academic journey that I am now on.

Chapter 1: Mirror, mirror on the wall

"The most valid and compelling argument for Canadian studies is the importance of self-knowledge, the need to know and to understand ourselves: who we are; where we are in time and space; where we have been; where we are going; what we possess; what our responsibilities are to ourselves and to others." (Symons, 1978, p. 12)

Over time there has been a growing number of management scholars (Gantman, Yousfi, & Alcadipani, 2015; Usdiken, 2004) questioning the assumption of "universal" knowledge and identity underlying the development of management theory. A good part of that concern has focussed on the "Americanization" of management theory, which equates US-based studies with universal knowledge (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Elteren, 2006; Kieser, 2004; Symons, 1978), across various national contexts, including Canada (Coller, McNally & Mills, 2015; Foster, Helms Mills, & Mills, 2014; McLaren, Mills & Weatherbee, 2015; McLaren & Mills, 2013, 2015; McQuarrie, 2005; Russell, 2015, 2019, 2021; Symons, 1978;). Nonetheless, while there has been considerable discussion illustrating examples of "Americanization" there has been little-in-depth study of how the Americanization of management studies takes hold across national boundaries. This dissertation sets out to understand some of the processes through which the "Americanization" of management studies (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Elteren, 2006; Kieser, 2004; Symons, 1978) has occurred, specifically in Canada.

Thus, this dissertation explores the Americanization of management studies through an examination of Canadian scholarship and identity (Coller, McNally & Mills, 2015). The dissertation will be developed through exploration of selected human (e.g., scholars) and non-

human (e.g., journals) actors (Latour, 2005), which will include Canadian scholars, conferences, and journal articles. Specifically, the study of Americanization of management studies in Canada will focus on the conference proceedings of *The Administrative Sciences Association of Canada* (ASAC) and articles published in the *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* (CJAS). These elements will examine the processes involved in producing "management knowledge". ASAC is a national management association that holds an annual conference and publishes a journal – CJAS. CJAS is an academic peer-reviewed journal that was founded by ASAC and continues to be affiliated with it. Understanding the development of management studies is important to recognize how our assumptions and biases influence the processes involved in the creation of management knowledge and to decenter prevailing accounts.

The focus is not new and, as the opening quote above indicates, the debates and concerns around the issue stretch back almost fifty years to the Symons Report. The title of the report provides an important clue to the concerns at the time – namely, "To know ourselves: The report of the Commission on Canadian Studies" (Symons, 1978). The report highlighted a challenge regarding the nature of knowledge as "scientific." Scientific knowledge is viewed as a neutral and value-free way to explain links between observed phenomena to build on an existing body of knowledge (Johnson & Duberley, 2000). As such, scientific knowledge is often viewed as universal and objective, building upon theoretical foundations that provide the "frameworks beyond which one must not stray" (Rorty, 1979, p. 315). In the process of making scientific knowledge objective, the framework within which knowledge is realized is influenced by "taken-for-granted assumptions" and deeply held values and beliefs (Johnson & Duberley, 2000, p. 7) that shift our understanding of what "knowledge" is. Thus "scientific knowledge" has come to be viewed as "universal" or generalized models void of context (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006). When

knowledge is viewed as a science, and therefore universal, there is no relationship between one's

nationality and the type of knowledge produced (Cormier, 2004, p. 29). Kieser (2004) has argued

that generalized models of knowledge have shifted from being universal to represent values and

traditions that are predominantly American (Kieser, 2004). These predominantly American

accounts of management knowledge have arguably resulted in the marginalization of other

accounts of knowledge and have implications for scholarship and identity within the academy.

Hiller and Luzio (2001), for example, argue that the universalist view renders the idea of

Canadian content as "inconsequential." Similarly, Papadopoulos and Rosson (1999) argue that

universal thinking has encouraged Canadian researchers to "follow closed system models, be

guided by American thinking..." (p. 78). In Canada, concerns over following American models

resulted in a movement to protect issues of Canadian identity and sovereignty (Cormier, 2005;

Nosal, 2000) and has influenced Canadian (and other non-American) accounts of history in the

arts (Edwardson, 2008), media (Collins, 2000; MacDonald, 2009) and the socialization of

Canadians (Cormier, 2004) and has extended into management theory and the absence of any

notable Canadian studies (Coller et al., 2015; Cooke, 1999; Kieser, 2004; McLaren & Mills,

2015; Wanderley & Faria, 2012).

To understand knowledge production (how ideas and practices become received as

knowledge), I draw on the sociology of knowledge (SoK) literature—specifically Actor Network

Theory (ANT; Latour, 2005)—to understand academic knowledge production (Latour &

Woolgar, 1979). ANT encourages the researcher to follow the human and non-human actors

whose various activities and interactions come to constitute ways of viewing specific accounts of

academia. Durepos and Mills (2011) have strengthened ANT by showing that history, or the

past-as-history (Munslow, 2010), also plays a role as a critical actor in the development of

knowledge. To that end, they have developed the ANTi-History (Durepos & Mills, 2011)

method, which, on one hand, explores how historical accounts are produced through networks of

actors and, on the other hand, how historical accounts serve as "non-corporeal actants" (Hartt,

2013) in producing extant knowledge. For example, in the first case ANTi-History has been used

to reveal how specific corporate histories have been produced through a series of actor

networked activities (Durepos, Mills & Helms Mills, 2008; Deal, Mills, Helms Mills & Durepos

(2019) and, in the second case, ANTi-History has been used to identify how history has been

used to explain the importance and legitimacy of an organization (Myrick, Helms Mills & Mills,

2013). Both foci are important aspects of my research.

Thus, I draw on ANTi-History to (a) explore how specific actor-networks come to

develop histories of the field of management studies (e.g., Wren & Bedeian, 2009), (b) how

specific histories of the past are drawn upon to legitimize organizational practices (e.g., Myrick

et al., 2013) and (c) how both of these forms of networked activities come together in places,

where a given history serves to inform extant understandings which, in turn, reinforce specific

notions of the past (e.g., Koontz, 1962). An example of the latter case is the influence of

Koontz's (1962) notion of schools of management theory. Koontz (1962) drew on selected

histories of the field of management, which then served to reinforce selected aspects of those

selected histories that, in the process, produced schools of management thought. As a result,

disparate activities around the notion of Human Relations were produced as an important school

of thought that, in turn, solidified certain activities (e.g., scientific management, human relations,

etc.) as historically situated entities (Foster, Mills & Weatherbee, 2014). It also served to ignore

other potential schools of thought that focussed on not-for-profit management thinking (Mills,

Weatherbee, Foster & Helms Mills, 2015).

ANTi-History is an amodern approach to history. An amodern approach facilitates the

surfacing of processes involved in producing knowledge (Jacques & Durepos, 2015) including

the human (e.g., management scholars) and non-human (e.g., journal articles) actors that shape

what comes to be seen as management knowledge in Canadian business schools. Actors provide

the opportunity to record the social elements involved in producing knowledge through the traces

that are left behind (i.e., journal articles; Latour, 2005). Following human and non-human actors

helps surface the social processes that are normally invisible during the production of

management knowledge. Given that the goal is to surface the assumptions and biases that

accompany knowledge, multiple actors will be investigated to understand how the

Americanization of (management) knowledge has occurred in a Canadian context (Symons,

1978). Following multiple actors across ASAC conference and CJAS journal articles will help

understand the assumptions and biases in existing models of management and recognize how

knowledge has shifted to fit prevailing philosophies (i.e., Americanized models).

The remainder of this chapter will outline my motivation for studying this phenomenon,

the implications that following American models has had on our understanding of what

management knowledge is, and how ANTi-History will be used to analyze ASAC and CJAS to

surface the processes through which management studies has developed in Canada.

Motivations

My interest in this topic initially came from involvement in a history project at Saint

Mary's University. The project, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

(SSHRC), explored how management knowledge is developed and the implications this has on

issues related to Canadian identity, gender, and management education[1]. As I began researching

archival data compiled by the primary investigators on the SSHRC grant, it came as a surprise to

me that over the past forty years, questions and concerns regarding the implications of

generalized models of knowledge have been raised consistently among scholars within Canada

(Cormier, 2005; Coller et al., 2015; Symons, 1978; Zur-Muehlen, 1979) and worldwide

(Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012; Engwall, 2004; Gantman et al., 2015; Kieser, 2004; Tiratsoo, 2004;

Usdiken, 2004; Usdiken & Wasti, 2009). Very little is understood about the conditions and

processes through which these models of management have been developed. To understand the

impact that the apparent Americanization of post secondary education in Canada has had on the

knowledge to which students are exposed, the Federal government commissioned a study in the

1970s (Symons, 1978). The Symons Report mobilized the collective concerns of involved

scholars to address issues related to identity and subject matter of Canadian university

curriculum.

The Symons Report and Understanding Canadian Management

Throughout the 1970s, Canadian scholars expressed concerns about the impact generalized

models of knowledge were having on what was being taught at Canadian universities. In

response to these concerns the Commission on Canadian Studies, often referred to as the Symons

Report, was established to understand the state of higher education in Canada and provide

guidelines for the development of curriculum at universities. The result was compiled in an

extensive, four volume report titled; "To know ourselves: The report of the Commission on

Canadian Studies" (Symons, 1978). The Commission on Canadian Studies provided guidance to

---

[1] SSHRC Grant number 435-2013-0490 Reassembling Canadian management knowledge: Dispersion, equity, identity and history.

Canadian universities about incorporating content relevant to research and business issues

including recommendations about university courses and their content and how to promote

Canadian issues across academic disciplines to differentiate what Canadian students were

learning compared to students attending institutions in other countries (Symons, 1978). The

Commission on Canadian Studies was at the time seen as an important tool by Canadian scholars

in recognizing the need for research and content that reflected the differences between Canada

and the United States.

The Commission on Canadian Studies was in part prompted by Canadian scholars of the

time who suggested that there was a crisis in "university management education and research in

Canada" (Zur-Muehlen, 1979, p. 28). Zur-Muehlen, among other scholars, recognized that

management theory being taught and used by scholars had implications on what came to

represent management knowledge. Concerns were raised over the political, cultural, and legal

differences between Canada and the United States, and that these differences were not being

reflected in existing programming at Canadian Universities. The Symons Report (1978)

attempted to address the importance of recognizing these differences, stating:

> Canada is an alternative. It is not the northern United States not the North
>
> American Switzerland or Belgium. Canadian studies will give students in this
>
> country an opportunity to examine the alternatives we have, by our history, our
>
> geography, our climate, our mistakes, and our victories. (Symons, 1978, p.21)

Although the report has been useful in surfacing concerns about generalized models of

knowledge and national identity, it does not analyze the socio-political, relational, or economic

conditions of the time or the impact of institutionalized processes on the knowledge being

produced within Canada. In this dissertation, I will address how institutionalized processes have resulted in a model of management studies that represents an Americanized model of management theory over time.

The production of knowledge and generalized Management Theories

Knowledge is comprised of "complex interactions between sets of communities of organizational actors" (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2001, p. 934) designed to persuade its audience (Ooi, 2002). As a result, knowledge is "produced" (Gantman & Parker, 2006). It is constructed, developed, presented, and written for others to consume in what has been described as a highly institutionalized cycle (Gantman & Parker, 2006). The process through which conference papers and journal articles are accepted into the academy after a blind review process, for example, provides confidence to the reader that the knowledge within the document is legitimate. As a result, most readers accept the material that is presented without questioning the underlying processes that make the contributions to scientific knowledge possible. For example, publications and presentations normally go through a review process, involving editors, publishers, reviewers, etc. As a result, some articles and books are accepted for publication while others are not. Although some articles are rejected based on the quality of the research and the writing, other articles are rejected because they are not seen as being of interest to potential readers or in contributing to scientific knowledge. The review process, while serving to legitimate knowledge, masks the social processes (Wolf, 1996) involved in privileging some ideas while marginalizing others. As a result, management studies has gradually become dominated by theories that are centered around research conducted, written, and produced to eliminate geographical, political and cultural differences to address institutional demands (i.e., published in so-called top tier publications - Gantman & Parker, 2006; Gantman et al., 2015)

built upon American-dominated traditions. By tracing the development of management studies in Canadian business schools, using multiple sources, I aim to unearth the processes involved in the Americanization of knowledge in management studies. In academia, the institutionalized nature of knowledge production has generally been seen as enhancing legitimacy of the industry as a whole (Gantman & Parker, 2006) and has increasingly become based on processes and systems that are dominated by a model based on the United States (Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012; Gantman & Parker, 2006; McLaren & Mills, 2014; Üsdiken & Wasti, 2009).

In highlighting the dominance of American traditions in management studies, the authors showcase how existing models of knowledge privilege a certain way of seeing the world. For example, management as a discipline in Brazil was strongly influenced by American models, motivated by the need to modernize Brazil, and promote the values of efficiency and democracy (Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012). This resulted in Brazil adopting management education that reflected "western" (i.e., US) values and principles. The adoption of "western" values and principles in the development of management education impacted the curriculum and Master of Business Administration programs (MBA's) and subsequent leaders and educators in the country (Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012). Kieser (2004) also examines the impact of American models in the "re-education" of German managers based on the exporting of American values as a result of their "economic superiority" (p. 91). Kieser (2004) goes on to identify how this process of re-education involved the growing acceptance of American values and ideals over time, ultimately impacting the structure of higher education in Germany. Although these studies have raised concerns about issues related to identity as a result of the Americanization of management models, they do not examine the processes through which this knowledge is produced.

By analyzing the contributions of authors and editors through conference proceedings, journal articles and executive meeting minutes to understand the processes through which management studies has been produced, we can surface how these processes have been influenced and resulted in predominantly American models of management. The issue with knowledge—specifically what is come to be seen as management knowledge—is understanding the processes involved in its production. By examining the processes associated with the production of knowledge within academia, the biases and assumptions associated with models of management that have come to represent American models may be unearthed. To surface these assumptions, an amodern approach to history will be adopted.

Amodern History

Given the aims of this dissertation, an amodern approach to history is adopted. An amodern approach focusses on the performance of the past and the relations between actors in creating and discussing the past (Durepos, 2015) and differs from modern and postmodern approaches to history. An amodern approach recognizes that the writing of history is an interpretive process where "historians transform the events of the past into patterns of meaning that any literal representation of them as facts could never produce" (Jenkins, 2003, p. 40) and differs from modernist accounts of history where it is viewed as a set of objective facts. An amodern approach to history, on the other hand, examines how historical accounts *come to be produced* through networks of actors. This is achieved by studying how specific accounts of the past come to be produced through networks of actors consisting of human actors (e.g., scholars), non-human actors (e.g., journal articles) and, what Hartt (2013) refers to as, Non-Corporeal actants or NCAs (e.g., historical accounts). An example of this is Myrick et al.'s (2013) study of how the history of the Academy of Management came to be produced though the actions of

selected actors (i.e., specific scholars who set out to establish an association of management theory educators); the development of practices (e.g., annual conferences) and documentation (e.g., a constitution) that served to change the purpose of the association to privilege management theorists over educators; and selected accounts of the association that served to (a) legitimize the notion of the scholarly group involved as an association (the Academy of Management) rather than a dinner club for like-minded educators, (b) to establish as historical fact the founding date (1937) and members of the association, and (c) to privilege certain accounts of the association as *the* "history". In revealing the human, non-human, and non-corporeal activities Myrick et al. (2013) "followed the actors" (Latour, 2015) through various traces of their activities. In my case, some of the traces may include conference proceedings, journal articles and looking at who were the authors, editors, and individuals in leadership positions. The amodern approach to history and the past, fused with Actor-Network Theory (ANT), is referred to as ANTi-History (Durepos & Mills, 2011; Durepos & Mills, 2012; Myrick et al., 2013). This approach provides a lens "for understanding how 'knowledge' is created, performed and sustained" (Myrick et al., 2013, p. 3), making it particularly relevant to understanding management knowledge.

ANTi-History

ANTi-History is the method that will be used to understand how prevailing models of management have been Americanized over time. ANTi-History involves taking apart what has come to be known collectively as management studies by following what has been left behind in the process and reassembling them in a new way (Durepos & Mills, 2012). These traces can include a variety of sources such as biographies, letters, meeting minutes and photographs that indicate how knowledge is organized and performed. Thus, ANTi-History recognizes that

knowledge is an outcome of the relationships, politics and underlying assumptions involved in

the development of management studies and how it has come to represent Americanized

traditions.

Given the complexity of the processes involved in producing knowledge, this dissertation

will focus on the institutionalized practices within academia. Specifically, the focus for the

dissertation is conferences and journal publications[2]. Although focus on these areas simplifies

the processes involved in understanding what management studies is, the institutionalized nature

of these activities provides the opportunity to surface traces that may have otherwise remained

hidden or obscured. Scholars, the use of bibliographies and articles to produce new works,

students in business schools, management consultants and the general public are also involved in

the production of what comes to be knowledge at different levels and stages, leaving traces that

can be analyzed. The different levels involved in the production of knowledge, while discussed

in this section as a hierarchical process, involving the relationship between conferences, and

journal publications is much more elusive, interdependent, and cyclical in nature. By addressing

these stages, the network can provide insight into the social forces and patterns of dissemination

that may be present at each stage.

Evaluating multiple channels of knowledge production and dissemination provides the

opportunity to overcome some of the challenges associated with the publication process at

various stages. Journals, for example, tend to have higher rejection rates and reject articles based

---

[2] We could argue that libraries have traditionally been an instrumental actor in the dissemination of knowledge (see, for example, Santini's, 2019 discussion of the influence of the Warburg Institute on UK academia in the 1930s and Febvre & Martin's, 2010 work on `the coming of the book'). Although the role of the library has changed from that of a physical repository of knowledge, the development of an online presence has served to legitimate their continued role as a source of academic knowledge (or perhaps an archive); however, for reasons of space, their role will not be included in the present discussion.

on the journal's mandate and reviewer comments and recommendations. Conferences, on the other hand, tend to accept a broad range of topics and papers at various stages of development (i.e., conceptual papers, forums, symposiums, etc.) and provide the opportunity for conference attendees to network and connect with authors and colleagues.

Conferences and journal articles each have information related to the authors, their affiliations, and references used in conference proceedings over sustained period of times. In addition to having access to information about the different actors, publishing and service is an institutional requirement for scholars in Canada and provides a systematic way of being able to follow scholars who have made contributions to the field. The ability to follow various actors, however, is often bounded. For example, the accessibility of ASAC proceedings is limited to a 1979 starting point, when the proceedings started to be published. CJAS was founded in 1984.

Tracing ASAC prior to the foundation of CJAS provides time for articles that have been presented at ASAC to have been published in CJAS. The early 1980s is also recognized as the timeframe in which business schools in Canada were institutionalized (Boothman, 2000a; Coller et al., 2015) and provides a starting point for analysis of management studies. 2009 was chosen as the end point to assess the impact that articles have had on the field. I recognize that the start and end points for this dissertation are socially constructed. Selecting a different start or end point could impact the traces followed and therefore the social processes surfaced between and with human and non-human actors. Focussing on thirty years of data provides a manageable parameter and framework for unearthing the processes involved in producing knowledge. Not only does this provide sufficient material for tracing authors throughout the span of a career (potentially) it also provides time for that knowledge to be recognized through institutionalized processes. It can often take time for articles presented at a conference to be revised and published

in a journal. This timeframe therefore provides witness to the process that can extend beyond

decades.

Dissertation Outline

This chapter outlined the purpose of the dissertation, including how ANTi-History will be

used to sketch the processes associated with the production of what comes to be known as

management studies. The next chapter will outline the literature on generalized models of

management and the different theoretical approaches to history. This will be important to

understanding the use of ANTi-History in chapter three. Chapter three will examine the

development of ANTi-History and will provide an overview of the methodological approach and

steps taken during analysis. Chapters four and five will follow the actors at the conference and

journal levels to identify prevailing ideas and themes that emerged from analyzing the traces of

the eighteen actors. Analysis focusses on the leadership roles that the actors have taken on in the

two organizations; how ASAC and CJAS evolved; and the impact that it has had on management

studies in Canada. Chapter six analyzes the prevailing themes in the apparent Americanization of

management studies that emerged by following the actors. Some of the themes included the

content and context of the articles and language of accepted articles. Finally, chapter seven

addresses the conclusions and limitations of the dissertation with recommendations to apply

these processes in an empirical context.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

"Men make history, but they do not make it just as they please: they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past." Karl Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte

Using a historical approach is important to understanding how models of management have shifted to represent Americanized knowledge. To recognize how models of management studies have shifted, the processes involved in producing "knowledge" need to be surfaced by looking at historical accounts to understand "how we got to the now" (Lamond, 2005, p. 93). Tracing historical accounts surfaces underlying assumptions and biases associated with generally accepted models of management studies and allows us to "stand back from our everyday intellectual experiences and consider the bigger identity-based questions" (Hobson, 2013, p. 1027).

Although using a historical approach is important to understanding this process, there are different approaches to history with different theoretical underpinnings. This chapter highlights the Symons Report and how it served as the starting point for this project; the role of models of management; the different theoretical approaches to history; and will demonstrate the different perspectives and philosophies governing its tradition. This chapter will examine how these different approaches to history impact an understanding of historical events and how I answer the call of management studies to reflect and incorporate a historical approach. Finally, this chapter will outline why an amodern approach is adopted to understand the development of management studies in Canada.

The Symons Report

In terms of understanding how management studies in Canada developed, the Symons Report came at an influential time. The Symons Report was commissioned when issues of sovereignty and identity were broadly being discussed at Canadian universities regarding the content and purpose of education. Reflecting on the role of the Symons Report is particularly important in this case, as business schools were being founded during the timeframe that the report was commissioned, and the report provided specific recommendations regarding content and curriculum across the academic field. Given these recommendations, the Symons Report provided the impetus for understanding how management studies in Canada was influenced by the Americanization of management knowledge.

In Canada, universities were each responsible for appraising "the body of essential knowledge" (Austin, 2000b, p. 6). This raised concerns about how best to protect Canadian identity during a time of economic, social, cultural instability (Cormier, 2005; Page, 1981) and significant changes in the nature of work (Russell, 2019). Protecting Canadian identity became increasingly important as universities continued to grow and faculty were increasingly being recruited from American and European institutions (Nossal, 2000) to support a growing number of students. The influx of foreign faculty raised concerns about the curriculum to which students were exposed and resulted in a movement to Canadianize university programming. The movement to Canadianize universities was not without controversy and created an environment sometimes described as being hostile (Steele & Mathews, 2006; Symons, 2013), like a battlefield (Cormier, 2005), and even seen as a "shallow and pointless endeavour" (Symons, 2013, p. 15) by scholars in the field.

The ensuing controversy was further exacerbated by a number of government sanctioned commissions to examine the impact of Americanization on Canadian culture, identity and education. Two commissions specifically set out to evaluate and provide recommendations pertaining broadly to concerns related to protecting and promoting Canadian content and sovereignty: the Massey Commission and the Symons Report. The Royal Commission on National development of the Arts, Letters and Sciences, commonly referred to as the Massey Commission, addressed concerns related to arts and culture in Canada in the period 1949 to 1951. Based on observations about the pervasiveness of American culture in Canada, the Massey Commission made recommendations for funding to promote Canadian arts and culture and recommended that funding be provided to Universities to protect issues related to identity and sovereignty.

Decades later, and with continued concerns regarding Canadian identity and sovereignty, the Commission on Canadian studies was established to focus on the impact of these issues in the education system. The Commission on Canadian Studies, also known as the Symons Report, was a "landmark in the overall move to Canadianize universities and other cultural institutions in Canada" (Cormier, 2004, p. 168). The report was designed to get a better understanding of the "state of teaching, research and publication about Canada" (Page, 1981, p. ix) and involved extensive research across numerous communities, hearings and letters from academics, professionals, agencies, research councils and educational societies (Page, 1981; Symons, 1978) over a period of three years (1972-1975). The report incorporated feedback from more than 2,500 people who shared their perspectives on Canadian studies. The report, which contained four volumes, provided more than 1200 specific and general recommendations covering a broad number of areas including the development of archives and curriculum to specifically address

Canadian social sciences. (Symons, 1978). The recommendations were designed to provide

guidance to federal and provincial governments, universities, private organizations, and the

general public (Symons, 1978) about how to incorporate, support and develop Canadian studies

in the education system. The Symons Report (1978) recognized that "[c]ulturally, we face in

Canada the large challenge of bilingualism and multiculturalism with the declared goal of

cultivating these heritages, whereas the United States faces the different challenge and objectives

of a melting pot society" (p. 13). The Symons Report (1978) went on to highlight the differences

between Canada and the United States in the political, industrial, population density and

geographical considerations that should be reflected in existing curriculum and research.

Reflecting on the similarities and differences between Canada and the United States in university

curriculum was seen as being "essential from the standpoint both of sound balanced scholarship

and of practicality" (Symons, 1978, p. 13). For the Symons Report the importance of reflecting

on cultural differences do not stop between Canada and the United States rather that "Canadian

scholarship has, thus, a strong international obligation" (p. 18) to reflect on Canadian scholarship

and issues so that other nations may be able to better understand their own situation.

Despite recognizing the importance of understanding the economic, political, and cultural

differences between nations, the Symons Report (1978) also highlighted the concerns of some

scholars regarding the external and internal forces impacting decisions to protect Canadian

identity. The report also recognized how

> [i]n many instances Canadian faculty members themselves have neglected or been
>
> indifferent to Canadian studies. In fact, the major responsibility for the neglect of
>
> Canadian studies rests with the Canadian members of the university community in
>
> Canada. Many Canadian scholars have adopted, or accepted, the attitude that

Canada is not a sufficiently interesting subject of study and research. Going

further than this, many obviously feel that Canadian problems, events and

circumstances are almost by definition of only second-rate academic importance.

It is no wonder that it was repeatedly suggested to the Commission that the 'big

problem is not so much that of de-Americanization of our universities as that of

selling Canada to Canadian academics.' (Symons, 1978, p. 27)

Even though the Symons Report (1978) specifically addressed the impact of these biases

on teaching Canadian studies, there are wider implications for the models of management

studies, their construction, and the values upon which they are built. The Symons Report (1978),

for example, highlighted resistance that many scholars had regarding the need for a Commission

of Canadian Studies. Some scholars expressed that "any research on the human condition is as

relevant to the Canadian situation as to the situation in other countries. Whatever its merits, such

a contention misses the point by suggesting that no society has discreet and distinctive attributes

worthy of investigation." (Symons, 1978, p. 28) while other scholars suggest that they "were

guided by the canons of international scholarship" and that Canadian studies were not needed at

all (Symons, 1978, p. 28). Such statements, alongside the apparent disregard for the findings of

the Symons Report by some Canadian institutions (Page, 1981) suggest that discussions

surrounding the model and governing philosophies were considerations as business schools and

institutional standards were being developed.

Five years after the publication of the Symons Report, a follow up report was

commissioned by the Department of the Secretary of State to evaluate the progress that had been

made regarding Canadian studies (Page, 1981). The report highlighted that while many Canadian

universities did a good job of incorporating Canadian content, development was inconsistent and

in some cases was "discreetly ignored" (Page, 1981, p. 228). Since the publication of the Symons

Report (1978), many programs focusing on Canadian content have been cut for a variety of

reasons including low registration numbers, a lack of faculty members interested in teaching

Canadian content, and a lack of support by university administration (Page, 1981)[3]. Further

contributing to the decline of these programs was a feeling that incorporating Canadian content

was

> no longer needed because the university curriculum had now been
>
> infused with appropriate Canadian content. Alternatively, it was
>
> also argued, with unconscious but delicious irony, that, if attention
>
> to Canadian content and context is still needed, it can be better
>
> found in a new framework of North American studies. (Symons,
>
> 2000, p. 28)

The suggestion that Canadian specific content was no longer needed and could be

replaced by North American studies reflects how scholars did not differentiate between the

issues facing Canadian businesses from those of its Southern neighbour. The implication was

that knowledge is objective and therefore universal in its application regardless of the country of

origin. With the idea that there is no relationship between one's nationality and the type of

knowledge produced, separate models were seen as unnecessary by the academic community

(Cormier, 2004). Other disciplines for example, including sociology, "perceived that sociology

as a social science should not be affected by national boundaries, and therefore the idea of

---

[3] This is despite the fact that many students expressed interest in courses that provided the Canadian context. Anecdotally, when presenting a paper about ASAC at a conference, one audience member expressed the challenge she felt in adequately providing her marketing students information relevant to the Canadian context. My own students have asked and been frustrated about the lack of quality Canadian case studies despite there being relevant examples that could be used to illustrate course concepts.

Canadian content was 'inconsequential.'" (Hiller & Luzio, 2001, p. 497). As a result,

Papadopoulos and Rosson (1999) argued, Canadian researchers "tended to follow closed system

models, be guided too much by American thinking, and neglect issues that are particularly

relevant to Canadian managers" (p. 78).

Although the Symons Report provided the impetus for understanding the processes

involved in the development of management studies in Canada, the report itself, and the impact

that it has had on the development of business schools, has largely been neglected by

management studies. Despite specifically mentioning the Administrative Sciences Association of

Canada (ASAC) and the growing prominence of business schools in the body of the report, the

Symons Report has been "written out" of accounts of management studies. The writing out and

in of management history highlights the differing theoretical underpinnings associated with the

different approaches to history and will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

Reflecting on Models of Management

As the Symons Report highlights, management studies was influenced by a variety of

conditions (i.e., political, social, cultural) predominant when business schools were founded.

These ideas were influenced by prevailing attitudes of the scholars who questioned the need for

content reflecting the Canadian business environment rather than an emphasis on what could be

viewed as "universal knowledge". As Symons (1978) suggests, this issue was not a uniquely

Canadian issue, but rather had similar implications for many other nations. Recognition that

differences exist among nations helps to highlight how the idea of "management" itself is a

concept that is constructed. That management is constructed has implications for how

management studies is defined and which ideas are privileged and which marginalized. As this

section will outline, accounts of management studies and the field itself have been socially

constructed based on the dominant models prevalent in the field. Until recently, the dominance

of American models of management have been unquestionably accepted by management

scholars. However, the rise of business schools worldwide, and pressure on nations to respond to

global trends, has led to growing pressure from non-American academics and organizations to

address the dominance of Americanized models. Alcadipani and Caldas (2012), for example,

examine the Americanization of Brazil's notion of "management". Similarly, Engwall (2004)

documents how Nordic universities shifted from German to Americanized models as a result of

professors and students visiting the United States for school and work. Kipping, Usdiken and

Puig (2004), on the other hand, highlight how France, Spain, Italy, and Turkey adopted

American models of management in the absence (or limited presence) of other alternatives.

Kieser (2004) highlights the "re-education" of German managers based on American principles

(i.e., democracy) and Frankel and Shenhav (2003) document the role of Americanization in

Israel. Tiratsoo (2004) suggests that Britain has "taken the American business and management

education gospel fully to heart" (p. 118). However, unlike other accounts that suggest the process

of Americanization as a relatively smooth transition, Tiratsoo (2004) suggests that this process

was contested, especially early on.

Although the Americanization of management models worldwide has been well

documented, none of the articles offer insight into the processes involved in the development of

historical accounts of the field. As Berger and Luckmann (1967) state "among the multiple

realities there is one that presents itself as the reality par excellence. This is the reality of

everyday life. Its privileged position entitles it to the designation of paramount reality" (Berger

& Luckmann, 1967, p. 21).

The privileged position of American models of management is evident throughout much of

management literature where standardized accounts serve to reinforce existing ideals over time.

To take one early example, George (1968) set out to provide "a true and comprehensive history

of management" (p. vii) for what he described as an emerging field. This early account depicts

management thought as a continuum, a progression of ideas. Although George outlines the

contributions of other cultures early on in the text as part of modern management's prehistory,

the contributions made by scholars to the different traditions of management thought are

predominantly American and highly gendered with only one female making the list despite the

availability of others (i.e., Mary Parker Follett was included but Lillian Gilbreth was excluded).

George's second edition was published in 1972 but was superseded by Wren's seminal work on

management thought, first published the same year.

Wren, a business historian, produced six editions[4] of *Evolution of Management Thought*

between 1972 and 2009, lending his account the air of a "timeless repository of accumulated

management knowledge…" (Novicevic & Jones, 2014). Given its prominence in the field, it

provides the starting point for several subsequent articles documenting management thought. In

the various editions of his text, Wren begins his analysis of management thought by chronicling

the contributions of Charles Babbage and Frederick Taylor to scientific management and then

proceeds in a linear progression to outline the contributions of key individuals and events from

the humanities and organization theory. These contributions and events tend to emphasize, the

contributions of American scholars as important milestones in the development of management

---

[4] The sixth edition (2009) adds Arthur G. Bedeian as a co-author. Wren and Bedeian have worked extensively with each other over the course of their careers.

thought. Each subsequent period is treated as building on the contributions of others in a linear progression.

Although the significance of the contributions by the individuals identified by Wren cannot be in doubt, these contributions are described such that their Americanism is taken for granted, even for individuals with connections and influences outside of the United States. For example, in Wren and Bedeian's 2009 edition of *The Evolution of Management Thought* they correctly indicate that Max Weber was of German descent and was born to a "life of affluence in a family with social and political connections…" (p. 228). However, they quickly move the focus to the observations Weber made about organizations while visiting the United States. The emphasis on how this American sojourn influenced of Weber's thought appears to have been privileged in Wren and Bedeian's account over the influences inherent in his upbringing and prior training. Wren and Bedeian's focus on the American experience is not an anomaly and similar distortions can be found in other histories of management thought. Elton Mayo, for example, is widely seen as an important American theorist despite not being from the United States. Mayo attended the University of Queensland in Australia (Smith, 1998) and was also said to be influenced by having lived and worked in England and Africa (Peltonen, 2015; Smith, 1998).

On the surface, the issue of where someone lived, received their academic training, or traveled may not seem consequential. However, it is important to recognize the impact of how someone's contributions to management thought have been constructed and recorded into the canon of management studies literature. These records provide the foundation for subsequent accounts of management thought, are rarely questioned, and inform subsequent scholars about key contributions to the field. Heames and Breland (2010), for example, conducted a study asking respondents to identify who the most influential theorists were in the field of

management. Respondents were from three predominantly American groups- the Business

History conference, the Academy of Management (AOM), and the Management History

Division of the AOM, and nominees were chosen as an extension of a prior study conducted by

Wren and Hay (1977)[5]. Respondents were asked to think broadly about contributions to the field

and the study found that respondents predominantly recognized the contributions of American

management scholars despite the respondents being from a diverse international group (Heames

& Breland, 2010). Although the contributions of the American management scholars identified

in the study are not being called into question, the survey results raise the question of how these

particular scholars rose to prominence in the field, and whose contributions are not being

recognized, and why. By acknowledging that knowledge is created and produced and that the

process represents the interests and needs of the individuals creating that knowledge, the political

nature of that knowledge has obvious implications for the discipline going forward (Hobson,

2013). Recognition that management studies is constructed and based on social and political

processes is the first step to identifying and unearthing the processes involved in the dominance

of American models of management over time.

Building on the examples provided by Heames and Breland (2010) and the Symons

Report (1978) we can reflect on the role that history, and its different approaches can have on our

understanding of management knowledge. A historical approach to understanding management

knowledge provides insight into how "an activity contributes to the process of world

construction, of generating new objects of knowledge (e.g., deviants, social roles), of tailoring

other objects in accordance with its own point of view, its perspectives and pretensions."

---

[5] Heames and Breland (2010) specifically indicate that AOM and the Management History Division at AOM were separate lists of respondents and followed the same research protocols of the Wren and Hay (1977) article it replicated.

(McCarthy, 1996, p. 8). As time passes, the literature that builds on prior accounts of management thought shifts further away from the context in which the original contributions were made, further reinforcing American dominance under the veil of objective theories of management. The gradual building of management studies around American dominated values and ideas reinforces the importance of adopting a historical approach. By adopting a historical approach to understanding these processes, this dissertation recognizes how management studies has shifted over time and the implications this has on predominant historical accounts.

What is History?

As the previous sections suggest, a historical approach provides the opportunity to reflect on how models of management came to be accepted. A historical approach allows a researcher to reflect on questions related to issues of identity and, in this case, how management studies has come to reflect American models. Although this approach is important to scholarship, history is complex and is viewed differently by various traditions and philosophies. These different approaches to history have resulted in numerous debates that, according to some scholars, have involved "a high degree of acrimony, mud slinging, misrepresentation and misquotation" (Fulbrook, 1991, as quoted in Down, 2001, p. 395), while other scholars have "effectively bur[ied] their heads in the sand hoping that theoretical controversy will disappear." (Down, 2001, p. 396).

It is important to acknowledge the differing theoretical underpinnings and debates about what History is and how it has been seen as important in contributing to the development of the "historic turn" (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006) in management and organization theory. The historic turn calls for a historical approach to analysing contemporary organizations to understand how they have been socially constructed. Addressing the social construction of management is

important as business history has "been criticized for being at its worst, uncritical, non-integrative and superficial corporate historiography" (Down, 2001, p. 396). The superficial application of management history is evident in George's (1968) and Wren's (1972) treatment of historical figures, their contributions to the field and the predominance of Americans listed throughout the texts that serve to reinforce current biases and assumptions. Hobson (2013) argues the need to view management history more critically is "not an intellectual luxury but one of urgent necessity" (p. 1027) and can be applied broadly to management disciplines. Incorporating a historical approach to understanding how models of management have developed addresses this need. In being able to apply a historical approach, it is important to understand and recognize the debates between competing approaches within the discipline of management and organizational history.

When writing about and discussing history, information about events are often described as having been "discovered", implying a certain "truth" (Burke, 2000); however, "…history is not the same as the past" (Boje & Saylors, 2015, p. 197). As Jenkins (1995) contends "the status of historical knowledge is not based for its truth/accuracy on its correspondence with the past *per se* but on the various historicizations of it, so that history always 'stands in for' the past..." (Jenkins, 1995, p. 18). Similarly, Prasad's (2005) analysis of knowledge production involves paying attention to the "*processes* whereby knowledge itself is created, asserting that the most useful and liberating forms of knowledge are those that are produced out of *dialogues* between multiple social constituencies." (p. 141). For example, many historical records include specific timeframes and dates that have been left off historical documents. These common "facts" or notions of the past form the written record upon which historians and scholars unquestioningly use as the basis for subsequent work on events of the past. Popular accounts of management

theory for instance often begin with Scientific Management (or the so-called Taylorist School) and progress in a linear, chronological fashion to contemporary management theories. This constructed starting point, chosen by a historian writing about management theory, now provides the foundation for which future discussions and writing about the history of management thought also begin and will continue to be perpetuated over time. As the ideas continue to be perpetuated through subsequent writings, they come to be seen as objective facts, rather than as an interpretation of events (i.e., the process of making History scientifically unbiased). Although Scientific Management is accepted as the starting point for many scholarly studies of management thought and theory (Koontz, 1962), others believe and discuss management theory as starting in the pre-industrialization era (George, 1968). Neither interpretation is incorrect, nor should one account be privileged over another. Rather History should be viewed as an interpretation of events rather than as objectified facts. Furthermore, it is important to recognize how these interpretations of the constructed start point of management thought impacts the development of management models. If Scientific Management is seen as the start point for management theory and the contributions recognized are predominantly American, this inherently shapes the understanding of the field and subsequent interpretations of management models. As a result, the start point for models of management are inherently structured around and built upon existing assumptions created by prior, accepted, and dominant accounts of management.

Recognizing that models of management are built upon existing assumptions requires acknowledgement that History can be viewed from different perspectives (Mills & Novicevic, 2020; Rowlinson, 2004; Vaara & Lamberg, 2015). These different perspectives are founded in different philosophical and theoretical underpinnings in understanding the difference between

history and History. Big H History recognizes that the past has occurred and that all

interpretations of it are constructed by the historian writing about historical events (Jenkins,

2003). Big H History recognizes that many histories exist since every individual (or actor) or

trace document makes a different account available as to what happened (Lustick, 1996) and

results in a collection of accounts about the past (i.e., the histories; Jenkins, 2003; Mills,

Weatherbee & Durepos, 2013). History therefore provides the foundation for understanding the

collective knowledge of the political, economic, social and cultural values of the time

documented in written records (Foster et al., 2014; Myrick et al., 2013) and is important to our

discussion on how models of management have evolved over time. This is different from

traditional views of history where it is viewed as a written record about events of the past (i.e.,

the past being things/time that have already come to pass; Jenkins, 2003). The different

philosophies around what History is impacts how available traces are viewed and how events

will be analysed. The three approaches examined here are the modernist, postmodernist and

amodernist.

Modernist History

A modernist approach to history emphasizes the discovery of "facts" that cannot be

questioned and are used to construct a truthful representation of history that is unchanging

(Durepos, 2015; Jacques & Durepos, 2015; Mills & Helms Mills, 2018) and objective (Suddaby,

2016). Because of the unchanging and objective account of the evidence, history is seen as being

neutral, void of values, and not tied to a cultural or geographical context (Durepos, 2015; Secord

& Corrigan, 2017), and is timeless in its presentation (Jacques & Durepos, 2015). Modernist

approaches to history in management are therefore seen as being an "evolution of management

thought" (Abraham, Gibson, Novicevic & Robinson, 2009; Jacques & Durepos, 2015; Wren, 1972) where prior knowledge is built upon and discussed in a linear progression (Boje & Saylors, 2015; Leap & Oliva, 1983; Weatherbee et al., 2012) and historians are "impartial reporters of information" (Secord & Corrigan, 2017, p. 97). Given the historian's status as impartial, they present as having the "authority to explain and convey the lessons of the past to others" (Coraiolo, Foster & Suddaby, 2015, p. 207). Wren's and George's accounts of management theory discussed previously, provides a working example of a linear progression where the reader is taken through the history of what the historians have selected as key milestones and individuals during specific timeframes. In the case of models of management, the historical account would be presented as acknowledging universal and scientific knowledge as the foundation for management theory.

The historian, in a modernist approach to history, "believe(s) that it is both possible and desirable to represent the past as it actually happened." (Durepos, 2015, p. 158). Van Fleet and Wren (2005) suggest that this representation of the past is necessary as "history is a way of organizing the time of our disciplines, enabling a framework for the who, what, when, where, and how of our studies. Through history, we must deal with events and people roughly organized in some defining of beginnings and outcomes" (p. 53) and emphasizes the objective perspective of history as fact through established frameworks. In part, Van Fleet and Wren (2005) argue that this approach is necessary as "[history] is the universal experience—infinitely longer, wider, and more varied than any individual's experience" (Van Fleet & Wren, 2005, p.53). The 'universal experience' therefore minimizes the actions of individuals, social conditions, and politics of the time, instead looking for "'multiple sufficient' causal explanations, or holistic narratives of change that seek parsimonious explanations…" (Suddaby, 2016, p. 53) to create a 'grand

narrative' that tend to be used to legitimate 'knowledge' over time (Powell, 2005). The 'grand narratives' allow us to make sense of the past (Boje & Saylors, 2015); however, it has implications for the production and reproduction of management knowledge. The currently dominant models of management studies are an example of a 'grand narrative'. They serve to legitimate the process of building what comes to be known as management studies and the models that academics come to view as the field.

Readers are asked, similar to other historical writings, to accept Wren's account of management thought without questioning the processes that went into the selection and writing of the History. However, key individuals have been included or excluded from different accounts of management theory based on the cultural, economic and political forces operating when these histories were written that have later been surfaced by adopting a postmodernist or amodernist approach to history. That is, these writings have been selected by scholars and historians and reinforce the 'grand narratives' that tell a particular 'story'.

Therefore, history is seen as being 'discoverable' through facts as "the past is all we know and history provides that knowledge." (Van Fleet & Wren, 2005, p. 53). Although there is value in these realist histories, they are not useful for understanding how management studies has developed. The modernist approach does not recognize the social, political and power relations associated with the creation of a given History and how existing models of management have been built upon "realist" values to reinforce "grand narratives". To understand how models of management have developed, it is important to surface the underlying biases and assumptions associated with its creation and surface perspectives that may have been "written out" of prevailing accounts. This leads us to examine how postmodernist history differs from a modernist approach.

Postmodernist Approach

Postmodernists contend that the "development of any theory must be viewed in the context of its time" (Smith 2007, p. 523) and goes beyond a linear and progressive view to recognize the pluralistic nature of History. A pluralistic approach provides a more discursive view of the world (Mills and Helms Mills, 2018; Powell, 2005; Secord and Corrigan, 2017) and recognizes the role of power in understanding that knowledge is "produced by heterogenous practices of power rather than from the discovery of truth…" (Calas & Smircich, 1991, p. 569).

As a result, postmodernist theorists recognize the role that the researcher or historian plays in the construction of the account provided and therefore specific accounts of History cannot be "proven" and do not provide definitive answers (Kemp, 2013). History must then be "read and understood as constructions by history mediators within the contemporary contexts in which the stories function, rather than as objective and unadulterated accounts of the past." (Ooi, 2002, p. 606). This means that modernist accounts of management history that are taken as objective and the "truth" can overlook and exclude individuals or groups. In contrast, postmodernists recognize the value in analyzing these modernist accounts to decenter the prevailing history to instead provide a pluralistic account of management. Mary Parker Follett and her contributions to management thought is one example of a contributor to organizational theory and organizational behaviour, whose work was largely excluded from early discussions about key contributors to management theory only to be "rediscovered" and included later (Phipps, 2011; Tancred-Sheriff & Campbell, 1992). As Lamond (2005) reflects, Mary Parker Follett was;

celebrated in the early part of the last century, but fell into obscurity in the 1920's

and 1930's. It was when her work was rediscovered in the 1980's and 1990's that

the stereotype was challenged as a part of the rediscovery process and new

insights into her ideas developed (Lamond, 2005, p. 1276).

Her earlier exclusion from discussions about key contributions to management theory helps

illustrate the process by which History is produced and performed and thus challenges existing

notions of what History is. Mary Parker Follett is not the only individual whose contributions

went unacknowledged at different times. Kurt Lewin is another example of how, during different

periods, an authors' ideas were excluded from "official" accounts of management thought

(Cooke, 2007) and, along with various other progressive thinkers, were written out of History

(Cooke, 1999). Similarly, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, the Symons Report (1978) and its

influence in the development of Canadian studies at universities has largely been neglected by

management studies. Postmodernism provides the opportunity to take a different, pluralistic

approach to generally accepted models of management.

As these examples suggest, postmodernist approaches to History recognize that there are

"some sort of fixed elements of empirical truth that can be uncovered through methodical

techniques of collection and analysis of information-bearing data." (Mills & Helms Mills, 2018,

p. 33) but that it "is from those multiple and diverse sites that their dimensions, organization and

organizing powers can be brought into view" (Smith, 1999, p. 17). The postmodernist

perspective provides the opportunity for these accounts to shed light on previous modernist

accounts of history and decenter previously understood notions.

Although postmodern History recognizes a pluralistic view of History and attempts to

decenter what has come to be known about the past, this approach is still not sufficient in

addressing the nature of the relationships involved in the development of management

knowledge and the apparent dominance of Americanized models. Because I have explored the

processes involved in the development of management knowledge and not just provided an

alternate account to existing narratives, the approach adopted here needs to acknowledge and

recognize the relational nature of academia and how individuals come together. As a result, this

dissertation adopts an amodernist approach to History.

Amodernist Approach

An amodernist approach recognizes the relational nature of History between (human and

non-human) actors in the context of a specific point in time. An amodernist approach to History

includes the social context where "a site of networked relations is to be explored and uncovered."

(Mills & Helms Mills, 2018, p. 34) and the historian is a "participant in the social production of

histories" (Secord & Corrigan, 2017, p. 96). From the perspective of amodernist scholars, history

represents the social where it "occurs in tentative relations among heterogenous actors, and relies

on impression management" (Secord & Corrigan, 2017, p.96) and is important to understand

how models of management have been developed. The different actors involved in the

construction of History, and in this case the construction of models of management studies, offer

multiple versions of the past and focus "on how 'knowledge of the past' is socially constructed

through a series of human (e.g., historians) and non-human (e.g., archives) actors to create *a*

sense of history" (Mills & Helms Mills, 2018, p. 32-3). In creating a "sense of history", the

decisions made, or actions of individuals are "given legitimacy, authenticity, status, or social

capital simply by being viewed through the lens of the past." (Suddaby, 2016, p. 48). The

amodernist approach to History therefore provides the opportunity to unearth prevailing

modernist accounts, thereby providing a different perspective. These accounts can decenter

existing knowledge allowing previously "unwritten" accounts to be surfaced and recognized.

This approach is particularly useful in reassembling existing narratives of management knowledge to view them from different perspectives.

For example, Frederick Taylor, is often presented in modernist histories as the father of scientific management, revolutionizing the view of management at the time. According to this narrative, Taylor's ideas were later taken on by the Taylor Society who were pro-labour and encouraged unionization (Schachter, 2018). Taylor's ideas were eventually superseded by Elton Mayo's more humanistic approach to management (Peltonen, 2015; Wren, 2005).

Adopting an amodern approach, Schachter (2018) provides an alternative perspective of why Taylor's ideas may have been replaced. Schachter (2018) posits that Taylor and the Taylor Society's ideas were replaced with ones more favourable to large factory owners. The Taylor Society was involved in the promotion of the labour and the unionization movement, which was politically unfavourable to business owners. Business owners therefore sought to improve their sociopolitical position by replacing Taylor's ideas with those of someone who could better advance their own interests (Schachter, 2018).

The Symons Report provided a different perspective on how universities were challenged based on two prevailing ideologies regarding knowledge (i.e., universal knowledge and Canadian knowledge). Adopting an amodernist approach to understanding how management studies has been developed in Canada provides the opportunity to examine the previously unwritten accounts of management studies. It should be clarified that in taking an amodernist approach to History, actual events and dates are not being called into question; rather, an amodernist approach includes discussion of the sociopolitical and economic conditions at the time (Jenkins, 2003; Lamond, 2005), thereby decentering existing accounts of prevailing models of

management. Using an amodernist approach to History recognizes that this dissertation provides but one account of management studies that cannot be seen as a definitive account of how models of management have been developed. In taking an amodernist approach, I recognize the role that I and the members of the dissertation committee take as actors in the development of this manuscript. Given the purpose of unraveling the social processes involved in the development of management studies and the multiple histories that can be surfaced, this theoretical lens is the best approach for understanding the production of knowledge.

Table 1 highlights the key characteristics of each approach to history and some of the literature that can be read to understand these different philosophical approaches.

Table 1 *Approaches to history*

Approach to History	Characteristics	Key Literature
Modernist	- Linear - Culturally and value neutral - Factual representation of history - History is verifiable - Singular view of history - History documents events as they happened - Seen as being an objective representation of the past - The past is discoverable - Universal account of history - Grand narratives	- Bowden and Lamond (2015) - George (1968) - Kieser (1994) - Urwick (1938) - Wren (2005)

Approach to History	Characteristics	Key Literature
Postmodernist	• Pluralistic view of History • We can only view the past through interpretations of it • All History is based on interpretation made by the historian • Destabilizes dominant narratives of the past • Traces are used to understand the text and language • History cannot be verified • History is not fixed • History is situated in the context of the time	• Jacques (1996) • Jenkins (1995) • McKinlay (2013) • Rowlinson (2004)
Amodernist	• History is culturally and value laden • Historical context is created • History is relational • Multiple histories • History is performed • The historian is a part of the performance • Historians are active in choosing the traces • Historians need to be reflexive in their role	• Bruce (2006) • Bruce and Nyland (2011) • Durepos (2009) • Hartt et al. (2014) • Jacques and Durepos (2015) • Myrick et al. (2013) • Durepos and Mills (2012)

Each of these different approaches to history reflect differing values and perspectives on what comes to be "known" about the past. Understanding the debates surrounding history are important given that knowledge is developed incrementally over time and is constructed by historians based on their philosophical approaches. Given the processes involved in producing management knowledge and how it has come to reflect American models of management, this dissertation adopts an amodernist approach. An amodernist approach provides the opportunity to surface the assumptions and biases associated with the development of management studies

providing a different account. ANTi-History will be the method used to apply the amodernist approach and surface the assumptions and biases in the development of management models.

Chapter Summary

As this chapter highlights, dominant models of management studies are based on American models. Although some scholars have highlighted these concerns, existing research does not examine the processes involved how these models have become dominated by American values and ideals. Using an amodernist approach to History allows existing accounts of management studies to be viewed in terms of the social, political and economic conditions to provide another account of management models. This differs from modernist approaches to management history where grand narratives are presented as factual or offering a "real" account and postmodernist approaches where the historian is seen as the interpreter of the event (Jenkins, 2003; Myrick et al., 2013).

The next chapter will discuss ANTi-History, outline the steps taken to identify the processes involved in the development of management studies in Canada and identify the actors that will be followed during this analysis.

Chapter 3: A Method to Understanding

"ANT prefers to travel slowly…" (Latour, 2005, p. 23)

As the previous chapter highlights, an amodernist approach provides the opportunity to surface how models of management have been performed based on the values and context under which knowledge was created. ANTi-History is the method that will be used to understand how management studies has been developed over time. ANTi-History combines Actor Network Theory (ANT) and historiography to understand how various actors come together to produce a network, therefore revealing the relationship between knowledge and the past (Durepos, 2015). This section will highlight ANT and its origins, outline the development of ANTi-History, and discuss the steps taken to identify which scholars were to be selected to understand the development of management studies in Canada.

Origins of ANTi-History: Actor-Network Theory

Actor Network Theory (ANT) originated with Latour's (1987) exploration of the role scientists and their interactions with the materials they used in a laboratory to create a product. Latour argued that ANT made it "possible to trace more sturdy relations and discover more revealing patterns by finding a way to register the links between unstable and shifting frames of reference rather than by trying to keep one frame stable." (2005, p. 24). Latour's seminal work is a useful start point to understanding the role ANT plays in the development of ANTi-History.

Latour argued that a variety of human and non-human actors come together to create a 'black box'. The black box makes the processes involved in the creation of a scientific paper, for example, invisible. A scientific paper involves scholars coming together to discuss ideas,

conduct experiments, use materials like computers to communicate and report results, reviewers read the paper and make decisions regarding its contributions, and finally the paper appears in a written form for others to read. Despite these many steps and processes few people reflect on how these processes impact the final product. The ANT framework identifies these different processes to understand the conditions under which the scientific paper was created, recognizing how various actors, both human and non-human, come together and thus contribute to its development.

ANT has since been advanced by scholars who want to understand how "actants mobilize and stabilize the heterogeneous social materials out of which actor-networks are composed." (Secord & Corrigan, 2017, p. 96). This process involves "following the actors" to understand how they come together to establish a relatively stable network (Callon, 1986). By following the actors, Law contends that ANT can reveal how "the large and the powerful come to be large and powerful" (1994, p. 95), by revealing important processes that can shift our understanding of various actor-networks. In deconstructing the actor-network, individual actors can be followed and can "enrich what we already may know without arriving at a singular reality of a particular phenomenon." (McKenna & Richardson, 2016, p. 155).

Actor-networks are developed as actors come together to establish an alliance (Lukka & Vinnari, 2017) and is "the product of actors inducing other actors to do something…" (McKenna & Richardson, 2016, p. 155). The enrolment of actors helps stabilize the social network between individuals forming an actor-network (Latour, 2005). As a result of the social nature of actor-networks "there is then no end or beginning…" (McKenna & Richardson, 2016, p. 155) and is a dynamic process that produces effects (Lukka & Vinnari, 2017; McKenna & Richardson, 2016). ANT is therefore useful to understand how actors come together to create a social phenomenon

based on the everyday practices forming relatively stable actor networks (Durepos & Mills,

2011; McKenna & Richardson, 2016) that can be traced and followed over time.

Although ANT has been useful surfacing how actors come together to reveal different

perspectives and trace actors across everyday practices, it is not sufficient to address the

development of management studies. As Durepos and Mills (2012) problematize, ANT does not

address the concept of history and the past or reveal how knowledge is created. A recent

development to address this has been to fuse ANT and historiography in a management context

to not only decenter prevailing accounts of management studies but to understand the processes

and conditions that allowed for its development to occur. The term, coined ANTi-History by

Durepos (2009) is examined in the next section.

ANTi-History

ANTi-History is useful in historical analysis as it brings together the sociology of

knowledge, postmodernist historiography, and Actor Network Theory (Myrick, et al., 2013). The

fusion of historiography and ANT provides a lens; "for understanding how 'knowledge' is

created, performed and sustained" (Myrick et al., 2013, p. 3), destabilizing dominant accounts

(Secord & Corrigan, 2017) and providing an alternate way of understanding the past (Novicevic,

Marshall, Humphreys & Seifried, 2019). ANTi-History, therefore, is different from ANT in that

it "assumes that actors are engaged in interest work, in which they seek out the interests of other

actors; negotiate with alternative actors; and, if successful alter their interests to match that of

their own…" (Durepos, 2009, p. 311). Although there is no single definition of what an actor is

(McKenna & Richardson, 2016) actors according to Latour (2005) can take on many different

forms since it is "never clear who and what is acting when we act since an actor on stage is never

alone in acting." (p. 46). As a result, actors can be human or non-human as they can come together to reassemble into a new type of actor, e.g., ASAC, CJAS (Latour, 2005).

ANTi-History recognizes that institutions such as universities "exist and exert social influence over decades, if not centuries, affecting multiple generations. Similarly, institutions extend their influence more broadly than mere organizational networks, but extend deeply into the core fabric of society" (Suddaby, 2016, p. 53), challenging modernist views of objectivity and detachment of management and its systems (Secord & Corrigan, 2017, p. 95). This positions ANTi-History particularly well to analyze the development of management studies in Canada. Given that the development of scientific knowledge is incremental and extends beyond an individual university, ANTi-History "is uniquely positioned to direct researchers to analyzing institutions not as reified social structures but rather as processes of network interactions through which those social structures are produced" (Suddaby, 2016, p. 56). Being able to follow human and non-human actors to reveal the social connections that do or do not exist between them and reassemble the actor network is important to understand how certain models of management knowledge comes to dominate.

To unearth this process, actors are followed using traces left behind to reconstruct the social network. The start point used to reconstruct the network, in and of itself is socially constructed by the researcher (Calas & Smircich, 1999). Traces can take on many different forms but includes relevant individuals, written records such as books, reports, minutes, policy statements letters/email, and other documents, depending on the nature of the network themselves (Moltu, 2008). Networks are defined as "any abstract assembly of entities interacting in a systematic manner" (Myrick et al., 2013, p. 5) and can be comprised of any number of actors working together to preserve knowledge (Moltu, 2008). It is important to remember that

networks do not have a single center (Mol, 2010). There are multiple actors that simultaneously

influence the network in different ways, creating tension. The tension, and the recognition that

there is no single center makes it possible to see how "the large and the powerful are able to

delete the work of others in part because they are able, for a time, to freeze the networks of the

social" (Law, 1994, p. 95). Over time, tension emerges as no one actor is given prominence over

another. As a result, an opportunity arises to see how knowledge is produced and how the

American model gained dominance.

The influence of actors can endure even after an actor has left a network; the ideas

themselves may continue being influential, further reflecting the social processes involved in the

production of knowledge. In the case of ASAC, for example, conference presenters may no

longer attend ASAC as a participant; however, their influence could remain through the citing of

a conference paper or through roles at the executive or administrative level. For this dissertation,

many human and non-human actors were followed, including article authors and editors, and are

outlined in detail in the following sections of this chapter.

A realist account of management studies is not provided through this process. Rather, this

dissertation offers a different account of management studies by surfacing the biases and

assumptions associated with how management studies has been developed over time. ANTi-

History builds on the ideas of Jenkins (2003) in recognizing that although there is one past, there

are multiple histories told through the eyes of each interpreter (e.g., historian). Recognition that

history is written by people with vested interests requires the need to acknowledge how this

affects the traces that are being followed. Traces provide clues about the discursive rules (Hartt,

Mills, Helms Mills, & Corrigan, 2014) and how history is performed (Durepos & Mills, 2012) by

different actors. As a result, the traces are socially constructed by actors with a vested interest in

the outcome and impact the story being told. The idea of interests and power generally mean that the voices of some individuals or groups are silenced, but Jenkins (2003) highlights that through a discursive approach to history, there is an opportunity for those voices to create their own identities, and in doing so, provide a better understanding of how some ideas and networks rise to prominence while others do not.

ANTi-History is similar to postmodernist accounts in approaching history discursively, but ANTi-History differs in that it "problematizes the notion of predetermined histories that the historian is expected to uncover or unearth" (Durepos & Mills, 2011, p. 712). As such, ANTi-History provides the opportunity to follow the actors surfacing the social conditions (Durepos & Mills, 2011) involved in the stabilization of management studies. This approach focusses on how actors "perform (in practice) as they talk about or do the past" rather than placing "events and phenomena into the context in which it has occurred to explain and understand it." (Durepos, 2015, p. 155). This means that ANTi-History provides the opportunity for the actors' actions within the actor network to surface the context rather than the researcher placing actors into the context used to understand the Americanization of management studies. Allowing the actors to surface the context that will be used to understand the apparent Americanization of management knowledge impacts how data is analysed.

ANTi-History is different from other methodological approaches in that it recognizes the role of human and non-human actors, including the role of the historian, in socially constructing a history (Mills and Helms Mills, 2018). This is different from other methodological approaches in that ANTi-History outlines a way of developing "a historiography that is capable of dealing with the past as "available" through innumerable traces" (Bryman et al., 2011, p. 441) because the past is "ontologically absent (Jenkins, 1991)" (Durepos and Mills, 2018, p. 432). In contrast, a

modernist approach would view the traces as a way of verifying established accounts of

management studies and post modernist accounts where history is mediated by the historian.

This distinction is important as the amodern approach not only recognizes the role of human and

non-human actors in the construction of a history but it "simultaneously dismantles the idea of

history as a real and truthful account of the past" (Mills and Helms Mills, 20198 p. 42). As a

result, this dissertation seeks to provide one account of management studies in Canada by

reflecting on the social conditions of the time (Bryman et al., 2011) by examining the human and

non-human relationships where the "the ideas about people and events are shaped through a

series of relationships between people and things" (Mills and Helms Mills, 2018, p. 42).

ANTi-History offers no consistent method for collection and analysis of data. This builds

on the tradition of ANT where Latour (2005) offers that the; "search for order, rigor, and pattern

is by no means abandoned. It is simply relocated one step further into abstraction so that actors

are allowed to unfold their own differing cosmos, no matter how counter-intuitive they appear."

(p. 23). The same is true of ANTi-History, where the steps taken to follow actors within and

outside of networks differ. Diverse steps to unravel the social processes may be taken depending

on the empirical nature of the materials being used. The present account will therefore utilize

documents and traces that previous authors have constructed.

Establishing a start point

The starting point of research provides a way of beginning the investigation and is, in and

of itself, socially constructed. The start point involved identifying the site and materials that

would be followed throughout the analysis to understand how management studies has

developed in Canada. Given the proximity of Canada to the United States and my interest in

Canadian identity, Canada provided a useful start point. With more than 78 business schools

offering a variety of undergraduate, Master's and PhD programs, traces can be followed across different institutionalized activities to observe the processes through which management studies developed in Canada.

Although there are many different levels of knowledge production in academia, this dissertation focusses on conferences and journal articles. These networks were chosen because of the availability of archival and secondary material that could shed light on how knowledge is used across conferences and journal articles. ASAC was selected because: (i) it organizes the only *national* scholarly business conference in Canada[6] and (ii) does so on an annual basis, thus providing consistency in available traces; (iii) the conferences are developmental in focus and content that is achieved through a high level of acceptance rates; (iv) the conference has been run over a considerable number of years making it possible to track over time[7]; (v) the existence of archival material established by the "Halifax School" of scholars at the Sobey School of Business at Saint Mary's University (Bettin, Mills & Helms Mills, 2016) helped to find not only clues and traces to people and events over time but also how or whether such clues were written about; (vi) the existence of written histories of the association (see Austin, 1994; 1995; 1998; 2000; McLaren & Mills, 2013) allowing us to explore the way that such histories contribute to our understanding of the association;[8] and the fact that ASAC had established a scholarly journal – CJAS – in 1984 allowing us to track published papers over time.

---

[6] There are a small number of regional conferences, the largest of which is the annual Atlantic Schools of Business (ASB) conference. Although ASB has ties to ASAC (Long, Pyper, Rostis, 2008), for reasons of time, resources, and the regional character of the ASB I have chosen not to include it as part of my study.

[7] Austin (2000) traces the association back to 1957 but contends that it wasn't until 1977 that it began to operate under the current name of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada. In any event, ASAC has arguably operated in one form or another for at least sixty years.

[8] For example, drawing on Austin's (2000a) observation of the organization's routes, the 2007 ASAC conference was heralded as the 50th anniversary of the association. As part of the process, Austin's 2000 paper was posted on the ASAC website to celebrate the longevity of the association. Yet, the following year, the 2008 conference

CJAS was chosen because of its close links to ASAC, and because of its lower levels of acceptance rates. With a fewer number of submissions, the ideas at the journal level are more likely refined and developed providing the opportunity to see how and if the ideas change from the conference level. CJAS also had the advantage of accessibility through ProQuest, an institutional database, which provided information related to the journal articles such as citation counts for each article. Databases provide an easy way of identifying articles, co-authors, and author affiliations, but remain only a digital archive. Tracing the processes across the two platforms highlights the shifts and changes that happen gradually over time by human and non-human actors that come together to produce the network of what comes to be seen as management studies.

What is in a question?

Since Canada was identified as the site for analysis and the sources of data established, the next step was to develop an idea of what questions should be asked. Questions that were asked included:

- Who are the people involved in the story to be told?
- What impact have these individuals had on the development of management studies?
- What information can be obtained from traces across both institutional mediums?

---

organizers advertised the conference as the association's 36th annual conference – this time drawing on another of Austin's (2000a) observations – this time to the establishment of the Canadian Association of Administrative Sciences (CAAS) in 1972 (see McLaren & Mills, 2013, p.53).

In this case, the traces analyzed included conference proceedings, journal publications, meeting minutes, curriculum vitae's, citation counts, books and published interviews. Each of these documents provided clues about human actors who come together to establish a network of management studies in Canada. These traces included the names and affiliations of authors in conference proceedings and journal publications; people listed as chairs at the annual ASAC conference; members who participated in divisional and association-wide meetings; and members of the editorial board listed in each journal. The last two items were particularly helpful in surfacing who actors were across both platforms.

In addition to identifying human actors across the different sources of information, ASAC proceedings and CJAS articles were used to identify the language of each accepted article, papers recognized with divisional awards, annual conference themes and special issues, ASAC and CJAS executive and divisional officers and additional membership information.

Tracing the involvement of human actors at different levels and at different times provides useful information in "understanding relationships between the past and history in understanding management and organizations over time… gaining insights into how history is produced as knowledge" (Mills & Helms Mills, 2018, p. 36). During the research process, certain accounts should not be privileged over other accounts. Rather each account should be equally seen as a way of understanding how the interactions between actors result from the social conditions established within the actor network during that time and should speak louder than that of the historian or researcher conducting the analysis (Durepos & Mills, 2012).

Archival Research

Adopting ANTi-History to trace the development of management studies requires the use of archival material. Archival materials provide the opportunity to surface tensions between actors, as archives

> do not simply arrive or emerge fully formed; nor are they innocent of struggles for power in either their creation or their interpretive applications. Though their own origins are often occluded and the exclusion on which they are premised often dimly understood, all archives come into being in and as history as a result of specific political, cultural, and socioeconomic pressures—pressures which leave traces and which render archives themselves artifacts of history. (Burton, 2005, p. 6)

As Burton (2005) suggests, using archival materials involves recognizing that archives exist because they represent the interests of those leaving traces for historians to follow. As a result, the researcher needs

> to ascertain which perspectives the documents omit as well as which they contain. … If these networks are restricted by gender or class, the result may be a document that discounts how traditionally underrepresented voices are viewed in a given phenomenon (Schachter, 2018, p. 8).

A researcher must therefore remember that the very act of "collecting" information and retaining it for a purpose—often unknown at that time—is an active process that is "enabling and limiting what we see, know, understand and accept as real" (Schwarzkopf, 2012, p. 9). As a result, the very process of analyzing documents is dependent on the availability and completeness of the information contained within the archive or collection of documents and acts as a significant actor in understanding the development of management studies in Canada.

Although the ASAC conference proceedings used in this dissertation are comprehensive, there were some years missing from the database. 1987, 1990, 2000, 2001, 2007 were not in the ASAC database. In addition to missing years, some conference proceedings were incomplete. 1992 did not include any proceedings for the Policy division and 1993 did not include any proceedings for Organizational Behaviour, International Business or the Policy divisions and therefore were not included in the analysis. Not having access to these documents could therefore impact the human and non-human actors that are followed and the information that is privileged at the conference level, impacting subsequent analysis of CJAS. CJAS on the other hand did not have a standard report submitted to the ASAC executive meetings. In some meeting minutes the issues and rationale behind specific decisions was highlighted and in others non-existent.

The archive was comprehensive and a variety of materials were contained within it (i.e., meeting minutes, miscellaneous correspondence, etc.), but we cannot know the motivations of the individuals who chose to keep the executive meeting minutes or the reasons that the individuals allowed these to be included in the archive. Although we may never know why that information has been kept or what information has been forgotten it is important to acknowledge the role these decisions have had in shaping management studies in Canada.

Establishing parameters: Time and place

In addition to recognizing the time frame and the research questions there also needs to be recognition of the role of the researcher/historian in selecting the parameters used. For example, what specific timeframe was examined and why was this era selected? Although the parameters are an important aspect of archival research, the timeframe may need to be modified as the data

collection process unfold, and patterns begin to emerge. It would be difficult, for example, to analyze a timeframe that did not include any contextual information related to the phenomena being investigated. The timeframe of 1979-2009 was selected for analysis in this dissertation. I could not begin analyzing data prior to 1979 because this was the first year ASAC conference proceedings were available, just as 1984 was the first available year for CJAS journal articles. It often takes time for conference articles to become journal articles (if ever). As a result, analyzing conference proceedings prior to the inaugural issue of CJAS provided the opportunity to see if any of the articles submitted to ASAC by selected scholars had been accepted for publication in CJAS. This process involved going back and forth between the different sources of data and making connections as patterns emerged from the traces followed within the selected timeframe.

Ending in 2009, therefore, provided the opportunity to identify the impact a body of work has had on the field. Although it is necessary to establish an end point in terms of organizing the data, such timeframes are socially constructed by the historian. The information about the authors, affiliations, article content and titles of the papers are "real", but the construction of the timeframe used for analyzing the sources of information was "invented" along with the meaning and definitions associated with these timeframes (Jenkins, 2003). It should also recognize that in addition to the timeframe being socially constructed, the traces being followed are in and of themselves socially constructed through selection by me as a way of being able to follow the actors involved.

The Organizational Behaviour (OB), International Business (IB) and Policy/Strategy divisions of ASAC were selected given the stability of these divisions over time and given that they provided the ability to compare conference themes with articles in CJAS. 1027 papers were accepted to these three divisions between 1979 and 2009 and included 1147 authors from more

than 30 Canadian institutions and businesses[9]. Selecting these three stable divisions facilitated

the process of analysis by providing a manageable number of human and non-human actors to

follow but also means that notable contributions by individual scholars, or the role of specific

institutions, may not have been fully realized or understood. Incorporating additional divisions or

choosing different divisions would have resulted in surfacing different human or non-human

actors and could have changed the findings of the present dissertation and the management

knowledge traced.

Another consideration that influences the traces were the changes made at the divisional

level of ASAC. In 1979 for example, there was no divisional structure given that it was the

inaugural year. The divisional structure continued to undergo numerous changes in the early

years as the annual conference began to grow with more submissions. The existing divisional

structure of ASAC has remained relatively stable among these three divisions across time

thereby facilitated analysis between ASAC and CJAS.

Following the traces is a time-consuming process of moving back and forth between

sources and following the investigation until a path or trace can no longer be followed (Latour,

2005). As a result, the analysis is bound by space and time. We cannot anticipate what papers

and information will be useful in the future. This means that the process of unearthing

information can only be done retrospectively; by looking into the past and tracing the various

sources of information to provide an alternate account (Secord & Corrigan, 2017). There is no

one network center or path to follow (Mol, 2010), rather, the process involves tracing multiple

---

[9] There were also authors who had articles submitted from international affiliations. In all, 31 authors were associated with institutions outside of Canada. These authors were not included in the study as they did not meet the selection criteria for making a sustained contribution to ASAC over multiple conferences.

paths simultaneously. As a result, extensive notes were taken throughout the process to facilitate retrieval of information and to identify potential people or themes involved in the development of management studies.

Assembling the Social: Human Actors Producing Knowledge

With the timeframe and parameters established, analysis began by reviewing the databases compiled for ASAC and CJAS (i.e., names of the articles, authors, affiliations of each author and the language of acceptance (French or English) to identify human actors that have made a sustained contribution to ASAC. Of the 1027 articles accepted to ASAC in the period under review (1979-2009), there were 1147 unique authors. Since 1147 would be too many actors to follow, the analysis proceeded by identifying the number of primary authors (i.e., authors listed first in the order of authors), who had more than one accepted article. With institutional pressures to publish (Golden-Biddle et al, 2006) selecting authors who have had multiple acceptances establishes scholars who have made sustained contributions to management studies. Of those 1147 authors, 502 authors were listed as the primary author and submitted one article to either the OB, Policy/Strategy, IB divisions during the timeframe. 113 of the primary authors from these divisions had two separate articles accepted to ASAC conference(s). Some of these authors had both papers accepted during the same conference, while others had two papers accepted to two different conferences.

Although there are a large number of individuals (i.e., human actors) who have had accepted articles to the ASAC annual conference (i.e., a non-human actor), it appears as though there is a small group of human actors who regularly produce articles at the conference level. Attending and presenting articles on a regular basis provide an increased opportunity for scholars

to become enrolled in the ASAC actor-network providing the opportunity to become more

involved or influential at the executive and divisional levels. As scholars become more involved

at leadership and organizing levels, their decisions become representative of ASAC as an

institution. This means that ASAC, in addition to individual scholars, becomes a non-human

actor network—a collective of decisions that are seen as a "black box" that collectively

influences management studies. As a result, a decision was made to look at authors who had

made sustained contributions to ASAC over multiple conferences, thus having more than one

article accepted to ASAC. In total, 49 authors had three articles accepted across the three

divisions and 16 authors had articles accepted more than five times when listed as the primary

author during the timeframe. The 16 authors and multiple acceptances represented a more

manageable number of actors to trace to understand the processes involved in producing

management knowledge. Table 2 lists the 16 actors in alphabetical order with more than five

articles, their institutional affiliations, authorship information, language of accepted articles and

additional information related to the articles that were accepted for presentation at an ASAC

conference. Listing the authors in alphabetical order was simply a way of being able to easily

work through the list of actors across multiple sources and does not reflect a level of importance

or prominence in the actor network.

Table 2 *List of notable contributors to the annual ASAC conference 1979-2009*

Name	Affiliation(s)	Range of Years articles were accepted to ASAC	Primary Author acceptances	Sole Author	Total number of articles accepted[10]	Language of accepted articles	Paper Awards and Recognition
Beamish, Paul W.	University of Western Ontario Wilfrid Laurier University	1982- 2005	7 times	1 time	20 times	English	Best IB paper (2005)
Dastmalchian, Ali	Athabasca University University of Lethbridge	1982- 200	6 times	3 times	7 times	English	
Elangovan, A. R.	University of Toronto University of Victoria	1991-2006	5 times	4 times	5 times	English	
Etemad, Hamid	McGill University	1981-2009	15 times	7 times	17 times	English	IB Honourable Mention (2003)
Finegan, Joan	University of Western Ontario	1992-2005	7 times	2 times	9 times	English	

---

[10] As an author or co-author of an accepted article.

Name	Affiliation(s)	Range of Years articles were accepted to ASAC	Primary Author acceptances	Sole Author	Total number of articles accepted[11]	Language of accepted articles	Paper Awards and Recognition
Irving, Gregory P.	University of New Brunswick Wilfrid Laurier University	1995- 2004	8 times	2 times	12 times	English	OB Honourable Mention (1995) OB Honourable Mention (2002)
Levy, Brigitte	University of Ottawa	1986- 2006	7 times			English and French	
McShane, Steven L.	Queen's University Simon Fraser University	1983- 1986	5 times	4 times	5 times	English	Best OB paper (1983) Honourable mention in OB (1986)
Miller, Diane L.	University of Toronto University of Lethbridge	1992- 2004	5 times	3 times	8 times	English	Best OB paper (2003)[12]

---

[11] As an author or co-author of an accepted article.

[12] Miller was the second author. Leonard Karakowsky was the lead author and Kenneth McBey was the third author.

Name	Affiliation(s)	Range of Years articles were accepted to ASAC	Primary Author acceptances	Sole Author	Total number of articles accepted[13]	Language of accepted articles	Paper Awards and Recognition
Rugman, Alan M.	University of Toronto Dalhousie University Indiana State University	1981- 2003	11 times	5 times	12 times	English	
Saha, Sudhir K.	Memorial University	1981- 2004	5 times	3 times	6 times	English	
Saks, Alan M.	Concordia University University of Toronto	1991- 2005	6 times	2 times	7 times	English	OB Honourable mention (1996)
Stone, Thomas H.	York University McMaster University University of Iowa Oklahoma State University	1981- 2005	5 times	1 time	7 times	English	

---

[13] As an author or co-author of an accepted article.

Name	Affiliation(s)	Range of Years articles were accepted to ASAC	Primary Author acceptances	Sole Author	Total number of articles accepted[14]	Language of accepted articles	Paper Awards and Recognition
Tallman, Rick	University of Manitoba\n\nUniversity of Northern British Columbia	1996- 2004	5 times	2 times	5 times	English	
Withey, Michael	Memorial University	1985- 2005	8 times	4 times	9 times	English	Best OB Paper (1988)
Withane, Sirinimal	University of New Brunswick\n\nUniversity of Windsor	1984- 1992	7 times	5 times	7 times	English	

Of the 16 ASAC contributors identified in Table 2, four became ASAC presidents

(Etemad, Irving, McShane & Miller) and six served at the divisional level. At the divisional

level, Rugman, Etemad, McShane, Beamish, Miller and Levy all participated as divisional

editors and chairs acting as gatekeepers to articles that would ultimately be accepted to the

annual conference. A list of individuals who have acted as divisional editors and chairs for

ASAC between 1979 and 2009 was recorded in a Word document and helped identify which of

---

[14] As an author or co-author of an accepted article.

the 16 actors may have been enrolled in the ASAC actor-network. Scholars who actively

participated in annual general meetings, participated at divisional levels, chaired the annual

conference and held senior leadership positions would have influence on the direction and

decisions made by ASAC and therefore directly and indirectly influence the development of

management studies in Canada.

After identifying the key ASAC contributors, the next step involved tracing any

contributions made at the journal level either as an author or editor by each of the ASAC

contributors identified above. Of the 16 ASAC actors, 11 had article(s) accepted to CJAS (See

Table 3) and three (Beamish, Dastmalchian and Rugman) were on the editorial board of CJAS.

This information was then used to further understand the social network of actors that have

contributed to the development of management studies in Canada and identify actors who may

have been enrolled into the actor-network. As analysis progressed during the examination of

CJAS, it became apparent that there were other actors that should be followed because of their

role in management studies in Canada. As a result, Hackett and Burke were added to the list of

actors because of their role as Editors-in-Chief of CJAS.

Table 3 *CJAS Articles published by 18 identified ASAC contributors*

Name	Affiliation	Primary Author acceptances	Sole Author	Total number of articles accepted	Awards and Recognition
Beamish, Paul W.	University of Western Ontario	1		1	
Burke, Ronald	York University	1	3	5	
Etemad, Hamid	McGill University		1	1	
Hackett, Rick D.	McMaster University	1		1	

Name	Affiliation	Primary Author acceptances	Sole Author	Total number of articles accepted	Awards and Recognition
Irving, Gregory P.	University of New Brunswick Wilfred Laurier	1	1	2	
McShane, Steven L.	Simon Fraser University		1	1	
Miller, Diane L.	University of Lethbridge		1	1	
Rugman, Alan M.	University of Toronto	1	1	2	
Saha, Sudhir K.	Memorial University		2	2	
Saks, Alan M.	Concordia University	1		1	Best paper for 1996
Stone, Thomas H.	Oklahoma State University	1		1	
Withane, Sirinimal	University of Windsor		1	1	

As Table 4 highlights, eleven of the actors have had publications at both ASAC and CJAS and eleven have taken on leadership roles within either ASAC or at the CJAS level. Only two individuals (Paul W. Beamish and Alan M. Rugman) have taken on leadership roles in both ASAC and CJAS and began to emerge as potential actors that may have impacted the development of management studies in Canada.

Table 4 *Contributions of ASAC actors across the two actor networks*

Actor	Medium		Leadership Role		
	ASAC Articles	*CJAS Articles*	*ASAC Divisional*	*ASAC President*	*CJAS Editorial*
Beamish, Paul W.	20	1	Yes		Yes
Burke, Ronald J.	4	5			Yes
Dastmalchian, Ali	7				Yes
Elangovan, A. R.	5				
Etemad, Hamid	17	1	Yes	Yes	
Finegan, Joan	9		Yes		
Irving, Gregory P.	12	2		Yes	
Levy, Brigitte	7		Yes		
McShane, Steven L.	5	1	Yes	Yes	
Miller, Diane L.	8	1	Yes	Yes	
Rugman, Alan M.	12	2	Yes		Yes
Saha, Sudhir K.	6	2			
Saks, Alan M.	7	1			
Stone, Thomas H.	7	1			
Tallman, Rick	5				
Withey, Michael	9		Yes		
Withane, Sirinimal	7	1			

Similar to the selection of a timeframe and the divisions analysed, the process of selecting human actors to analyze is itself socially constructed. Using different criteria would have resulted in a different list of authors and could impact our understanding of how management studies has developed in Canada. For example, if the total number of contributions were

analysed, regardless of how an author contributed to a paper, 44 scholars made contributions more than five times across the three divisions. Although this would have expanded the analysis and provided a more comprehensive overview of management studies in Canada, unearthing the social processes between human and non-human actors would have become too time consuming and unwieldly. Making a decision to focus on the primary author made it possible to trace the social connections and contributions to the broader academic field.

Ways of organizing

Another important element of the research process is devising a way to organize and make sense of the information that is collected. This project, as outlined in the previous sections, involved many different types of data and required a way of organizing the information to follow the traces and patterns that emerged. An Excel database was used to record information to facilitate comparisons between ASAC and CJAS. Excel provided the functionality to sort information by author, keywords, awards and other important information facilitating retrieval of traces allowing both human and non-human actors to emerge and be followed until the endpoint (i.e., no longer submitting articles to ASAC).

In addition to Excel, Google Scholar was used to determine author profiles to see what other publications they had authored or co-authored and their institutional affiliations. Having the ability to identify an author and their current affiliations made it easier to locate curriculum vitae, co-authors, and to identify research interests. Google Scholar was chosen because of its widespread accessibility worldwide and inclusion of journal articles, theses, books and institutional repositories ("Google Scholar," 2013). Google Scholar was a useful tool to understanding knowledge production and the influences of knowledge; however, it does not

provide a definitive account of impact and should be viewed in light of other information that is

available. One challenge of Google Scholar is with articles written prior to extensive use of the

internet. Older articles and authors do not have clickable profiles and this limited the

effectiveness of relying on digitalized sources to trace actors. Table 5 summarizes the materials

used during the analysis process and a brief description of what information was recorded and

used for analysis.

Table 5 *Summary of materials used in the analysis*

Sources of Information	Timeframe Used	Material	Description
ASAC	1979-2009	Conference Proceedings	- Title of the article - Identified authors and affiliations - Language of article - Citation counts of the article - Student status - Awards and recognition - Conference theme
		Annual General Meeting Minutes	- Members in attendance - Agenda items - Discussions regarding conference development and themes - Discussions regarding scholarly development - Costs and funding decisions - Awards
ASAC	1979-2009	Executive Meeting Minutes	- Members in attendance - Agenda items - Discussions regarding conference development, themes, quality - Discussions related to divisions - Discussions related to CJAS, costs, number of articles submitted, number of conference attendees, challenges and successes

Sources of Information	Timeframe Used	Material	Description
CJAS	1984-2009	Journal Articles	- Title of the article - Identified authors and affiliations - Language of article - Awards and recognition - Special issue themes - Article references - Citation counts of the articles
		Editorial Board	- Members of the board and affiliations - Length of time served on the board - Editorial messages published in CJAS
		Authors/Editors	- Identified authors and affiliations - Language of text
Selected Scholars	1979-2009	Articles	- Affiliations - Co-authors - Citation counts - Article title - Language of articles - References
Selected Scholars	1979-2009	Curriculum Vitae	- Affiliations - Research Interests - Member Associations - Student Supervision
		Google Scholar Page	- Affiliations - Co-authors - Article titles and journal - Language of articles - Citation counts - Identify other articles that have referenced selected articles (i.e., CJAS article written by one of the 18 actors)

Databases provide a number of advantages; however, databases are only a tool and only provide the researcher with the information that it is asked to produce. As a result, it was necessary for me to know what I was asking the database to perform and how it could result in information or connections being overlooked.

Chapter Summary

This chapter outlined ANTi-History as the method to analyze how management studies has been developed over time, the sources of data, and the steps taken with each of the sources. Specifically, the chapter outlined the timeframe used, three stable divisions within ASAC (i.e., IB, OB, Policy), the issues of archival research, and the ways that the data was organized. The following section will outline the role of ASAC and the development of management studies.

Chapter 4: ASAC—At the Crossroads

The landscape is changing, with quite substantial shifts, often within the space of a year or two. Rather than the continuous upward trend that some hopeful proponents decry, the scenario, more realistically, is one of shifting and uncertain ground. (Symons, 2000, p. 28)

Conferences are at the forefront of theoretical developments—an opportunity for researchers to communicate results of their research with other interested scholars (Asimakou, 2011). Although conferences are often the starting point for scholars to develop their ideas prior to refining them for publication in journals, they are not value free. Symons (1978) recognized the importance of conferences, stating that a national conference should be established to promote research "rooted in Canada" and to be "more concerned with the particular problems and conditions of this country…" (p. 128). The report presumably represents the values and interests of the informants who provided feedback to the commission. Conferences, as a non-human actor, therefore represent the values and preferences of the leadership team (i.e., developing the long-term direction and competitiveness of the conference) and the researcher who selected and wrote about the topic for the conference paper. Whereas the modernist interpretation generally views conference papers as objective science and value free, an amodernist approach acknowledges the inevitability of selected papers reflecting the underlying values of various actors (Asimakou, 2011). The higher levels of acceptance rates at conferences than for journals highlight how decisions by the leadership team impact the development of management studies in Canada and surfaces the topics and research areas conference attendees are exposed to over time. Austin (2000b) indicates that in the early 1990's ASAC's acceptance rate was around 50% though this varied between divisions (i.e., 24% for the Policy stream). In

addition to tracing the 18 actors as conference attendees, this chapter traces how ASAC was influenced by sociopolitical conditions of the time and the role of divisional editors and presidents in developing ASAC.

Growing a National Conference

To address concerns regarding Canadian scholarship and identity, ASAC decided to grow its annual meeting into an annual conference. The development of an annual conference was seen as a way of providing scholars a venue to present papers on issues of import to Canadian businesses and of strengthening overall scholarship in Canada (Austin, 2000b). Two considerations that were important to the ASAC executive were choosing desirable locations as a venue for the conference and the selection of conference themes (See Table 6 for the list of conference locations and themes). A decision was made early on to switch between Eastern and Western Canada on an annual basis to address membership concerns regarding the cost of travel (Austin, 2000b) and had implications for the number of people attending the annual conference. Although the ASAC executive chose locations to facilitate travel, there are implications for the development of management knowledge. Because of limited funding, scholars choose which conferences to attend each year based on a number of factors (location, cost, language, subject, and appropriateness; Gur, Hamureu & Eren, 2016). As a result, ASAC is competing with other, more prominent (e.g., *Academy of Management*) conferences.

Conference themes are seen as one way to encourage research with a Canadian focus and to be in line with funding opportunities from organizations like SSHRC (Austin, 2000b). Alan Blair, the president of ASAC in 1979, stated that the "theme, the choice of speakers, and the contacts planned with officials of funding and Granting agencies, are all meant to make us more

visible in the larger community when it counts" (ASAC, 1979, p. 2). Themes that lined up with

institutions like SSHRC were viewed as a way of enhancing the legitimacy of the annual

conference (Austin, 2000b). Conference themes may also reflect an effort by the ASAC

executive to appeal to a broader management membership base and to appear more legitimate

within the broader field of management or to coincide with global issues and research trends. In

addition to reflecting the broader research trends and priorities of funding agencies, conference

themes can also reflect the values of conference organizers and the goals of executive members

to meet institutional objectives. Conference themes can therefore act as a powerful non-human

actor that impacts the decisions of conference organizers and prospective contributors to the

annual general conference. For example, Bill Wedley, conference chair for the 1985 conference,

provided the rationale for the selection of the theme "*Business in its international dimension:*

Implications for management education, and research":

> This is the first time that international business has been featured as a theme for an
>
> ASAC Conference. It is a topic which fits in well with the concepts of Expo '86,
>
> and it provides relevance for all of ASAC's divisions. Moreover, issues of trade,
>
> investment, and cultural relations with other nations are becoming major public
>
> policy issues for Canada. (ASAC Bulletin, Fall 1985)

Wedley's explanation suggests that the choice of theme was to adhere to ASAC's

mandate of focussing on Canadian issues but also fits in with the broader socio-economic

conditions and notable events of the time (e.g., Expo '86). Conference themes can impact the

direction of conference papers for that year but can also signal shifts and trends in management

topics for future years. In this case, the emphasis on how the topic addresses general trends

associated with international business and how Canada fits into the broader academic field

reinforces ideas consistent with how management studies come to represent American dominant

models. As a result, the themes of a conference are discursive and impact how subsequent

models of management are developed and reinforced.

Table 6 *List of ASAC conference themes and locations by year*

Year	Conference Location/Sponsor	Conference Theme	Year	Conference Location/Sponsor	Conference Theme
1979	University of Saskatchewan	"Managing in the 1980s: Themes for management research"	1994	Halifax (Dalhousie)	"Looking South: The Canadian perspective on North American trade"
1980	Montreal	"Towards excellence in the 80's"	1995	Windsor (Windsor University)	
1981	Dalhousie University		1996	Montreal (HEC)	
1982	University of Ottawa	"The Future: Today's Challenge"	1997	St. John's (Memorial)	"Discovering new worlds"
1983	University of British Columbia	"Linking Knowledge to Action"	1998	Saskatoon (University of Saskatchewan)	
1984	University of Guelph	"Management "Education: Its Place in the Community"	1999	Saint John (UNB Saint John)	"Managing on the digital frontier"
1985	University of Montreal	"The information society: Its implications for teaching and research"	2000	Montreal (UQAM)	"Taking Stock: a look at competing paradigms"
1986	Whistler (Simon Fraser)	"Business in its International Dimension"	2001	London (University of Western Ontario)	
1987	University of Toronto		2002	Winnipeg (University of Manitoba)	"Where East meets West"
1988	Halifax (Saint Mary's University)	"Management education in the 90's: Challenges and Changes"	2003	Halifax (Saint Mary's University)	"New paradigms for a new millennium"
1989	Montreal (McGill)	"Changes and challenges of the 1990's and beyond: Le future commence aujourd'hui"	2004	Quebec City (Laval University)	"Research Agenda for the next decade"

Year	Conference Location/Sponsor	Conference Theme	Year	Conference Location/Sponsor	Conference Theme
1990	Quebec City (Laval)	"Adapting to Turbulent Environment"	2005	Toronto (Ryerson University)	"Managing in Turbulent Times"
1991	Niagara Falls (Brock University)		2006	Banff (University of Lethbridge)	"Reaching new heights"
1992	Quebec, Quebec		2007	Ottawa (University of Ottawa)	"The essentials of leadership"
1993	Lake Louise (Calgary)		2008	Halifax (Dalhousie University)	"Managing the responsible enterprise"
			2009	Niagara Falls (Wilfrid Laurier University)	"Creating Knowledge in the New Economy"

Despite efforts of the ASAC executive to increase membership and interest in the annual

conference through themes and location choices, many established scholars viewed ASAC as a

developmental conference for graduate students before beginning their academic careers in the

larger (and more legitimate) academy. Even many Canadian business school faculty, supervising

graduate students, deter graduate students (particularly PhD students) from submitting papers to

ASAC because of the questions this could raise about the quality of their students or their

abilities as a graduate supervisor and continues to present challenges to the ASAC executive.

There are also a growing number of master's degree students attending ASAC which, although it

serves to strengthen the academic base of quality scholarship over the long term, has further

called the legitimacy and quality of the ASAC conference into question by some business

schools who privilege top tier conferences with an international focus. As a result, many

students, in an effort to advance their careers, choose to submit work to conferences such as the

Academy of Management to raise their profile and job prospects. The *Academy of Management* is

generally considered to be a top tier conference for management scholars and generates

submissions from around the world (Johnson, 2008). One way that ASAC sought to develop and grow the annual conference and develop a strong Canadian identity was to focus on the development of Canadian scholars.

Scholarly Development

One issue with which ASAC was confronted was the hiring of faculty in Canadian business schools. This concern was echoed by the Symons Report (1978) which highlighted that "[t]he shortage of qualified Canadian graduates…. forced business schools in this country to go outside Canada to recruit faculty in large numbers" (p.192). Of the actors traced in the current study, some obtained their PhD education outside of Canada (Burke, University of Michigan; Etemad, University of California, Berkeley; McShane, Michigan State University) and were later recruited to work in Canada. Hiring foreign faculty was justified by Canada's business schools stating, "[w]e continue to hire top-flight Americans only because we feel their help is essential in developing our PhD programmes and thereby acquiring the ability to graduate first-class Canadian-born and educated students who will begin to fill the gaps in Canadian business education." (Symons, 1978, p. 192). Boothman (2000a) highlighted that when American-trained scholars were recruited to work at Canadian institutions, they "usually maintained their professional credentials through American academic societies" (p. 65) continuing to develop work that would appear "in American conferences or journals, concentrated upon American practices, and applied models or theories based upon American experiences" (Boothman, 2000a, p. 65). University leaders and ASAC executive were concerned that importing American and American-trained academics might lead to an over-reliance on American models. The maintenance of their professional credentials and participation in American conferences

demonstrates how actors were performing the activities required to be successful in the academic field.

To address concerns related to the lack of available Canadian faculty, the development of PhD programs in Canadian universities was paramount to ensuring that Canadian knowledge and identity could be developed within Canada. As a result, there was a push to increasingly develop PhDs who could later be recruited to work in Canadian institutions. Both Beamish and Irving for example received their PhD's at the University of Western Ontario, Miller received hers at the University of Victoria and Saks received his from the University of Toronto. Developing Master and PhD programs in Canada was a challenge. Students often privileged European and US programs (i.e., Etemad, University of California, Berkeley), which were seen as being more prestigious and legitimate than their Canadian counterparts who were still struggling to institutionalize basic undergraduate programming. Students privileging international institutions over Canadian ones provides another example of how management studies is performed and influenced by non-human actors (i.e., universities are non-human actors which attract students based on their reputation, funding, supervising faculty, etc.). With funding support from SSHRC, ASAC actively worked to encourage students to remain in Canada when completing graduate school throughout the 1990s (e.g., Irving, Beamish, Miller, etc.). With an emphasis on management, the ASAC executive discussed a number of initiatives including the possibility of placement services; a PhD best paper award; a pre-convention consortium; and a best dissertation award (ASAC, 1990). The proposal of these ideas mirrored national-level initiatives with which ASAC was involved, including membership on the steering committee for the National PhD program (ASAC, 1990) which occurred during Etemad's tenure as ASAC president. The National PhD program was founded by the Canadian Federation of Deans

Management and Administrative Sciences (CFDMAS). The CFDMAS has a mandate to promote

management education by bringing Deans from different business schools together. Arising from

concerns regarding the lack of PhD's in Canada, the CFDMAS founded the National PhD

program; however, despite initial efforts it does not appear that the National PhD program was

successful (ASAC, 1991) and even with the addition of government scholarships, many students

still travelled outside of Canada to pursue their education (Austin, 2000a).

Despite the suggested lack of success of the National PhD program, the development of

graduate students at the Master's and PhD level have continued to grow across Canada. Many of

the actors traced in this dissertation have actively participated in the development of graduate

students. Beamish, for example, actively worked with students and had articles accepted to

ASAC. Beamish's staff profile at the University of Western Ontario indicates that he has

supervised 35 doctoral students and has taught for the Executive MBA at Ivey's Hong Kong

campus (University of Western Ontario, accessed June, 30th, 2020). Elangovan co-authored

papers with three PhD students at ASAC and Tallman co-authored one paper with a health

sciences PhD student. Working with graduate students provides supervisors with the opportunity

to mentor like-minded students who share similar values and research interests. In doing so,

supervisors' impact subsequent generations of scholars in the type of research seen as acceptable

within the broader academic field by imparting their values to the next generation of students.

The mentorship activities also reinforce how academic activities should be performed to be

enrolled into the management studies network.

Content, Context and Language at ASAC

ASAC conference articles written by the 18 actors identified were analysed for their

content, their context (i.e., framing as Canadian) and their language (i.e., English or French).

Reviewing conference articles across these three dimensions can reveal how articles build upon their respective fields over time and reflect the values predominant in management studies. As a result, reviewing the titles, content and references of accepted ASAC articles can be instrumental in understanding how academic literature is constructed and developed.

One way to evaluate the development of management studies is to examine the content of accepted articles. For example, two of Beamish's 20 accepted ASAC articles specifically mention Canada in the title. One article titled *A corporate view of international business education in Canada: National and provincial assessments* (Beamish & Calof, 1989) looked at how curriculum at business schools in Canada should internationalize content to maintain global competitiveness. Although the article focusses on a survey sent to Canadian corporations, public sector organizations and universities, the reference list relies heavily on articles from the *Academy of Management, Journal of International Business* studies and books published by American publishers. This article was specifically addressing the need to legitimize Canadian business schools by identifying the ideas and training that experts expressed as being important. By relying on American sources in the development of a paper on the internationalization of management education, the inference is that American models of education are privileged as being "reality par excellence" (Berger & Luckman, 1967, p. 21). Privileging high tier (i.e., predominantly American) sources could suggest to readers that Canadian business schools are unable to be competitive unless American ideals are adopted or that there is an absence of available Canadian literature from which to draw. I am not suggesting that Beamish and Calof (1989) were deliberately restricting themselves to Americanized examples to define quality management education; rather, that this example reflects broader institutional pressures

governing academia that motivate actors to perform accepted activities in the management studies network. Beamish's articles were not an anomaly.

The use of American sources to develop conference papers was evident among many of the 18 actor's work. Saks and Ashforth (1996) for example did not reference any Canadian publications and relied exclusively on American publications like the *Academy of Management, Journal of Management* and *Journal of Applied Psychology* in their honourable-mention-winning paper on socialization practices of new employees. Withey's (1988) award-winning paper only referenced two Canadian publications—a previous submission of his from the 1985 ASAC conference proceedings and his doctoral dissertation. The only reference to the Canadian context in Withey's 1988 paper was to Ontario commerce graduates to understand organizational commitment using models from the organizational behaviour literature.

When looking at other articles written by our 18 actors it became apparent that regardless of the context of the article, the reference lists appear to privilege predominantly American journal publications (e.g., *Organization Studies, Administrative Sciences Quarterly, Academy of Management; Harvard Business Review*, etc.). Dastmalchian, Javidan, and Pasis (1985), for example reference *Administrative Sciences Quarterly* and *Organization Studies* regularly in their article titled *Centralization of Decision Making, Organizational Context and Dependence: Evidence from Canadian Provincially Controlled Organizations.* Although the article focusses on the Canadian context, citations related to Canada are limited to the structure of provincial and crown corporations and play a limited role in discussion of the findings. Unlike Beamish and Calof's (1989) article, which suggested the need for internationalization, Dastmalchian et al. (1985) emphasized the need for more research in a Canadian context. For example, Dastmalchian et al. (1985) highlight how their research supports some variables of decision-

making models that are American; however, they also highlight how there are different cultural

and political explanations for other aspects of their findings and identify the need for more

research in this area.

Although many of the 18 ASAC actors relied heavily on American sources to inform their

articles, some incorporated Canadian and European journals more frequently. Etemad, for

example, frequently referenced European journals in addition to an Australian and a Brazilian

journal to inform his papers (Etemad, 1981, 1982, 1986a, 1986b). Rugman (1986) referenced a

number of sources: the *Canadian Journal of Economics,* a book about Canada, the Ontario

Economic Council, and the Canadian Tax Foundation in his paper titled, *The determinants of*

Canadian outward direct investment which focusses on Canada's investment in the United

States. The article emphasizes reasons why Canadian firms seek to expand into the United States,

references the different context of the Canadian market (i.e., smaller population) and discusses

the political environment of Canada to explain how organizations make investment decisions.

Despite the inclusion of Canadian references in his 1986 article, Rugman's articles are submitted

to the IB division and the content and context generally worked to internationalize management

studies. Although some of the actors incorporated Canadian content and sources in their articles,

this was not common and only comprised a small number of the total references. Who the

authors were citing in conference papers signalled to other scholars what were appropriate

sources of information when constructing and submitting papers. Although references are an

important aspect of building on what was taken as scientific knowledge, the prominence of

American sources in the reference lists, even when papers were discussing Canadian issues (i.e.,

political, economic and cultural dimensions) serve to reinforce broader institutional values that

privilege American journals as top tier and marginalize other accounts of management studies that could add to our understanding of OB, Strategy/Policy and IB.

In addition to analyzing the reference lists of the 18 actors for the type of references used in their conference papers, the references were also examined to see if any of the other ASAC actors or other identifiable Canadian scholars (e.g., Mintzberg, Barling) were referenced in their conference papers. Identifiable Canadians in the reference lists were, however, minimal. Beamish and Calof (1989) referenced an article by Rugman and Verbeke (who served as an editor for CJAS) but aside from referencing Beamish's dissertation and another University of Western Ontario dissertation, no other identifiable Canadians were referenced. In Beamish and Jung's (2005) award-winning paper, Etemad was referenced as was Delios (who served as an Associate editor for CJAS). Delios and Beamish have co-authored other papers together and were referenced in addition to another article that Delios had co-authored with other individuals. The Saks and Ashforth (1996) article referenced Ashforth's and Mudrack's work, two individuals who have made contributions to ASAC both as authors and as divisional editors at ASAC and CJAS. Although some of the 18 actors referenced others on our list, many did not. Elangovan (1994) and Irving (1995) did not reference any of the 18 actors identified on our list and only referenced one identifiable Canadian, Henry Mintzberg, in their articles.

The extensive use of American sources when constructing conference articles, even when the article is designed to address Canadian issues, reveals the dominance of American journals throughout management studies. Canadian scholars wanting to incorporate Canadian sources are further constrained by having only a single general management journal (CJAS) and a relatively small number of Canadian discipline-specific journals (i.e., *International Business Research*). Relying on American journals and scholars when writing an article about the Canadian context

shifts management studies to reflect and generalize the findings in the broader academic field. Through the permanence of accepted articles (non-human actor), the articles are instrumental in signaling what steps scholars need to take to be successful in performing management studies. The reliance on American journals when developing management studies in Canada has been a concern highlighted by scholars over the past forty years (Boothman, 2000b; Symons, 1978). The number of American journals cited, however, only provides part of the picture in understanding the context and content of accepted ASAC articles.

In addition to looking at the types of sources used in conference articles, it appears that ASAC articles draw on a broad body of literature when developing their papers and go beyond journal articles. Beamish and Calof's (1989) article about international business education, for example, referenced two doctoral dissertations (one was Beamish's PhD dissertation) both from the University of Western Ontario, as well as the Academy of International Business Conference in London, England. Dastmalchian et al. (1985) reference the Institute for Research on Public Policy and a book called *Crown corporations in Canada* to inform their article on the centralization of decision-making policy in Canada. Referencing a variety of sources at the conference level appears to be common and demonstrates that when writing papers at the conference level, scholars draw on a greater variety of sources to help develop their ideas with different subject areas. Elangovan (2004), for example, referenced a working paper series from the University of Wisconsin as well as an *American Psychological Association* conference paper presented in 1986 and an *Academy of Management* paper presented in 1991. Etemad referenced the Government of Canada, the Economic Council of Canada, working papers, books, texts, and magazines (1981, 1982).

Although a broad number of sources were used in accepted ASAC articles, there were very few references by the 18 actors to the ASAC annual conference and CJAS. There was one reference to the Atlantic School of Business conference (Irving, 1995), a Canadian regional conference. Irving also referenced research bulletins and an unpublished manuscript. Irving, Kovacheff, Coleman and Wood (1995) referenced a paper presented at the 1993 ASAC conference. Withey did reference ASAC once in his paper (1988); however, it was his own paper presented at a previous conference.

Canadian sources are only used when providing context in ASAC articles rather than in the development of theory. These sources are used to highlight the economic, political, and cultural dimensions that journal articles published in American publications generally do not address. Although there are Canadian sources to inform the context of the articles, the annual ASAC conference is not generally seen as a source for individuals writing about Canadian specific content. Journal articles are therefore relied on to apply and build on theory from American journals.

In addition to using a variety of sources to construct the conference paper, there were differences in how the articles addressed the content and context. Although many of the article titles were general, some article titles did reference Canada and other geographic regions. Etemad for example, authored and co-authored 15 articles to ASAC. Etemad referenced Canada four times in the title of the articles and referenced China, South Korea, Taiwan, the Netherlands, and Finland in various articles and appears to have deliberately incorporated research with varied geographic regions. Elangovan, Finegan, Irving, McShane, Miller, Saha, Stone, Tallman, Withey, and Withane, on the other hand, did not have any articles listed with Canada in the title and in some of those articles the context for the topic studied was unclear. One way to try to

identify the context of the paper was to review the methods sections of papers. The methods

sections identified differences in how the actors described respondents.

Finegan, for example, did not include references to Canada in any of the article titles and

the methods section of her 1995 article simply read "Questionnaires were distributed to 10, 300

employees at a subsidiary plant of large petrochemical company" (p. 60)[15]. As a result, it is

unclear whether the research was conducted in Canada, United States, Europe, or elsewhere.

When geographic context is removed from the article, the implication is that the knowledge

applied is universal and value free and could be motivated by "academics feeling that they need

to conduct "context-free" (i.e., meaning American) research to be successful in their careers in

Canadian universities" (McLaren and Mills, 2015a, p. 321). Finegan, working for a Canadian

institution, may have removed references to Canada to make it easier for the paper to be accepted

by a non-Canadian journal. The conference paper was developed and accepted for publication in

the *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, a British publication, in 2002. The

article's publication at the journal (non-human actor) level further demonsrates that actors

perform activities consistent with the development of management studies which privileges the

idea that knowledge is value free.

Saks and Ashforth (1996) took a similar approach when describing their research

participants as "members of the 1991 and 1992 graduating classes of an undergraduate business

program" (p. 13) omitting all geographic references in their longitudinal study. Given that they

were looking at the lived experiences of business school graduates in their first post-graduate

jobs, one would expect that the graduates' experiences could be impacted by broader societal

---

[15] Finegan later published the same article in the *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (2002), a British journal and has been cited 247 times (ProQuest, Retrieved October, 3, 2020).

conditions such as the economy, politics, and cultural context. Examination of articles written by

Saks and Ashforth reveal a similar article, using longitudinal data from recent business school

graduates, published in the *Academy of Management Journal* (Ashforth & Saks, 1996). That

article, although with a different title than the conference paper, does examine similar constructs

and matches the timeframe of the ASAC conference piece. Authors may eliminate geographical

references to increase the likelihood of publication in an American top-tier journal, but it also

supports the idea that context need not be a consideration when developing papers in

management studies (McLaren & Mills, 2015a) reflecting the taken-for-granted assumption that

the results are value free and could be applied universally.

Withey (1988) did identify that his survey respondents were from an Ontario university. A

longitudinal study to explore organizational commitment of employees involved sending surveys

to recent commerce graduates who were employed by an organization. Despite recognition that

the participants were from Ontario, there was no further consideration given to the geographic

context of the participants or to the impact that this could have on the paper's findings. The

survey participants were randomly selected from a list of graduates where a mailing address was

available; however, the methods section did not indicate if the survey respondents were

employed by a Canadian or American organization or if this information was captured in the

survey data. Given the proximity of major Ontario cities to the border with the United States, the

failure to capture the employment context once again implies geography was not seen as

important to the development of commitment by employees. With many individuals crossing the

Canada-United States border for employment, there are unique considerations that may not be

present in other parts of the country. Based on the different political structures and economic

considerations, respondents who lived in Canada but worked in the United States would likely

have different experience then those working in Canada for a Canadian organization. Not capturing this information or including it in the study reflects an assumption that geographic context is non-consequential because of the universal applicability of management knowledge.

Another consideration involves analyzing the models used to conduct studies with Canadian data. Irving (1995), for example, indicated that the subjects in his study were students from a University of Western Ontario introductory psychology class, but did not include any additional discussion regarding the Canadian context of the study. In the section discussing the model used in the study, the limitation of using university students to evaluate the conflict resolution interventions made by managers using vignettes was discussed, but no consideration was given to understand how geographic context could impact the generalizability of the findings (Irving, 1995). Discussing the geographic context would be important in this research as it relied on models and vignettes that were developed and tested using American data. The model adopted by Irving (1995) was Vroom-Yetton's decision model. Vroom was born in Canada, obtained his PhD from the University of Michigan and developed the model while a professor at the University of Yale. In addition to the ties of Vroom to the United States, Vroom and Yetton used managers from a management development program (presumably in the United States) in their landmark model. Adopting a model based on United States data does not mean that the model cannot be of use to understand decision-making in a Canadian context. Rather, the purpose is to understand how we came to view management studies as being value-free and universal rather than acknowledging the conditions around which knowledge has been produced.

Although not including identifying information is seen as protecting the identity of respondents, the removal of geographic information from the methods section is problematic. The lack of discussion regarding the generalizability of the findings based on economic,

political, and sociocultural dimensions in Canada further influences the Americanization of management studies making it appear value free. Some of the decisions by authors could reflect institutionalized standards by conferences, journals, and universities to improve chances of acceptance and eventual publication by journals. It could also reflect the idea that "[r]esearch on Canadian issues was little understood in American associations and not readily accepted by U.S. journals" (Austin, 2000b, p. 275). As a result, it may have been easier to omit geographical references rather than explain the relevance or applicability to a broader audience. Although removal of geographic information could make it more appealing to prospective journals, the exclusion of important contextual information does not inform the reader about the political system, culture or other distinguishing features that could impact the application of the information.

Another dimension of ASAC that differentiates it from American conferences is that it is bilingual. Despite recognition of its bilingual status, dominant accounts of ASAC's history have glossed over the impact of language on ASAC's development. Austin (1998) for example reduces the impact to "ASAC is bilingual and tries to balance regional representation on its executive" (p. 255). The bilingual nature of the conference is an important dimension to consider in the development of management studies in Canada. Of the 16 ASAC actors who had papers accepted to the annual conference, 15 write solely in one language. As a result, the individuals they collaborate with tend to be English-speaking as well. Brigitte Levy is the only exception from our list. Six of her seven accepted articles were written in French and she has gone on to write in both of Canada's official languages. Five of her seven articles reference Canada in the title. Unlike our English-speaking actors who exclusively draw on English articles, Levy draws on both English and French articles to inform her conference papers, referencing journals such as

Interventions economique (in 1986) and *Analyse de politique* (in 1989). Levy also drew on the French version of government publications, a French working paper from the University of Ottawa, and included a variety of sources to inform each of her accepted ASAC articles.

Language also appeared to be influential with those who served at the divisional and editorial level of ASAC. There has historically been French speaking members of ASAC, the representation at the executive level and at the divisional levels has been fewer than their English-speaking counterparts. Based on a review of Google Scholar and published articles, it appears that between 1979 and 2009 there have been four bilingual presidents of ASAC but the majority of divisional chairs and editors have been English speaking. Recognizing that there are fewer French speaking members at ASAC as contributors and in leadership positions is important to acknowledge as English is the standard language accepted for premier journal articles (i.e., American). The privileging of English could signal to authors that for their work to be published and accepted in the broader institutional field they must adhere to specific language requirements.

Chapter Summary

As this chapter highlights, management studies in Canada has been influenced by the development of the ASAC annual conference. The ASAC executive selected locations and themes that would be appealing to scholars and it was motivated by the mandate to develop a conference to represent the interests of businesses and scholars conducting research relevant to Canadian issues and topics. Despite the development of a national conference to address Canadian issues, analysis of accepted ASAC articles by 18 actors highlight a predominance of American journals as sources (e.g., *Academy of Management, Harvard Business Review,* etc.)

and a decontextualization of the methods section of articles even when referring to Canadian

topics. When Canadian sources were used, they were primarily used to explain the Canadian

context rather than to build on and develop theory. In addition to analyzing the content of the

articles, the co-authors and affiliations were analysed to understand the relationships between co-

authors and how actor-networks come together. Finally, this chapter highlighted that conference

articles were predominantly English and relied on English sources. As discussed throughout the

chapter, the implications of relying on predominantly American journals and English articles

impacts what comes to be seen as management studies and has gradually shifted the knowledge

that it comes to represent. The next chapter will examine CJAS's mandate, editorial board, and

the context, content, and language of its articles to examine the similarities and differences

between conferences and journals.

Chapter 5: CJAS and the Founding of a Journal

The difficulty lies not so much in developing new ideas as in escaping from the old ones.

—John Maynard Keynes

Journal articles act as a key element in understanding how management studies has developed since "[o]ne of the key ways in which many scientific fields (including management) develop is through scholarly journal publication (McWilliams, Siegel, & Van Fleet, 2005; Spencer, 2001)" (Conlon, Morgeson, McNamara, Wiseman & Skilton, 2006, p. 857). Although journal articles are a common source for research, "the distribution of scholarly information has become increasingly complex" (McCartan, 2010, p. 238). Even Symons (1978) indicated that they used journals as a way of communicating the mandate of the Commission on Canadian Studies to recruit scholars interested in participating in the project. Journal articles leave a permanent record and are seen to reflect "stable and durable relationships between publishers, scholars, libraries and agents" (McCartan, 2010, p. 238). As this chapter will outline, scholars and their publications may reflect institutional pressures impacting where articles are submitted and how they are written. This makes journals important to consider when surfacing an account of management studies in Canada. This chapter will trace the origins of CJAS, how the direction of CJAS has been impacted by human and non-human actors, and the implications for the development of management studies by tracing the 18 actors who have published in CJAS.

The Founding of a journal

The Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences (CJAS) was founded by ASAC (non-human actor) because key individuals at the executive level wanted to provide the opportunity for scholars to publish research focussed on Canadian issues. With the help of Government

funding, CJAS published its inaugural issue in 1984 (Austin, 2000b). Discussions regarding the founding of a Canadian journal began in 1972 and ASAC executives proposed that it would publish articles that could be used in Canadian universities to teach issues directly related to Canadian businesses. Despite discussions about a Canadian journal beginning in 1972 the idea was rarely discussed again until 1979. In 1979, Jim Ellert of Queen's University was tasked to investigate the viability of a journal (ASAC, 1979) and came at a time when issues regarding Canadian identity were at a high. The Symons Report (1978) was now formally published, and the report's implications and recommendations were presumably being discussed by universities and ASAC executive members. A Canadian journal was viewed by some as an important venue for Canadian research and was taken on by ASAC executive. In a letter to ASAC president Alan G. Blair, Burke (1979) stated "P.S. Now for the good news! I think it is about time A.S.A.C. develop a journal. With J.B.A. going to themes we lack a single outlet in Canada for our research". A proposal was submitted to SSHRC in January of 1982 to see if funding could be provided to help offset costs associated with founding CJAS. The proposal, prepared by J. Brent Ritchie (ASAC President 1980-1981), explicitly stated that CJAS would focus on Canadian issues related to the administrative sciences and was reinforced by stating that the journal would focus on research "…based upon Canadian data which American and other foreign journals do not consider of sufficient interest to the readers of their publications . . . research in the administrative sciences discipline would be facilitated if Canadian researchers knew there was an appropriate publication outlet for their research efforts." (Richie, 1981, p. 1). The statement of focus on Canadian issues and research would presumably set the initial vision for CJAS and help the journal and its editors establish the criteria on which articles would be evaluated for acceptance and publication.

Once funding was granted there appeared to be considerable pressure to ensure CJAS was successful. In a letter written to Wallace Crowsten (Dean at York University), Roger J. Hall (ASAC president 1983-1984) wrote;

I guess that like you, we (the ASAC Executive) are waiting with bated breath and pleasant anticipation for Ron Burke's first edition of the Journal to come off the press. A lot is riding on its success: the hopes and aspirations of the Management and Administrative Studies academic community of Canada, not to mention our collective reputations! (Roger J. Hall, January 3, 1984)

The above quotation highlights the hopes that ASAC executive had for CJAS as a way of being able to expand the field of management studies in Canada and the personal risk that some members of the executive took in helping make CJAS a reality. Providing a venue for Canadian research was seen as a worthwhile endeavour by some Canadian scholars; however, as the Symons Report (1978) highlighted, it was viewed as being anti-academic in its pursuit by other scholars who viewed knowledge as being universal. The close relationship between ASAC and CJAS also caused some issues regarding decisions about what was published and how these decisions were being made. In one somewhat testy correspondence between Burke, the first CJAS Editor-in-Chief, and Michel Laroche, the 1985 program chair of ASAC, Burke stated

As I indicated to you before, the contents of any given issue, when the number of acceptable manuscripts is limited, is purely a function of what I have before me. This has been generally the case with the first issue which is now out, and the second issue, which is at the printers. I hope that you, finally, will understand that I treat all Divisions within ASAC the same; I have not sought manuscripts from any Division to the exclusion of others, the Editorial Advisory Board contains individuals from all

Divisions…I find it hard to take responsibility for or even agree with, the notion that

there exists "disenchantment of members of many Divisions who do not recognize

themselves in the Journal (Burke, September 19, 1984, p. 1).

Burke was expressing his frustration at questions regarding the articles published in the inaugural

issue of CJAS. The minimal number of submissions, while expected for a new journal, implied

that there were concerns about the identity of the journal as too generalist in nature. Burke's

comments also reveal his apparent values, stating that all divisions are regarded equally and

suggests that quality articles would be given equal consideration for publication. Michel Laroche

responded to Burke's letter.

I suggested that <u>you</u> appoint departmental editors representing the various divisions

(for example from your editorial board). This way, everyone would feel more

comfortable that what you call "acceptable manuscripts" are really mainstream.

These departmental editors would be closer to the membership of their divisions,

they would relieve you some of the basic chores, and would take the heat off of you.

Their role would be to generate submissions, select reviewers, control the quality of

the reviews and report to you with a separate written recommendation. You would

still be the final judge on the acceptance/refusal decision sent to the author(s).

(Michel Laroche to Ronald Burke, September 27, 1984)

Laroche is presumably expressing concerns regarding the criteria and judgement exercised with

the inaugural issue of CJAS and with the content therewithin. The inaugural issue included

articles by Mintzberg, McShane, and an article co-authored by Burke himself. Laroche also

expressed concerns regarding whether the articles within CJAS were mainstream and highlights

the role that the editor plays in making the ultimate decision about what is or is not published

based on the values of that individual. Burke expressed different values or perspectives regarding the quality and content of the articles and impacts the strategic vision of the journal. As a result, journals provide the ability to recognize which ideas are privileged based on the values represented by, in this case, the Editor-in-Chief. Laroche's concerns about Burke continued to be an issue. Pasquero and Laroche (1985) complained that "the Editor publishes his own articles in CJAS on a regular basis" (p. 3) which resulted in additional policies being established to address the issue moving forward. Given that the Editor-in-Chief is in part responsible for determining the strategic direction of the journal and ensuring that a review process is undertaken to evaluate submissions to meet the standards of rigour in the field, the editor publishing his own articles raised concerns over the perception of quality and could have implications related to the content that CJAS readers were exposed to early in the journal's development.

As CJAS grew and the number of submissions increased, several changes were implemented. The number of issues grew from three to four, special interest issues were introduced, and a best paper award was launched (Austin, 2000b). However, because of growing concerns regarding cost, changes to the publishing environment, and a transition to a digital platform, CJAS made decisions designed to increase readership on a global scale. Fooladi and Rosson (2000), in their first editorial as incoming Editors-in-Chief, emphasized the contribution of Canadian content.

> Our starting point is the view that CJAS is important to Canadian academics in the administrative sciences. CJAS has assumed a significant position because it provides a logical dissemination vehicle for research that is Canadian in its approach and/or application. It would be a mistake, however, to give the impression that CJAS is narrowly "Canadian" in its content. Nothing could be

further than the truth: CJAS has always included articles on issues with broader

implications… (Fooladi and Rosson, 2000, p. 8)

Fooladi and Rosson (2000) recognize the mandate of CJAS to provide a venue for

Canadian research. There is a marked difference, however, from Jalilvand's expression of the

CJAS's mandate during his tenure as Editor-in-Chief, where he stated that he wanted to "further

promote the journal's *raison d'etre* as a multidisciplinary instrument devoted to advancing

research on issues of interest to Canada and Canadian academics" (Jalilvand, 1999, p. 271). The

differences between the three editors and their proposed mandates reveal the tensions that existed

regarding the direction and continued mandate of CJAS as a repository for Canadian research.

With Fooladi and Rosson (2000) emphasis on articles with "broader implications" signaled a

shift in the content that would now be considered acceptable for publication at CJAS. The shift

toward a more universal (i.e., modernist) approach to the administrative sciences continued with

the appointment of Rick Hackett, who served as Editor-in-Chief following Fooladi and Brooks.

Hackett, Editor-in-Chief of CJAS between 2006 and 2011, appeared to promote CJAS to

a broader audience by attending international forums and explicitly asked Division editors to

promote it at discipline-specific conferences. At the beginning of his term, Hackett specifically

stated that his mandate was to:

(a) build upon the favorable international stature of CJAS; (b) leverage its unique

strengths by publishing more *cross*-disciplinary papers; (c) increase the number of

submissions from outside Canada; (d) increase further its citation impact; (e)

improve administrative efficiencies that maintain high-quality, fair, developmental

and timely reviews with shortened lead times to publication; (f) raise revenue for

special initiatives; (g) improve monitoring systems for tracking manuscripts, from

point of submission to publication; and (h) identify and celebrate the most highly

cited CJAS articles. I also intend to publish special issues on topics that, while of

particular importance to Canada, draw international interest, providing the

opportunity for readers abroad to learn from the "Canadian experience". (Hackett,

2006a, p. E)

Hackett explicitly states his vision and goals for CJAS during his tenure to increase the

international presence and reputation of the journal. Hackett's vision was likely guided by ASAC

executive who worked to legitimize the association within the broader academic field and to

respond to growing pressure at Canadian universities. To further develop these values into the

vision of CJAS, and promote them to Divisional Editors and readers, Hackett frequently

emphasized the rise in international submissions in his editorials (Hackett, 2006c) and promoted

CJAS at venues like the *Academy of Management* annual conference. In his 2006 CJAS

Editorial, he mentions having a booth and co-hosting a reception at the *Academy of Management*

annual conference. "These venues brought much favorable exposure to ASAC and CJAS. There

was considerable 'traffic' around the CJAS booth, and the reception was very well attended, with

much international representation" (2006c, p. 3).

By emphasizing the traffic at the ASAC and CJAS booth, Hackett reinforces the mandate

mentioned at the beginning of his term to increase the international exposure of CJAS and to

demonstrate interest from the international community to submit articles to CJAS. Hackett is

presumably responding to pressures by universities and in the broader field of management

designed to increase the rankings of CJAS and appears to be reinforcing his actions throughout

his term. Hackett goes on to state that "[w]hile CJAS may be a particularly suitable home for

such manuscripts, it also publishes articles that are not specific to Canada. Indeed, all of the

"ProQuest top 5" CJAS publications transcend Canada dealing with broader, universal

phenomena" (Hackett, 2006c, p. 167-168).

Hackett, and his endorsement by the ASAC executive, therefore, could be seen as actors

in the development of management studies in Canada. As this section highlights, the role of the

editor and support of executive members can have an impact on the strategic vision of the journal

and, as a result, the policies and decisions that would be used to establish criteria over content

published within its covers. Although the Editor-in-Chief comes to be seen as the "face" of the

journal (i.e., black box), they are not self-appointed and there is a process involved in their

selection. As a result, it is important to remember that the Editor-in-Chief, although playing a

key role in the direction of CJAS, is not alone in making these decisions and is building on the

efforts of previous Editor-in-Chief's, executive members, and broader institutional pressures.

CJAS Special Issues

Similar to ASAC and its conference themes, special issues are designed to gather similar

articles together into one central thematic issue to increase readership about a topic of interest.

Guest editors propose a topic and, with approval of the Editor-in-Chief, accepts or rejects the

topic area based on the journal's interest and alignment with its mandate. With the Editor-in-

Chief determining what special issues are accepted for CJAS, the special issue themes provide

traces of what topics were of value at specific points in time and can provide insight into the

development of management studies.

Only two of our actors have been the guest editor of special issues: Burke and

Dastmalchian. Burke had two special issues: *Managing an increasingly diverse workforce* in

1991 and one on *Downsizing and restructuring in organizations* in 1998. Dastmalchian co-edited

a special issue on *Workplace flexibility and the changing nature of work* with Paul Blyton in

2001. In each case, the Guest editors also had articles published in those editions of CJAS. Of the

actors traced in this dissertation, Etemad was the only other actor to have a paper accepted to the

2004 special issue on the *Internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises* and none of

our other actors have had been cited in a CJAS special issue.

Despite CJAS's mandate to provide a venue for research focussed on the Canadian

context, special issues appear to overwhelmingly focus on general management trends rather

than specific issues facing organizations in Canada. For example, the special issue in 1991

addresses concerns related to productivity interfaces and in 2004 the internationalization of small

and medium-sized enterprises (see Table 7). Of the 18 special issues that have occurred between

1991 and 2009, only three specifically address Canadian issues in the title and only one special

issue was exclusively French. Dogan Tirtiroglu, guest editor of the 2002 special issue on real

estate finance in Canada stated "limited Canadian research output, published sparsely and mostly

in the United States academic journals, was one of the main reasons behind my request to CJAS

for this special issue." (p. 317). Aside from the 2002 special issue on real estate finance in

Canada, many of the special issues had limited reference to Canada and the references that did

occur were restricted to providing statistical information (e.g., the percentage of Canadians who

engage in e-commerce in the March 2003 special issue).

Table 7 *List of CJAS special issues between 1991-2009*

Year	Theme	Guest Editor(s)
1991	Productivity Interfaces (March, Vol. 8, Iss. 1)	Jean Harvey (UQUAM) Robert R. Britney
	Managing an increasingly diverse workforce (June, Vol. 8, Iss. 2)	Ronald J. Burke (York University)
	Women in Management (December, Vol. 8, Iss. 4)	Carol A. McKeen (Queen's University)
1994	Financial markets and institutions in Canada (June, Vol. 11, Iss. 1)	Nabil Khour
1995	TQM	David Waldman
1996	International accounting and finance (June, Vol. 13, Iss. 2)	Jean-Claude Cosset (Universite Laval) Jeffrey Kantor (University of Windsor)
1996	Entrepreneurship: Theorie et pratique (Dec, Vol. 13, Iss. 4)	Jean-Marie Toulouse (HEC)
1998	Downsizing and restructuring in organizations (Dec, Vol. 15, Iss. 4)	Ronald J. Burke (York University)
1999	Financial risk management (Sept, Vol 16, Iss 3)	Nabil Khour
2001	Workplace flexibility and the changing nature of work (March, Vol. 18, Iss. 1)	Ali Dastmalchian (University of Lethbridge) Paul Blyton (Cardiff Business School)
	Ethical leadership and governance in organizations (Dec, Vol. 18, Iss. 4)	Rabindra N. Kanungo (McGill University) Manuel Mendonca (McGill University)
2002	Real estate finance in Canada (Dec, Vol. 19, Iss. 4)	Dogan Tirtiroglu (Concordia University)
2003	Electronic business and commerce in Canada (March, Vol. 20, Iss. 1)	Charles H. Davis (University of New Brunswick)
2004	Internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises (March, Vol. 21, Iss. 1)	Hamid Etemad[16]

---

[16] There was no formal introduction to this issue. The lead article was written by Etemad.

Year	Theme	Guest Editor(s)
2005	Transportation policy and management (March, Vol. 22, Iss. 1)	Tae Hoon Oum (University of British Columbia) Chunyan Yu (University of British Columbia)
2009	Healthy and safety in organizations (June, Vol. 26, Iss. 2)	Sue Bruning (University of Manitoba) Nick Turner (University of Manitoba)
	Information technology in support of financial markets (June, Vol. 26, Iss. 2)	Ali R. Montazemi (McMaster University) Zahir Irani (Brunel University)
	Gender and diversity at work Part 1- Changing theories. Changing organizations (Sept, Vol. 26, Iss. 3)	Gloria Miller (Isle of Man International Business School) Albert J. Mills (Saint Mary's University) Jean Helms Mills (Saint Mary's University)
	E-Service Part 1: Conceptual frameworks (Dec, Vol. 26, Iss. 4)	Paul R. Messinger (University of Alberta) Dennis Galletta (University of Pittsburgh)

Given that special issues are brought forward by motivated scholars to promote a specific topic and that the Editor-in-Chief has accepted the proposal for a special issue provides an important clue regarding the development of management studies. The guest editors and content of special issues signal what topics are timely and relevant within the broader institutional field and endure over time, acting as a non-human actor that can impact subsequent special issue development. There appeared to be a strong interest in finance related topics in the 1990s and a broad range of topics represented throughout the 2000s with an emphasis on general management topic areas (i.e., context free and thus modernist). As a result, special issues at CJAS suggest that topic areas

are focussed on broad issues and could reflect institutional pressures to increase the visibility of

CJAS within the broader academic field. The next section will analyse the content, context and

language of the articles accepted to CJAS by our actors.

Content, Context and Language

Journal articles are an important source of information and are relied upon by scholars to

identify gaps in the literature and to make a contribution to the scientific body of knowledge.

Cummings and Bridgman (2016) suggest that over time there have been changes in the way that

scholars write about and use sources of information. As a result, the articles by the actors

published by CJAS have been reviewed to assess the content, context, and language to surface

how the sources of information are used to incrementally develop the body of knowledge across

management studies.

Miller (2003) had an article published in CJAS titled *The stages of group development: A*

retrospective study of dynamic team processes. The article was recognized by Hackett, then

Editor-in-Chief of CJAS, where he stated, "Congratulations to the authors of the 'ProQuest top

5', and in particular to Dianne Miller (University of Lethbridge) for occupying the #1 position

for her 2003 paper…downloaded from ProQuest 2563 times." (Hackett, 2006b, p. 3). The article,

recognized by Hackett for the number of downloads it received exclusively referenced American

sources such as the *Academy of Management, Administrative Sciences Quarterly,* and *Human*

Relations and adopts Tuckman's model of team development (i.e., forming, storming, norming,

performing and adjournment). Although the article presumably uses undergraduate students at

the University of Lethbridge, there was no discussion about the how cultural context could

impact the findings of the paper. Although Miller's paper was not designed to discuss the impact

of culture on the generalizability of Tuckman's model, not addressing the context of the study

and the role that cultural differences could have on the findings, speaks to the unspoken

assumptions of management studies being universal and value free.

Miller's (2003) article was not an anomaly. Stone and Smith's (1996) CJAS article

referenced American journals extensively, including the *California Management Review* and the

American Journal of Sociology and Saks, Mudrack and Ashforth (1996) and Irving and Coleman

(2003) also referenced only high profile, American journals. The reliance on high profile

journals is seen as best practice and is copied to adhere to traditional conventions (Cummings &

Bridgman, 2016). As we see from analyzing the references, the articles published in CJAS by the

identified actors, reference a relatively narrow number of journals and sources compared to

ASAC conference proceedings. The journals that are referenced are recognized by many scholars

as top tiered journals and impact the decisions of human actors. This suggests that actors may try

to increase the credibility of the ideas presented in their papers to increase the perceived

legitimacy of CJAS within the field of management studies.

In addition to identifying the journals referenced in the articles, the articles were also

analysed to see if any of the 18 actors I followed were cited by others in CJAS. Most of the

articles analysed did not include any identifiable Canadian scholars or cite any of the actors

traced in this dissertation. Irving and Coleman (2003) referenced other identifiable Canadian

scholars. They referenced a paper by Hackett (CJAS Editor-in-Chief) and Gellatly and another

one by Saks, Mudrack and Ashforth (1996) however, they did not include any of the actors

followed in this dissertation and no other identifiable Canadians were referenced. Miller (2003)

did mention Dastmalchian for his suggestions on the paper in the acknowledgements section and

they have co-authored an ASAC conference article together. Although including Canadian

scholars is not a prerequisite to having an article accepted to CJAS, the minimal recognition of

Canadian publications (i.e., CJAS) and identifiable Canadian scholars (e.g., Mintzberg, Barling, etc.) has implications for the development of management studies in Canada. With scientific knowledge built upon by subsequent research, the prominence of American dominated publications and research could continue to influence the topics, ideas, and direction of subsequent studies in perpetuity.

For example, to increase the likelihood that an academic's articles will be published in respectable journals, and in response from feedback given by editors and reviewers, scholars have been removing or minimizing the geographic, political and cultural context of their research to fit prevailing values that have privileged American-dominated models. Symons (1978) addressed the lack of context when describing the state of journals in political science. Although Symons (1978) states that there has been an increase in the quality of articles and that there were contributions to understanding Canadian processes in political science "much of it could just as readily have been conducted by political scientists in the United States or in a any other country as by those in Canada." (Symons, 1978, p. 70). This suggests that the lack of context in articles has been an ongoing issue in management studies. There was some evidence, for example, of the actors generalizing the articles that appeared in CJAS. One form of generalization was in the overall lack of context presented in the article and the other were very limited, passing references to Canadian respondents or research locales in the methodology section.

Saks, Mudrack and Ashforth's (1996) article did not contain anything inherently Canadian in its content and only contained one small reference to having used Canadian respondents in its methods section. This was a common phenomenon when reviewing the CJAS articles written by the 18 actors. Stone and Smith's (1996) article *A contingency theory of human resource management devolution* wrote about trends in human resource management and its

structures. The article does not differentiate between Canada and the United States and states that "[e]mployee leasing appears, at this time, to be a uniquely American phenomenon that resulted from a change in the tax codes in 1982." (Stone & Smith, 1996). The expectation appears to be that the article would be of interest and relevance to the CJAS readership despite the legal differences that exist between Canada and the United States.

There are also differences in how authors positioned context in the methods section of the CJAS article. In Miller's (2003) article recognized by Hackett for its number of downloads, the methods section simply stated that "these items were evaluated by 12 subject matter experts…" (p. 124) and did not reference any geographic context in the paper. Myer, Gemmell and Irving's (1997) article generically referred to their respondents as undergraduate students; however, Irving and Coleman's (2003) article identifies their survey respondents as belonging to "a regional branch of a Canadian governmental agency." (p. 99). Saks, Mudrack and Ashforth (1996) also provided geographic context to their methods section stating that their respondents were from a Canadian theme park. Removal of contextual information is presumably to protect the anonymity of research respondents; however, the practice also serves to disassociate the context from the cultural, political, and often times economic realities of the region being researched. Such regional context could be significant, either further reinforcing the universality of scientific knowledge if earlier findings are supported or to explain or refine existing models where results are not supported.

In addition to the decontextualization of the methods section, Cummings and Bridgman (2016) indicate that a growing number of scholars' reference more recent sources over citing primary sources. Referencing more recent sources builds on the philosophy that "scientific knowledge" builds on existing knowledge and demonstrates currency; however, it renders prior

knowledge invisible and potentially inconsequential to the development of the field. Similar to

the findings of Cummings and Bridgman (2016), most of the ASAC actors followed throughout

this dissertation rely on recent research in the development of their articles, but with two notable

exceptions. Etemad's article titled *Internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises: A*

grounded theoretical framework and an overview (2004) cited translated works by Say (1803).

Stone and Smith (1996) also appeared to cite original sources, including Durkheim (1933), when

developing their article. The development of scientific knowledge is incremental and takes time

to evolve. The inclusion of original sources, especially when referencing seminal theoretical

contributions, provides the opportunity to recognize and acknowledge the impact of prior work

in the field. Therefore, recognition of early contributions could provide additional insight into the

context through which theoretical contributions were made.

For example, when looking at contemporary research it could be said that the

development of management studies has been relatively uncontested (modernist), aside from a

small but growing body of work (amodernist). Analysis of the Symons Report (1978), however,

reveals the controversy associated with the approaches to the development of management

studies in Canada as discussed previously (amodernist). Using original sources as a part of the

development of contemporary research can help surface and reveal insights that have previously

been rendered invisible.

Language

As discussions of ASAC conference articles revealed, language is another aspect of the

development of management studies in Canada. Jalilvand (1999) stated that during his tenure as

CJAS Editor-in-Chief approximately 15% of submissions were French. Despite this, none of the

CJAS articles traced in this dissertation were written in a language other than English, despite

CJAS's bilingual status. Although we cannot know why there are not more French acceptances

at CJAS (i.e., whether fewer French articles were submitted or fewer French articles were

accepted) it does reflect broader institutional pressures where English is viewed as the standard

of accepted articles (i.e., American) and are generally seen as a way to obtain widespread

recognition of one's ideas. The language of an article therefore acts as a non-human actor that

influences human actors in management studies. Although articles in English are seen increasing

exposure (i.e., citation counts), Hackett did express some frustration in his 2006 editorial:

> If English or French are not your mother tongue, have someone fluent in English
>
> and/or French review your manuscript for suggested improvements before
>
> submitting. This can save tremendous time and headaches for the reviewers and
>
> contribute in no small way toward a positive editorial decision. (2000a, p. E)

Although this was likely meant to be a helpful suggestion to enhance the likelihood that a

manuscript would be accepted for publication, it reflects the institutionalized standards of

journals where the expectation is that articles would appear to be written by a natural English

speaker (language acting as a non-human actor). Papers that are required to meet specific

language guidelines (i.e., English being recognized as the standard) and privileges research

conducted by English and/or bilingual speakers over scholars who are not able to write fluently

or who have the resources to translate articles for publication.

Chapter Summary

As this chapter highlights, the development of management studies has been influenced

by the vision of CJAS editors who actively worked to increase CJAS's international profile. In

doing so, we saw that editors, special issues and authors privileged topics and themes that

transcended geographical context. As a result, authors reference predominantly American journal articles to adhere to scholarly traditions privileging journals as acceptable sources of information and differs from ASAC conference papers. In addition to referencing top tier American journals, it is apparent that many of the articles generalized the context of the paper by avoiding or minimizing the geographic context to appeal to a more international audience. Finally, this chapter highlighted that despite the bilingual status of the journal none of the articles by the actors in this dissertation were written in French. The next chapter will discuss the broader implications of these findings on the development of management studies.

Chapter 6: The foundation of a network

The most valid and compelling argument for Canadian studies is the importance of self-knowledge, the need to know and to understand ourselves: who we are; where we are in time and space; where we have been; where we are going; what we posses; what our responsibilities are to ourselves and to others. (Symons, 1978, p. 25)

The previous chapters outlined the role various human and non-human actors have had on the development of management studies in Canada. This chapter will build on the analysis of chapters four and five to demonstrate how human and non-human actors come together in a network to impact management studies in Canada, reveal the tensions that supported Canadian-specific content, and discuss the implications for Canadian identity.

Management Studies in Canada

Unlike Tiratsoo's (2004) account suggesting Americanization was contested in Europe, management studies in Canada had a different starting point. Tiratsoo (2004) highlighted how Americanization in Britain occurred in part because of market pressures. Management studies in Canada, on the other hand, intentionally modeled conferences and journals after its more prestigious American counterparts. Modelling conferences and journals after American equivalents appeared to be influenced by geographic and cultural similarities between Canada and the United States (Russell, 2019) and growing acceptance worldwide of an American model of management. The modelling of the conference and journals were further facilitated through the hiring of American-trained scholars to Canadian universities. These individuals brought their training and experience to their Canadian institutions (non-human actors) and to the roles that

they took on in ASAC and CJAS. As a result, it appears as though management studies in

Canada was founded with American values and traditions from its inception.

Although modelling ASAC and CJAS after American counterparts was designed to

enhance the perceived legitimacy of the institutions, it also provides guidance regarding how the

annual conference and journal should be structured. Adopting similar divisional and editorial

structures, conference themes, and special issues were commonplace among conferences and

journal publications. The generally accepted format impacted decisions on the review process

and development of strategic directives. Basing decisions on American models was designed to

improve the likelihood that Canadian scholars would view ASAC and CJAS as legitimate venues

for their research, and also resulted in human actors inadvertently adopting traditional American

conventions that would increase the likelihood that their work would be accepted by the broader

academic field.

One convention that actors appeared to follow included how respondents were reported in

the methods sections of articles. Most of the actors exclude geographic references in both the

ASAC and CJAS articles when identifying participants in their work. The removal or omission

of geographic references is a non-human actor that may signal that scholars in Canada do not feel

it necessary to include the geographic context of the research conducted, on the assumption that,

by accepting the dominant (American) model, the research context is irrelevant and does not

impact the (universal) generalizability of the findings.

Another convention that appears to have been adopted by our actors is the types of

sources included in conference and journal articles. Conference articles incorporated a broad

number of sources including conference proceedings, dissertations, and government publications.

The differences in the type and quality of sources adopted at conferences suggests that our actors

may have looked to increase the likelihood that their papers would be accepted for publication by

journals. At CJAS for example, there appears to be emphasis placed on top tier publications (e.g.,

Harvard Business Review, Academy of Management) which are seen to be of higher quality and

using current sources rather than primary sources. Accepting journal articles that focus on top

tier publications and that focus on current sources legitimizes the idea that authors adopt patterns

of citing information on previously published articles and works to stabilize the management

studies actor network.

Acknowledging how sources change between the conference and journal is important.

Conferences and journals see themselves as contributing to the development of scientific

knowledge. As a non-human actor, conference papers and journal articles signal to scholars the

rules or acceptable ways of presenting information. Once the article has been published, readers

are more likely to adopt a similar approach when developing their own papers for publication.

Adopting supposedly proven formats is perceived as increasing the likelihood that their article

would also be accepted for publication. This serves to reinforce what information is important

(e.g., prior research, novel findings) or not important (e.g., context, geography of participants) to

include in published research papers. Similar to the removal of geographic references from the

methods, the actors in this analysis may not have explicitly recognized the shift in the types of

sources used between conference and journal and lacked quality options when selecting sources.

The conventions adopted by actors in the management studies network are further

reinforced by editors and division chairs ASAC and CJAS. Authors who use certain more

acceptable references as a cue of what is acceptable can also reinforce the decisions made by

editors at each level to accept or reject articles that do not adhere to these informal rules. The

rules governing the responses of editors are a non-human actor that influence the apparent Americanization of management studies. As McCarten (2010) highlights, each stage of the peer review process provides "different levels of feedback as a piece of a research develops into a formal journal article" and is a hierarchical process (p. 244).

This process is further impacted by decisions made by editors. Editors consciously and unconsciously make decisions designed to reinforce the mandate of ASAC and CJAS (i.e., to increase readership) which reflect the values of the prevailing model of management studies (i.e., American). In doing so, editors make decisions that not only impact the annual conference or current journal issue, but rather, make decisions that continue to influence management studies long after the conference has concluded, or the issue has been published. The decisions made by editors also impact readers and potential contributors regarding the standards, content, and applicability of their work to ASAC and CJAS.

Through their roles at CJAS, Beamish, Hackett and Rugman were influential in making decisions regarding the acceptance or rejection of articles and the activities that would promote the mandate of the journal. Hackett, for example, as Editor-in-Chief and guided by the mandate of the ASAC executive, worked to grow CJAS and expand its international reach by engaging in specific activities (e.g., CJAS reception at AOM) and enrolled scholars (e.g., Beamish and Rugman) who were likely to support the vision for CJAS. Making decisions about what articles would be accepted or rejected for publication in CJAS also served to advance the vision of the journal by making decisions based on the quality, content, and appropriateness of the article for the CJAS readership. The articles that were subsequently accepted for publication become powerful non-human actors that influence the direction of the journal and of scientific knowledge moving forward.

In addition to division editors influencing the acceptance of articles submitted to CJAS, the Editor's-in-Chief, like Hackett, also used their position to communicate the vision and goals of CJAS through the publication of regular editorials. The editorials, which are written by human actors, become non-human actors over time and provide a way of communicating to potential contributors. Editorials can influence the decisions of potential contributors about the context, content and even language of their articles prior to developing or considering CJAS as a venue for their paper. Editorials therefore serve as a powerful non-human actor that reinforce the journal's values and works to obtain a greater international influence that, perhaps unintentionally, reflect the prevailing values of American-dominated models of management studies.

Beamish and Rugman, despite never having been CJAS Editor-in-Chief or ASAC President's, are examples of how individual actors seemingly accepted an American model of management through their scholarship activities. Each author wrote articles that actively promoted internationalization of research. These articles act as non-human actors that influence subsequent development of scientific knowledge in management studies. As highlighted throughout the analysis of conference and journal articles, Beamish and Rugman had their ideas more widely referenced by other actors and have had their ideas internationally recognized by other scholars. The widespread recognition of their articles reinforces to other Canadian scholars (human actors) what acceptable scholarship within the field of management studies (content, acceptable sources, etc.) and serve to reinforce the standards that reflect the values and standards prevalent in an American-dominated model of management studies.

These human actors also influence others in the management studies network through mentorship roles. Mentorship, as an institutional activity is a non-human actor that is enacted by

human actors. It is an important aspect of academia and is broadly incorporated through

institutionalized processes (i.e., graduate student supervisor, divisional progression). Rugman for

example, is recognized for his support of incoming Division editors and chairs at ASAC and

Beamish indicated that he supervised a number of PhD students throughout his career. In taking

on these mentorship roles, Beamish and Rugman would presumably instill their values in

incoming members and upcoming students. Ideas, like the acceptability of conferences (i.e.,

ASAC, AOM, etc.), journal articles (CJAS, *Harvard Business Review*, etc.), methodology (i.e.,

quantitative, qualitative, etc.), and sources (time frame for sources, type of sources, etc.) are all

implicitly and explicitly communicated through mentorship of graduate students. Graduate

students then progress through their careers adopting similar approaches when developing,

submitting, and publishing their work. Instilling the acceptable ways of navigating through

academia ensure the perpetuation of values and traditions that support the dominant American

model, having an enduring impact that extends beyond the supervisor-student relationship.

As this analysis reveals, these values are embodied by human actors to adhere to the

values and traditions that would increase the impact and visibility of their work on a widespread

scale. These processes do not act in isolation; rather, multiple human (e.g., editors, reviewers,

and scholars) and non-human actors (e.g., ASAC, CJAS) come together to stabilize a network of

management studies in Canada based on American models. Although the stabilization of

management studies is facilitated by numerous human and non-human actors, the process did not

go uncontested and revealed a tension in a network that sought to infuse management studies

with Canadian content.

Recognizing how ASAC, CJAS, and individual actors are influenced by American

models of management is important to acknowledge since "researchers have to follow a

particular way of reporting" (Johnson & Duberley, 2000, p. 60). By tracing the human and non-human actors across conferences and journals, and analyzing how they influence each other, analysis reveals how management studies reflects the values of American research traditions. By acknowledging the apparent impact of American models, analysis reveals how management studies is performed by human and non-human actors in their creation. By adopting an amodern approach, analysis reveals how models of management are a reflection of values and culture of American models. ANTi-History surfaced how the actors performed management studies (e.g., articles, mentorship, editorial roles) to reveal how the assumptions that researchers base their decisions on have become "ingrained in our common-sense understandings of research and thus often remain unchallenged" (Johnson and Duberley, 2000, p.60) and are reflected in the actions of the human actors (e.g., removing context, privileging top tier sources, etc.).

Revealing Tensions in the Network

Not all actors accepted the Americanization of management studies in Canada. Some of the actors traced throughout this dissertation sought to infuse Canadian content in management studies and decenter the apparent dominance of American models. The original intent behind the founding of ASAC and CJAS was to provide a venue for scholars to present and publish research addressing Canadian specific issues in response to concerns raised by the Symons Report (1978). The ASAC executive worked to increase the prominence of the annual conference among Canadian business schools by selecting desirable Canadian locations, choosing themes that would be of interest and working to develop a national PhD program to promote homegrown academics who could then obtain faculty positions in Canadian institutions. The ASAC executive further promoted a vision to support Canadian scholarship through the founding of CJAS. The efforts by ASAC is taken up by committed scholars who are motivated to develop

scholarship and content within Canada. The support of funding agencies like SSHRC further

reinforce established national priorities designed to protect Canadian studies and influenced

policies at an institutional level. These policies and actions reflect the values of the human actors

who work with others to promote a Canadian account of management studies. As a result, ASAC

and CJAS, the programs, themes, and contributions are non-human actors in the development of

management studies and reflect the value of trying to preserve Canadian identity through the

development of venues and publishing opportunities.

In trying to preserve Canadian identity, some actors appear to try to influence the

development of Canadian-trained PhD's. McShane, for example, during his tenure as ASAC

president, was involved in securing funding for the establishment of the doctoral consortium at

the annual conference. Etemad, also an ASAC president, saw the National PhD program

proposed during his term. Both initiatives were developed with the intention of strengthening the

ability to attract home-grown PhD scholars. This non-human actor influenced the actions of

potential graduate students to select a Canadian institution when selecting potential programs. In

addition to supporting the development of PhD students in Canada, the two programs aligned

with the goals of SSHRC. The development and funding by Canadian Government agencies

explicitly and implicitly communicate the values that are important to the development of

management studies in Canada. The provision of funding to support the development of PhD

students is another non-human actor influencing the decisions of human actors. Human actors

aligned the development of the two programs to increase the likelihood of funding to offset the

costs and increase the chances that the programs would be successful. Despite the provision of

funding and alignment to the mandate of ASAC, the national PhD program was viewed as being

unsuccessful. The collapse of the program could reflect the values of some scholars who

perceived knowledge as universal and suggest that institutional pressures influenced ASAC and CJAS in maintaining their Canadian mandate.

In addition to the development of the doctoral consortium and national PhD program, ASAC aligned conference themes with funding opportunities to appeal to its membership. The conference themes provide the opportunity to see how the values of ASAC reflect the values of its membership and broader institutional trends. Chapter 4 reveals how, although some conference themes addressed specific Canadian topics (e.g., "Looking south: The Canadian perspective on North American trade"), many of the conference themes reflect broad, generalizable themes (e.g., "Management education in the 90's: Challenges and changes"). Analysis of how decisions of where to locate the annual conference and choosing conference themes revealed that despite the mandate of ASAC and alignment to government funding priorities, ASAC struggled to obtain legitimacy from its members within Canada. ASAC therefore made decisions to appeal to broader membership to enhance its legitimacy but was not entirely successful. As a result, ASAC responded to the values of its members and inadvertently privileged American-dominated values and traditions in its selection of locations and themes.

In addition to the development of Canadian-trained scholars and an annual conference, ASAC founded CJAS with the intent of providing an outlet for Canadian specific research. As the founding Editor-in-Chief of CJAS, Burke worked with the mandate provided by ASAC executive to establish and reflect the values of CJAS at its inception. His vision for CJAS set the direction for Divisional editors and was supported by the ASAC executive at the time. Burke, and his team of divisional editors, ultimately determined which submissions would be accepted to CJAS and would be an outlet for Canadian specific issues. This mandate is taken up by select human actors to conduct Canadian-specific research. Despite the clear mandate of both ASAC

and CJAS, analysis supports other accounts that document how they struggled to be seen as a legitimate (McLaren & Mills, 2015). Analysis in this dissertation then surfaced how human and non-human actors seemingly responded to pre-existing, embedded values and traditions consistent with American-dominated models of management studies. These values are reflected in the work of the actors traced in this dissertation and provide a different account of management studies in Canada.

Etemad, for example, had 17 conference papers accepted to ASAC and was an ASAC president. Etemad had one article accepted to CJAS and as highlighted in previous chapters, actively worked to incorporate Canadian and European content into his work (i.e., referenced Canadian journals). His ASAC and CJAS articles appear to reflect the values of their mandate of providing an outlet of Canadian specific research. Dastmalchian is another actor who appears to reflect the mandate of ASAC and CJAS. As chapter 4 highlighted, Dastmalchian et al. (1985) acknowledged how the differences between the Canadian and American context could impact the generalizability of their findings; however, they were among the only actors traced in this dissertation to make this statement. Recognition that their research could be influenced by taken-for-granted assumptions underlying the foundations of the model is powerful and accepts that their research may not reflect the accepted dominant model.

Etemad and Dastmalchian are not the only actors traced who wrote extensively on Canadian context. Levy, for example, had a number of accepted articles to ASAC based on Canadian-specific topics and are almost exclusively written in French. Although ASAC is a bilingual conference, Levy was the only actor identified in this dissertation who had articles accepted in French and almost exclusively wrote about Canadian issues (e.g., NAFTA, free trade, etc.). It appears, however, that Levy recognized and responded to broader institutional

pressures when publishing her work outside of ASAC and CJAS. One article, published in the

International Business Review, was titled "The interface between globalization, trade and

development: Theoretical issues for international business studies" (Levy, 2007). The article has

been cited 80 times (Google Scholar, accessed January 2, 2021) and is broader in its context than

the articles accepted to ASAC. Many of Levy's articles listed on Google Scholar appear to adopt

a more generalized context than her ASAC articles. A notable difference in the type of articles

accepted for publication in journals could reflect how Levy responded to institutional pressures

when developing and submitting articles. In addition to a more generalized context for articles

published outside of ASAC and CJAS, Levy—despite writing extensively in French for

ASAC—tends to write in English. Given that many journals adopt English in their publication

and appeal to broad issues of interest to their readership, Levy may have recognized and adapted

to these institutional pressures to obtain widespread acceptance of her ideas. English therefore

acts as a non-human actor influencing the language authors adopt for the publication of their

articles.

Despite the actions of human and non-human actors to provide a venue for Canadian

scholarship through their contributions to ASAC and CJAS, their collective efforts appear to be

overshadowed by institutional pressures to stabilize the dominance of the American model of

management. In the process, some actors, whose work focus on Canadian-specific research

topics or who wrote in a language other than English, found that their work needed to change to

reflect the values of more prominent (American) journals.

Implications for Canadian Identity

The Symons Report (1978) brought awareness to the growing dominance of American management models and motivated scholars to protect Canadian identity. The Symons Report (1978) was determined to highlight the cultural differences that exist between Canada and the United States socially, economically, and politically to ensure that universities were adequately prepared to address the needs of Canadian organizations. This was important given the growing number of students pursuing University (Boothman, 2000a). It was, in part, because of the recommendations outlined in the Symons Report (1978) that ASAC adopted a mandate to provide a Canadian venue for research. As such, the Symons Report (1978) impacted the movement to protect Canadian identity. CJAS was designed to provide a publication outlet for Canadian-specific research in both official languages and provided a way to further incentivize ASAC conference attendees to the annual conference through the fast tracking of papers (Austin, 2000a).

This dissertation went on to surface how the movement to provide a venue for Canadian scholarship involved ASAC and individual actors taking on personal risks. ASAC, for example, undertook a feasibility study to assess the viability of a Canadian journal and individual actors took what they described as considerable risk to make the journal a success (Roger J. Hall, January 3, 1984). Burke for example, as the founding editor, was under scrutiny at the outset of CJAS and was questioned for the decisions he made regarding accepted manuscripts. The questions raised about the journal and its content reflects the differing values regarding scholarship at that time. One view represented the protection of Canadian identity while the other reflected the pursuit of the development of universal scientific knowledge (i.e., the American ideal). The Symons Report (1978) reflects these tensions and describes how the idea of protecting Canadian identity is viewed by some as unscholarly and unscientific. These tensions

are surfaced in this dissertation by tracing the actors; that is, the work they publish and how they

respond to broad institutional pressures that privilege American values and traditions.

Symons did not view Canadianization as a leisurely academic exercise, but rather as an

obligation that Canada had to the rest of the world. As the Symons Report (1978) stated:

> Knowledge is essentially universal in character, but its application has strong
>
> and often differing implications for the culture and well-being of each
>
> community. There is an obligation to put knowledge to use in the service of
>
> man. In pursuing the obligation, Canadian universities should observe their
>
> particular responsibility to give service to the people of their own community
>
> by directing an appropriate amount of attention to the needs and problems of
>
> that community. Apart from the matter of social obligation, it is only
>
> reasonable to work on the nearby problems and the problems of one's own
>
> society before tackling those that are more remote. Who is in a better position
>
> to understand and to work on these problems than Canadians? And who will
>
> tackle them if we do not? (Symons, 1978, p. 29)

Despite the concerns highlighted in the Symons Report (1978) and the efforts of committed

scholars to promote Canadian scholarship, analysis reveals how the establishment of a Canadian

management studies was not entirely successful.

With the apparent acceptance of American-dominated models of management studies in

Canada and actors following conventions designed to support prevailing models has implications

for Canadian identity. As content and context are removed to appeal to a broader and more

international market, scholars are not able to identify relevant research to address specific issues

confronting nations. Over time, this has made it increasingly difficult to identify what

"Canadian" issues are in relation to the dominant American models. The increasingly

generalized research also broadens the gap between practitioners and corporations who rely on

scientific expertise to address business issues and provide guidance about proposed directions,

policies and strategies based on the unique political, cultural, and social dimensions in Canada.

As a result, systems and policies reflect the values of scholars who are motivated to maintain

prevailing models to secure coveted funding and international recognition. This works to

increase the gap between what businesses have identified is needed from the workforce, what is

being taught at universities, and how theoretical contributions can help resolve Canadian

business issues. When scholars unintentionally focus on research that will appeal to American

conferences and journals to secure grants and funding, it leaves the Canadian story of

management studies unexamined. This would make it appear as though the Canadian context can

be easily substituted by American concepts and theories and that Canadian businesses share the

same concerns and challenges as their American counterparts. The idea that Canadian businesses

have similar issues as American ones supports the idea that some actors view management

studies as universal and "…therefore existing research applies to both Canadians and Americans

equally" (McLaren and Mills, 2015a, p. 323). Although there are many similarities between the

two countries, there are many differences (Russell, 2015). As the Symons Report (1978)

highlights; "[i]n the case of Americans, for example, while we have much in common, our

differences are many and diverse" (p. 25) and should be recognized. There are differences in the

political systems of the two countries, socioeconomic conditions, and culture (McLaren and

Mills, 2015; Symons, 1978). As a result, Canadian corporations have different laws that need to

be followed, different barriers and opportunities and are governed by the values of a nation who

has approached business differently. This issue is not unique to Canada alone. European nations,

Scandinavian nations and many others are all confronted with similar issues resulting from

prevailing models of management studies. The United States, as the current prevailing model of

management, does not need to have these same discussions since the standards established reflect

what is defined as being American (i.e., American scholars; American context and American

publishers = American knowledge).[17]

Chapter Summary

As this chapter highlighted, management studies in Canada remains based on American

models. This process was facilitated by modeling ASAC and CJAS after its American

equivalents and was reinforced through the actions of individual actors. These actors adhered to

conventions that were inherently American and served to further reinforce values and traditions

privileging the dominant American model. Some actors sought to protect Canadian identity;

however, their efforts were largely unsuccessful. Finally, this chapter examined the implications

that this has had on the development of Canadian management studies. The final chapter will

highlight the theoretical contributions of this analysis and directions for future research.

---

[17] On my Twitter account on April 30th, 2019, for example, Minna Salami @MsAfropolitan, who describes herself as being Scandinavian laments; "I find the Americanisation of culture suffocating. Its not just pop culture, but also academia, social media and even our innermost thoughts, all Americanised in ways that way too few people even question anymore."

Chapter 7: The Changing Face of Management Studies

"[Research and learning] are carried on by particular individuals, in particular places, at particular times, about particular problems in the context of particular communities. In the social sciences and the humanities, it is from these inescapable particularities that the unique qualities and distinctive character of much teaching and research are derived." (James Steele, 1968 as quoted in Cormier, 2004)

This dissertation set out to understand how management studies in Canada came to be influenced by, if not based on, American models. Adopting an amodernist approach, ANTi-History was used to follow 18 Canadian actors across ASAC conferences and CJAS journal articles. This process involved analyzing; the articles written by actors, the editorial and leadership positions by actors and evaluating the mandates of ASAC and CJAS to understand how human and non-human actors were impacted by internal and external forces in the development of management studies. Evaluating these dimensions using ANTi-History revealed the interests and values of actors that impacted decisions at each level. Decisions included the development of the ASAC annual conference and founding of CJAS to support a venue for Canadian issues and policies. The use of ANTi-History revealed tensions in the network where some actors were motivated to protect Canadian identity. Other actors revealed the pressures of institutional practices which seemingly supported models of management based upon American traditions and values. This chapter will discuss the theoretical contributions and limitations of the dissertation and provide concluding thoughts on the implications to management studies.

Theoretical Contributions

By adopting ANTi-History and selecting ASAC and CJAS as the starting point for analysis, my research revealed that unlike other accounts of the Americanization of management, management studies in Canada was largely founded on American models. Analysis reveals how using American conferences and journals as the model for ASAC and CJAS privileged and fostered processes and policies that are inherently American from their inception. This is an important contribution because (a) there is no study examining how beginning with an inherently American model has impacted development of management studies (b) ANTi-History provided the opportunity to trace the actors across multiple levels of academia and (c) provides an empirical example of how ANTi-History could be applied to provide a pluralized account of management studies.

By adopting ANTi-History, this dissertation answers the call for more critical reflection on historiography and the historic turn. The use of ANTi-History helps surface how decisions by human actors at ASAC and CJAS impacts the development of the two Canadian institutions revealing "how we got to the now" (Lamond, 2005, p. 93) in management studies. Tracing the actors reveals that decisions made reflect the values that dominated in the American model of management studies. These values include publishing in top tier journals, writing in the English language, decontextualizing the content of articles, and privileging American sources when developing papers (i.e., non-human actors that influence the decisions of human actors). The tracing of actors across multiple levels of management studies offers a pluralized account where some actors embrace the dominant model while others sought to protect Canadian identity revealing the tensions that existed throughout its development.

Secondly, this dissertation traced human and non-human actors across ASAC conferences and CJAS journal articles. This provides a unique perspective on the

Americanization of management studies that has not been applied in other accounts. Other accounts adopt a post-colonial approach (Alcadipani and Caldas, 2012) and compare European nations in a symposium format (Usdiken, 2004), or use an essay format (Tiratsoo, 2004) to understand how Americanization occurred in different contexts. By adopting ANTi-History, my research demonstrates how the apparent Americanization of management studies can be studied. The dissertation traced scholars and their activities across ASAC and CJAS. In doing so, this dissertation surfaced the impact that policies and decisions (non-human actors) have had on the development of management studies. This revealed how actors attempted to influence and were influenced by institutional forces as management studies developed in a Canadian context (i.e., culturally and value laden).

Finally, this dissertation contributes to the growing body of literature adopting ANTi-History in management research. Adopting ANTi-History in an empirical context that provides other scholars with a roadmap of how different historical accounts can be surfaced by tracing human and non-human actors. Using a combination of primary and secondary archival material, my research outlines how ANTi-History can be used to establish a research question, identify traces, establish parameters and how to organize data over an extended period to reveal a different account of the phenomenon being analysed. More importantly, this dissertation provides guidance on how researchers can adopt ANTi-History using archival research to pluralize management studies. Being able to adopt ANTi-History provides researchers with the opportunity to explore fields of management from a different perspective in a seemingly saturated field.

Practical Implications

This dissertation acknowledges the challenges that ASAC and CJAS have encountered to legitimize their annual conference and journal among Canadian faculty and business schools. With a management model that seemingly represents American-dominated values and traditions, business schools, scholars and students have responded to broad institutional pressures. However, as the analysis in this dissertation reveals, despite the efforts of the Symons Report (1978) and actors committed to preserving Canadian identity, these pressures made it difficult for ASAC and CJAS to stick to their mandate of providing a venue for Canadian-specific issues and research. As a result, they have adopted policies and strategies that will allow them to participate in an increasingly competitive international operating environment and is increasingly an issue that is being addressed on a global scale.

From a practical standpoint, this dissertation offers guidance into how policy decisions can impact the culture of an organization. As discussed throughout the analysis, ASAC and CJAS were influenced by using American institutions as their model. This impacted decisions that were made by individual actors to conform to the values and traditions that would increase their likelihood of succeeding in the field (i.e., publishing in English and American journals, removing geographical context). Adopting practices that would increase the likelihood of success in a profession could result in some actors being marginalized and could shift the culture of the organization to represent the dominant traditions upon which the policies are created. This is important for organizations to consider as we saw, in the case of language, policies can have enduring and unintended consequences that could impact stakeholders. Using ANTi-History, organizations are able to reflect on how there could be other accounts of the organization that may differ from the dominant accounts. Recognizing that there could be differing experiences in the organization provides a pluralized account of the organization's history.

Limitations

Although the present dissertation has unraveled elusive processes, it is not without criticism and limitations. The analysis throughout was constrained by the available data. Some data was missing, some sources contradicted other accounts and different formats were used over time. As a result, not all proceedings and divisional members could be substantiated or located and some early CJAS Associate Editors were not able to be identified. Therefore, the account of management studies in this dissertation can provide but one account and could be impacted if additional archival material becomes available.

Another limitation involves the use of ANTi-History as a method. As mentioned during the analysis process, the start and end points, divisions selected for analysis and actors selected are socially constructed and are selected by myself using criteria I created for the purpose of this research. Choosing different start and end points, including additional divisions, or selecting different divisions may have surfaced different human and non-human actors resulting in a different actor network from being deployed. Although missing data, contradictory material or the socially constructed nature of the research could be perceived as weaknesses, this is a challenge in archival research regardless of the theoretical approach to history (i.e., modernist, postmodernist, or amodernist). The recognition of these limitations (i.e., missing data, socially constructed start and end points) is an important aspect of ANTi-History. By reflecting on the impact that missing data could have on the development of the account provided, there is an opportunity to surface different accounts as new material and/or narratives become available.

In addition to the socially constructed nature of the research, ANTi-History, while shedding light on the processes associated with the development of management studies in Canada, cannot tell us the motivations of individual actors. Individual actors may have been

influenced by institutional policies (i.e., journal rankings, tenure and promotion processes), interactions with other human actors in the network, and involvement at different levels in ASAC and CJAS thereby prompting publication decisions, research questions and opportunities to collaborate with other scholars. Without the ability to travel back in time or being able to speak with individuals directly about their motivations on a range of topics, it is difficult to unearth these more elusive intangible traces associated at different levels of academia and the development of management studies.

Directions for Future Research

Given the limited scope of the dissertation there are several directions for future research. One potential opportunity would be to examine Canadian edition textbooks. Textbooks are often written with undergraduate students in mind and are designed to implicitly and explicitly communicate the values and beliefs of a discipline (Maclennan, 2000). As a result, textbooks are often the first point of contact that students have that inform their discipline and have implications for the knowledge that they continue to develop as they progress through their education and professional lives. Analyzing Canadian edition textbooks would provide the opportunity to evaluate how Canadian issues are presented and the impact that they may (or may not) have had on professionalization in Canadian organizations. In addition to examining the impact of Canadian edition textbooks on management professionals in Canada, archival research from publishers examining the decisions to Canadianize American edition textbooks would surface yet another account of management studies in Canada.

Another potential research opportunity would be to choose a theory and trace its development over time. The University of Alberta, for example, has been influential in the

development of Institution theory (Coller et al., 2015). Being able to trace the development of

Institution theory by following Canadian actors who have been instrumental in its promotion

would provide a different account of how management studies has developed over time.

Adopting an ANTi-History approach would surface the processes involved and evaluate how

actors responded to the apparent Americanization of management studies using a theory that is

known to have strong Canadian ties.

Another opportunity to evaluate the Americanization of management studies would be to

examine how technological changes (non-human actors) are impacting management knowledge.

As McMarten (2010) highlights, the internet has changed every aspect of the journal business

and should be viewed as a "tool for manufacturing goods and services..." (p. 238) making

platforms like Twitter an important actor in the Americanization of management studies. The

popularity of social media platforms, like Twitter and academia.edu (non-human actors) and

their use by scholars, provide the opportunity to examine how these platforms have shifted the

way information is produced, disseminated, and consumed across the field. Scholars, for

example, are increasingly using platforms like Twitter to increase the visibility of their work.

Although these platforms can reach a broad number of scholars at a relatively low cost, there are

differences in how these platforms are adopted based on cultural ideologies and political

structures and is likely going to have implications for the Americanization of management

studies.

Conclusion

The journey to understanding the development of management studies in Canada has

been more than forty years in the making. This dissertation began with the Symons Report

(1978), was continued by committed scholars (Cormier, 2004) and continues to be of importance

to present day scholars and academics (Alcadipani and Caldas, 2012; Coller, McNally and Mills, 2015; Gandman and Parker, 2006; Gantman, et al., 2015; McLaren and Mills, 2015; Papadopoulos and Rosson, 1999; Wanderley and Faria, 2012). The implications of the Americanization of management studies do not end with this dissertation and extend beyond Canada's borders. As the world is increasingly global and interconnected, it is important that we, as a profession, recognize the role of creating a space for all nations to see themselves in the research being conducted. As Symons (1978) stated;

> What happens in the rest of the world will often influence Canada. But what is done in Canada may also have a profound and helpful influence elsewhere. By addressing Canadian problems and conditions in our research and study, we can help others to understand not only our country and ourselves but also their situation and themselves. The maxim 'to know thyself one must know others' applies equally to all societies. (p. 18)

By surfacing another account of management studies, this dissertation makes an important contribution to recognizing how it can be pluralized. There is inherent value in surfacing different accounts where nations can see themselves reflected in the theories and context of the literature that constitutes the field. This is increasingly important when questions of diversity are openly being discussed and challenged on a worldwide scale.

References

Abraham, D. R., Gibson, M. C., Novicevic, M. M., Robinson, R. K. (2009). Becoming an
outstanding management historian in the USA: Biographical research of Wren's and
Bedeian's pathways. *Journal of Management History, 15*(1), 9-19. doi:
10.1108/17511340910921754

Alcadipani, R., & Caldas, M. P. (2012). Americanizing Brazilian management. *Critical
Perspectives on International Business, 8*(1), 37-55. doi: 10.1108/17422040610644144

ASAC. (1979, April 6-9). *Minutes of the Executive Meeting.* Archives of Canadian Management.

ASAC. (1985, Fall). Bulletin. Archives of Canadian Management.

ASAC. (1990, June 5). *Minutes of the Executive Meeting.* Archives of Canadian Management.

ASAC. (1991, September 28-29). *Minutes of the Executive Meeting.* Archives of Canadian
Management.

Ashforth, B. E., & Saks, A. M. (1996). Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer
adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(1), 149-178. Retrieved from
http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-
com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/socialization-tactics-longitudinal-effects-
on/docview/199790834/se-2?accountid=1343

Asimakou, T. (2011). The Production of Management Knowledge: Abuses and Prevention.
Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry, 9(1-2), 53-60. ISSN 1532-5555.

Austin, B. (1994). ASAC: The Early Years of the Association.1957-1972. *Proceedings of the
1994 Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, Business History Interest Group,
Halifax, 25-28 June, 15*(14), 1-11. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca

/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/role-

administrative-sciences-association-canada/docview/204872592/se-2?accountid=1343

Austin, B. (1995). *ASAC And The Crisis In Management Education, 1973-1985*. Proceedings of

the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada.

Austin, B. (1998). The role of the administrative sciences association of Canada in

institutionalizing management education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Administrative

Sciences, 15*(3), 255-266. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca

/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/role-

administrative-sciences-association-canada/docview/204872592/se-2?accountid=1343

Austin, B. (2000a). The administrative sciences association of Canada, 1957-1999. In B. Austin

(Ed.), *Capitalizing knowledge: essays on the history of business education in Canada*

(pp. 266-294). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Austin, B. (2000b). Introduction. In B. Austin (Ed.), *Capitalizing Knowledge: Essays on the

history of business education in Canada* (pp. 3-10). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Beamish, P. W., Calof, J. L. (1989). *A corporate view of international business education in

Canada: National and provincial assessments*. Proceedings at the Administrative Sciences

Association of Canada, 35-54.

Beamish, P. W., Jung, J. C. (2005). *The performance and survival of joint ventures with

asymmetric parents*. Proceedings of the annual general conference of ASAC IB division, 1-

16.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the

sociology of knowledge*. New York, NY: First Anchor Books.

Bettin, C., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2016). "The Halifax School": An Actor-Network

      Analysis of Critical Management Studies and the Sobey PhD in Management

      Programme. In C. Grey, I. Huault, V. Perret , & L. Taskin (Eds.), *CMS : Global Voices,*

      Local Accent (pp. 36-53). London: Routledge.

Boje, D. M. & Saylors, R. (2015). The future of history: posthumanist entrepreeurial storytelling,

      global warming and global capitalism. In P. Genoe McLaren, A. J. Mills and T. G.

      Weatherbee (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to management and organizational history*

      (pp. 197-205). NY, NY: Routledge.

Booth, C. & Rowlinson, M. (2006). Management and organizational history: prospects.

      Management and Organizational History, *1*(1), 5-30. doi: 10.2307/2093510

Boothman, B. (2000a). Culture of Utility: The development of business education in Canada. In

      B. Austin (Ed.), *Capitalizing Knowledge: Essays on the history of business education in*

      Canada (pp. 11- 86). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Boothman, B. (2000b). Canadian management education at the millenium. In B. Austin (Ed.),

      Capitalizing knowledge: Essays on the history of business education in Canada (pp. 295-

      356). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Bowden, B., & Lamond, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Management History: Its Global Past & Present*.

    IAP.

Bruce, K. (2006). Henry Dennison, Elton Mayo and human relations historiography.

      Management and Organizational History, *1*(2), 177-199.

Bruce, K. and Nyland, C. (2011). Elton Mayo and the deification of human relations.

      Organization Studies, *32*(3), 383-405. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/

login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/elton-mayo-

deification-human-relations/docview/863551880/se-2?accountid=1343

Burke, R. J. (1979, March 12). [Letter to Alan G. Blair]. Candadian Management Archive.

Burke, R. J. (1984, September 19) [Letter to Michel Laroche] Canadian Management Archive.

Burke, P. (2000). *A social history of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot*. Cambridge, UK:

Polity Press.

Burton, A. (2005). Introduction: Archive Fever, Archive Stories. In: Archive Stories: Facts,

fictions, and the writing of history. Burton, A. (ed.). London: Duke University Press.

Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions.

Academy of Management Review, 24(4), 649-662.

Callon, M. (1986). The sociology of an actor-network: The case of the electric vehicle.

In *Mapping the dynamics of science and technology* (pp. 19-34). Palgrave Macmillan,

London.

Coller, K., McNally, C., & Mills, A. J. (2015). The Inner Circle: Towards a 'Canadian'

Management History - Key Canadian contributors to new institution theory. In P. Genoe

McLaren, A. J. Mills, & T.G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to*

Management and Organizational History (pp. 342-360). London: Routledge.

Collins, R. (2000). *Culture, Communication and National Identity: The case of Canadian*

Television: University of Toronto Press.

Conlon, D. E., Morgeson, F. P., McNamara, G., Wiseman, R. M., & Skilton, P. F. (2006).

Examining the Impact and Role of Special Issue and Regular Journal Articles in the Field

of Management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(5), 857–872. https://doi-

org.ezproxy.aekc.talonline.ca/10.5465/AMJ.2006.22798160

Cooke, B. (1999). Writing the left out of management theory: The historiography of the

      management of change. *Organization, 6*, 81-105. doi: 10.1177/135050849961004

Cooke, B. (2007). The Kurt Lewin-Goodwin Watson FBI/CIA files: A 60th anniversary there-

      and-then of the here-and-now. *Human Relations, 60*(3), 435-462. doi:

      10.1177/0018726707076686

Coraiola, D. M., Foster, W. M., & Suddaby, R. (2015). Varieties of history in organization

      studies. In P. G. McLaren, A. J. Mills and T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *The Routledge*

      companion to management and organizational history (pp. 206-221). NY, NY:

      Routledge.

Cormier, J. (2004). *The Canadianization Movement: Emergence, Survival, and Success*. Toronto:

      University of Toronto Press.

Cormier, J. (2005). The Canadianization Movement in Context. *The Canadian Journal of*

      Sociology, 30(3), 351-370. doi: https://doi.org/10.1353/cjs.2005.0047

Cummings, S. & Bridgman, T. (2016). The limits and possibilities of History: How a wider,

      deeper, and more engaged understanding of business history can foster innovative

      thinking. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *15*(2),250-267. doi:

      http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0373

Dastmalchian, A., Javiden, M., Pasis, H. (1985). *Centralization of Decision Making,*

      Organizational Context and Dependence: Evidence from Canadian Provincially

      Controlled Organizations. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of Administrative

      Sciences Association of Canada*,* 23-32.

Deal, N., Mills, A. J., Helms Mills, J., & Durepos, G. (2019). History in the Making: Following

      the Failed Attempt of Wolfgang Langewiesche in Pan American History Project. In Hartt,

C. M. (Ed.), *Connecting Values to Action: Non-Corporeal Actants and Choice* (pp. 37-51). Bingley: Emerald.

Down, S. (2001). Knowledge sharing review: The use of History in business and management, and some implications for management learning. *Management Learning*, *32*(3), 393-415.

Durepos, G. (2009). *ANTi-history: toward an historiographical approach to (re) assembling knowledge of the past* (Doctoral dissertation). ISBN: 978-0-494-55979-6.

Durepos, G. & Mills, A. J. (2011). Actor-network theory, ANTi-history and critical organizational historiography. *Organization*, *19*(6), 703-721. doi: 10.1177/1350508411420196

Durepos, G. & Mills, A. J. (2012). *ANTi-History: Theorizing the Past, History, and Historiography in Management and Organizational Studies*. Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, NC.

Durepos, G. (2015). ANTi-History: toward amodern histories. In P. Genoe McLaren, A. J. Mills and T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to management and organizational history* (pp. 153-180). NY, NY: Routledge.

Durepos, G., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2008). Tales in the Manufacture of Knowledge: Writing a company history of Pan American World Airways. *Management & Organizational History, 3*(1), 63-80.

Edwardson, R. (2008). *Canadian content: culture and the quest for nationhood*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Elangovan, A. R. (1994). *Managerial intervention in disputes: A comparative study of factors affecting strategy selection*. Proceedings of the annual general conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 52-61.

Elteren, M. (2006). *Americanism and Americanization: a critical history of domestic and global influence*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co

Engwall, L. (2004). The Americanization of Nordic Management Education. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 13*(2), 109-117. doi: 10.1177/1056492604265327

Etemad, H. (1981). *Are domestic and international marketing dissimilar? A re-examination and extension.* Proceedings of the annual conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 24-38.

Etemad, H. (1982). *World product mandating in perspective*. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada,107-119.

Etemad, H., Zhou, L. (1986a). *Foreign trade arbitration in China*. Proceedings of the annual conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada,1-7.

Etemad, H. (1986b). *International marketing at the crossroads: the new technologies and strategies of the past*. Proceedings of the annual conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 69-82.

Etemad, H. (2004). Internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises: a grounded theoretical framework and an overview. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *21*(1), 1. doi: 10.1111/j.1936-4490.2004.tb00319.x

Finegan, J. (1995). *The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment.* Proceedings of the annual conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 58-66.

Fooladi, I., & Rosson, P. (2000). Editorial. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 17*(1), 1. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/editorial/docview/204867071/se-

2?accountid=1343

Foster, J., Mills, A. J., & Weatherbee, T. (2014). History, field definition and management

studies: the case of the New Deal. *Journal of Management History, 20*(2), 179-199. doi:

10.1177/0018726706066437.

Foster, J., Helms Mills, J., & Mills, A. J. (2014). Shades of Red: Cold War Influences on

Canadian and U.S. Business Textbooks. *Journal of Management Education, 38*(5), 642-

671.

Frankel, M. and Shenhav, Y. (2003). From Americanization to colonization: the diffusion of

productivity models revisited. *Organisation Studies*, *24*(9), 1537-1561.

Gantman, E. R., & Parker, M. (2006). Comprador management? *Critical Perspectives on

International Business, 2*(1), 25-40. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17422040610644144

Gantman, E. R., Yousfi, H., & Alcadipani, R. (2015). Challenging Anglo-Saxon dominance in

management and organizational knowledge. *Revista de Administração de Empresas, 55*(2), 126-

129. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020150202

George, C. S. (1968). *The History of Management Thought*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall,

Inc.

Golden-Biddle, K., Lockey, K., & Reay, T. (2006). Using knowledge in management studies: An

investigation of how we cite prior work. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(3), 237-254.

doi: 10.1177/1056492606291199

Google Scholar. (2013). Retrieved from http://scholar.google.ca/

Gür, S., Hamurcu, M., & Eren, T. (2016). Selection of academic conferences based on analytical

    network processes. *Multiple Criteria Decision Making, 11*, 51-62. doi:

    http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.22367/mcdm.2016.11.04

Hackett, R. D. (2006a). Editorial. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 23*(1), 2-E,

    F. Retrieved from http: //libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/editorial-éditorial/docview/204877654/se-

    2?accountid=1343

Hackett, R. D. (2006b). Editorial. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 23*(4), 1.

    Retrieved from http: //libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/editorial-éditorial/docview/204877193/se-

    2?accountid=1343

Hackett, R. D. (2006c). Editoria. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 23*(3), 167-168.

    Retrieved from http: //libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/editorial-éditorial/docview/204877424/se-

    2?accountid=1343

Hall, R. I. (1984, January, 3). [Letter to Wallace Crowsten]. Canadian Management archive.

Hartt, C. M. (2013). Actants without actors: Polydimensional discussion of a Regional

    Conference. *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry, 11*(3), 15-25. Retrieved

    from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/actants-without-actors-polydimensional-

    discussion/docview/1436044291/se-2?accountid=1343

Hartt, C. M., Mills, A. J., Helms Mills, J., & Corrigan, L. T. (2014). Sense-making and actor networks: the non-corporeal actant and the making of an Air Canada history. *Management & Organizational History*, *9*(3), 288-304. doi: 10.1080/17449359.2014.920260

Heames, J. T. & Breland, J. W. (2010). Management pioneer contributors: 30-year review. *Journal of Management History*, *16*(4), 427-436. doi: http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/10.1108/17511341011073915

Hiller, H. H., & Luzio, L. D. (2001). Text and context: Another "Chapter" in the evolution of sociology in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Sociology, 26*(3), 487-512. doi: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3341898

Hobson, J. M. (2013). Part 1- Revealing the Eurocentric foundations of IPE: A critical historiography of the discipline from the classical to the modern era. *International Political Economy, 20(5)*, 1024-1054. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login ?url=https://www-proquest- com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/part-1-revealing-eurocentric-foundations-ipe/docview/1470085576/se-2?accountid=1343

Irving, P. G. (1995). *Dimensions of managerial third-party conflict intervention strategies.* Proceedings of the annual general conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada*, 11-21.

Irving, P. G., & Coleman, D. F. (2003). The moderating effect of different forms of commitment on role ambiguity-job tension relations. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 20*(2), 97-106. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/moderating-effect-different-forms-commitment-on/docview/204875304/se-2?accountid=1343

Irving, P. G., Kovacheff, J. D., Coleman, D. F., Wood, S. (1995). *Behavioral responses to organizational injustices: The effect of affective and continuance commitment.* Proceedings of the annual general conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 75-84.

Jaques, R. (1996). *Manufacturing the employee: Management Knowledge from the 19th to 21st Centuries.* Sage Publications.

Jacques, R., & Durepos, G. (2015). A history of management histories: does the story of our past and the way we tell it matter? In P. Genoe McLaren, A. J. Mills and T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to management and organizational history* (pp. 96-111). NY, NY: Routledge.

Jalilvand, A. (1999). Editorial. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 16*(4), 271. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/editorial/docview/204888667/se-2?accountid=1343

Jenkins, K. (1995). *On 'What is history?': from Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. Psychology Press.

Jenkins, K. (2003). *Re-thinking History*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, C. D. (2008). "Doing well by doing good" garners broad appeal for academy of management conference. *Equal Opportunities International, 27*(7), 646-653. doi: http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1108/02610150810904337

Johnson, P., Duberley, J. (2000). *Understanding Management Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Kemp, L. J. (2013). Modern to postmodern management: developments in scientific

    management. *Journal of Management History*, *19*(3), 345-361. doi: 10.1108/JMH-02-

    2011-0005

Kieser, A. (1994). Why organization theory needs historical analyses - And how this should be

    performed. *Organization Science, 5*(4), 608-621. Retrieved from http:

    //libproxy.mtroyal.ca /login?url=https://www-proquestcom.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/

    scholarly-journals/why-organization-theory-needs-historical analyses/docview

    /213832498/se-2?accountid=1343

Kieser, A. (2004). The Americanization of Academy of Management education in Germany.

    Journal of Management Inquiry, 13(2), 90-97. doi: 10.1177/1056492604265301

Kipping, M., Usdiken, B., & Puig, N. (2004). Imitation, tension, and hybridization: Multiple

    "americanizations" of management education in Mediterranean Europe. *Journal of*

    Management Inquiry, 13(2), 98-108. Retrieved from http: //libproxy.mtroyal.ca

    /login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/imitation-

    tension-hybridization-multiple/docview/203305524/se-2?accountid=1343

Koontz, H. D. (Ed.) (1962). *Toward a Unified Theory of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill

    Book Company.

Lamond, D. (2005). On the value of management history: Absorbing the past to understand the

    present and inform the future. *Management Decision, 43*(10), 1273-1281. doi:

    10.1108/00251740510634859

Laroche, M. (1984, September, 27). [Letter to Ronald Burke]. Canadian Management Archive.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through*

    *Society.*Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Universtity Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social.* New York: Oxford.

Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory Life: The construction of Scientific Facts.* 2nd ed.

    Princeton: Princeton University Press. Originally published by Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Law, J. (1994). *Organizing Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Leap, T., & Oliva, T. A. (1983). General systems precursor theory as a supplement to Wren's

    framework for studying management history: The case of human resource/personnel

    management. *Human Relations*, *36*(7), 627-639. Retrieved from

    http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/general-systems-precursor-theory-as-

    supplement/docview/231478385/se-2?accountid=1343

Levy, B. (1986). *Le Canada et le GATT: Alliance ou mesalliance?* Proceedings of the annual

    conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 152-163.

Lukka, K., Vinnari, E. (2017). Combining actor-netowrk theory with interventionist research:

    present state and future potential. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*,

    30(3), 720-753. doi: 10.1108/AAAJ-082015-2176

Lustick, I. S. (1996). History, historiography, and political science: Multiple historical records

    and the problem of selection bias. *American Political Science Review*, *90*(3), 605-618.

    Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/history-historiography-political-science-

    multiple/docview/214434051/se-2?accountid=1343

MacDonald, P. K. (2009). Those who forget historiography are doomed to republish it: empire,

    imperialism and conteporary debeates about American power. *Reveiw of International*

    Studies, 35, 45-67. doi: 10.10171so260210509008328

MacLennan, J. M. (2000). "Canadianizing" an American communication textbook. *MGill Journal of Education, 35*(1)*,* 31-52.

McCartan, P. (2010). Journals and the production of knowledge: A publishing perspective. *British Journal of Political Science, 40*(2), 237-248. doi: http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1017/S0007123410000062

McCarthy, E. D. (1996). *Knowledge as Culture: The new sociology of knowledge*. New York, New York: Routledge.

McKenna, S. & Richardson, J. (2016). Self-initiated expatriation: changing the ontological and methodological box. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, *11*(3), 150-168. doi: 10.1108/QROM-09-2015-1326

McKinlay, A. (2013). Following Foucault into the archives: Clerks, careers and cartoons. *Management & Organizational History, 8*(2), 137-154.

McLaren, P. G., & Mills, A. J. (2013). Internal cohesion in response to institutional plurality: The Administrative Sciences Association of Canada. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 30*(1), 40-55. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/internal-cohesion-response-institutional/docview/1326901615/se-2?accountid=1343

McLaren, P. G., & Mills, A. J. (2014). *History and the obfuscation of Canadian management theory*. Atlantic School of Business Proceedings.

McLaren, P. G., & Mills, A. J. (2015). History and the absence of Canadian management theory. In McLaren, P. G., Mills, & Weatherbee T. G. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Management and Organizational History* (pp. 319-331). New York, NW: Routledge.

McQuarrie, F. A. E. (2005). How the Past is Present(ed): A Comparisio nof Information on teh

    Hawthorne Studies in Canadian Management and Organizational Behaviour Texbooks.

    Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 22(3), 230-242.

Miller, D. L. (2003). The stages of group development: A retrospective study of dynamic team

    processes. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 20*(2), 121-134. Retrieved from

    http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/stages-group-development-retrospective-

    study/docview/204869662/se-2?accountid=1343

Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2018). Archival research. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative

    Business and Management Research Methods London: Sage*.

Mills, A. J., & Novicevic, M. M. (2020). *Management and Organizational History*. New York:

    Routledge.

Mills, A. J., Weatherbee, T. G., & Durepos, G. (2014). Resembling Weber: The-past-as-history

    in Management and Organization Studies. *Organization, 21*(2), 225-243.

Mills, A. J., Weatherbee, T. G., Foster, J., & Helms Mills, J. (2015). The New Deal, History, and

    Management & Organization studies: Lessons, insights and reflections. In P. G. McLaren,

    A. J. Mills, & T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *Routledge Companion to Management &

    Organizational History* (pp. 265-284). London: Routledge.

Mills, A. J., Weatherbee, T. G., McLaren, P. G. (2015). Actors, networks, theory, and history -

    what are we producing? In P. G. McLaren, A. J. Mills, & T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.),

    Routledge Companion to Management & Organizational History (pp. 380-384). London:

    Routledge.

Mol, A. (2010). Actor-Network Theory: Sensitive terms and enduring tensions. *Kolner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpyschologie, 50*(1), 253-269.

Moltu, B. (2008). Satirical and romantic stories about organzisational change. Actor network theory and action research. *International Journal of Action Research, 4*(1/2), 155-179.

Munslow, A. (2010). *The Future of History*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Meyer, J. P., Gemmell, J. M., & Irving, P. G. (1997). Evaluating the management of interpersonal conflict in organizations: A factor-analytic study of outcome criteria. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*(1), 1-13. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/evaluating-management-interpersonal-conflict/docview/204871270/se-2?accountid=1343

Myrick, K., Helms Mills, J., & Mills, A. J. (2013). History-making and the Academy of Management: an ANTi-History perspective. *Management & Organizational History*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2013.821662

Nossal, K. R. (2000). Home-grown IR: The Canadianization of international relations. *Journal of Canadian Studies, 35*(1), 95-114.

Novicevic, M., M., D., Humphreys, J., Seifried, C. (2019). Both loved and despised: Uncovering a process of collective contestation in leadership identification. *Organization*, *26*(2), 236-254. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/10.1177/1350508418812567

Novicevic, M. M., & Jones, L. (2014). *Decentering Wren's History of Management Thought.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.

Ooi, C. (2002). Persuasive histories: Decentering, recentering and the emotional crafting of the

past. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *15*(6), 606-621. doi:

10.1108/09534810210449569

Page, J. E. (1981). *Reflections on the Symons report : the state of Canadian studies in 1980 : a*

report prepared for the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada. [Ottawa, Ont.]:

Secretary of State.

Papadopoulos, N., & Rosson, P. (1999). Inventory and analysis of Canadian research and and

scholarship in exporting and international marketing. *Canadian Journal of Administrative*

Sciences, 16(2), 77-94.

Pasquero, & Laroche (1985, May 29). *Minutes of the executive meeting*. Archives of Canadian

Management.

Peltonen, T. (2015). History of management thought in context: the case of Elton Mayo in

Australia. In P. G. McLaren, A. J. Mills, & T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *Routledge*

Companion to Management & Organizational History (pp. 380-384). London: Routledge.

Phipps, S. T.A. (2011). Mary, Mary, quite contrary. *Journal of Management History, 17*(3), 270-

281.

Powell, J. (2005). 'Modernist' Sociology in a 'Postmodern' world? *The International Journal of*

Sociology and Social Policy, *25*(10/11), 1-13. doi:

http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/10.1108/01443330510791351

Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting Qualitative Research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. New

York, New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Ritchie, J. R. (1981). *A proposal to establish a Canadian journal of administrative sciences.*

Retrieved from Canadian management archive.

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton University Press.

Rowlinson, M. (2004). Historical Perspectives in Organization Studies: Factual, Narrative, and

    Archaeo-Genealogical. In D. E. Hodgson & C. Carter (Eds.), *Management Knowledge*

    and The New Employee (pp. 8-20). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Rugman, A. (1986). The determinants of Canadian outward direct investment. *Proceedings of*

    the annual conference of ASAC IB division, p. 96-108.

Russell, J. (2015). Organization men and women: making managers at Bell Canada from the

    1940s to the 1960s. *Management & Organizational History, 10*(3-4), 213-229.

    doi:10.1080/17449359.2015.1098546

Russell, J. (2019). Finding a turn in Canadian management through archival sources. *Journal of*

    Management History, 25(4), 550-564. doi:

    http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/10.1108/JMH-02-2018-0020

Russell, J. (2021). *Canada, A Working History*. Toronto: Dundurn.

Saks, A., Ashforth, B. (1996). *Organizational socialization: The effects of stressors and self-*

    efficacy. Proceedings of the annual conference of the Administrative Sciences Association

    of Canada, 11-20.

Saks, A. M., Mudrack, P. E., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). The relationship between the work ethic,

    job attitudes, intentions to quit, and turnover for temporary service employees. *Canadian*

    Journal of Administrative Sciences, 13(3), 226-236. Retrieved from

    http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/relationship-between-work-ethic-job-

    attitudes/docview/204869375/se-2?accountid=1343

Schachter, H. L. (2018). Labor at the Taylor Society: Scientific management and a proactive approach to increase diversity for effective problem solving. *Journal of Management History*, *24*(1), 7-19. doi: 10.1108/JMH-06-2017-0031

Schwarzkopf, S. (2012). What is an archive: And were is it? – Why business historians need a constructive theory of the archive. *Business Archives, 105*(11), 1-9.

Secord, P., & Corrigan, L. T. (2017). ANTi-history and the entrepreneurial work of privateers. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management, 12*(2), 94-110. doi: http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/10.1108/QROM-06-2016-1389

Smith, D. (1999). *Writing the social: Critique, theory and investigations*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, G. E. (2007). Management history and historical context: Potential benefits of its inclusion in the management curriculum. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *6*(4), 522-533. Retrieved from http: //libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest- com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/management-history-historical-context- potential/docview/223309658/se-2?accountid=1343

Smith, J. H. (1998). The enduring legacy of Elton Mayo. *Human relations*, *51*(3), 221-249.

Steele, J., & Mathews, R. (2006). Canadianization revisited: A comment on Cormier's "The Canadianization movement in context". *Canadian Journal of Sociology, 31*(4), 491-508.

Stone, T. H., & Smith, F. L. (1996). A contingency theory of human resource management devolution. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 13*(1), 1-12. Retrieved from http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca

/scholarly-journals/contingency-theory-human-resource-management/docview

/204883966/se-2?accountid=1343

Suddaby, R. (2016). Toward a historical consciousness: Following the historic turn in

management thought. *M@n@gement, 19*(1), 46-60.

Symons, T. H. B. (1978). *To know ourselves : the report of the Commission on Canadian

Studies*. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

Symons, T. H. B. (2000). The state of Canadian studies at the year 2000: Some observations.

Journal of Canadian Studies, 35(1), 27-51.

Symons, T. H. B. (2013). Forty years on: An interview with Thomas H.B. Symons. *Canadian

Issues*, 14-19.

Tancred-Sheriff, P., & Campbell, E. J. (1992). Room for women: A case study in the sociology

of organizations. In A. J. Mills & P.Tancred (Eds.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis*

(pp. 31-45). Newbury Park: Sage.

Tiratsoo, N. (2004). The "Americanization" of Management Education in Britain. *Journal of

Management Inquiry, 13*(2), 118-126. doi: 10.1177/1056492604265329

Tirtiroglu, D. (2002). Real estate finance in Canada: A preamble. *Canadian Journal of

Administrative Sciences, 19*(4), 317.

Ivey School of Business, University of Western Ontario. (n.d.). P. W. (Paul) Beamish. Retrieved

from https://www.ivey.uwo.ca/faculty/directory/Paul-Beamish/

Urwick, L. F. (1938). *Scientific Principles and organization*. American Management

Association.

Usdiken, B. (2004). Americanization of European Management Education in Historical and

    Comparative Perspective: A Symposium. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 13*(2), 87-89.

    doi: 10.1177/1056492604265224

Üsdiken, B., & Wasti, S. A. (2009). Preaching, Teaching and Researching at the

    Periphery:Academic Management Literature in Turkey, 1970-1999. *Organization*

    Studies, 30(10), 1063. doi: 10.1177/0170840609337952

Vaara, E., & Lamberg, J. A. (2015). Taking Historical Embeddedness Seriously: Three

    Historical Approaches to Advance Strategy Process and Practice Research. *Academy of*

    Management Review, 41(4), 633-657. doi: 10.5465/amr.2014.0172

Van Fleet, D. D., Wren, D. A. (2005). Teaching history in business schools: 1982-2003.

    Academy of Management Learning, 4(1), 44-56. Retrieved from

    http://libproxy.mtroyal.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-

    com.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/scholarly-journals/teaching-history-business-schools-1982-

    2003/docview/223324005/se-2?accountid=1343

Wanderley, S. & Faria, A. (2012). The Chandler-Furtado case: a decolonial (re)framing of a

    North/South (dis)encounter. *Management & Organizational History*, *7*(3), 219-236.

Weatherbee, T., Durepos, G., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2012). Theorizing the Past: Critical

    engagements. *Management & Organizational History*, *7*(3), 193–202.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1744935912444358

Whithey, M. (1988). Antecedents of value based and economic organizational commitment.

    Proceedings of the annual conference of the Administrative Sciences Association of

    Canada, 124-133

Wren, D. A. (1972). The Evolution of Management thought, New York.

Wren, D. A. and Hay, R. D. (1977). Management historians and business historians: differing

perceptions of pioneer contributions. *Academy of Management Journal*, *20*(3), 470-476.

Wren, D. A. (2005). *The history of management thought: An evolutionary approach* (5th ed.).

New York: John Wiley & Sons

Wren, D. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (2009). *The Evolution of Management Thought* (Sixth ed.).

Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wolf, W. B. (1996). Reflections on the history of management thought. *Journal of Management

History, 2*(2), 4-10.

doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.mtroyal.ca/10.1108/13552529610106806

Zur-Muehlen, M. (1979). *University Management Education and Research in Canada: Some

Unresolved Issues*. Paper presented at the Administrative Sciences Association of

Canada, Saskatoon.